

Other branches of CFAAR may reprint without prior permission any portion of the contents of this newsletter, provided proper author, title and publication credits, where applicable, are given. The editorial board reserves the right to edit information submitted for publication in the newsletter.

CFAAR: Who We Are

CFAAR is a nonprofit educational organization which formed originally in 1988 on the University of California-Berkeley campus. The organization was formed in response to activities which were attempting to discredit animal research and animal researchers. Several local CFAAR chapters have since sprung up across the country. These groups share the following objectives:

- 1) To **organize** students, faculty and staff at institutions in Arizona in which animal research is performed so effective letter writing campaigns can be initiated quickly.
- 2) To **educate** the public in general and the campus in particular about the true nature of animal research and animal researchers.
- 3) To **support** 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 affects animal research, we need to respond so our representatives know exactly how we, the people, want them to vote. Accordingly, through our newsletter, we will help inform you about 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.

Animal Rights Group's Tactics Provoke Anger By Marc Rodriguez

The dust may have settled, but the debate continues. Be it "terrorism" or "humanitarian Desperation" many students are questioning the effectiveness of Friday morning's animal rights demonstration which destroyed part of Anthony Hall.

The Animal Liberation Front, ALF, a national animal rights group, claimed responsibility for breaking in and ransacking the office of an animal science professor. The group released a statement through People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, citing statistics on alleged animal abuse at Michigan State University facilities.

The group also poured sulfuric acid on feeding equipment and removed identification tags of 350 research minks. The group justified its actions as an attempt to raise public awareness and warned it would be back.

Some students are ready for the group. Veterinary medicine freshman Sharisse Berk said Friday's demonstration was "totally asinine." She said she questions the acts of any group that justifies violence as a means of proving its point.

Berk, who is involved with ferret research, said the group didn't act out of altruism. If the ALF intentions were based on humanitarian aims, it would respect the professionals who work on the behalf of animals, she said. "They are not using their heads," Berk said.

Veterinary medicine freshman Douglas Eckert said the act was not effective because it attempted to relieve animal suffering through potentially fatal means.

Eckert said negative connotations are often elicited through such radical demonstrations and inadvertently mute the original aim. He believes in the group's right to an opinion, but said it needs to find different ways of expressing it's ideas. "It's certainly not going to further their cause," he said.

Veterinary science freshman Melissa Behrens said she learned in animal science class that the ALF is labeled a terrorist group by the FBI. In a particular manual circulated to members, the animal rights group explained how to create a homemade bomb.

Calling it's acts "self-defeating," Behrens said the group needs to distinguish between the rights of animals and humans.

William Foster, a veterinary medicine freshman, said he was sickened when he heard about Friday's event. He challenged the ALF to develop an effective dialogue before resorting to violence."

Foster said if he could speak face to face with a representative of the ALF, he would call them "cowards." He said he wouldn't condone violence as a tool of persuasion. "The more I think about it, the angrier I get," he said.

(The State News [MSU], March 2, 1992)

Mink Research Ok By Federal Standards By Jeff L. Kart

Mink are used in research as model animals because they are extremely sensitive to environmental contaminants.

Michigan State University animal science Professor Richard Aulerich has conducted animal research projects for 32 years.

The professor's mink studies focused on nutrition, physiology, diseases and management, Aulerich said.

By exposing the animals to substances like DDT, PCB/s and dioxins, Aulerich discovered the long-term effects of the chemicals. In some of these tests, the toxins were applied directly to the animals's skin, he said. Aulerich's research was used by the Environmental Protection Agency to establish water quality standards for people.

His latest research was devoted to determining why the numbers of wild mink and otter were declining in the Great Lakes area. A feeding study used carp from the Saginaw Bay in the animal diet. Several generations of mink fed on fish from the Great Lakes were observed.

Fur animal physiology, management and toxicology also are included in Aulerich's research.

There are some 1,200 mink farmers in the United States that produce more than 4.5 million mink annually. Aulerich's mink projects received \$10,000 in funding from the Mink Farmer's Research Foundation in 1991, he said.

His programs also were funded by an additional \$50,000 to \$100,000 grants from the EPA, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The State of Michigan provided \$83,000 for a two-year study beginning in 1991, Aulerich said.

All of Aulerich's research was periodically reviewed by the All University Committee on Animal Use and Care, as required by federal law.

(The State News [MSU], March 2, 1992)

Harm-Free Research Lost In Fire By Jeff L. Kart

Ten years of data from a second MSU researcher have been added to the toll of damage waged by Friday's fires at Anthony Hall.

Assistant animal science professor Karen Chou worked with mice and swine, using sperm as a substitute for the animals in technology testing.

A fire in her office destroyed more than 200 computer disks. Her office is next to Professor Richard Aulerich's targeted in the Friday attack.

Chou was in Seattle when the fire wiped out her work. She planned to use most of the material for a book.

"I had an idea in my mind," Chou said. "I thought about a concept. Day by day, I accumulated those ideas and put them into the computer. So this is 10 years of thinking, 10 years I've spent - and I can't relive my life."

Chou's research methods are endorsed by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, the same group that issued a news release on the raids Friday. The Animal Liberation Front, speaking through PETA, claimed responsibility for vandalizing Aulerich's office and splashing sulfuric acid on equipment at the mink research farm on Jolly Road.

The raid caused from \$75,000 to \$125,000 damage to rooms 28 and 132 Anthony Hall, and \$20,000 to \$25,000 damage to the mink farm. Police said Chou's office destroyed data should increase the damage estimate.

ALF did not notify PETA of the damage to Chou's office, PETA spokesperson Amy Bersch said. PETA endorses seeking substitutes for laboratory animals, as was Chou's practice.

"I'm surprised by that," Bersch said. "We didn't know files other than those on the minks had been confiscated or vandalized. I can't give a statement for them."

Bersch said destroying Chou's data was probably unintentional.

"I can only say that they have not taken responsibility for it," Bersch said.

Special Agent Matthew Fitzpatrick of the FBI Lansing Bureau said investigators would check into the newfound damages today. He was investigating the Anthony Hall offices Tuesday and said offices near Aulerich's had been blocked off.

Zoology Chairman Donald Straney saw the torched offices and said the sight was grim.

"Clearly, they were sloppy and the damage was greater than needed to make their point," Straney said. "The fact they're damaging other's work as well, shows how careless and thoughtless the things they do are."

Chou said graduate students in the animal science department are working on retrieving data from some of the disks. She always kept backup copies of the data, but never took the disks out of the building.

"I'm trying to laugh instead of cry," Chou said. "It's tragic and unnecessary. I guess these people are trying to make a statement, but there are more intelligent and effective ways to make a point."

Chou's work with sperm as an animal substitute was part of an overall program aimed to access problems with animals reproducing. She studied the toxic effects of benzene and other chemicals commonly found in areas where environmental waste is dumped.

The MSU animal science faculty is aware of other ALF attacks on Oregon State and Washington State Universities, Chou said. The University had advised professors of potential attacks by animal rights groups.

MSU President John DiBiaggio said at Tuesday's Academic Council meeting that MSU and other universities have realized for years how vulnerable they are to animal rights extremist attacks.

"This terrorist act did nothing to advance the cause of humane treatment of animals on this campus - in fact it did just the opposite," DiBiaggio said. "Their professionalism stops with their ability to make scientists - who I believe are trying to make the world a better place - fear for their lives."

Although the department was prepared to respond to the raids, losing 10 years of her work still is frustrating, Chou said.

"It's hard to lose the research data," she said. "It's even harder to be the target of the attack."

(The State News [MSU], March 4, 1992)

Animal Rights Extremist Threat Included in OTA Report on Countering Terrorism

The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) has released a publication entitled, *Technology Against Terrorism: Structuring Security*, which discusses terrorist trends worldwide, and outlines the role technology plays in combating such activities. A chapter which reports on "The Terrorist Threat - 1991," uses criminal acts of animal rights extremists as an example of "single-issue terrorism." A brief overview of the movement's origins, philosophical beliefs and its impact on society is provided. The report states that terroristic acts carried out by groups such as the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), "...have had a significant effect on biomedical research, slowing work in a number of areas. Not only are law enforcement authorities attentive to threats of life and property, but they have labeled some of the acts of animal-rights as terrorist. In 1988, the FBI included the ALF on its list of active domestic terrorist organizations. The FBI now lists the ALF as one of the 10 most dangerous terrorist organizations." It also reports that leaders of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) "...are reported to have acted as intermediaries to the press for the ALF, including distributing a videotape of an ALF break-in," and that the views of Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, which works closely with PETA, appear "...to have little support within the scientific community."

(NABR Update, Vol XIII, No 7, March 31, 1992)

What Ever Happened To All The Other Soldiers? By John B. Mulder, DVM

On a few occasions I have been privileged visit foreign countries. During my last trip, my wife and I poked all around the Netherlands in a rented underpowered Opel. I was interested primarily in learning about my

parents' roots. How excited I was when I found my great grandmother's grave at the edge of a tiny village in Northern Holland. She was buried in a small cemetery adjacent to an old abandoned rock-constructed Gereformeerde Kerk (Dutch Reformed Church). As I stood near her weather-worn headstone in the refreshing fall breeze my mind began to wander to days gone by. What was she like? How did she live? Would she be happy to see me?

I confess that I know little about the thinking processes of great grandmas. But if she could have spoken to me, I think she would have said, "Johnny, I am so grateful my son and grandson emigrated to America so you could be born and live in a great free and progressive land." Then she would have added quickly, "My, but aren't you are a fine and handsome great grandson!" Surely she would have said this because great grandmothers are programmed to be kind and loving albeit not necessarily truthful.

As we got better acquainted, the conversation would have moved to earlier years. Soon we would be discussing events that occurred in the Netherlands during the last great devastating war, World War II. She would have expressed her deep gratitude to those dedicated and brave American soldiers who gave their lives fighting intense Allied battles that eventually saved her beloved Holland. By now we would have been cuddling closer together. We would continue exploring the reasons our soldiers were willing to pay the ultimate price of life itself to save a small, seemingly insignificant, country. Then over an intimate setting of tea, diluted with milk and sugar, we would have concluded that soldiers probably do not differ much from us. We too would be willing to give our all for ideals we believe to be of crucial importance.

You may ask, how do I know our conversation would have taken this course? I know because, although I never met my great grandmother, she was a wonderful, giving and caring person. You know why? Because that is the way God made all great grandmas.

Thank you for taking a moment to visit with my great grandmother. Indeed, we all go beyond

the normal call of duty for things we consider to be of great importance. Don't we feel a sense of importance and urgency about the ever present conflict of using animals for research, teaching and testing? So often we are told we are not alone regarding this issue. Most people are aware that the use of animals has resulted in tremendous medical and surgical advances for both humans and animals. In fact, several national polls have documented this truth over the past years.

I am troubled increasingly by the easy and willing words of support expressed on this issue by nearly everyone. Investigators believe in animal use, administrators advocate using animals, the public overwhelmingly supports the use of animals and even my mother-in-law thought it was OK. With that colossal level of support, why do I usually stand alone when the use of animals requires defending. Where are all those other reassuring folks? When the media calls, if there is a break-in or when there are demonstrations, how come I'm the one who is expected to make a response?

As a laboratory animal specialist, I should accept responsibility for defending the use of animals. However, a little helpful support from the other advocates would be very nice. I am willing to be a brave soldier and lead the troops into this battle but I don't enjoy being on the front line alone. Sometimes I wonder, **what ever happened to all the other soldiers?** I think great grandma would like to know too.

(Contemporary Topics in Laboratory Animal Science, March, 1992)

Whose Life is More Important: An Animal's or a Child's? By Alice Steinbach

Is it morally acceptable for animals to die for medical research that will save human lives? Do animals have rights? Is a chimp more worthy of being spared than a lab rat?

She is a businesswoman in her mid-thirties, married, with no children, and she lives "somewhere on the East Coast." But that's all Sally S. will reveal about

her personal life. Anonymity is important, Sally says, if she is to continue the perilous and sometimes illegal mission she secretly pursues. As part of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), a loosely organized underground group committed to abolishing the use of all animals in research. Sally has chanced arrest and a jail sentence. "I know there's a risk involved," Sally says, "but my decision to rescue animals from horrible suffering in research laboratories is a matter of conscience." She is speaking from a pay phone beside a highway she will not name.

Even her friends don't know - although her husband does - of Sally's participation in two guerilla-style break-ins: one in 1985 to remove a baby monkey from a lab at the University of California at Riverside and another in 1987 to expose what Sally calls "nightmarish" conditions at a federally operated facility in Beltsville, Maryland.

When ALF members entered the basement lab at the University of California, they found a five-week-old, stump-tailed macaque monkey, whom they later named Britches. Britches had been taken from his mother at birth for use in an experiment designed to test whether sonar equipment might help blind children navigate. Sally says she will never forget what she saw. "He had both eyelids sewn shut to mimic blindness, and there was a sonar device attached to his head," she recalls. "They had taken this baby monkey away from his mother and isolated him in a small, soundproof metal cage with nothing at all to comfort him. If you touched him he would get spastic and clutch his own body for comfort."

Britches was spirited away that night and given to an adoptive mother monkey; his whereabouts remain a secret. The \$275,000 experiment involving Britches has since been denounced by Grant Mack, a former president of the American Council of the Blind, as "one of the most repugnant and ill-conceived boondoggles that I've heard about in a long time."

Sally's second raid took place on an August night in 1987, when she and other ALF members cut their way through a chain-link fence and "liberated" thirty-six cats and seven pigs from an Agriculture Department research lab. Six of the cats had been infected with a parasite harmful to humans and animals as part of research on toxoplasmosis, a disease dangerous to pregnant women because it can cause birth defects. Sally calls the condition of the cats horrifying. "What I remember most was two kittens chained in crates. They had been infected with some kind of parasite and had severe diarrhea, the liquid stools running down their legs, all the skin burned off. They were chained at the neck and couldn't move." The animals were taken to a vet, the placed on farms and in homes. Sally took some of the cats.

The specter of arrest worries Sally, but it won't stop her, she says. Although she hasn't taken part in a

laboratory raid in almost two years - a security measure, ALF spaces out a member's missions - she has vowed to continue her work. "For the rest of my life," she says softly, but with conviction, "I am determined to do whatever I can to stop the suffering and exploitation of animals." She says that she and other ALF members are motivated by a sense of moral obligation. "I'm just an average person; all of the ALF members are. But we feel that you can't just go through life being safe and having your little apartment and your nice car. I would hope I will look back on my life and be proud that I did these things for animals."

The ten million or so Americans actively involved in animal-interest groups might consider Sally a hero. But Karen Ogle, a young mother from Linthicum, Maryland, thinks animal-rights activists like Sally are misguided people who would rob her son and other desperately ill people of the chance to live.

Her son, Jason, now an energetic four year old, was born with serious kidney disease. A transplant at the Johns Hopkins Hospital when he was 2½ saved his life. "Ten years ago, he would have died," Ogle says. "But fortunately, by the time he was born the research needed to keep him alive had been perfected. If they had not done those first transplants on animals, Jason wouldn't be with us today."

Karen Ogle knows that some members of the more radical animal-rights groups wouldn't necessarily consider Jason's life more valuable than that of a baby monkey. They feel that it is never ethical to maim or kill animals even if the research is of benefit to human beings. This belief in an innate equality between animal life and human life, says Ogle, "drives me crazy. I don't believe in hurting animals, but they've learned so much so far. A person's life is more important than an animal's life."

It is one of several philosophical questions at the heart of the growing controversy over animal rights versus human rights: Are animals as important as human beings? Does the value of research justify the death and suffering of an animal? Is there a hierarchy among sentient creatures that places human beings on the top of the ladder and animals beneath them? What rights do animals have?

Our position is that animals are not things or tools put here for us to use however we want," says Ingrid Newkirk, the British-born national director of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), perhaps the best known group opposed to animal research. "We feel that animal research is immoral. And I don't believe it's essential.

"The animal-rights movement is like the anti-slavery movement. We are challenging the moral basis on which we discriminate against animals by saying it's okay to make them suffer and to kill them as long as there might be some, even small, human benefit. What

the animal-rights movement is saying is 'Wait a minute. Maybe animals don't belong to people.'"

Critics of animal-rights activists, including many scientists and physicians, emphasize that without the use of animals, important medical research would grind to a halt: life-saving breakthroughs we take for granted - drugs, vaccines, surgical techniques - might never have happened. "Virtually every advance in medicine has directly or indirectly depended on experiments that utilized animals," says Jerod M. Loeb, PhD, director of the Division of Biomedical Science for the American Medical Association. As examples he cites organ transplantation - kidney, heart, liver, lungs, endocrine glands - and the development of the immunosuppressive drugs that keep the body from rejecting replacement organs. There is also the creation of vaccines against diphtheria, hepatitis, tetanus and polio (which according to Andrew Rowan, PhD, director of Tufts Center for Animal and Public Policy, required fatal experiments on more than 750,000 rhesus monkeys); in the discovery of insulin, which resulted in classic experiments with dogs; and animal studies that have allowed doctors to reduce heart disease and childhood leukemia. "These are all clear-cut examples of advances that couldn't have been achieved without animals," he says.

Right now, Dr Loeb says, animal research is yielding important information about pancreatic transplants and high-tech gastrointestinal surgery. A vaccine for chicken pox is in the works, and he's hopeful that AIDS research using chimps will prove valuable. "I would be absolutely shocked," he says, "if research underway using animals does not produce some advances in either prevention or treatment of HIV infection."

Newkirk isn't swayed. "I believe animal experiments are the most ineffective way to save human lives. From the moral standpoint, we have no right to torture these animals." She insists that advances like the polio vaccine, skin grafts and transplants would eventually have happened without using animals for experiments. "Science wouldn't have come to a grinding halt. We would have been creative and found another way. Science is supposed to be about innovation and creativity."

Not all groups working for animal welfare agree completely with PETA's view that animals have certain inalienable rights. And some people who are outraged over experiments on higher animals like dolphins and chimps have a hard time getting upset about lab rats. Newkirk scoffs at the idea of such a hierarchy. PETA's work, she says, isn't based on the popularity or cuteness of an animal.

In spite of their differences, Newkirk thinks the various factions have come closer together in the last five years. "First there was the humane movement, which says you should treat animals decently and kindly within

the context of using them and killing them, if human beings gain from it. Then animal-rights movement came along and said, "Hey, wait. We don't just want bigger, cleaner cages for animals in the labs; we want empty cages." PETA is the nation's largest animal-rights organization, with 280,000 members, including celebrity spokeswoman like actress Rue McClanahan of *Golden Girls* and singer Belinda Carlisle. Besides being concerned with the approximately twenty million animals used annually in biomedical research - 90% of them are rats and mice - the nonprofit group, founded in 1980, is opposed to the use of animals in zoos and circuses, and as food or fur. Officials say the grass roots movement's goal is to fight animal abuse and exploitation through education (in 1984, PETA, got a head-injury laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania closed down by publicizing videotapes of the inhumane conditions inside), investigations, lobbying, demonstrations and sponsorship of crucial lawsuits affecting the well-being of animals. One of PETA's most successful campaigns to date has been its sustained push to end the use of animals to develop and test the safety of cosmetics like mascara and lipstick. Recently, several large companies have agreed to stop all such tests, which are often painful for animals.

"Attitudes are changing," Newkirk says, "More people are starting to think of animals as feeling, thinking beings who have an interest in living and are afraid of pain and suffering and death."

Some of the newest converts to the movement are physicians, nurses and scientists. One such group is the 2,000 member Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM). "Our goal is to use the expertise of physicians to identify those areas of animal use in research that are most questionable, and to try to bring about changes in those areas," Says Neal Barnard, MD, a Washington D.C. psychiatrist who heads PCRM.

Animal tests to identify cancer-causing chemicals such as ALAR or DDT, for example, could be replaced by tests on tissue cultures, Dr Barnard says. Some vaccines and drugs can be developed and tested using human cells and tissue cultures; CAT scans and needle biopsies can replace some exploratory surgery on animals. And PCRM would like to see a drastic cutback in the number of animals used in medical education; they'd substitute videotapes, computer models that show how drugs work and observation during surgery.

Last year PCRM was asked by the Animal Rights Community, a group of Cincinnati activists, to investigate a fourteen year, \$1 million, federally funded University of Cincinnati experiment. Researchers were delivering severe blows to the heads of cats in an effort to simulate human head trauma. Neurosurgeons and trauma experts from PCRM unanimously condemned the

work as clinically irrelevant and ethically unacceptable. In the face of this criticism and the negative publicity that followed, the researchers halted the experiments and announced future plans to concentrate on tissue studies.

Better technology had enabled scientists to reduce the number of animals used in research by about 45% over the past twenty years. But many scientists say that no alternative exist for much of the animal work being done.

Lorraine Racusen, MD, a pathologist at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine who does the kind of kidney-transplant research that helped save Jason Ogle's life, says that is true in her field; there are no ideal alternatives to using animals in the work she does. "Some of the work can be done using cell-culture systems, but that removes a lot of physiological variables." The charge by animal activists that animal models aren't reliable stand-ins for humans, often yielding inaccurate data, is arguable, she says; certainly enough reliable, transferable data has been gathered from animal studies to make transplants common. The ideal would be to do all these experiments on humans. But that's unethical. Hitler and his associates did that, but I don't think anyone admired them for it.

"We don't use the animals callously or frivolously," adds Dr Racusen, who says that she has more emotional difficulty working with primates than with rodents. She uses mostly rats and some rabbits; other Hopkins scientists use dogs, sheep, pigs, monkeys, mice and a few cows in research studying asthma, strokes, vision and hearing loss, anesthesiology and experimental surgical techniques, among other things.

Dr Racusen points out that the animal experiments being done at Johns Hopkins are done only after a stringent review process assures that the experiment is necessary and will be done humanely. "The care of the animals is under close scrutiny," she says, allowing that this might not be the case in all animal laboratories. "I don't know about the labs broken into by animal-rights people and I'm sure there are places where animal care is not optimal, even in large institutions. And to the extent the current militant movement changes that, I think that's all to the good."

Even animal-rights supporters who don't endorse illegal activities or destruction of property worry about that without break-ins, severe mistreatment might never have come to the public's attention. And they're concerned that sometimes the very people responsible for regulating the treatment of laboratory animals have the most at stake in maintaining the status quo.

Two years ago, famed naturalist Jane Goodall, who has spent thirty years studying chimpanzees in Tanzania, toured Sema, Inc., a federally funded laboratory in Rockville, Maryland, where chimps are being used in hepatitis and influenza research. "I still have nightmares

about it. It was the worst experience of my life," says Goodall, a look of profound distress crossing her face.

"The conditions are absolutely horrendous. Imagine! Two young chimps in a cage the size of a standard oven. Pairs of chimps, just stacked up in these tiny cages." Citing the humanlike needs of baby chimps for maternal nurturing, room to romp and group social contact, Goodall blasted the severe deprivation at Sema, and says that number of the chimps exhibited psychotic behavior.

The president of Sema, John C. Landon, defends his laboratory. He points out that in 1987, following Goodall's visit, the laboratory was investigated by both the National Institutes of Health and the American Association of Accreditation of Animal Care and given a clean bill of health. Animal-rights activists counter that neither agency is a disinterested party: NIH both funds and conducts experiments at Sema, and the AAAAC is made up of organizations that perform or endorse research on animals.

Recently a hot new subcontroversy has developed over who should decide what research is valuable and necessary. In 1988, after a long campaign of protest by a Pennsylvania-based animal-rights group, Michiko Okamoto, Ph.D., a pharmacologist at New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center College who had been using cats to study barbiturate addiction, abandoned the fourteen-year project and returned \$600,000 in federal grant money. Pamphlets described how Dr. Okamoto and her assistants pumped drugs into the cats stomachs for several weeks, then abruptly cut off their supplies; the animals went through withdrawal and were ultimately killed so their tissues could be studied.

The activists contended that the study was useless and a duplication of previous work; that cats are poor scientific models in addiction studies; and that barbiturate addiction is not a major social problem.

Okamoto won't talk to the press. But some members of the medical community say the research revealed important facts about addiction and withdrawal -- that low, prescription doses of barbiturates are ultimately as addictive as street drugs, for example. Frankie Trull, president of the National Foundation for Biomedical Research, an organization of professional associations and animal-using institutions that advocates the use of animals in biomedical research, says stopping the Cornell experiment marks a shift in the animal-rights movement. "They were not questioning the care and treatment of the animals." Trull says, "They were offended by the type of research being done. Drug addiction is a very serious problem. If they don't want to reap the benefits of this approach, that's fine. But it is irresponsible to impose that view on a population that has not yet made that decision."

Even those who would have the most to gain from animal research, such as the incurably ill, are

polarized on the subject of animal rights and have formed opposing groups. Dona Spring, thirty-six, is a founding member of a national group called Disabled and Incurably Ill for Alternatives to Animal Research. "When I first heard a talk about animal rights, I wasn't keen about the idea." Says the wheelchair-bound Spring, whose rheumatoid arthritis was diagnosed when she was twenty-one. "I thought, 'But these people don't understand the terrible pain I'm in.' If you're sick and in pain, it's very threatening to think you won't get the benefits of new treatment." But she ultimately came to oppose the use of animals in medical research for two reasons: "First, it's proved to be ineffective, and second it is very cruel and ethically unjustifiable." Spring says she's living proof that what works in animals doesn't necessarily work in humans. "When medications I used were tested on animals, they didn't cause kidney damage. But those same drugs did cause permanent kidney damage in me."

Steve Carroll, thirty-eight, executive director of a group called Incurably Ill for Animal Research, disagrees with Spring. "When I was nineteen, I was in an airplane accident and burned over half of my body. Had it not been for the skin-graft techniques worked out on pigs in the 1940's, a multitude of procedures and drugs that have been tested on animals, I would have died." Carroll, who also suffers from chronic osteomyelitis, a bacterial infection of the bones that's controlled with medication, says his group holds press conferences around the country whenever a news story needs a patient's perspective. "Our message is that the use of animals is very important to human health."

Activists struggle with the complexities of the issue. "I try to do everything in life-style in a way that won't take an animal life," says Victoria Thomas, twenty-six, who works for PETA full time. "I don't wear leather or fur, I don't eat animals. But if I became suddenly ill and came into a hospital and the best thing for me was a drug or a procedure tested on animals. I wouldn't say no; once a month I take Tylenol, the ingredients of which were originally tested on animals, for a headache. But just because scientists have always done medical testing doesn't mean they have to keep doing it. My major concern is that we should be spending more time, money and creativity on nonanimal alternatives."

For many of us, the argument about the scientific merit or immorality of using animals in biomedical research boils down to this: If we have to choose between saving human lives or saving animal lives, which side are we on? Or to pose such a question at its most visceral level: Do you value an animal's life over your own child's life?

Karen Ogle doesn't hesitate. "When I look at my son with this successful transplant, all ideas of being fair go out the window. I feel scientists should do whatever research on animals that is necessary to come up with the answers."

Says Mary Beth Sweetland, thirty-five, a PETA researcher, "I think animal lives are as valuable as human lives. But would I choose the life of an animal over the life of my twelve-year-old son? Of course not. That would be contrary to the way every species feels about their own offspring. But the question misses the point, there are no guarantees that if this animal dies your child will be saved."

Sweetland tries to avoid drugs that emerged through animal testing. "early in my son's life, I had him vaccinated: I wasn't into animal rights then," she says. However, I was recently encouraged to give him a tetanus-diphtheria booster shot and I turned it down." She says that if she had to do it over again she would have refused the polio vaccine for her son.

According to Scott Giebink, MD, former member of the American Academy of Pediatric's Committee on Infectious Diseases, "Refusing the tetanus-diphtheria booster certainly puts the person at some increased risk of acquiring those infections. To keep immunity up you need a booster every ten years. The degree of immunity provided by having only the early shots and no boosters has never been adequately measured." He notes that passing up the polio vaccine is more serious; its benefits far out weigh its risks.

Ironically, Sweetland's life depends upon a drug developed as a result of animal studies. "I'm an insulin-dependent diabetic. Twice a day I take synthetically manufactured insulin that still contains some animal products - and I have no qualms about it. When insulin therapy developed in the 1920's, I wasn't there. I didn't ask for animals to die for my drug. Now I resent it that they did, but I'm not going to take the chance of killing myself by not taking insulin. I don't see myself as a hypocrite. I need my life to fight for the rights of animals."

The animal-rights issue isn't going to go away, says Arthur L. Caplan, director of the Center for Biomedical Ethics at the University of Minnesota. For the time being, he thinks the middle-of-the-road approach is the right one. "Ingred Newkirk and I agree that we should reduce of number of animals used in research and treat them humanely. But I don't agree that there should be empty cages.

"I can certainly endorse doing away with animal research as a way of perfecting deodorants or detergents. But there are areas of science and medicine where I don't see any alternatives to using animals. I think it is tragic, I think is's sad m but when I have to choose, I put more value on human life than on animal life."

Alice Steinbach is a Pulitzer-prize winning reporter for the Baltimore Sun.

(Glamour, January, 1990)



CFAAR BUTTONS - New Eye-catching Colors - Now, for just \$1 you can show your support for CFAAR. Remember - Support CFAAR So CFAAR Can Support You!

Stenholm Bill Approved By House Agriculture Committee

On April 2, the full House Agriculture Committee marked up and passed by voice vote Representative Charlie Stenholm's (D-TX) substitute version of HR 2407, the "Farm Animal & Research Facilities Protection Act of 1992."

Representative George Brown (D-CA) praised the bill's improvements, commenting that the substitute was so well drafted that it could serve as an example for other members promoting controversial legislation. Congressman Brown also criticized animal rights groups who break the law to further their cause. Representative Glickman (D-KS) as well as other members complimented Stenholm on his revised bill and the broad input that was sought in the process.

Revisions in HR 2407, which now has 263 cosponsors, were made to clarify language and to make certain that the bill is consistent with other federal laws. The definitions of "animal enterprise" and "exhibition" were added to clarify that the bill is intended to protect only particular activities using animals. Under prohibited acts, "to receive, conceal, or retain material, equipment or animals knowing that they have been stolen" was deleted, while "to knowingly aid, abet, command, induce, or procure the commission of any prohibited act" and "knowing an offense has occurred, to assist the offender in order to prevent apprehension, trial or punishment" were added. Under the section on penalties, the revised bill establishes a floor of \$5,000 on the value of the property damage before certain penalties are imposed, and clarifies that animal loss or damage is to be considered in determining penalties.

A new subsection requiring that the court determine the reasonable costs attributable to a violation, and that any person convicted of a violation shall be ordered to make restitution was added and the private right of action authorization was dropped.

Language was also added to ensure that nothing in the subtitle ". . . shall be construed to affect any other rights of a person damaged by reason of a violation . . ." nor ". . . to limit State or Federal whistleblower laws." Under the revised bill, it will not be an offense to copy or disseminate material to report activity that may be a violation of any State or Federal law or regulation. The substitute measure also modifies reporting provisions and specifically authorizes the Secretary to report any offense to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Representative Jack Brooks (D-TX), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has requested that the measure be referred to his committee. NABR members should write letters of thanks to the Agriculture Committee. Also, please write to Judiciary Chairman Brooks to request quick action on H.R. 2407. Reinforce your own support, and the broad Congressional sponsorship of this legislation. Names and addresses are listed in your congressional directories.

(NABR Update, Vol XIII, No 8, April 16, 1992)

Have you seen a cartoon or article on animal research that would be good to have in the CFAAR NEWS? Why not submit it today? Just send it to CFAAR NEWS, University of Arizona, Building 101, Tucson, AZ 85721. Do it today!

CFAAR: 1992 Membership Application Form

Name: _____

Mailing Address: (Campus, if available)

Phone: _____

Institutional Affiliation (if any): _____

Faculty ()

Staff ()

Student ()

Other ()

I have enclosed a contribution of \$5 \$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**