

# Coalition For Animals & Animal Research

## CFAAR Arizona Newsletter

P.O. Box 210101, Tucson, AZ 85721-0101 (520)621-3931

Volume 13, Number 1

Editor: Grace Aranda (antrnweb@ahsc.arizona.edu)

---

To join the Arizona Chapter of CFAAR, please fill out the membership form on the back page. Donations publish our newsletter and educational materials. A years subscription to this newsletter is included with your contribution.

### CFAAR: Who We Are

CFAAR is a nonprofit educational organization which formed in response to activists who were attempting to discredit animal research and animal researchers in 1988. 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 where 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 to contact your Washington, D.C. representatives.

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 and educational materials.

**HELP SUPPORT CFAAR  
SO WE CAN SUPPORT YOU**

### SHAC Protests Update

*Despite months of publicizing plans for three days of protests against Huntingdon Life Sciences, SHAC was able to gather only about 300 activists for its main demonstration Sunday against the HLS facility in New Jersey.*

*Because of a standing court order, only 50 activists at a time were allowed at Huntingdon's gates, while others were forced to stand in the cold in a nearby park waiting their turn to protest. "Uneventful" is the best description of the protests thus far.*

*The most notable development was the arrest of Robin Webb, a key and virulent figure in the UK's Animal Liberation Front. He was taken into custody when he attempted to become the 51st protester at the HLS gates, violating the court order. He is currently in jail in lieu of a \$50,000 bond.*

*There was at least one "home visit" to a HLS employee last night and there is a plan for a demonstration today in New York City. It is not expected to cause any significant disruption. The following two media articles are made available for those wishing additional details.*

*Oh...and one more thing. The activists chose this date for the protests to mark the 50th anniversary of Huntingdon Life Sciences. The problem is that Huntingdon is celebrating its 51st anniversary. Jacquie/AMP*

### Demonstration Against Animal Testing Held At Laboratory

Police in riot gear kept watch as about 300 animal rights activists protested outside the New Jersey laboratories of Huntingdon Life Sciences, which tests drugs on animals. One person was arrested on a contempt of court charge during the demonstration by Stop Huntingdon Animal

Cruelty, which holds regular protests outside the lab.

For three hours, protesters carried signs that read "Warning! Animal Abuse Inside," and shouted "H-L-S. Shut them down!" Huntingdon Life Sciences, based in the United Kingdom, is Europe's largest contract research company and says it performs tests on about 75,000 animals per year, most of them rodents. The Somerset County lab is its only U.S. testing facility.

According to a July 2001 court order, only 50 protesters at a time were allowed near the laboratory's property. The remainder waited at a nearby park. "The organizers of this rally have been categorized by the FBI as an extremist group," Michael Caulfield, Huntingdon's general manager in New Jersey, said in a statement. He added that some SHAC members are under indictment on extortion, harassment and stalking charges.

Robin Webb, of Darbyshire, England, was arrested after apparently leaving the area where protesters were allowed to stand, county authorities said. He was being held on \$50,000 bail. Kevin Jonas, a spokesman for SHAC, said Webb is a member of the Animal Liberation Front.

Local officers staffing the police line distributed copies of the court order and checked protesters for bottles and other prohibited items. State police were also there. One protester, who identified himself only as Falcon, said he was denied access to the protest site because of medical equipment he carried to aid demonstrators who may be injured or felled by pepper spray.

Brenda Shoss, who came to the rally from St. Louis, said the animal testing was without merit: "This is not medicine. This is to test coffee sweeteners, pesticides and household products." In his statement, Caulfield acknowledged the demonstrators' free speech rights, but added that some activists have overstepped that right.

In April 2001, four people were arrested at a SHAC rally outside the facility a day after 14 beagles were stolen from the lab. Violations included throwing things at police officers and knocking over barricades. That protest led local officials to demand SHAC pay \$22,400 for traffic and crowd control by police as a condition for a permit for Sunday's rally. SHAC sued in U.S. District Court, and local officials acquiesced.

The SHAC's Jonas claims that police provoked protesters during April's rally, which resulted in the four arrests. He added that SHAC planned 14 more protests later Sunday at the homes of company staff in New Jersey. Another protest was planned for Monday at the New York home of Huntingdon board chairman Andrew H. Baker, he said. "Our view is the animals don't get to go home at night, neither should they," said Jonas, who added that two other protests were to be held Sunday in the United Kingdom at the company's headquarters and laboratory.

Huntingdon has long been the target of animal rights activists, who have rallied outside Huntingdon facilities and the homes of its scientists and corporate officials. The company entered into a settlement with the U.S. Agriculture Department in 1998 over record-keeping deficiencies and agreed to pay \$50,000, some of which went to a center for alternative testing.

(WNBC.com news, 12/2/02)

## **New Majority Leader's Influence on US Science Policy and Funding Hard to Predict** By Catherine Zandonella

He has piloted planes into African war zones, sweated through seven marathon races, and performed more than 250 heart-and-lung transplant surgeries. But moving science-related legislation through Congress may be the greatest challenge the new Senate Majority Leader William H. Frist has ever faced. The Republican senator from Tennessee officially took the mantle of Majority Leader last week, replacing Senator Trent Lott, who was ousted from the position in late 2002.

How the Harvard-trained transplant surgeon will act on science policy and funding issues is difficult to predict. He has long been a champion of science funding, and likely understands the technical side of issues dear to scientists' hearts better than most senators. However, his ascension to leadership of the Senate has been greeted with tempered enthusiasm from the science community.

Frist's clear stance in favor of banning "therapeutic" cloning, his role in inserting language into the Homeland Security Act barring

citizens from suing drug makers, and his problematic past dissection of cats released to him as pets, have left many scientists unsure if he will be their hero, as he has been for so many others.

The surgeon-senator has developed an image as a Good Samaritan over the years, reinforced as recently as New Year's Day, when he was the first to arrive at a highway traffic accident scene in Florida and stabilized three victims until paramedics arrived. In 1998, he rushed from the Senate floor to aid the wounded after a gunman opened fire in the Capitol building. He travels yearly to Africa on humanitarian missions.

Born and raised in Nashville, Frist attended Princeton University and graduated with honors from Harvard Medical School in 1978. After training in the nascent field of transplantation surgery at Massachusetts General Hospital, Southampton General Hospital in Britain, and Stanford University Medical Center, he joined the faculty of Vanderbilt University Medical Center in 1985 where he later founded and directed the Vanderbilt Transplant Center. Frist also built a family fortune, founding with his father, Thomas F. Frist, Jr., the Hospital Corporation of America, now known as HCA and the nation's largest for-profit hospital chain.

In 1994 Frist ran for the US Senate, telling a National Public Radio interviewer at the time that he wanted to be a "citizen senator" who would come to Washington, do some good, and leave. But with Lott's downfall, Frist's trajectory appears to have changed and now his name is bandied as a potential 2008 Republican presidential candidate.

However, first he'll have to get through some difficult years as the economy and a potential war with Iraq vie for attention with the passage of fiscal 2003 appropriations bills. "I'm not sure how much time he's going to have to devote to general science funding and science issues," Samuel Rankin, chair of the Coalition for National Science Funding, told *The Scientist*. And on future budget authorizations for 2004, Frist may find the hands that served him so well as a surgeon tied firmly behind his back.

The President's proposed 2004 budget request, due to be released February 4, reportedly provides only a one percent increase for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). After several

years of substantial budget increases, "It is like you are going along and suddenly you fall off a cliff," said Albert Teich, head of Science and Policy Programs for the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). "Frist will be sympathetic (to the budgetary needs of research scientists) but what he'll be able to do in terms of constraints that the 2004 budget is going to present, you can't forecast it right now," said Teich.

The National Science Foundation received a welcome budgetary boost in December 2002 when President Bush signed a law authorizing a near-doubling of NSF's budget over three years. The gains could be a boon for non-biomedical life science researchers, who have felt that five years of increases in the NIH budget had left them underfunded. But authorized money is not the same as appropriated money, noted Nadine Lymn, public affairs director of the Ecological Society of America and head of the Biological and Ecological Sciences Coalition (BESC). "Anything not related to homeland security and defense may have to take a backseat for a while."

There is one piece of legislation crucial to many life science researchers that is likely to come up in the Senate very soon, however — a proposed ban on reproductive and therapeutic human cloning sponsored last year by Senator Sam Brownback (R-Kan). Last Wednesday, Rep. Dave Weldon (R-Fla.) reintroduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. In a Senate speech on April 9, 2002, Frist said, "I will support legislation to ban all forms of human embryo cloning, reproductive, research and therapeutic, when the issue comes before the Senate" (Congressional Record, April 9, 2002).

Still, some science organizations are hopeful that Frist, given his past role as a leader in the emerging field of transplantation, will change his mind on this issue. "He was in an industry before he became senator that was as controversial in its time as therapeutic cloning," said Michael Manganiello, president of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research.

But pro-life advocates see little reason to think Frist will change his mind. Of the view that therapeutic cloning differs from reproductive cloning because the cells are never implanted and have no chance to develop into a human life, "Frist has not bought into that argument," said

Douglas Johnson, head lobbyist for the National Right to Life Committee. "He says these are human embryos and should be treated as such."

Despite Frist's opposition to using somatic cell nuclear transfer to create new human embryonic stem cells, he has said that embryonic stem cell research should continue as long as it is conducted within an ethical and moral framework. The senator is widely reported to have been the architect of President Bush's policy on stem cell research, which allows use of existing embryonic stem cell lines, created from discarded IVF embryos, in federally-funded research.

On the ethics of using animals in research, Frist said in his 1989 memoir, that his dedication to preserving human life is what led him, while in medical school, to adopt cats from local shelters, treat them as pets for a few days, and then dissect them. Although the animal rights organization People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) has used this revelation to pressure Frist to support animal welfare legislation, Frist is unlikely to change his long-standing support of the humane use of animals in medical research, said Frankie Trull, president of the National Association for Biomedical Research. "As a pioneer in transplantation surgery, Frist obviously understands the role that laboratory animals play in medical research."

While Frist campaigned in 1994 as an outsider to politics, he has since shown that he knows how to play the game as a major fundraiser for the 2002 Republican campaign to take back the Senate. But his skill in raising pharmaceutical industry donations has already led to accusations of conflict of interest for his support of language in the Homeland Security Act that barred lawsuits against vaccine-maker Eli Lilly by parents who believe their children developed autism due to vaccines containing the preservative thimerosal.

That clause will be removed under an agreement announced Friday, brokered by Maine Senators Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins and Rhode Island Senator Lincoln Chafee, all three Republicans who were angered by insertion of the seemingly unrelated provision in the Homeland Security Act. At the time Frist first introduced the legislation, he said that protecting vaccine makers from frivolous lawsuits, especially when no studies have linked thimerosal to autism, is

relevant to homeland security because it ensures that vaccine makers will stay in the business of making vaccines. In a turnaround that may portend more surprises, Frist supported the New England senators' agreement to repeal the provision.

(The Scientist, 1/13/03)

## **No Violence as Animal Activists Mark an 'Unhappy' 50th Birthday** By Jeff Diamant

With two-thirds of the Franklin Township police force nearby garbed in riot gear, the 200 animal-rights protesters -- a mixture of locals and people from across the country -- who were demonstrating near the Huntingdon Life Sciences complex expected there would be arrests. Many had completed forms ahead of time with family contact information.

But the loud, occasionally profane three-hour rally against animal testing by Huntingdon ended peacefully. Police arrested one person for trespassing. "We're very happy to say it was a peaceful day, and that everything went well for all parties involved," said Franklin Police Sgt. Marie Bandtlow.

But the protesters, rallying against the laboratory's testing of drugs on mice, rats, dogs and monkeys for pharmaceutical companies, called the police presence outrageous. "Overkill is an understatement," said Kevin Jonas, president of Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty, or SHAC. "We've got grannies here from different parts of the country. They've got guns."

Sixty-five officers out of a 96-officer department were on hand, as well as county and state police. Authorities cited violence at an SHAC rally in April 2001 as justification for their strong presence. At that rally, protesters allegedly threw objects at police and knocked over barricades to reach the Huntingdon building. Five people were arrested and two officers injured.

In June 2001, a judge ordered SHAC to stop holding protests of more than 50 people in front of the building, restricting larger demonstrations to Colonial Park several hundred feet away on Mettlers Road. Four months ago, police arrested 14 protesters at Huntingdon for trespassing and contempt of court.

Yesterday's rally was based at Colonial Park, though 50 protesters at a time were allowed in front of the laboratory, where employees were at work. SHAC holds small local rallies against Huntingdon each month, but yesterday's protest attracted people from across the nation to wish an "unhappy birthday" to the company on its 50th anniversary.

The rally drew big names in the animal-rights movement, including Robin Webb, a spokesman for the Animal Liberation Front; Rod Coronado, who served 3 1/2 years in prison for participating in a Michigan State University laboratory bombing; and Chris DeRose of Last Chance for Animals, a Los Angeles-based group. "If you're cold, it's too bad. The animals inside there are a lot worse off," DeRose told the protesters as snow flurries landed on their hair. "...This stuff has got to stop."

The protesters cited the \$50,000 fine levied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture five years ago against Huntingdon for mistreating animals and held mini-rallies outside the homes of several Huntingdon employees after the Colonial Park protest. They lauded the theft of 14 beagles from the lab in April 2001 as a "liberation," chanting, "For the animals we will fight! Smash the windows in tonight!"

Based in Great Britain, Huntingdon opened its facility in Somerset County in 1995. In recent years, protesters have pressured the company's investors to withdraw money. In December 2000, the Royal Bank of Scotland, whose workers were targeted because of its investments in Huntingdon, refused to lend the company more money. Huntingdon shares subsequently plummeted.

Huntingdon officials were unavailable for comment yesterday, but the company's Web site defends animal research as necessary for advances in organ transplants, heart surgery, joint replacements and cataract operations. In addition, the Web site says the number of animals used for research is minuscule compared to the number used for food. "In the United States, 5 billion animals are used in the food industry compared to the 18 million used in research," it says.

Yesterday's protesters toted signs calling animal research unnecessary and Huntingdon employees "puppy killers." "They're evil! They don't belong on this planet," yelled Webb, the only

person arrested when he tried to walk, without police escort, along the closed Mettlers Road from the laboratory to rejoin the larger protest, Jonas said.

Wearing a "Meat is Murder" button was Penelope Smith of New Brunswick, a self-described vegan (a person who doesn't eat or wear animal products or byproducts). "I see this as protecting human and animal rights," she said. "They're related. It's not an issue of vegan or vegetarianism. It's an issue of animal cruelty."

(The NJ Star-Ledger, 12/2/02)

## **Chimp Deal By Wesley J. Smith**

The animal-rights/liberation movement is living high on the hog these days. In the last election, for example, activists induced Florida voters to grant gestating sows a state constitutional right to be kept in a space large enough to turn around in. As a consequence, the two pig farms in the state that had used gestation crates to confine pregnant pigs slaughtered their herds and went out of business. This suited the animal liberationists just fine. Their ultimate goal, after all, is not merely the better treatment of pigs but an end to all animal husbandry.

Now we learn that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is planning to spend \$24 million to build a retirement community for — no, not people — "retired" chimpanzees. The chimps in question were bred for medical research. But there are more animals than scientists need to conduct their important work to reduce human suffering, such as in researching cures for malaria.

That leaves the question of what to do with the unneeded chimps. This is an important problem. We humans have a moral obligation to treat animals properly and with humane care. Toward this end, the chimps could be given to well-managed zoos, wild-animal parks, and private primate sanctuaries. As a last and regrettable resort, if there were no option other than maintaining the animals in a cruel or inhumane manner, the chimps could be painlessly euthanized. Instead, thanks to well-meaning but misguided congressional lawmakers back in 2000, the NIH is going to fund a cushy chimpanzee "sanctuary." Yes, you read it right.

The federal government is going to put tens of millions of your taxpayer dollars into a Sun City for chimps.

In the bottomless pit that is the U.S. budget, \$24 million may not seem like a lot of money. But remember, it's being taken out of funds specifically allotted for NIH, which is supposed to use its money to improve the health and welfare of people. Moreover, with the NIH budget threatened with possible new budget restrictions, this money may soon be desperately needed to fund crucial human needs. Surely research into cancer, Parkinson's disease, or AIDS should take precedence over paying for chimps to swing happily through the trees. Or, in the highly unlikely event that the NIH has more than enough in its coffers, here's a thought: How about transferring that 24 mil to the Department of Veteran Affairs? With a new front in the war on terror seemingly about to open in Iraq, wouldn't these millions be put to far better use supporting the health needs of our veterans? True, the money would not solve the problem of the shameful levels of inadequate care to which they are too often subjected. But it would still do far more public good there than paying for a chimpanzee sanctuary.

Besides, it wouldn't be as if rescinding the grant would likely end up hurting the chimps. The animal-liberation movement is rolling in dough. Organizations such as People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and the Humane Society of the United States could all pitch in to help fund the sanctuary. Any shortfall could be made up by rich animal-rights supporters, like Sir Paul McCartney, or by vegan members of the Hollywood A-list elite, like Joaquin Phoenix. Or how about a "For the Chimps" concert tour by Barbra Streisand, assuming of course, that she can spare the time from her political consulting.

There is a darker side to this story that we also should ponder. Using NIH money, as opposed to private animal-welfare philanthropy, to fund not just a shelter but a 200-acre retirement home for a few hundred chimps seems part of a wider effort by animal-rights lobbyists and liberationists to transform apes, and eventually other mammals such as pigs, dogs, elephants, and dolphins, into legal "persons." Don't laugh. Legal clinics have already been established at some of our elite university law schools dedicated to obtaining that very objective through the courts.

Indeed, advocacy seeking human/ape legal and moral equality is international in scope. The Great Ape Project, for example, explicitly states that its goal is "to include the nonhuman great apes within the community of equals by granting them the basic moral and legal protection that only human beings currently enjoy."

Making apes morally equivalent to humans would cause tremendous harm. Among the consequences: a total end to using chimps and other apes in medical research. As unpleasant as it admittedly is, we must, on occasion, use primates as research subjects because of their intelligence and genetic closeness to human beings. Monkeys, for example, have been used in research for the treatment of paralysis caused by stroke and in AIDS research, while chimpanzees were essential to the development of the human vaccine against hepatitis B.

If these mammals became legally unavailable for this purpose, what would replace them? Actually, the question would be better phrased: "Who would replace them?" One possible answer was given a few years back by Princeton professor Peter Singer, the guru of the animal-liberation movement, in an interview with *Psychology Today*. When asked what alternatives he could suggest to the use of chimpanzees in medical research, he responded: I am not comfortable with invasive research on chimps. I would ask, is there no other way? And I think there are other ways. I would say, 'What about getting the consent of relatives of people in vegetative states?' If you could really confidently determine that this person will never regain consciousness, it's a lot better to use them than a chimp."

Once that ball got rolling, it wouldn't stop with the primates. Animal-rights activists seek to prevent us from using all animals in medical research, including mice and rats. Indeed, some animal liberationists have turned violent toward obtaining that very end, attacking laboratories, threatening researchers, and even vandalizing insurance companies that do business with medical-research facilities. The potential harm and unnecessary human suffering that outlawing the use of animals in medical research is beyond quantifying. Think about it: Animals are used in stem-cell research, to test the efficacy of drugs, and in developing new surgical techniques, just to mention a few. And while some liberationists pretend that computer simulations or human

tissue lines could make up the difference, in the real world that simply isn't, and may well never be, true.

Let me be clear: I recognize that chimpanzees are highly intelligent creatures that exhibit sophisticated social behavior. They have a higher capacity to suffer than do mice, rats, or birds. Hence — as empathetic, moral beings — we have a higher duty to treat them properly and humanely, both when using them as research subjects and after we no longer need them for that purpose. But as intelligent as chimpanzees are, as sophisticated as their social interactions may be, as easy as it is to anthropomorphize their lives, we must also never forget that they are animals, not persons. Toward the end of alleviating human suffering and curing human diseases, the well-being and welfare of chimps must come second to our own. That should also be true with regard to how we decide to invest our limited public-health resources. It is a disheartening sign of the times that such sentiments are now explosively controversial.

(National Review, 1/16/03)

## **U.S. Company Raises Hopes for AIDS Vaccine** By Patricia Reaney

A preventive vaccine against HIV/AIDS could be available by 2005 if results from human safety and efficacy trials are as good as expected, a U.S. biotechnology company said Monday. Early results from Phase III trials of a preventive AIDS vaccine will not be available until early next year but its California-based developer VaxGen Inc said it was optimistic it would work.

"I think we will get protection (from the virus) but I don't know what level we will get," Donald Francis, president and co-founder of the company, told an AIDS conference. Francis admitted he did not have any early clues about the results but he said the vaccine uses a standard approach and it worked in chimpanzees, so he believes it will be effective in humans. "We expect to see in humans what we have seen in animal studies," he said. "If all goes well it could be available by end of 2004 or early 2005."

Hopes for AIDS vaccines have been dashed in the past and the charity ActionAid, which welcomed the news, advised a cautionary approach. "This is potentially great news. But it is

far too early to celebrate," said Omo Igogho, the head of health programs in Nigeria for ActionAID. With 40 million people living with HIV/AIDS and infection rates rising, a preventive vaccine is considered the best hope to control the rampant epidemic. Drugs have prolonged the lives of sufferers in the West but few in the developing world have access to them. It is doubtful that the first preventive vaccine will be 100 percent effective against the virus, but experts believe even 30 percent protection could help to curtail the epidemic. "Our target is 100 percent but if we get 30 percent I'll be thrilled," said Francis.

VaxGen's AIDS vaccine works by inducing the immune system to produce antibodies that attach to the gp120 protein on the surface of the virus. The theory is that by preventing the virus from attaching to the cells it will stop infection. Francis said VaxGen was committed to tiered pricing, which would make it affordable for poor countries, and is also beefing up its manufacturing capabilities to produce it in bulk quickly.

The impact of the vaccine in protecting high-risk people from sexual transmission of HIV is being tested on 5,400 volunteers in the United States, Canada, Puerto Rico and the Netherlands. A similar trial in Thailand, involving 2,500 injecting drug users, will determine if it can prevent blood-borne transmission. All of the volunteers, who were given the vaccine or a placebo, were free of the virus at the start of the study and counseled about safe sex. The efficacy rate will be determined by comparing the number of infections in the placebo group with infections in people who received the vaccine.

There are five major subtypes of HIV in different areas of the world. In Thailand there is just one subtype but Africa has many so VaxGen is working on vaccines to induce antibodies against several subtypes of HIV. Other vaccines, both preventive and therapeutic, are being discussed at the 14th International AIDS Conference in Barcelona but progress has been slow. Pharmaceutical companies can make more money making drugs to treat disease, than vaccines to prevent them. "We don't value prevention," said Francis.

(Yahoo Science News, 7/8/02)

**Coalition For Animals & Animal Research - CFAAR  
2003 Membership Application**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: (Campus, if available) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Electronic Mail: \_\_\_\_\_ Send me my newsletter electronically \_\_\_\_\_  
(In an attempt to reduce the cost of printing we hope to send most newsletters electronically.)

Institutional Affiliation (if any): \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty ( )

Staff ( )

Student ( )

Other ( )

I have enclosed a contribution of \$10\_\_ \$20\_\_ \$50\_\_ \$100\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**A years subscription to CFAAR News is included with your donation.**

Make checks payable to **CFAAR** and return to: **CFAAR**, P.O. Box 210101, Tucson, AZ, 85721

**CFAAR ARIZONA**

University of Arizona

P.O. Box 210101

Tucson, AZ 85721-0101

*Address Correction Requested*

212810

**Time to Renew Your Membership!**

**Your Donations Make Our Publications, Materials & Website Possible  
We Have our Website Up & Running: [www.swaebr.org/cfaar/index.htm](http://www.swaebr.org/cfaar/index.htm)**