



Coalition For Animals & Animal Research CFAAR Arizona Newsletter

P.O. Box 210101, Tucson, AZ 85721-0101 (520)621-3931
Vol 16, No 1 Editor: Grace Aranda (antrnweb@ahsc.arizona.edu)

Time to Join or Renew Your Membership

If you have not renewed or would like to join Arizona CFAAR, please fill out the membership form on the back page. Your donations publish our newsletter and educational materials and will be used to expand our webpages. A year's 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**

Campus-Wide Security Update

Friday, March 31: 11:30 am
UMC's Duval Auditorium

This meeting will be held for all persons involved in biomedical research in order to prepare for April, **Animal Rights Month, & World Week for Animals In Labs** (April 23-30, 2006)

Topics to be covered will be:

History of Protests, Vandalism, & Break-ins;
How to Handle Suspicious Mail;
Personal Safety Advice;
Internet Security, etc

This meeting should be considered mandatory for all new employees (anyone who was not here last April). Each lab should send at least one representative.

Questions? Call 621-3931

Tucson Environmentalist Charged with Teaching Arson Class

Federal prosecutors unsealed an indictment charging an environmental activist with teaching others how to start an arson fire during a 2003 lecture in San Diego, where the costliest act of ecoterrorism in U.S. history had just occurred. Prosecutors said Rodney A. Coronado gave the lecture 15 hours after a \$50 million fire destroyed a massive apartment complex in a north San Diego neighborhood. The indictment, however, does not link Coronado to that fire.

Coronado, 39, was arrested Wednesday in Tucson, Ariz., on a charge of distribution of information relating to explosives, destructive devices and weapons of

mass destruction. He will be arraigned there Thursday. Defense attorney R. Antonio Felix of Tucson, Ariz., did not return a message left seeking comment. Coronado previously served four years in federal prison for a 1992 blaze at a Michigan animal research facility.

Daniel Dzwilewski, special agent in charge of the San Diego FBI office, alleged that Coronado was a national leader of the radical Earth Liberation Front. ELF is an underground movement with no public leadership, membership or spokesperson, according to its Web site. An e-mail sent to the Web site didn't elicit an immediate response.

The 2003 fire destroyed a five-story, 206-unit apartment complex, an underground parking garage and a construction crane in the University City area of San Diego. No one was injured. A 12-foot banner found at the scene read "If you build it, we will burn it" with the initials of the ELF. The group, which only communicates with the news media by e-mail, issued a brief statement in response to media inquiries, saying the banner "is a legitimate claim of responsibility by the Earth Liberation Front."

Coronado's subsequent talk covered animal rights and militant environmental activism. According to an account and photos of the speech posted on the Internet, Coronado demonstrated how to build a crude ignition device using a plastic jug filled with gasoline and oil. Three animal rights activists who attended the lecture were ordered jailed for contempt for their refusal to testify before a grand jury investigating the fire.

While he repeatedly insisted that he had no role in the arson, Coronado has said he sympathized with the arsonists. Describing himself as an unofficial ELF spokesman, Coronado told The Associated Press at the time that young activists are "doing the only thing they know to do and that is strike a match and draw a whole lot of attention to their dissatisfaction with protecting the environment."

Authorities said the charge on which Coronado was indicted has only been used four times since it was written in 1997, most recently in an Ohio case unsealed Tuesday against three men charged with attempting to wage terror attacks against the United States. The charge carries a maximum penalty of 20 years in prison.

Coronado was previously sentenced to nearly five years in prison for a crime in which he said he did not participate: the 1992 firebombing of a Michigan State University laboratory and the offices of two animal researchers that caused \$1.2 million in damage. In December, a federal jury in Tucson, Ariz., convicted Coronado of illegally entering the Sabino Canyon Recreation Area to interfere with efforts to trap and relocate mountain lions following public sightings. He faces up to 7 1/2 years in prison when he's sentenced in March. That indictment called Coronado a member of Earth First!, perhaps best known for forest protests aimed at halting logging.

(KVOA news, 2/23/06)

2 Arizonans among 6 Charged in Ecoterror Attacks By Gene Johnson

Six people have been arrested in connection with ecoterrorism attacks in Oregon and Washington dating back to 1998, including a fire at an Oregon poplar farm that was set at the same time as a devastating unsolved fire at the University of Washington's Center for Urban Horticulture. The university fire - one of the Northwest's most notorious acts of ecoterrorism - was set early on May 21, 2001. About 110 miles away in Clatskanie, Ore., fire ripped through buildings and vehicles at the Jefferson Poplar Farm, causing more than \$1 million in damage. The Earth Liberation Front, a shadowy collection of environmental activists, claimed responsibility for both fires, which caused no injuries.

UW researchers said the two arrests in the poplar farm case gave them hope that the horticulture center fire would soon be solved. The center, which was rebuilt at a cost of several million dollars, had done work on fast-growing hybrid poplars in hopes of limiting the amount of natural forests that timber companies log. The ELF said in a statement five days after the fire that the poplars pose "an ecological nightmare" for the diversity of native forests. "We do see it as encouraging," said Fred Hoyt, manager of facilities and grounds for UW's Botanic Garden. "We see this as a positive thing and a way for us to draw some resolution to this incident."

The arrests were made Wednesday in New York, Virginia, Oregon and Arizona, and each of the defendants has been indicted in Oregon or Washington, the U.S. attorney's office said. Besides the tree farm fire, the attacks included three other arsons in Oregon, a \$1.2 million fire at a U.S. Department of Agriculture facility in Olympia, and the toppling of a Bonneville Power Administration transmission tower near Bend, Ore., as the millennium drew near.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Andrew Friedman declined to say Thursday how authorities developed information that led to the arrests after years of investigation. But the FBI and the Building Industry Association of Washington recently began offering \$100,000 rewards for information leading to the arrest and conviction of ecoterrorists.

The FBI estimates that ecoterrorist groups have committed more than 1,100 crimes in the United States since 1976, causing about \$110 million in property damage, and the building industry group says \$8 million of that damage has been in Washington state since 1996. As to whether the horticulture center fire might soon be solved, Friedman said: "Obviously there's a connection there. That would obviously be a lead we'd be pursuing."

The two people charged in the poplar farm fire were Stanislas Gregory Meyerhoff, 28, and Daniel Gerard McGowan, 31. They are also charged with setting a Jan. 2, 2001, fire that caused more than \$1 million in damage at the Superior Lumber Co. in Glendale, Ore. They face a maximum sentence of life in prison if convicted of several counts of arson and use of incendiary devices. Meyerhoff was arrested in Charlottesville, Va., where he attended

Piedmont Community College. McGowan was arrested in New York City.

Kevin M. Tubbs, 36, and William C. Rodgers, 40, face up to 20 years each if convicted of a June 21, 1998, arson at the Agriculture Department's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services facility in Olympia. Another fire at a nearby Agriculture Department research facility, set the same day, remains under investigation. Tubbs was arrested in Springfield, Ore., and Rodgers was arrested in Prescott, Ariz.

Sarah Kendall Harvey, 28, an administrative assistant at Northern Arizona University, was arrested in Flagstaff after being charged in a Dec. 27, 1998, fire at U.S. Forest Industries in Medford, Ore. That fire caused an estimated \$500,000 in damage. She faces up to 20 years if convicted.

Chelsea Dawn Gerlach, 28, a Portland, Ore., woman with strong Eugene, Ore., ties, was charged with conspiring to destroy an energy facility and destruction of an energy facility in the Dec. 30, 1999, toppling of the transmission tower. A not guilty plea was entered for her Thursday by court-appointed attorney Pat Ehlers in U.S. District Court in Portland. Gerlach was ordered held pending a release hearing Monday and was scheduled for trial Feb. 14. She faces up to 25 years on the conspiracy charge, and also was accused by federal complaint of serving as a lookout during a 1999 arson that caused \$1.2 million in damage at the Childers Meat Co. in Eugene. The complaint said two confidential sources had identified her as a participant in the fire.

The 80-foot-tall tower supported transmission lines that carry surplus BPA energy from the Northwest to Southern California. No loss of service occurred because the load was instantly switched to other lines by computer, and workers re-erected the tower the next day. The other defendants were scheduled to make initial appearances in federal court in the districts where they were arrested. It was not immediately clear whether any but Gerlach had lawyers.

(AZ Republic, 12/9/05)

Six Animal Rights Advocates Are Convicted of Terrorism By David Kocieniewski

An animal rights group and six of its members were convicted of terrorism and Internet stalking yesterday by a federal jury that found them guilty of using their Web site to incite attacks on those who did business with or worked for a British company that runs an animal testing laboratory in New Jersey. The case was the first test of the Animal Enterprise Terror Act, enacted in 1992 to curb the most aggressive tactics used by activists. The verdict, which came after 14 hours of deliberation, was called an insidious threat to free speech by some activists, but was cheered by

research scientists, some of whom are lobbying Congress to tighten restrictions on protesters.

During the three-week trial, defense lawyers acknowledged that a Web site run by Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty posted home addresses and other personal information about animal researchers and others. But the activists said they were simply trying to shame their targets into dissociating themselves from the company, Huntingdon Life Sciences, and they disavowed any involvement with the vandalism, death threats, computer hacking and pipe bombs against those on the Web site. Although federal prosecutors presented no evidence that the defendants directly participated in the vandalism and violence, they showed jurors that members of the group made speeches and Web postings from 2000 to 2004 that celebrated the violence and repeatedly used the word "we" to claim credit for it.

Prosecutors also produced telephone records indicating that the president of Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty, Kevin Kjonaas, called a man charged with bombing a California biotech lab shortly after the explosion. Jurors were also shown a videotape of the group's director, Lauren Gazzola, at a protest in Boston, making reference to the previous acts of violence and warning a target, "The police can't protect you!"

The defendants showed little emotion as the jury foreman announced that they had been found guilty on all counts, but after jurors left the room, Ms. Gazzola wept and Mr. Kjonaas turned to the 20 supporters in the courtroom and offered a wan smile and a shrug. They face prison terms of up to 23 years, but are likely to serve no more than 7 under federal sentencing guidelines, according to Michael Drewniak, a spokesman for the United States attorney's office.

Pam Ferdin, who became president of the group after Mr. Kjonaas was indicted, called the verdict an insidious curb on free speech and said she was "ashamed of the jury." "Anyone who writes anything on an e-mail or on a Web site is being treated like we're in a fascist state," said Ms. Ferdin, a former child star who played Felix Unger's daughter on "The Odd Couple" and was the voice of Lucy in the "Peanuts" cartoons. "Our forefathers fought for the right to free speech."

But the prosecutor, Charles B. McKenna, praised the decision, saying that jurors had correctly found that the First Amendment does not protect speech that is likely to incite violence. Although Ms. Ferdin said that the verdict would most likely lead the group to disband, the group's campaign has succeeded in causing substantial economic damage to Huntingdon, where, the group claims, 500 animals a day are killed and dissected as part of drug and cosmetic research. By concentrating on a wide range of people who invest in, and do business with, Huntingdon, the campaign led many companies to sever their ties with the lab, including insurance companies like Aetna and Marsh and major financial institutions including Goldman Sachs and the Bank of America.

One group of researchers, Americans for Medical Progress, warned that the verdict would lead to more violence and called on federal lawmakers to strengthen

the laws against animal rights extremists. "We've seen a dramatic rise in the number of criminal actions against research over the past five years," said Dr. John Young, a veterinarian who is chairman of the research organization. "There's no doubt today's guilty verdicts will provoke still more acts of harassment, intimidation and violence. That is terrorism, and it must be stopped."

Ms. Ferdin vowed that the campaign against animal testing would continue, despite the verdict against her group.

(NY Times, 3/3/06)

Ex-Beatle Urges Napolitano to Block Biotech Firm

Sir Paul wrote to Governor Janet. In a letter mailed from his London offices and signed by the former Beatle, Paul McCartney asks Gov. Janet Napolitano to intervene in Chandler and stop a drug-testing company from building in the city. A spokeswoman in McCartney's London office confirmed the letter's authenticity.

Covance, a global biotech company, has announced plans to build one of its largest facilities near Price and Queen Creek roads, a move that has drawn protests from animal-rights activists worldwide. The firm tests drugs for pharmaceutical companies and uses animals in some of those tests.

In the letter, made public by Norfolk, Va.-based People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, McCartney refers to his late wife, Linda McCartney, an animal-rights advocate, died from breast cancer in 1998 at the couple's ranch near Tucson. "Linda was a champion for animals so it is for her and for all of us who want to protect animals from harm that I am writing to ask you not to let Covance, an animal testing laboratory, set up shop in Chandler."

A famous signature isn't likely to sway the governor, said Napolitano's spokeswoman Jeanine L'Ecuyer. "This is an issue between the city of Chandler and Covance and does not directly involve the governor's office, although she's monitoring the situation," L'Ecuyer said.

A vocal proponent for Arizona economic development and high-paying jobs, Napolitano helped Chandler land a \$3 billion Intel expansion last year by signing a bill that gives the corporation tax breaks. She has also pushed to lure biotech companies that would diversify the state's economy.

The letter contradicts comments McCartney made during a 1998 radio interview shortly after his wife's death, Covance spokeswoman Camilla Strongin said. In a transcript of the interview that she provided, McCartney is reported to have said, "If a drug has got to be used on humans then legally it has to be finally tested on an animal." The interview was aired during Breast Cancer Awareness Month. "It is unfortunate that PETA is using Mr. McCartney to spread their false allegations against our company," she said. "Covance

conducts government required medical research to find medicines for diseases like breast cancer, diabetes, heart disease, Alzheimer's and many others. This is the kind of life-saving research we hope to do at our proposed facility in Arizona, which ultimately benefits people like Mr. McCartney, his family, his friends and his fans around the world."

The proposed Covance site is in an area designated by the city as a prime industrial corridor, but the land still carries agricultural zoning that needs to be changed before construction can start. No rezoning request has been filed, city records show.

(AZ Republic, 3/8/06)

Mice Play a Critical Role in Medical Research

When it comes to the price of mice, you pay extra for defects. A mouse with arthritis runs close to \$200; two pairs of epileptic mice can cost 10 times that. You want three blind mice? That'll run you about \$250. And for your own custom mouse, with the genetic modification of your choosing, expect to pay as much as \$100,000.

Always a mainstay of scientific research, mice have become a critical tool in the quest for new drugs and medical treatments because their genes are remarkably similar to a person's. With proper manipulation — either by man or nature — a set of mouse genes can produce an animal with just about any human ailment, or a reasonable facsimile of it. Strains of mice that succumb to Alzheimer's disease, obesity, diabetes, cancer and countless other conditions are being used to study both the illnesses themselves and potential treatments. As many as 25 million mice are now used in experiments each year.

Where do they come from? Where else? Mouse farms. There are many vendors: The Jackson Laboratory, a nonprofit supplier in Bar Harbor, Maine, ships more than 2 million a year. Commercial breeder Charles River Laboratories of Wilmington, Mass., makes about \$500 million annually selling and caring for lab animals, most of them mice.

Yet the mouse business is a challenging one. What was once a relatively simple business of breeding and shipping animals has become an extremely challenging enterprise that requires cutting-edge technology and a mastery of difficult logistics. "It's not just putting two animals together any more," said Terry Fisher, general manager for business development and surgical services at Charles River Laboratories, a Wilmington, Mass., which offers laboratory animals and services to pharmaceutical companies and researchers.

Mice gained their new significance not long after the completion of the human genome project in 2001. Scientists rushed to finish sequencing the mouse's DNA sequence the following year, and when they put the two genetic codes side-by-side they found something they'd always suspected — the genes of mice and humans are virtually identical. The obvious differences between us and them lie not in the genes themselves but in where, when

and how those genes are activated. "It means that the anatomy and physiology of a mouse is pretty darn similar to what you see in a human," said Rick Woychik, director of the Jackson Laboratory.

When scientists began working with mice a century ago they didn't know anything about DNA, and had only the foggiest notion of genes. But mice were the obvious choice for breeding experiments. Small, docile and more than willing to reproduce, they were readily available from the collections of Victorian mouse fanciers who bred the animals to have interesting coat colors and patterns. Many of today's most popular lab mouse strains are direct descendants of those original "fancy mice."

Over decades, researchers created inbred lines of lab mice by repeatedly mating siblings to one another until every member of the strain was virtually the same genetically. That standardization made it possible for a researcher in Japan to replicate the experiment of a colleague in California without having to worry about genetic variation affecting the result. It also gave each strain a distinct character that made it preferable for certain experiments. The strain BALB/c, for example, is especially useful for immunological studies. Another strain, C3H, is known for its susceptibility to breast tumors.

For much of the 20th century new strains of lab mice were created either by selective breeding or by chance. If a sharp-eyed lab technician or graduate student spotted an unusual animal that turned out to have a novel mutation, a new line would be produced in order to study that particular gene. Now researchers — and increasingly biotechnology companies — can create their own mutations, inserting or deleting genes at will.

Companies such as Deltagen of San Carlos, Calif., will create a "knockout" mouse that lacks a particular gene. Artemis Pharmaceuticals of Cologne, Germany, offers to insert human genes into a mouse's genetic code. PolyGene Transgenetics, a Swiss company, will insert genes whose output can be turned up and down as if they were on a biological dimmer switch. And the award for sheer weirdness goes to Xenogen, an Alameda, Calif., outfit that can hitch the gene of interest to one that codes for the protein that makes fireflies glow. The result: Whenever and wherever the gene being studied switches on inside the mouse, it glows.

Depending on the specific genetic manipulation, the cost to create a custom mouse is usually in the tens of thousands of dollars. Once the line has been established, individual animals can run into the hundreds. "Not that much to pay if you want to see how a disease affects a mammal or how a drug is going to work," said Lee Silver, a Princeton University biologist who has worked with mice since 1978.

This year the NIH spent \$10 million to purchase 250 strains of knockout mice, along with detailed information about their physiology, from two biotechnology companies, California's Deltagen and

Lexicon Genetics of The Woodlands, Texas. The acquisition is just an "hors d'oeuvre" for a much larger international effort to create a knockout strain for every one of the mouse's 20,000 to 25,000 genes, said Chris Austin, director of the National Institute of Health's Chemical Genomics Center.

Some researchers believe studying knockout mice will even lead to the development of new drugs, perhaps dozens of them. One of the first steps in drug development is the identification of what biologists call a target — a biological molecule that is involved in the disease process and can be blocked or otherwise affected by a small, relatively harmless compound.

Good targets are hard to come by. But knockout mice are virtual target factories, because they are missing a single gene, and thus a single biological molecule. For example, if researchers found a knockout mouse that stayed skinny no matter how much it ate, they would immediately have a promising target for an obesity drug. "You can manipulate the genes ... and use the mouse as a translator of mammalian physiology," said Brian Zambrowicz, executive vice president of research at Lexicon Genetics.

Lexicon has knocked out 3,000 mouse genes already, and has designs on 2,000 more. With each knockout, the company performs a detailed battery of tests to determine how the function of the deleted gene correlates to human physiology in six areas: ophthalmology, cardiology, immunology, cancer, metabolism and neurology.

If Lexicon can find just a few dozen good targets among the 5,000 genes it is knocking out, it could easily revolutionize the pharmaceutical industry. Zambrowicz claims that the company has already identified 70 new targets, which is pretty impressive when you consider that the 100 top-selling prescription drugs on the market exploit no more than a few dozen.

Still, it remains to be seen whether a leap can be made from mice with knocked-out genes to therapies for humans. In the past, discoveries that looked promising in rodents have often failed in human patients. "These mice are not going to tell us everything, and sometimes they tell us nothing. But as a starting point," Austin said, "mice play a central role."

(MSNBC.com, 3/6/06)

Experiments in Protest

By Steve Boggan

Imagine sitting at your computer one morning to check your email and finding this: "We are going to kill you, you evil, evil scumbag." For decades, this kind of tactic has frustrated and silenced the vast majority of scientists, universities and research laboratories in the UK when it comes to the thorny issue of animal testing. It has also led to individuals, shareholders, academic institutions and construction companies pulling out of scientific projects because they're afraid.

Last month, a 16-year-old boy decided that he had had enough. Laurie Pycroft, a bright youngster from Swindon with a passion for science, witnessed a demonstration by animal rights activists opposed to the construction of a new research laboratory at Oxford University while he was visiting the town. He went to WH Smith, bought some card and a marker pen, and constructed a placard that read: "Support Progress. Support the Oxford Lab." Then he stood opposite the anti-vivisection protest, holding up his own piece of card.

After that he went home and decided to set up a new organisation called Pro-Test, creating a website at www.pro-test.org.uk with the aim of "promoting and supporting scientific research and debate including animal-based research". His argument is that science that uses limited research on animals can advance human knowledge, particularly in the field of medicine. Within days, he was inundated with messages of support from people who shared his frustration with the status quo. Then, last Saturday in Oxford, around 1,000 people joined him on a march to support the scientists.

Considering the particular circumstances of the Oxford dispute, this was undeniably an act of courage. Oxford University says the lab will not increase the amount of animal experimentation that it carries out, but is intended to replace older facilities within the biomedical research department. But construction on the laboratory has been under way only since December, after 16 months in which no developer was willing to work on the project. The previous construction company, Montpellier, pulled out in 2004, after repeated threats to its workers and directors and a slump in its share price. The names of the companies that have taken over have been kept a closely guarded secret. Workers at the site enter and leave wearing balaclavas and take precautions against being followed as they go home. Plans for a similar laboratory at Cambridge University, meanwhile, have been shelved altogether because of the intimidation.

Pycroft's campaign attracted immediate attention - including the email quoted above. But soon a group of students at Oxford University also read about the new campaign group in a newspaper article, and decided they wanted to stand alongside Pycroft. This week they have put their own heads above the parapet - courting some risk themselves in agreeing to talk to and be photographed by the Guardian.

These few students are now at the centre of a movement that could have enormous implications for scientific research and for the safety of those involved in it. In some ways this is a strange movement - students campaigning to defend the establishment instead of attempting to bring it down - yet Pro-Test's supporters would argue that it also belongs in the finest traditions of protest: embracing debate and opposing intimidation. Pycroft says he believes this is the world's first student-based pro-vivisection movement.

I meet five of the students behind Pro-Test at the Mitre pub in Oxford. Perhaps predictably, given the

historical reluctance of the establishment to combat the issue head on, a university room for our meeting has been withdrawn at the last minute. They are scruffy, in jeans and T-shirts; they are young and palpably idealistic. "After hearing about what Laurie had started, we all felt this was an issue of such huge importance that we had to keep it going," says Iain Simpson, 19, the most vocal of the group.

Like many of those joining Pycroft, Simpson is not a science student; he is studying politics, philosophy and economics (PPE). Born in East Anglia to a mother who teaches and a father in the financial services industry, he got involved, he says, because he feels the issue goes way beyond scientific considerations. "This is about academics feeling under siege and our concern that no one is defending them. For decades scientists have been vilified for conducting necessary animal research that has led to advances that have saved millions of lives. Because no one has spoken out on their behalf, and because they have been too afraid to defend their work, a culture has developed where people are suspicious of what they are doing. "This started as a local issue, but on a macro scale we hope to turn the tide in terms of animal research. Scientists and academic institutions have been too afraid to engage in the debate and, therefore, have allowed activists to set the agenda. Now I feel it is right to draw a line in the sand and say, 'No more.' We want to get that debate out in the open and win it based on reason."

With him are Tom Holder, a 20-year-old PPE student from Cambridge; Chris Bickerton, 26, a PhD student in international politics, from Glasgow; Tom Ogg, 21, another PPE student, from south London; and James Panton, a 29-year-old lecturer in politics from Fife. They say they are part of a hardcore group that includes about 10 other activists (at least half of whom are science students) who are prepared to go public. They intend to form an action committee to plan further marches, events and debates.

The five are a mixed bunch and say they have no wider party political ambitions for the group. Like many young people, several do not identify themselves with the politics of left or right. Bickerton, for example, describes himself as a humanist interested mainly in moral issues. Simpson, though, is actively Labour. Bickerton's mother is a teacher, his father a professor of modern languages. He says he is a keen boxer. "What has concerned me is that a culture has grown in society that dictates that unless they are reined in, scientists will go off the rails and pursue things we should be afraid of," he says. "There is an underlying scepticism of the work they do, and this has been fostered by their fear of explaining their work in case they are targeted by the animal rights movement. "But this raises much bigger issues, intuitive issues about humanity's right to conduct research with animals. Given the choice between not experimenting or saving human lives, I would put human life above all else."

The university says that 98% of the research in the lab will be carried out on fish and rodents, with a further 2% on higher mammals, and less than 1% on primates. But Speak, a local anti-vivisection group

involved in the protests against the development, claims that "whole troupes" of primates will be subject to experiments. Robert Cogswell, Speak's co-founder, says he regards the student group as "irrelevant". "It is not so much a group of pro-vivisection individuals as a collection of people who simply oppose the animal rights movement," he says, claiming that most of those on Saturday's march (he puts the number at "400 at most") were "hunters in hunting regalia, and there were hardly any students". "Nevertheless, if they give us someone with whom to debate, I welcome them. We have always wanted a public debate because we feel we can win the argument." He says the group does not condone violence.

The Animal Liberation Front is also involved in the dispute; it has said that anyone associated with the construction of the £20m laboratory - or with the university itself, including students - is what it calls a "legitimate target". One recent warning stated that any company or individual that donated to the university would feel its wrath. "[They] can now expect the full attention of the ALF," it said. "It's not going to be pretty."

It is part of a long-running campaign by the ALF that in recent years has intensified in the Oxford region. In 2000 and 2001, the ALF launched numerous threats and attacks on property and staff of Huntingdon Life Sciences, a contract research laboratory in Abingdon, including a physical assault on Brian Cass, its managing director, by three men wielding pickaxe handles. Another ALF target has been a guinea pig farm in Newchurch, Staffordshire. During a two-year campaign of intimidation, there were more than 450 incidents of threats against the farmer, Chris Hall, and his suppliers.

In October 2004, the body of Gladys Hammond, Hall's mother-in-law, was dug up and stolen from a graveyard in Yoxal, Staffordshire. It has still not been recovered and the farm has now closed. Four people have been charged with conspiracy to blackmail the guinea pig breeder.

Yesterday, one victim of intimidation, asking not to be named, described how it feels. "There are death threats by email, or threats to kidnap your children," he said. "They might slash your car tyres or throw paint stripper over it. Then there are telephone threats, some of which threaten violence and others that are strangely polite. And there are letters to your neighbours telling them you are a paedophile or a rapist. "This brings about enormous psychological pressure on you and your family, but the threats of violence are rarely followed up. Most of it is noise and bluster. But I was attacked on my doorstep one morning and had a substance sprayed into my eyes and then some men began to rough me up. Fortunately, I fell backwards into my hall - in front of my wife and three-year-old daughter. Then they smashed my windows, leaving me lying there covered in glass."

The Pro-Test group say they are aware of the risk of becoming targets themselves, but still want to speak out. Panton, the politics lecturer, says: "There may be some danger but I don't see a great deal. When

1,000 people come out to a demo, then there are 1,000 people to be taken on. If the ALF threaten us, they will simply make their cause more unpopular. "And there is an issue of safety in numbers; the more people who come out and stand up to be counted, then the more scientists will feel confident enough to argue their corner. We simply can no longer allow a tiny minority employing anti-democratic methods and intimidation to take control of this debate."

The scientific community, meanwhile, is delighted at this new-found support. John Stein, a professor of neurophysiology at Oxford, says: "What Pro-Test is doing is stupendous. It is true that, unusually for students, they are supporting the establishment, but that is only because the establishment has not been standing up for itself. There has been a terrible policy of universities keeping their heads down and that results in those advocating intimidation and threats of violence winning the argument by default. What these students are doing displays an immense amount of courage."

Simon Festing, director of RDS, formerly the Research Defence Society, agrees. His group, funded by universities and pharmaceutical companies, exists to make the case for using animals in medical research; he argues that the threat to the Pro-test group may not be as great as it seems. "There are threats, but the ALF concentrate all their serious efforts on a certain number of targets and they would see Pro-Test as a distraction," he says. "ALF members are more interested in finding out who is building the lab so they can threaten them than in attacking campaigners."

But what of the ALF? "More people campaigning for the rights of animals have been killed or injured than anyone targeted by protesters," says Robin Webb, the organisation's spokesman. "These people should consider themselves lucky to enjoy freedom to speak their minds. In 1994, I was banged up for seven months on remand simply for campaigning."

Pycroft, meanwhile, believes last weekend's march is just the beginning. His family has been given security advice from the police and his parents have installed a panic alarm in case of attacks, but he insists he will remain at the head of the organisation. "I had been following the issue for quite some time before I began Pro-Test, so I knew it could get nasty," he says. "But I was very pleasantly surprised when half of Oxford came out to support us at the march. We're planning more marches and events now, and we hope our support will grow. Our main aim is to bring more information out into the debate so that people are not so suspicious of scientists."

Whether this is really the beginning of a popular movement remains to be seen. There will be a large section of the population for whom animal experimentation will always remain morally unacceptable. Many respected scientists, meanwhile, argue that computer simulations could project many of the results sought by experimenting on animals and that animal tests may be worse than useless, since their physiology is so different from that of humans.

In the meantime, however, this small group of young people has certainly caused some ripples. The Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry published an open letter calling "on the leaders of the banking, transport, construction and services industries, which have been targets of intimidation in the past, to stand in public solidarity with each other, with British patients and their families, and with the scientists who seek to find cures for human and animal disease." It ascribed its newly emboldened stance to a "growing grassroots movement".

No matter which way the debate develops in future, it is clear that science is increasingly determined to put its side of the argument.

(Guardian Unlimited, 3/3/06)

Animal People's Annual "Who Gets The Money" List

In its December 2005 edition, which was just released, the animal rights publication Animal People once again published its annual analysis of IRS reports by key animal rights/animal welfare groups. For those extremist groups involved in campaigns against the use of animals in research, the amount of money raised and budgeted increased in FY2004 in all but a couple of instances.

As you review these numbers, keep in mind that groups such as SHAC, Hugs for Puppies, and the Animal Defense League did not file tax documents for FY 2004, yet were responsible for the most visible attacks against research.

Also for your thoughts, here is how Americans for Medical Progress placed in FY2004 in the categories noted by *Animal People*. Clearly, the animal rights forces have much more in the way of finances to wage their campaigns. We need your support.

Americans for Medical Progress/AMP

raised/earned: \$709,680
budget: \$516,252
programs: \$416,932
overhead: \$99,320
net assets: \$387,973

ANIMAL RIGHTS GROUPS

*(figures in parentheses show
FY2003/FY02/FY01 budgets)*

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals/PETA

raised/earned: \$28,072,597
budget: \$25,063,060 (\$16,414,174/\$13,499,614
/\$17,668,699)
programs: \$21,583,096
overhead: \$3,479,964
net assets: \$11,479,793

Foundation to Support Animal Protection/FSAP

budget: \$3,294,816 (\$2,192,281/\$2,430,555/
\$2,610,200)
programs: \$30,926

overhead: \$3,263,890
net assets: \$18,543,022

(Note that PETA was apparently the sole beneficiary of FSAP in FY2004. Animal People has consistently noted that FSAP serves as a place for PETA to locate some of its fundraising and management costs. From Animal People: "Attributing those costs to FSAP has the effect of concealing the true extent and nature of PETA spending and assets. If FSAP and PETA were seen as a single fundraising unit, they raised \$31 million, spent \$28.4 million; spent \$18.6 million on programs; and their overhead expense came to \$8.8 million, 31% of the budget. Their total assets were \$30 million, 60% held by FSAP including 57% of the cash and securities. Their combined payroll was \$6.1 million, of which FSAP paid \$1.8 million - 29%.")

Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine/PCRM

raised/earned: \$10,180,959
budget: \$10,683,823 (\$2,667,912/\$2,915,847/
\$2,533,289)
programs: \$10,086,265
overhead: \$597,558
net assets: \$2,756,346

PCRM Foundation

raised/earned: \$5,823,902
budget: \$1,616,079
programs: \$1,493,415
overhead: \$122,663
net assets: \$8,597,066

(According to Animal People, the newly-created PCRM Foundation exists exclusively to perform services for the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. If taken as a single entity, their combined overhead expense would be 21% of their total budget.)

American Anti-Vivisection Society/AAVS

raised/earned: \$954,348
budget: \$1,408,762 (\$1,219,000/\$1,235,214
/\$1,088,433)
programs: \$1,101,108
overhead: \$307,654
net assets: \$16,620,677

Animal Legal Defense Fund/ALDF

raised/earned \$3,581,142
budget: \$3,072,467 (\$3,208,308/\$3,360,728/
\$3,133,399)
programs: \$2,403,676
overhead: \$668,791
net assets: \$3,560,815

Animal Welfare Institute/AWI

raised/earned: \$2,913,514
budget: \$1,426,742 (\$1,260,416/\$1,072,951/
\$1,169,280)
programs: \$1,219,473
overhead: \$207,269
net assets: \$4,841,036

Humane Society of the United States/HSUS

raised/earned \$74,015,068
budget: \$70,306,473 (\$67,272,795/\$58,865,207/
\$50,431,797)
programs: \$51,561,573
overhead: \$16,210,212
net assets: \$111,021,299

(Note that these figures do not include statistics from the Fund for Animals, which merged with HSUS at the end of 2004. In FY

2003, the Fund's budget was 7,358,158 and it had net assets amounting to nearly \$20 million.)

In Defense of Animals/IDA

raised/earned: \$3,194,409
budget: \$3,150,113 (\$2,304,433/\$2,339,784 /\$1,841,705)
programs: \$2,642,963
overhead: \$507,150
net assets: \$3,301,045

Last Chance for Animals/LCA

raised/earned: \$705,699
budget: \$651,099
programs: \$516,186
overhead: \$134,913
net assets: \$94,676

National Anti-Vivisection Society/NAVS

raised/earned: \$1,665,144
budget: \$1,840,996 (\$2,810,328/\$2,657,596/\$2,620,228)
programs: \$1,348,163
overhead: \$492,833
net assets: \$3,904,098

New England Anti Vivisection Society/NEAVS

raised/earned: \$818,234
budget: \$866,917 (\$779,088/\$885,239/\$1,084,575)
programs: \$723,981
overhead: \$142,936
net assets: \$7,175,451

(AMP News, 1/2/06)

The Southwest Association for Education in Biomedical Research - SwAEBR

The progress of biomedical research is threatened by the growing scientific illiteracy of the public and, in particular, our young people. Opinion polls have shown that most adults do not understand the process of bringing basic research into applications that directly benefit their health and well-being. Biological science education is in serious trouble as indicated by the rapid decline in numbers of college students graduating with degrees in biomedical science. Education of the general public, our young people and their teachers is of vital importance to the future of science and biomedical research.

Science teachers in the elementary, middle and high schools must be provided information on the relevancy of animal research and the roles that animals play in scientific and medical progress. At all levels of society, the facts concerning the process of medical discovery must be instilled. Without exposure to the truth concerning research, many of our next generations will be deceived into believing that biomedical research, particularly that involving animals, is unnecessary.

SwAEBR's Mission

SwAEBR has been formed with the specific mission of developing and implementing a strong proactive campaign to educate school children, as well as the

general public, in the vital role biomedical research plays in their everyday lives. The Association will disseminate information necessary to improve the public's understanding of how responsible and humane animal research has led to significantly improved health care for man and his animal companions.

Friends of SwAEBR:

Individuals may support the Association through honorary membership known as Friends of SwAEBR. Friends are not required to pay dues, not entitled to vote, and have access to all services and programs sponsored by the Association.

How Can You Help?

Provide financial support - For general support, production of educational resources and sponsorship of the summer internship program.

- \$25 helps sponsor educational materials for the classroom
- \$50 sponsors a game for a class of students
- \$100 thanks teachers for getting their students involved in the essay contest
- \$250 helps pay for videos to be used by in classrooms
- \$500 sponsors awards for one of the regional science fairs
- \$1100 sponsors a student in the summer internship program

Serve on our speakers bureau - Speakers are frequently requested for classroom and organization presentations. This increases the visibility of your company, SwAEBR, as well as educating the public.

How Will Your Company Benefit?

- 1) Your website can be linked through our actively viewed webpage.
- 2) Satisfaction of contributing to the education of promoting biomedical research.
- 3) Through sponsoring the essay contest winners your company directly affects the workforce of tomorrow by enhancing their interest in science and technology.

To become a Friend of SwAEBR go to:

www.swaibr.org

LIVING PROOF - Seniors

You have a special story to share. You have benefited from incredible medical advances. You are living proof that medical research touches us all. The Living Proof project would like to hear how advances in medical science changed your life.

Share your own story online: www.Living-Proof.us
or write to Living Proof at P.O. Box 360,
Milwaukee, WI 53201-0360 -Phone: 414-899-9246,
www.Living-Proof.us

Coalition For Animals & Animal Research - CFAAR
2006 Membership Application

Name: _____

Mailing Address: (Campus, if available) _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Electronic Mail: _____

Send me my newsletter electronically Yes _____ No _____
(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 \$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

Arizona CFAAR
University of Arizona
P.O. Box 210101
Tucson, AZ 85721-0101

Address Service Requested

181040

Your Membership Dues Produce This Newsletter

Please Pay Your Dues Today!