

bases that COSSA has sought to protect. The money is therefore welcome, but, notes Miller, "the other side of the coin is that there is not much of an increase left for research."

In general, COSSA's analysis shows that funding for social and behavioral science research was cut in the Office of Human Development Services in the Department of Health and Human Services, the Policy Development and Research budget in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the clinical training budget in the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). NIMH's research budget was increased by 12 percent, however, and there were large boosts in the budgets for research on alcoholism and drug abuse.

—COLIN NORMAN

Primate Centers Brace for Protests

Proponents of animal welfare are planning major demonstrations at federal primate research centers across the nation on 24 April to protest alleged abuses of primates. Leaders of animal welfare groups are promising peaceful marches, but officials at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which funds the primate centers, are uneasy that the large crowds expected will become unruly.

The demonstrations are being coordinated by a new group called the Mobilization for Animals, a coalition of about 100 groups in the United States and abroad. The marches are likely to attract much support, given the publicity about the recent conviction of Maryland researcher, Edward Taub, who was found negligent in his care of laboratory monkeys. (The Court of Appeals of Maryland recently decided to consider an appeal filed by Taub and will hear the case in May.) Taub's former lab assistant, Alex Pacheco, who brought the abuses to the attention of authorities, is a leader in the coalition.

Demonstrations are to be held at four of the seven primate research centers, located in the Boston suburb of Southboro; Atlanta; Madison; and Davis, California. Marches in cities overseas are also planned to coincide with the U.S. protest.

Fliers advertising the marches paint a gory picture of animal research. "The animals cannot speak, cannot defend themselves, cannot stop the torture. . . . Help us bring this blood-drenched age to a close," one pamphlet appeals. Information distributed by the group gives the impression that there are many good alternatives to animal testing, such as mathematical modeling and tissue culture, for a wide variety of experiments. Scientists vigorously dispute this point.

The group is demanding several changes in the way primate research is conducted. It wants access to primate centers to ensure proper care of animals, membership on committees at primate centers and NIH, and elimination of duplication in primate research. It is also calling on NIH to close down the centers located in Beaverton, Oregon, and Covington, Louisiana, because of their allegedly poor track record in animal care, according to Don Barnes, a group spokesman. (The seventh center is located in Seattle.)

NIH director of primate centers, Leo A. Whitehair, says that all the centers are "on the alert." The coalition, he



Animal abuse charged

says, has promised to conduct orderly demonstrations, "but there are bound to be radical elements." He says the centers will depend mainly on police protection. But Whitehair downplays NIH's concern. "No one's lost any sleep over this."

Of greater concern to Whitehair and other NIH officials is the animal group's effect on upcoming budget hearings on Capitol Hill. Animal welfare organizations in general have developed much more political savvy during the past year and are expected to lobby heavily. The NIH primate centers program was allotted \$18 million for fiscal year 1982.

—MARJORIE SUN

Some Haunting Words on Arms Control

A senior strategic analyst at the Stanford Research Institute reviled the field of arms control a few years back. "I can't think of any negotiations on security or weaponry that have done any good," he said. "In a democracy, these negotiations tend to discourage money for defense programs. The public says, 'why increase the military when we're negotiating with the Russians?'"

The analyst said that he thought arms talks could be held anyway. "We are willing to have a real reduction in nuclear weapons," he said. But such negotiations would be unlikely to result in success. "My policy would be to do it for political reasons." This would be a "sham." But the subterfuge might be successful if a diplomat was dispatched overseas, "very low key," and the arms talks then went unmentioned. "If anyone brings up the subject," the analyst explained, "you can say, 'we have a guy over there.'" In this manner can U.S. allies and the American public be placated.

The analyst is Kenneth Adelman, who was 34 years old when he made these remarks to Ken Auletta, a columnist at the *New York Daily News*, in 1981. A month ago, President Reagan nominated Adelman to be the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) in Washington. When these remarks were subsequently called to the attention of the Administration, ACDA released a statement that "Adelman does not recall having said anything of the sort and those quotes certainly do not reflect his thinking."

Auletta replied that "there is nothing to discuss here. He said what he said and I printed it." Senator Alan Cranston (D-Calif.), who brought the interview to the attention of his colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on 16 February, said that "if these quotes are accurate, it seems to me that they are so serious as to disqualify Mr. Adelman." President Reagan's immediate response was to reiterate his support. "I think he is eminently qualified for this," Reagan said. "All of his experience indicates it."

—R. JEFFREY SMITH