

# Coalition For Animals & Animal Research

## CFAAR Arizona Newsletter

P.O. Box 210101, Tucson, AZ 85721-0101 (520)621-3931 Volume 13, Number 2

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

---

To join the Arizona CFAAR, please fill out the membership form on the back page. Donations publish our newsletter and educational materials. A years subscription 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**

### Deloitte Details Given to Animal Rights Group By Patrick Jenkins

A mole at Deloitte & Touche has turned the big four accountancy firm into a new target for animal rights extremists. The insider has handed over the phone numbers and e-mail addresses of 135 staff to Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty, the protest group that has been targeting Huntingdon Life Sciences.

Deloitte is auditor to the drug-testing group, which has struggled to survive as a campaign against banks, stockbrokers and marketmakers has scared away many of its commercial and financial supports. Deloitte yesterday refused to comment. However, workers said they had begun this week to receive letters, e-mails and telephone calls from protesters.

The campaign against Deloitte is focused on senior managers and secretaries in the firm's life sciences team. The data passed to Shac includes e-mail addresses, direct dial landline and mobile telephone numbers, which Shac plans to disable using phone-jamming computer software. "This is the best information we've ever had from inside a company," said Greg Avery, Shac coordinator. Shac said it would occupy Deloitte offices around the country and stage demonstrations outside offices and managers' homes.

Andrew Gay, HLS's head of marketing, said: "It is awful that legitimate companies can be targeted in this way. The extortion continues." The activists began their campaign with direct protests against HLS in the late 1990s. More recently, they have shifted their focus to the financial and commercial struts of the group.

In December, the government was forced to supply HLS with emergency insurance, following a campaign by Shac against Marsh & McLennan, the world's largest insurance broker, which Shac said had placed cover for HLS. Staff in the UK and US were harassed in their homes

and an office in Seattle was smoke-bombed. The action cost Marsh millions in round-the-clock protection for directors.

Early last year, HLS was prompted to restructure under a new US parent company in the hope that more limited financial disclosure requirements would help to protect the company, its staff and its backers from further attack. The tactic has worked to an extent and HLS's fundamental business appears to have recovered from the bad publicity it attracted in 1997 for allegedly mistreating some of the animals on which it was testing drugs and chemicals.

But Shac has regrouped, and has growing support in the US and elsewhere in the world. The protesters plan to raise the stakes on HLS's drugs-group customers, particularly in Japan, where companies are felt to be culturally sensitive to Shac's aggressive tactics.

(Financial Times, 2/19/03)

### **Grieve for Fido, but Don't Litigate**

Some people think animals have rights, while almost everyone would agree that it's absolutely wrong to inflict needless suffering on them. Our own concern for animal welfare hasn't clouded our judgment regarding human conduct, however, which is why we're howling with indignation at House Bill 1260.

The bill would allow dog and cat owners to sue animal abusers and veterinarians and seek damage awards for "loss of companionship" of up to \$100,000. Despite the measure's requirement that the lawsuits go to arbitration before proceeding to the courts, we think its main result will be to provide yet another trough for tort-feeding lawyers.

That said, we realize people love their pets. So do we. And we would even agree that the present law's characterization of a loved pet as "property" fails, in most cases, to describe the relationship. But whatever the emotional distress of losing a dog or cat, we don't think the courts should treat it the same way it treats injury to or death of, say, a child, a best friend, or a nonmarital partner.

Most people who have companion pets consider them part of the family. But courts have yet to define "pet," let alone determine the extent to which an animal owner has bonded with one.

On what rational basis could a court measure any claim of damage objectively? HB 1260 would spur the statewide growth of the "pet lawyer" industry, and we would soon see its ads in newspapers everywhere: "Have you lost a pet lately?"

Our tort system, which is supposed to be a means of compensating the truly wronged, is already a mess. HB 1260 would open the door to frivolous lawsuits and thus block the way for citizens who've suffered real damages that can be more objectively measured. Those people shouldn't be stuck in a queue behind the cases for Spot, Sparky or Winky.

There's also an issue of "moral hazard" here. Down the road, why, for example, shouldn't there be a law that allows a person to sue for emotional distress over the injury or death of a companion jellyfish? In June 2001, the Wisconsin Supreme Court expressed the same concern when it decided a woman could not recover damages for her anguish resulting from the death of her dog. In its ruling, the court said it was "particularly concerned that were such a claim to go forward, the law would proceed upon a course that had no just stopping point. Humans have an enormous capacity to form bonds with dogs, cats, birds and an infinite number of other beings that are non-human."

We worry too about the bill's potentially far-reaching effects on veterinary medicine. We would expect such suits to drive up the costs of vets' malpractice insurance. And as in the human medical field, the heightened litigious environment would surely lead to the practice of "defensive medicine," resulting in higher fees for pet owners.

And then there's the murky issue of the bill's restrictions on vaccinations. The majority of vets appear to dispute that today's dogs and cats are overvaccinated, as the bill suggests. In its current form, HB 1260 could impede the ability of the veterinary community to respond quickly and effectively to an outbreak of rabies. Lawmakers should send this bill to the boneyard where it belongs.

(Rocky Mountain News.com, 2/11/03)

### **2 Strategies, Same Goal in Activism for Animals** By Jon Yates

Robin Webb stood in back of a cramped Logan Square storefront last week, his face flush

and his fists clenched as he barked out orders to an attentive army. Break windows, he implored the overflow crowd. Burn cars, stage protests, clog door locks with Super Glue. "It is a war," said the 59-year-old British spokesman for the Animal Liberation Front, now almost shouting. "It is an all-out bloody war in which all of the victims have been on one side so far."

Webb likens ALF's fight to protect animals to the abolitionists' fight to end slavery. The FBI calls ALF a domestic terrorist group, and many animal welfare groups agree. "Every freedom fighter has been deemed a terrorist," said Webb, who was in Chicago to speak at the Autonomous Zone, 2129 N. Milwaukee Ave., a social gathering spot that caters to activists. His presentation drew more than 50 people. "I don't think the great-great-grandchildren of these activists will say 'Why did you break the law in pursuit of this goal,'" he said later. "I think they'll say 'Why didn't you do more?'"

The ALF, which has no leadership, no membership list and almost no discernible structure, has claimed responsibility for vandalism Feb. 2 at Supreme Lobster and Seafood Co. in Villa Park. Members of the group cut the brake lines and damaged the refrigeration systems on dozens of the company's trucks. Later that day, the group sent an e-mail to the Tribune claiming it targeted Supreme Lobster because it was "responsible for the deaths of more than 1 billion sea creatures over the past 25 years." Webb said he did not take part in the vandalism and does not know who did. But he does support it.

The ALF's primary tactic is to target companies that it believes harms animals and cause those companies economic pain, generally through property damage. The goal is to convince people that animals should not be exploited. Webb and other ALF members say they go to great lengths to ensure no one is harmed in their attacks.

In the Villa Park incident, "ALF--No Brakes" was spray-painted on a bay door of a company building as a warning not to drive the trucks, Webb said. Even if the message was unclear, drivers should have been able to figure out the brakes were inoperable before they got out of the company lot, meaning the risk of injury was minimal, Webb said.

A Supreme Lobster official said the damage was discovered when a driver started a truck, pushed on the brakes and got no response. The truck came to a stop before leaving the parking lot and did not hit anything or anyone, according to officials.

In other cities, members of ALF and a sister group, the Earth Liberation Front, have staged protests, handed out leaflets and picketed. But it's the violent acts that have drawn attention. The groups have broken into laboratories, blown up cars, burned buildings, spray-painted homes and set animals free. Over the past decade, ALF members have been responsible for millions of dollars in damage. "No one wants to break the law, but they feel compelled," said Webb, who also has encouraged people to speak at schools and talk to lawmakers.

Webb defends the violent tactics he spelled out to activists. "I was certainly explaining that that's one way of moving toward animal liberation because, unfortunately, the law has failed," Webb said. "These are tactics that have been used in the past and have been successful."

Others disagree. Wayne Pacelle, senior vice president of the Humane Society of the United States in Washington, D.C., says ALF's message can get lost amid the violence. "There's sympathy for the motive but increasing antipathy for the means," Pacelle said. "It's clearly counterproductive. We believe you lose your moral authority when you resort to vandalism, threats of violence and other means of illegal conduct."

Pacelle said ALF's tactics give the opposition ammunition and damage the image of other animal protection groups. Patti Strand agrees. As president of the Portland-based National Animal Interest Alliance, she advocates for animal welfare by working with businesses, research facilities and farmers. "This movement likes to compare itself to other social welfare movements, but in those movements, like the civil rights movement, you had leaders that condemned violence," Strand said. "That's not the case with this group."

Strand believes ALF hurts the animal welfare cause. "It just confuses the public about what it is they should be supporting," Strand said. Webb brushes aside such criticism, saying groups such as the Humane Society and NAIA

simply aren't willing to do what needs to be done to protect animals.

At the Autonomous Zone, he talks about how easy it is to throw a rock through a butcher shop window or walk by with a hammer in your hand, then suddenly have a glass-shattering convulsion. "Violence?" he says. "I utterly condemn extremism and violence." Then Webb waits a beat. "I do not condemn the compassionate commandos of the Animal Liberation Front."

(Chicago Tribune, 2/16/03)

### **Lab Increases Security During Animal Rights Conference By Cody Mork**

A UC Berkeley animal testing laboratory was under heightened security this weekend amid fears that activists in town for a conference might attack it. UC police beefed up their presence at the Northwest Animal Facility during the three-day animal rights conference at Martin Luther King Jr. Student Union. Police stationed a van outside the entrance of the building and tightened access to it.

The facility has on average 40,000 animals, ranging from mice to monkeys, used for medical tests. Northwest Animal Facility workers were unavailable for comment on the new security measures. The animal rights conference, Liberation Now!, brought together more than 300 students, youth and professors from across the country.

A flier handed out by the Berkeley Organization for Animal Advocacy, a group whose main focus is to get UC Berkeley to steer away from animal research, displayed names of professors and descriptions of their "cruel" research on animals. This research includes making monkeys "undergo surgery to attach a pedestal to their skulls to enable brain cell recording," and making hamsters "endure incisions to expose muscles and/or injections," according to the group.

Members of the organization said they were not at the conference to incite attacks against the lab. "The purpose of the conference is not to incite retaliation against the laboratories," said UC Berkeley senior Julie Ahern, a representative for the Berkeley Organization for Animal Advocacy. "We don't want the conference to get a bad reputation."

Organizers said the conference's intentions were entirely peaceful. "I find it ridiculous that the animal laboratories would increase their security," said organizer Patrick Kwan. "It's sad that the victimizers try to make themselves into the victims." Participants were able to "connect with each other, develop a better understanding of animal rights issues and learn basic organizational skills," Kwan said.

In the past, groups and individuals in the animal food, clothing, entertainment and experimental industries have been targets of crime in the name of animal rights. These attacks have included animal theft, vandalism, harassment and assaults. "There is no exception," said Matt Prescott, Youth Outreach Coordinator for People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. "The animal rights movement must be a nonviolent one. PETA does not support the use of force."

PETA did provoke controversy, however, when it displayed posters on Lower Sproul Plaza that visually compared the treatment of Jews during the Holocaust to animals being prepared for slaughter. The Berkeley Organization for Animal Advocacy plans to hold a protest in front of the Northwest Animal Facility in April as part of World Week for Animals in Laboratories. The group, which held a similar event last year, said the vigil will be peaceful.

(The Daily Californian, 2/24/03)

## **Animal Research Saves Lives!**

## OHSU Puts its Message First

By Robin J. Moody

Oregon Health & Science University is going on the offensive after years of responding to claims of abuse from animal rights activists. OHSU has launched an effort to educate employees about anti-animal research tactics and threats, and how to defend the institute's research through public education and communication with the media.

On Feb. 3, OHSU hosted three speakers to discuss the topic at a video conference. The 115 who attended received materials on topics including "the long-term effects of animal extremism," "telling your story before your critics do" and ways to get the pro-animal research viewpoint out via letters to the editor, news interviews and opinion page contributions.

The push comes as OHSU is constructing a new 35,000-square-foot building at OHSU's Oregon National Primate Research Institute in Beaverton. The \$11 million research facility will house 900 rhesus monkeys, adding 450 new animals to the site. It will be complete in June 2004, according to OHSU spokeswoman Lisa Godwin. The informational effort began about 18 months ago and has included a series of articles in the OHSU employee newsletter, Godwin said. She said the effort is not connected to the primate center expansion.

The OHSU primate center has long been targeted by animal-rights activists. The institute currently houses 3,100 primates—about 25% of which are used in research projects. Research topics run the gamut from depression to heart disease. "It is ironic that they focus so much on the primate center because 95% of research animals at OHSU are rodents. It might be because people feel more sympathy about monkeys," Godwin said.

Critics say that the institute's psychological research for women's and

children's depression is flawed because the monkeys are removed from their social groups and put into isolation. "The research has shown that in isolation they go crazy," said Matt Rossell, an employee of the nonprofit In Defense of Animals (IDA), which aims to eradicate animal cruelty. "They suffer from depression, anxiety and they show behaviors of self-injury. In the worst cases they become psychotic." Rossell worked for the OHSU primate center for two years, and after he quit he released film footage taken at the primate center and spoke out against alleged animal abuses at the center.

At the new primate center, pens have been designed to house a minimum of two monkeys and many will hold larger groups of the animals, Godwin said. Others question whether the physiology of animals can really be used to predict reactions in human bodies. "This has been a constant concern: That animals are simply not good models if we are trying to gain information about human beings," said Courtney Campbell, chair of the philosophy department at Oregon State University and co-professor of a veterinary ethics course.

If the goal is to extrapolate information about humans, and scientists can't design an animal experiment to generate knowledge which can be applied to humans, "the research should not be performed on ethical grounds," Campbell said. A focal point of the controversy is whether alternative models could supplant animal research, at least in some cases.

Could computer models, brain mapping technologies, robotics, in-vitro studies, epidemiology (a branch of science studying the statistical incidence and control of disease) or autopsies suffice? "Cell cultures and computer modeling are used whenever possible," Godwin said. "They are a good first step, but you still need to test something on a live organism. Medical research would love to rely on these alternatives. They are less

expensive and don't have the political liability of animal research, but the scientific reality is nothing has been developed that will replace animal research."

Dr. Jill Parker, an associate professor of veterinary medicine at OSU, said she believes most researchers and instructors using animals subscribe to the "reduce, refine and replace" guidelines. Reduce the number of animals used, refine techniques to minimize distress in the animals and look for ways to replace animal research. Rossell countered that other forms of research are being underutilized. "We should stop wasting money on unreliable and outdated animal studies," he said.

University officials say the animal-rights issue has moved beyond a purely philosophical discussion. In recent years animal-rights activists have taken actions that OHSU officials say threaten employees. In 1999, activists showed up at OHSU President Dr. Peter Kohler's home, and pounded on the windows, reported Gary Granger, OHSU director of public safety. That same year, letters containing razor blades were mailed out to animal research scientists at OHSU and throughout the nation. The blade had been tainted with rat poison, the letter said. People have been spotted outside the primate center recording employee license plate numbers, Granger said. "The challenge is not to treat legitimate activists as if they are extremists or terrorists, but at the same time not to allow people who use extremist or terrorist tactics to get into our facilities or staff under the guise of innocent activism," Granger said.

Animal-rights groups which are active locally include People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, the Animal Liberation Front, IDA and the Coalition Against Animal Testing. Campbell warned against painting all animal rights activists with the same brush. "If you have a fringe group like ALF, supporters of animal research tend to lump them all in the same boat so the public will view them as wild-

eyed fanatics who will stop at nothing to liberate animals," Campbell said.

During OHSU's recent video conference, a speaker from Huntingdon Life Sciences, a private biomedical research company, talked about how employees had been threatened, beaten, their cars overturned and firebombed, and the company's vendors harassed. "Some of those same tactics have occurred here, not the violence, knock on wood, but others," Godwin said. OHSU has taken precautions to protect employee safety. The primate center is surrounded by fences topped with razor wire, employees carry security badges to enter buildings and the grounds are guarded.

Much of the philosophical basis for the debate comes from Australian philosopher Peter Singer, who wrote that humans have duties to animals, Campbell said. "Aren't we part of the animal community as well?" Campbell asked. "What is the basis of our differential treatment toward animals?"

(Portland Business Jrnl, 2/21/03)

### **Monkey's Escape May Sink Biodefense Lab** By Elizabeth Fernandez

The escape of a small gray and tan monkey from a UC Davis medical research center may threaten a proposed high-security lab on campus to study deadly infectious organisms such as anthrax and smallpox that could be used as terrorist weapons. The 4-pound rhesus macaque monkey vanished two weeks ago as her cage was being cleaned at the California National Primate Research Center, where she was used for breeding purposes and was "disease free," according to the university.

But the primate's disappearance is raising grave concerns among the many opponents of a proposed \$150 million biocontainment facility that would be entrusted

to study the world's most dangerous diseases. "A lot of people are anxious about security and the university's ability to operate a lab with such high security needs," said Davis City Councilwoman Sue Greenwald. "This doesn't reassure citizens who have the perception that the proposed facility cannot be failsafe."

On Wednesday, the City Council will vote on a letter, drafted by Mayor Susie Boyd, formally telling UC Davis officials that city government opposes the facility. The Davis campus is among several institutions in the country that applied this month to the National Institutes of Health for the funds to build the National Center for Biodefense and Emerging Diseases. The facility would be the only Biosafety Level 4 lab on the West Coast, and it would house such highly infectious and deadly organisms as anthrax, smallpox, the Ebola virus and the plague. Monkeys for the Level 4 lab would be supplied by the California National Primate Research Center - from which the monkey escaped.

The research center currently supplies monkeys to other UC campuses for Level 2 and 3 research such as cancer, asthma and AIDS, and it is one of eight centers nationwide supported by the NIH to conduct medical research. Opposition to the proposed Level 4 facility from Davis city government cannot, by itself, stop UC from getting the lab, but NIH has said community input will be a factor in selecting a site. Boyd says the disappearance of the monkey, which has been on the lam since Feb. 13, played no role in her decision to ask the council to vote against the lab.

The 2-year-old monkey stands 20 inches high and is valued at \$5,000. It was kept in an indoor cage for breeding purposes with a "disease-free" group of animals at the research center, said UC Davis spokeswoman Maril Stratton. More than 4,200 monkeys live in the primate center, Stratton said. Every year, several monkeys make a break from their outdoor enclosures but are found within the confines of the center itself, Stratton said. She said indoor escapes have been rare and the last one happened 30 years ago. That monkey

was quickly found and tighter security imposed.

The university is investigating the possible theft of the monkey - officials said she could not have slipped off campus on her own. They have searched for her in vain, scouring sewers, baiting traps. The university has said that security would be much more stringent at the proposed Level 4 lab and that no monkey would escape from the facility, which would have armed guards. Nonetheless, many community members are capitalizing on the AWOL primate to raise alarm about the project. "They can't even handle security to keep a monkey in," says Samantha McCarthy, a member of the newly formed Stop UCD BioLab NOW. "They didn't even tell the public about the monkey's disappearance for a week. . . . It's a security breach regardless of how it disappeared. "It's all so ridiculous -- we have monkeys escaping, we have faculty members and the community up in arms."

UC Davis' proposal has been endorsed by numerous politicians and agencies, including the Yolo County Board of Supervisors, the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors and the public health directors of California's 58 counties. Earlier this month, the Davis City Council sent a "neutral" letter to the NIH, saying it needed additional information and public outreach before voting on the proposal.

Particularly in Davis, public opposition has been increasingly thunderous. Boyd says letters and phone calls to her are running 50-1 against the project. "While I personally still support it . . . I have to put aside my personal point of view," she says. "I knew it would be controversial, but I believed the support would be stronger. I have not seen an issue that was so overwhelmingly opposed in my 13 years on the council."

(San Francisco Chronicle, 2/24/03)

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