

LAMLEH AND NON-LAMLEH; NEVER THE TWAIN SHALL MEET?

TT WORLD CONGRESS, UK, 14th MAY 2017

Dr Mike Tempest (Mikudi TTs, UK)

Just 'out of the blue' some months ago I received a phone call from Philippa Gilbert who said that the Congress Organising Committee, at Pat Tempest's suggestion, wanted to ask if I would talk about 'Lamlehs'. My first reaction was what a 'poisoned chalice' this could turn out to be, but the request was made because I have owned, bred and shown both 'Lamleh' and 'non-Lamleh' dogs, and combinations of them, so it didn't take me long to say yes. I'm also not the sort of person who would shy away from any challenge, especially if it could be good for the breed! When I received the final Congress Agenda I could see that my talk was to be the discussion opener under the heading "Addressing topical issues" and I asked myself "Lamleh – a topical issue?" – yes 'Lamleh' always seems to have been a topical issue! So, I deliberated long and hard as to how I would approach this thorny subject. I didn't want to talk about the history of 'Lamleh' dogs, or repeat previous writings from other TT enthusiasts such as Angela Mulliner and Jane Reif, except for two quotes from Angela Mulliner's book, as you can read their writings in other places. I therefore decided to put some facts to you about the derivation of 'Lamlehs' and 'non-Lamlehs' in the hope that we can all understand one another in a better way.

You will note that I have just used the term 'Lamleh' in my introduction, so I am going to say right at the outset that such a term is not really a correct term for today's dogs. Why? Because there are no 'Lamlehs' in the TT population now, nor are there any 'Lamlehs' currently being bred. **'Lamlehs' were only bred by Dr Greig.** There are some breeders and owners who constantly say: "my dogs are Lamlehs", but this is incorrect. I repeat 'Lamlehs' were only bred by Dr Greig, and furthermore Dr Greig would probably have never used the breeding combinations that are behind modern day 'Lamlehs'. What I think the modern day 'Lamleh' breeders and owners are trying to say is that their dogs are "exclusively descended from Dr Greig's Lamleh dogs", but even the accuracy of this statement needs to be examined, and I will do this shortly. However, I will acknowledge that it's a bit of a mouthful to say every time they describe their dogs: "my dogs are exclusively descended from Dr Greig's Lamleh dogs"! So, I want to be a bit compassionate and say that I recognise what they mean, I accept the short cut to say: "my dogs are Lamlehs" and I would like to think that all the 'non-Lamleh' breeders and owners would do that.

I also want to say I do admire those breeders who have bred TTs that are exclusively descended from Dr Greig's Lamleh dogs, and have stuck to their principles over many decades and over many canine generations. BUT it has always been a bone of contention in this breed that some of them claim that 'Lamlehs' are the only true Tibetan Terriers, as if 'Lamlehs' are 'holier than thou'; and they often refer to 'non-Lamlehs' as 'the crossbreds'. So, as I have just a few words ago asked for the understanding of 'non-Lamleh breeders' and owners towards the use of the phrase "my dogs are Lamlehs", I am now asking that 'Lamleh' enthusiasts recognise that TTs of 'non-Lamleh' and any other breeding are not crossbreds. I will eventually provide facts that show the term 'crossbreds' could equally well be applied to some dogs that are claimed to be 'Lamlehs'.

Another thing that I want to say is that the 'Lamleh' name has been protected by the TTA from use by other breeders in the UK, but we are all aware that the word 'Lamleh' is highly used by other breeders who are not in the UK as part of the naming process of their dogs. Perhaps we should reflect for a moment and consider whether that offers respect to the real 'Lamlehs' of Dr Greig.

To consider this matter further, I need to analyse why 'non-Lamlehs' are labelled 'crossbreds'; and analyse the term "exclusively descended from Dr Greig's Lamleh dogs". The term 'crossbreds' for 'non-Lamleh' dogs was I think first used by Dr Greig to describe

John and Connie Downey's foundation dog Trojan Kynos, whom we all know was found on the dockside at Morecambe in England, and the derogatory 'crossbred' term has persisted throughout the history of the breed. This was not only because Dr Greig thought that the dog was not a purebred TT, but also probably because it couldn't be proven that he was as there was no record of his sire and dam. Angela Mulliner wrote that Dr Greig's objections were on genetic rather than aesthetic grounds.

So, to pull together the two threads of 'crossbred' and "exclusively descended from Dr Greig's Lamleh dogs" I am going to show some pedigrees, and it may surprise you when I tell you I'm going to start with the pedigree of Luneville Prince Khan, because his pedigree begins to pull these threads together (Figure 1).

The first thing to notice is that Prince Khan was sired by a 'Lamleh' dog out of a daughter of that 'crossbred' Trojan Kynos – it was indeed strange that Dr Greig allowed this mating when she was so against 'the crossbred'? But it shows the twain (the Lamlehs and the Non-Lamlehs) have met, and met very early in the history of our breed (Luneville Prince Khan was born in 1960). Prince Khan's sire was Kala Kah of Lamleh, so the initial reaction is that he was 50% Lamleh! But look further, in Prince Khan's third generation we have another Lamleh, Pa-Sang, adding a further 12½% of 'Lamleh' breeding (parents each contribute 50%, grand-parents 25%, and great-grandparents 12½%) BUT a 'Latmah' is taking away 12½%. So, for the time being let's take it that Prince Khan was 50% Lamleh. All of this assumes that Kala Kah and Pa-Sang were 100% 'Lamleh'. We may have to amend this thinking when we put in more information later, but at this initial stage later – we can say that Luneville Prince Khan was more Lamleh (50%) than 'crossbred' (25%)!

Next I want to look at the pedigrees of four dogs that are in Prince Khan's pedigree - Kala Kah himself, and in the third generation: Zana of Latmah, Pa-Sang of Lamleh and Princess Chan. Let me get Princess Chan out of the way first. She was not a Lamleh, she was owned by Miss H Slaughter, but crucially her sire and dam were both unknown, but she wasn't labelled a 'crossbred'!

So, to Kala Kah - you will see in his pedigree (Figure 2), in the second generation the aforementioned Latmah bitch called Zana of Latmah, who herself is half Lamleh, so we can add a further 6¼% Lamleh to Prince Khan's origin (because we are in his 4th generation) to now make him 56¼% 'Lamleh'. BUT in the third generation of Kala Kah is a bitch called Lady Towsa whose pedigree was unknown - why was she not labelled 'a crossbred'? So here we have a so-called 'Lamleh' dog (Kala Kah) that on two counts was not 100% Lamleh! He himself was only 87½% Lamleh.

Now to Pa-Sang of Lamleh (Figure 3). First in the third generation on his sire's side there are two 'Ladkoks' – which was Dr Greig's mother's kennel name, this distinction may be somewhat too pedantic but strictly speaking they were not 'Lamlehs'. There were another two 'Ladkoks' on Pa-Sang's dam's side, but of more significance is Mingtong in Pa-Sang's second generation on his dam's side, leading back to Boochak Ali who was neither 'Lamleh' nor 'Ladkok'. Mingtong was bred by Mrs A K Marsh-Smith, and we can see in her pedigree (Figure 4) that Boochak Ali's dam was a bitch called Platinum Blonde, whose parents Pan Assahl and Betty were unregistered. Pan Assahl's sire and dam were Cupid Assahl and Psyche Assahl, both unregistered, but Betty's pedigree is unknown. How do we know they were not 'crossbreds'? Even Luvmi of Lamleh (and her dam Gyan Tse of Lamleh) and Yukshee of Lamleh are of unknown pedigree. Putting the 'Lamleh' name on these acquired bitches does not confer 'Lamleh' status, and it is not accurate to consider them as Lamlehs.

Pa-Sang of Lamleh was therefore only 41% Lamleh [41% Lamleh, 56% Ladkok, 3% unknown]. **He was less of a Lamleh than Prince Khan**, let me put that the other way around: **Luneville Prince Khan was more Lamleh than Pa-Sang of Lamleh!** And Pa-Sang had two dogs with unknown breeding in his pedigree (Pan Assahl and Betty), the same as Prince Khan (Trojan Kynos and Princess Chan). The proportion of Prince Khan that is Lamleh now must be factored back a little because Kala Kah and Pa-Sang were not 100% Lamleh, but he is still more Lamleh than Pa-Sang.

Why have I said all of this? For two reasons (1) Because I wanted to show the integration of 'Lamlehs' and 'Non-Lamlehs' from very early in the history of our breed in the UK – a lot earlier than the 1960 of Prince Khan; and (2) **I want issues to be based on facts** - that in 'Lamleh' pedigrees we have many TTs not associated with Dr Greig – in addition to Lady Towsa, Pan Assahl, Betty, Gyan Tse and Yukshee already mentioned, there is Princess Salli, Audrey of Carolina, Ukie, Chang of Ormesby and others, all brought in by other people from Tibet with unknown pedigrees, but if Dr Greig objected to Trojan Kynos on genetic grounds, why did she not object to these on the same basis? There is no difference in principle between these and Trojan Kynos, all of whom had unknown parentage, but it was only Trojan Kynos that was labelled 'the crossbred', and these others weren't! This is illogical and hypocritical! For all we know those others could have been 'crossbreds'! And even more recently introduced by the 'Lamleh' breeders we have another 'non-Lamleh' by name of Kanze, pedigree unknown, no proof that he was TT or crossbred?

Even though the above is very important in this issue, I'm now going to say something extremely important, not thought of by me but written by Angela Mulliner (Vol 1 of her TT book): "these new lines intermingled with those of Dr Greig's original imports, so that **today it seems impossible to trace any pedigree of a living TT containing only Dr Greig's own original bloodlines**". That was written in 1977 – 40 years ago, equivalent to 10 dog generations ago. If that statement was true then, it is even more true now! So, what is a 'Lamleh'? What does it mean does to say: "my dogs are Lamlehs"? maybe it no longer means "my dogs are exclusively descended from Dr Greig's Lamleh dogs"! Maybe they should be called 'Ladkoks' or 'Ladkok-Lamlehs' but even then, there is unknown ancestry behind them.

So those who claim: "my dogs are Lamlehs"; those who claim that their dogs are 100% descendants of the breed's original population; and that the 'Lamleh' line never experienced interference from dogs of questionable, unknown origin should think again. They should be careful what they wish for; because all is not as it seems!

To put my cards on the table: I am not a 'Lamleh' fanatic, nor am I a 'non-Lamleh' fanatic, but I am a fanatic of quality TTs no matter what their breeding is; and what I would like to see happening as a consequence of this paper is a coming together to be able to appreciate quality in each other's dogs. No more forcing of unsolicited opinions on other breeders/exhibitors; no more "holier than thou" and "better than all the rest"; no more 'crossbreds'; no more separate 'Lamleh' meetings to which others are excluded; an end to this futile, separatist 'Lamleh' versus 'non-Lamleh' argument. There are exceptionally good TTs in both camps, and in the UK both win and this seems to be accepted generally without acrimony, but the continual divisive labelling of the 'non-Lamlehs' as 'crossbreds', which is still perpetuated on websites and social media has got to stop. We need to respect each other's breeding lines, and encourage breeders and owners to be able to 'do their own thing' without constant criticism.

In answer to my original question, "Never the twain shall meet?" I have shown that in the breeding of the dogs the 'twain' have already met, they met very early on in TT history, and many successful breeders have in the past combined, and are in the present combining, the best of both 'Lamleh' and 'non-Lamleh'. Now it's up to us. I sincerely hope we can end the divide and become one TT community. It would be a great achievement of this World Congress if we can acknowledge that.