

Welcome to the first issue of the Coalition For Animals and Animal Research (CFAAR) Newsletter! Like many of you, we feel that we can no longer remain inactive in the struggle against animal rights activists.

The success of the first meeting in April, 1990 was promising and encouraged us to establish a local chapter of CFAAR. CFAAR is a nonprofit educational organization formed by students, faculty and staff at UC Berkeley in the spring of 1988 in response to activities by those who attempt to discredit animal research and animal researchers. Undoubtedly, you have read about this group in **The Scientist** of the journal **Science**. Several months ago we contacted Dr. Sharon Russell at CFAAR Berkeley and received literature about starting an active group and free use of the CFAAR logo. This Newsletter marks the debut of the newly formed Arizona Chapter of CFAAR which will include all institutions in the state. Our objectives are the following:

1. To **organize** faculty, students and staff at institutions in Arizona in which animal research is performed so that effective letter writing campaigns can be quickly initiated.
2. To **educate** the public about the true nature of animal research and animal researchers.
3. To **support** the responsible and humane use of animals in biomedical research.

The first of these objectives will be the primary function of the group. As legislation is introduced that effects animal research, we need to respond so that our representatives know exactly how the people want them to vote. Accordingly, through our newsletter, we will help inform you about the legislation and other "happenings" concerning attacks on animal research. Our goal is to make it as easy as possible for you to contact your representatives in Washington D.C. The key to the effectiveness of this organization is you! We need your willingness to write an occasional letter, perhaps talk with a school group and, of course, give a few dollars to cover the cost of printing the newsletter.

If you wish to join the Arizona Chapter of CFAAR and want to continue to receive the Newsletter, fill out the application for membership on the back page. Please include a voluntary contribution. Remember, it will be used to support publication costs of the Newsletter and gather new materials.

Special Guest Speaker

Charles Nicoll, Ph.D.
Professor of Integrative Biology
Co-founder CFAAR

"A Physiologist's Views on
the Animal Rights Controversy"

March 25, 1991, 12 noon

**University Medical Center
DuVal Auditorium
ANIMAL RIGHTS IN AMERICA'S
CLASSROOMS**

The next animal rights activist you meet just might be 12 years old.

Across the country, animal rights organizations are visiting classrooms, sponsoring after-school clubs, and providing teachers and students with educational materials that explain the rights of animals, and the wrongs of the use of animals for research, product safety testing, or food production.

The appeal of the animal rights movement for children is clear. Children love animals, care about the environment, and generally root for the underdog. Having learned that the use of animals is wrong, their beliefs will influence their lives and career choices.

People for the Ethical Treatment of animals (PETA) is in the forefront of student activism, with two paid outreach coordinators who visit schools; PETA KIDS, a magazine for elementary and junior high students; animal rights music festivals; an album, "Animal Liberation"; and an "Animal Rights 101" class.

Representatives of PETA recently spent a day at a Washington area high school to show "Unnecessary Fuss", a shocking and graphic film that misrepresents research, to all of the school's sociology and psychology classes. Not surprisingly, the exact nature of the presentation came as something of a surprise to the administration and many parents.

PETA KIDS, available in a number of school classrooms and libraries, mixes children's drawings and poems with

interviews with kids who are "changing the world" through animal rights activities. You can read about the student who took animal rights literature door to door instead of collecting Halloween candy, or helped a mouse through a maze to escape a bespectacled scientist brandishing a hypodermic and a large knife. Need more information? PETA has a library pack just for you, and will send books and videotapes to your school.

PETA is especially good at providing animal rights role models who are young and hip, like teen heartthrob River Phoenix (even his dog is on a vegetarian diet), or singers Belinda Carlisle and Howard Jones.

While PETA's message is fairly explicit, many animal rights educational materials reach the classroom under the guise of humane or environmental education. A humane educator visiting an elementary school classroom may progress from lessons on animal care and the spaying and neutering of pets to the horrors of animal research, cosmetic testing and factory farming.

Barraged with pro-animal rights materials, it's no wonder that student groups are springing up like wildfire, often sponsored as clubs or extracurricular activities that help the environment or benefit endangered species. Petitions, boycotts and demonstrations are popular activities for idealistic adolescents.

Even traditional youth organizations are feeling the heat. The 4-H Club, bastion of animal husbandry and American values, has been attacked by animal rights groups because young members raise food animals for profit. The Boy Scouts, too, were assailed for survival courses that involved the killing and eating of animals.

The success of the animal rights movement in reaching America's classrooms can be traced to a number of

factors: the effectiveness of grassroots organization, active campaigns to recruit students, and the appeal of a movement that is presented as an environmental and ethical issue.

Equally important, students aren't hearing anything different. Many teachers are just as unaware as the rest of the general public of the importance of animal research, or the real goals of the animal rights movement. Most of the students who contact FBR for positive information on the use of animals in research, testing or education complain that while their opponents have videotapes and stacks of antivivisection literature, they can find no information on the benefits of animal use.

Science education, the one area of the curriculum where one would expect the importance of animal models to be stressed, is at an all time low. Between the 10th and 12th grades the number of students taking sciences drops 50%. The students who do stick with science appear to be getting less and less out of it. The National Science Foundation discovered that hands-on activities in science classes, important for sparking interest, have dropped between 15 and 27%, depending on the grade. One of the chief casualties seems to be biology class dissection.

The National Association of Biology Teachers proposes using alternatives whenever possible, and biology textbooks are being revised to eliminate dissection as a major activity.

So, how are students to learn about the contribution humane and responsible research makes to the health of both man and animals?

When Dr Robert Stuhlman saw students writing the local paper in support of animal rights this fall, he knew it was time to get involved. Stuhlman, Director of the Laboratory Animal Resources Program at Wright State University, quickly invited

area schools to tour the laboratory animal facilities to learn how animals are really used for research and teaching. Although he cautions this is not an option for labs where students might be exposed to hazardous materials, thousands of visitors have toured Wright State's facility since it began its open-door policy in 1975.

Animal rights activists have already made student education a number one priority. Can we do anything less?

(Reprinted with permission from Central Illinois AALAS Newsletter)

"BEYOND CRUELTY" LAWSUIT

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) announced at a news conference on February 15, 1990 that it had filed a \$3 million libel suit against Katie McCabe, author of the article "Beyond Cruelty" in the February 1990 issue of The Washingtonian. Alex Pacheco, co-founder and chairman of PETA, states that the "article's misstatements can be classified into three categories . . . first, that the Silver Spring Monkeys did not suffer and that evidence used to convict Dr. Edward Taub was "staged" . . . the second . . . of financial misconduct . . . the third . . . paint(s) PETA as engaged in funding illegal activities."

Jack Limpert, editor of The Washingtonian, when asked to comment about the PETA lawsuit, as well as two other suits against the magazine, said, "in 25 years of publication, we've never lost a suit for anything we've published. We're confident and we'll fight these suits and win them".

Letters of support to Ms. McCabe can be sent to the attention of: John Limpert, Editor, Washingtonian Magazine, 1826 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

MORE "BEYOND CRUELTY" FALLOUT

The following letter, dated April 13, 1990, was addressed to three San Antonio CFAAR members from Alex Pacheco, chairman and co-founder of PETA:

"It has come to my attention that your organization, the Coalition for Animals and Animal Research (CFAAR), distributed an article written by Ms. Katie McCabe entitled "Beyond Cruelty" published earlier this year in the Washingtonian Magazine.

"The Washingtonian article, which CFAAR distributed, contains totally false, malicious and defamatory statements which can be refuted by transcripts of court testimony and other records. It has resulted in PETA's and my filing a \$3 million libel suit against Ms. McCabe personally. Be advised that any further publication or distribution of this article is a further publication of libel.

"I hereby request that you cease all distribution of "Beyond Cruelty" immediately.

"If I do not receive a response from you within ten calendar days, I shall consider your lack of response to mean that you are not willing to cease distribution of "Beyond Cruelty". Such conduct will exacerbate the harm already done. Please address all communication to my office by fax or telephone. We await your response."

The response, reprinted by permission, is as follows:

"I have received your letter of April 13. Thank you very much for making me aware of your opinion regarding the article "Beyond Cruelty", by Katie McCabe. As the courts have yet to decide whether the article constitutes libel, and as the article is in the public domain, with The Washingtonian having granted permission

for its duplication, I see no reason not to distribute it if I choose, although I do not have specific additional plans to do so. I have seen nothing that would convince me that statements in the article are untrue, and much of the article contains material with which I am familiar from other sources and appears to be very accurately reported.

"I would, of course, be happy to review the "court testimony and other records" to which you refer in your letter of April 13. Please send me the details with regard to which items in "Beyond Cruelty" you assert to be libelous and the documentation that will be used to demonstrate this in court. If in my judgement, on the basis of this material the article contains substantial factual errors, I will cease to distribute it.

"I would add that there is one thing that your organization might do, if it really wished to convince the public that it had no association with the terrorism against research and agricultural facilities, retail outlets, and individuals carried out by members of the Animal Liberation Front: Condemn their activities, as have many animal welfare and animal rights organizations. Refuse materials stolen by ALF, and don't defend their associates in criminal trials. This would show us all that PETA believes in actions within the limits of the law and put you in good stead to argue that PETA does not support criminal activities and terrorism."

OVERWHELMING PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR ANIMAL RESEARCH

Approximately 77% of U.S. adults surveyed agreed that the use of animals in biomedical research is necessary for progress in medicine, 17% disagreed and 6% were unsure.

The survey, commissioned by the

AMA, was conducted by the Gallup Organization's Houston office. 1,500 U.S. residents were randomly selected from a Gallup database of 2 million households. The sampling error was +/- 2.5% at the 95% confidence level.

When asked if they actually support the use of animals in biomedical

research 64% did support it, 29% did not and 6% were unsure. Support varied with education and the income level of those responding. Among college graduates 75% supported this research and among those with earnings greater than \$50,000/year 76% supported the use of animals in biomedical research.

Also of interest was the opinion on the use of pound animals for research purposes. 71% of those surveyed favored allowing biomedical researchers the use of animals that otherwise would be put to death at the local pound. 22% opposed the practice and 7% were unsure.

- American Medical News, June 1989

**Coalition For Animals & Animal Research
Donation Form and Membership Application**

Name: _____

Mailing Address: (Campus, if available)

Phone: _____

Institutional Affiliation (if any): _____

Faculty ()

Staff ()

Student ()

Other ()

I have enclosed a contribution of \$10 \$20 \$50 Other _____

A subscription to CFAAR News is included with your donation.

Make checks payable to **CFAAR** and return to: **CFAAR, University of Arizona, Bldg 101, Tucson, AZ, 85721**

We are in the process of applying for tax-exempt status.