



# Coalition For Animals & Animal Research CFAAR Arizona Newsletter

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

Vol 18, No 1 Editor: Grace Aranda (antrweb@ahsc.arizona.edu)

## Time to Join or Renew Your Membership

To Join Arizona CFAAR, or to renew your membership, 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.

### In this issue...

UCSC Researcher's Family Attacked at Home	1
FBI Joins Investigation into Attack on Home of UC Santa Cruz Researcher	3
Security Awareness	4
Why is Security So Important? A Look Back to the 1989 Break-in	4
Bill to Conceal Names of Animal Researchers Passes	5
UCLA Is Suing to Protect Researchers from Animal Extremists	5
Animal Rights Activist Pleads Guilty to Charge Related to Arson	6
When Workers are Targeted	6
PETA Infiltrates Primate Center	7
Covance Foes' Suit Against City Dismissed	8
Research's Best Friend	9
Toward Tolerating Transplants	10
Animal Research Saves Lives: A Real Life Example	11
Membership Form	12

### 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.

CFAAR chapters share the following objectives:

- To **organize** students, faculty, and staff at institutions where animal research is performed so effective letter writing campaigns can be initiated quickly.
- To **educate** the public, in general, and the campus, in particular, about the true nature of animal research and animal researchers.
- To **support** responsible and humane use of animals in biomedical research.

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 Wednesday, March 26: 12:30 pm 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 20-26, 2008)

**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

### UCSC Researcher's Family Attacked at Home By Tom Ragan

A University of California-Santa Cruz faculty member whose biomedical research uses animals was the target of an attack Sunday afternoon, reportedly by animal rights activists. UCSC Chancellor George Blumenthal confirmed late Monday that an off-campus home invasion by six masked intruders occurred at a faculty member's home. In a statement, Blumenthal called the incident "very disturbing."

Santa Cruz police reported that six people wearing bandanas tried to break into a Westside home just before 1 p.m., and that one of the family members, not the faculty member, was attacked before the intruders

fled. The male victim had made sure his wife and children were safe in the back of the house before he confronted the attackers. He suffered minor injuries after being hit with an unknown object. None of the other four people in the house were injured.

The name of the faculty member, who performs research on the causes of breast cancer and neurological diseases, was not released. Measures have been taken to protect the faculty member and the family — in addition to other staff members and students who have been targeted by animal rights activists in recent weeks — campus spokesman Jim Burns said. "This represents an escalation, breaking into somebody's house," Burns said.

In his statement, Blumenthal condemned the attacks, saying, "disagreement, debate and dissent on a range of subjects are all hallmarks of a healthy university community. However, an attempted home invasion by masked perpetrators is not free speech — it is a criminal act that threatens, intimidates and stifles academic freedom."

On Feb. 12, Blumenthal sent a message to staff members saying there had been several recent incidents of intimidation to faculty and staff, "purportedly over laboratory research involving animals. The incidents include harassing phone calls and graffiti vandalism at the victims' homes. "No claims of responsibility have been made, and police are investigating. These actions come in the wake of dangerous incidents involving researchers at other campuses, including UCLA."

Santa Cruz police raided a house in the 700 block of Riverside Avenue late Sunday night in connection with the home invasion. No arrests were made. Santa Cruz Police Lt. Rudy Escalante said investigators believe three UCSC students were involved in the home invasion. The investigation is continuing and Escalante said he would have more information today. Witnesses to the Westside attack provided police with a license plate of the vehicle the attackers fled in, Escalante said.

Early Monday, Escalante would not confirm a motive or say if the attack was related to animal activists. He could not be reached to comment late Monday. Earlier in the day, Escalante said of the suspects: "They were wearing bandanas ... and were screaming and trying to break into the house. Witnesses gave us information on the suspect vehicle. We tracked it to Riverside Avenue. We obtained a search warrant. We served the search warrant last night. It's relative to a home invasion and right now the case is continuing. We've got evidence we're processing."

Seized in the 9:50 p.m. raid were clothes, cell phones and boxes of paperwork, which Escalante said showed evidence of possible other attacks. The owner of the house on Riverside Avenue, Frank Male, said he received a call from police Sunday that three of his tenants were not cooperating with the investigation and that police were seeking a search warrant. Male said he gave officers keys to the house, but Escalante said

officers broke down the side door when no one answered.

Joe Marcus of Santa Cruz said he heard shattering glass and a woman inside the house scream when police barged through the door. Male said his tenants have kept his house clean and in the month he's rented to them have posed no problems.

Several UCSC students gathered around the house early Sunday afternoon while police were waiting for the search warrant. Some wore bandanas to cover their faces. The Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Office helped police secure the area as the crowd grew to more than 70, Escalante said. "The Sheriff's Office got called in later after the crowd got agitated," he said.

While the search was taking place, protesters taunted officers, asking them to reveal their badge numbers and shining flashlights in their eyes. When officers emerged from the house carrying evidence, some of the students were following the police, taking pictures of the undercover squad car and its license plates with their cell phones.

A friend of the students who were inside the Riverside home told the Sentinel the incident was related to animal rights and SHAC. A group, called SHAC7, includes six activists and a corporation, Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty USA Inc. They were found guilty of multiple federal felonies for their role in shutting down an animal testing lab, Huntingdon Life Sciences. SHAC7 has an office in San Francisco. Attempts to reach them Monday were unsuccessful.

Saturday night, animal rights activist Peter Young appeared at the Loudon Nelson Community Center to talk about his experiences with the animal liberation movement and SHAC7. The film "Behind the Mask," about the lives and motivations of animal liberationists, also was screened.

This isn't the first attack against UC researchers. Thursday, a Los Angeles County Judge issued a temporary restraining order against animal rights groups and activists accused of threatening UCLA employees and graduate students because they conduct research using animals.

The order by Superior Court Judge Gerald Rosenberg forbids the activists from engaging in acts of harassment and threats of violence, and requires that they stay away from anybody who is known to be a university employee involved in animal research, UCLA's attorney John C. Hueston said.

It also ordered the activists and their groups to remove the researchers' personal information from Web sites that name them as targets of their protest. "That's what's been so distressing for the faculty members," Hueston said.

Three times since June 2006, Molotov cocktail-type devices have been left near the homes of faculty members who oversee or participate in research that involves animals, according to the university. Researchers' homes have been vandalized and they have received threatening phone calls and e-mails. On at least one occasion a faculty member received a package rigged with razor blades, UCLA said in a statement. "Enough is enough," UCLA Chancellor Gene Block said. "We're not

willing to wait until somebody is injured before taking legal action to protect our faculty and administrators from terrorist tactics, violence and harassment."

The University of California's Board of Regents also sought permanent injunctions against the Animal Liberation Front, the Animal Liberation Brigade, the UCLA Primate Freedom Project and five protesters believed to be affiliated with those groups. The lawsuit alleges that the defendants invaded researchers' privacy, interfered with business practices and intentionally caused emotional distress. Jerry Vlasak, a spokesman for the Animal Liberation Press Office, had earlier said underground protesters would not be moved by the lawsuit.

(Monterey County Herald, 2/26/08)

### **FBI Joins Investigation into Attack on Home of UC Santa Cruz Researcher** By Jennifer Squires

The FBI is investigating whether there is any connection between militant animal rights activists in Southern California and the weekend attack on the home of a University of California - Santa Cruz researcher, a spokeswoman confirmed Wednesday. "The reason we said we'd look into it is to see if there's a possible link to domestic terrorism," said Patti Hanson, an FBI public affairs specialist in San Francisco.

A demonstration by six masked protesters in front of a UCSC scientist's Westside home Sunday afternoon turned violent when the group pounded on the door and were confronted by the researcher's husband, police reported. The incident bears a striking resemblance to recent attacks on University of California - Los Angeles researchers that were linked to three animal rights groups.

Los Angeles County court documents filed last week state that "masked persons ... trespass onto the property of an employee... They attempt to terrorize the employee and family members by banging on the front door and shouting threats and obscenities through bullhorns ..."

No one has claimed responsibility for the Santa Cruz attack. Police have not made any arrests or confirmed that Sunday's incident was connected to any animal rights organization, though UCSC's chancellor clearly stated that was the case in a statement Monday. "We're still trying to identify the people and what the motive is," Santa Cruz police Lt. Rudy Escalante said. "It's still not 100 percent conclusive that it's an animal rights group."

The FBI says some of the animal rights groups named in the Los Angeles judge's restraining order signed Monday are considered domestic terrorists because of the violent nature of their attacks. Two FBI agents were in Santa Cruz on Tuesday to assist with the investigation, according to Escalante.

The Los Angeles restraining order names UCLA Primate Freedom, the Animal Liberation Brigade and the Animal Liberation Front, as well as five Southern California people suspected of harassing UCLA employees involved in animal research. Investigators

have not linked the UCLA incidents - vandalism, trespassing, demonstrations, threatening phone calls, flooded homes and unexploded Molotov cocktails - to the Santa Cruz attack. "Right now we're just looking into it," Hanson said.

Meanwhile, Santa Cruz police released more details about Sunday's attack. Escalante said the UCSC's researcher's husband heard yelling in the front yard, looked out the front door window and saw protesters about 12:50 p.m.

At the time, the family was celebrating a birthday party for one of their children. Their two children and two others, all under the age of 10, were inside. They moved the kids to the back of the house and the wife stayed with them. "By that time he hears pounding," Escalante said. The man returned to the front door, locked the dead bolt, checked on the kids and went back to the door. "He can see the [door] frame moving."

At some point, someone from the home dialed 911 but didn't speak. "It was an open line with some sort of disturbance," Escalante said. "There was a woman screaming in the background and children crying." Police were dispatched to the address associated with the phone number. Meanwhile, the man opened the front door and confronted the protesters.

He was hit on the hand once or twice by an unknown object, and fought back throwing a punch or two, according to police. "He defended himself after being attacked," Escalante said. "He started in the doorway by trying to push the people back, then moved back out onto the lawn area." Eventually, the group of six ran to a car parked around the corner and drove away.

Police released a photo of the suspected getaway car Wednesday, asking for the public's help to identify whoever ditched the white Chevy sedan on Elm Street in downtown Santa Cruz. The car was linked to the attackers by the license plate number captured as the car fled the Westside residence. The vehicle's registered owner, who lives out of the county, told officers the car's likely driver lives in a home on Riverside Avenue. Officers raided that house, occupied by three UCSC students, Sunday night.

Police seized cell phone records, computer files and documents from the home, which Escalante said contained evidence of "possible other attacks." Escalante said those attacks were previous vandalism incidents, which included "chalking and writing on sidewalks" with "threatening and derogatory overtones." He declined to say if the language used in the graffiti was animal rights-related or where the incidents occurred. Both the researcher and UCSC have said an animal rights message had been written in chalk in front of her house earlier this month.

Police have been reluctant to link the attack at the Westside home to a half-dozen reports of vandalism at homes of UCSC researchers in Santa Cruz and surrounding areas within the past month. "We've been aware of some of these incidents," Escalante said, adding officers were doing extra patrols past homes of researchers.

Additionally, the restraining order approved in Los Angeles County protects those researchers and any other UC employees, their research areas and homes, from the

groups and people named in the court documents, according to Paul Schwartz of the UC Office of the President. "So if these people that were involved in the Santa Cruz incident are affiliated with those groups, it would apply to them," Schwartz said. He also said UC officials have not decided if they would seek another restraining order if those suspected in the Santa Cruz attack are not named in Los Angeles County order. "I really can't speculate," Schwartz said. "I think we need to know what the folks doing the investigation turn up before we determine what the appropriate next steps may be."

(San Jose Mercury News, 2/27/08)

### Security Awareness

Periodically a refresher in security matters helps to remind all of us to take a couple of seconds to be aware of what is going on around us.

If your laboratory is in a secure facility, ensure that the doors remain locked, and that none of the doors are propped open. Propping doors creates the opportunity for unwanted visitors. If you see a door ajar, close it and insure that it is locked.

Report maintenance difficulties such as burnt out lights, inoperable locks, doors or windows that will not close to your supervisor.

Know who should be in the laboratory. If you do not know who someone is ask them if you can help them. If they do not answer your questions satisfactorily, or do not seem to belong there, call the UAPD.

If someone just seems to be loitering in the area, there is a possibility that the person is "casing" the area - watching for patterns in routines. Try to avoid establishing patterns whenever possible.

Report suspicious or unusual activity to the UAPD at once. Be specific with the description of the person and his/her location.

If your office or laboratory is "taken over" immediately notify UAPD. To report an emergency dial 911 from any University of Arizona telephone. Shut down computers and secure important files. Remain calm! Protect yourself, do not try to be a hero. By calling the police and protecting yourself you have done as much as anyone could ask.

Crime prevention is everyone's responsibility. By eliminating the "opportunity" you have reduced the risk of becoming a victim.

If you have specific concerns or questions contact UAPD at 621-8273.

### Why is Security So Important?

#### A Look Back to the 1989 Break-in...

Damage Estimates At UA Doubled By Gene Varn

Tucson -- Damage estimates doubled Tuesday for vandalism at the University of Arizona, from which animal-rights group took more than 1,200 animals, including some diseased-infected mice.

Officer Brian Seastone, spokesman for the UA Police Department said new estimates puts the damage for two building fires and other destruction at \$200,000, compared with \$100,000 estimated Monday.

Seastone said that there are no suspects and "no new leads whatsoever" in the destruction for which a group called the Animal Liberation Front claimed responsibility in press releases sent Monday to news organizations.

Sharon Kha, director of the UA Office of Public Information, said Tuesday that the infected mice are "dangerous primarily to the person who is handling them."

There is little danger if the mice are released, because air rapidly dries up their fecal matter, which contains a parasite that causes a severe form of diarrhea, she said.

The mice are infectious for up to three weeks, Kha said. An effort to retrieve the mice is part of the criminal investigation being conducted by UA police, Kha said.

On Monday, UA officials asked that the mice and the other animals be returned to the UA laboratories from which they were taken. Michael Cusanovich, UA vice president for research, said, "A huge incentive (for the animals' return) would be common sense."

The Animal Liberation Front's press release, which contained no names, said the group set fires at two UA buildings and ransacked laboratories in two other buildings in protest of the use of animals in laboratory research.

UA officials said that the group took more than 1,200 animals, more than 1,000 of them white mice, including 30 that had been purposely infected with a contagious parasite for research purposes.

According to a UA warning, those who took the infected mice could contact cryptosporidium, a parasitic disease that causes severe diarrhea. The illness is common in Third World countries.

The disease is not life-threatening in healthy adults, although it could be fatal to malnourished children or "immunocompromised" people, such as victims of acquired immune deficiency syndrome, UA researchers said.

The mice had been infected in a project aimed at finding a cure for the disease.

Members of the animal-rights group apparently shattered windows to gain access to the mice.

On Tuesday, Seastone said that damage estimates for one of the buildings in which fires were started were increased to \$100,000 from \$10,000. That building is a house on the northern side of the campus. The structure was used as headquarters for University Animal Care, which oversees animals used in UA laboratory research. Seastone said that further investigation indicated the building no longer is useable and that extensive smoke damage had been done to computer and other equipment.

The damage estimate for the other fire, at the Pharmacy and Microbiology Building on the southern side of the campus, remained the same at \$90,000, Seastone said. At that building, a rooftop laboratory area called The Penthouse was set on fire.

Seastone said that a preliminary damage estimate was put at \$10,000 for another building, in which laboratory areas were ransacked. There was no damage estimate for similar destruction at another UA building, Seastone said.

(The Arizona Republic, April 5, 1989)

### **Bill to Conceal Names of Animal Researchers Passes** By Rochelle McConkie

The Utah House of Representatives passed a bill to conceal the names, personal addresses and phone numbers of U animal researchers. The bill, which passed unanimously Feb. 22 and the Senate president signed on Monday, would modify the Government Records Access and Management Act to classify personal information of researchers who do medical or scientific research on animals at Utah colleges and universities as protected documents. Gov. Jon Huntsman must now sign the bill for it to become law.

Sen. Greg Bell, R-Fruit Heights, sponsored the bill in response to animal rights protesters from the group Utah Primate Freedom who, he said, had been harassing U researchers and vandalizing their homes. "The public has the right to understand what research is going on...but they don't need to know specific information of workers," Bell told *The Daily Utah Chronicle* earlier this month. "Basic human dignity and decency requires that we have people in good faith pursuing legitimate research, but we shouldn't be harassing people just because we disagree with them. But that hasn't worked, so we have to resort to legal means."

Utah Primate Freedom activist Harold Rose said the legislation won't have any effect on the group's campaign to stop animal research. "It's more of a symbolic gesture on their part," Rose said. "Unless they completely cease doing research, we're going to hear about it."

Rose said none of the names or addresses of researchers his organization has used to target researchers' homes were found through GRAMA requests or the Freedom of Information Act, because the U denied all of their requests. The group petitioned the U for the identities, positions and salaries of researchers last year, but the U denied the request, a decision the Utah State Records Committee upheld. On one occasion, Utah Primate Freedom submitted a request for the types and number of animals being used for research at the U, which was also denied. "All this does is make the denials of our requests legal," Rose said. Although he said Utah Primate Freedom has discussed challenging the legality of the bill, it has not taken any legal action.

U President Michael Young said the U supports the bill because it protects the safety of animal researchers without significantly limiting rights. "This law is a very modest way of ensuring protesters themselves stay within bounds of law," Young said.

(Daily Utah, 2/26/08)

### **UCLA Is Suing to Protect Researchers from Animal Extremists** By Phil Hampton

UCLA is suing extremists to stop a campaign of terrorism, vandalism and menacing threats directed at faculty and administrators who conduct or support research involving laboratory animals. A hearing is scheduled for 8:30 a.m. Feb. 21 in Department A of Los Angeles County Superior Court in Santa Monica, when a judge will formally receive the complaint and hear arguments on a temporary restraining order. A hearing on a preliminary injunction is expected in two to three weeks. The lawsuit names three groups and five individuals as defendants and seeks a temporary restraining order and a permanent injunction prohibiting them from harassing UCLA personnel or facilitating their harassment. The University of California Regents, which oversee all 10 UC campuses, is serving as the plaintiff of record on behalf of UCLA.

On three occasions since June 2006, Molotov cocktail-type devices have been left near the homes of UCLA faculty who conduct or oversee research involving animals. In addition, their homes have been vandalized and they have received threatening phone calls, e-mails and, on at least one occasion, a package rigged with razor blades. Extremists have appeared at residences in the middle of the night, worn ski masks to conceal their identity and used megaphones to shout threats, obscenities and epithets. "Enough is enough," UCLA Chancellor Gene Block said. "We're not willing to wait until somebody is injured before taking legal action to protect our faculty and administrators from terrorist tactics, violence and harassment." "It is imperative to provide a safe environment for our faculty to conduct research — research that leads to new medicines and treatments that benefit our society and is conducted in compliance with stringent federal laws and university guidelines," Block said.

The defendants are groups known as the UCLA Primate Freedom Project, the Animal Liberation Front and the Animal Liberation Brigade, as well as several individuals believed to affiliate with these groups. The suit alleges that these groups and individuals have promoted and facilitated unlawful activities directed against UCLA faculty and administrators. The Animal Liberation Front and the Animal Liberation Brigade have in some cases claimed responsibility for unlawful activities directed against UCLA personnel and their homes.

The UCLA Primate Freedom Project maintains a Web site displaying the photographs, home addresses and phone numbers of targeted UCLA personnel, and the Animal Liberation Front press office regularly posts anonymous communiqués about the Animal Liberation Brigade's unlawful activities. The FBI has identified the Animal Liberation Front, which publicly advocates violence to advance its aim of discontinuing the use of lab animals in research, as a top domestic terrorism threat.

Several of the individual defendants named in the lawsuit have recently been the subjects of temporary restraining orders and injunctions prohibiting them from harassing employees affiliated with the City of Los

Angeles and private institutions. Extremists also have targeted research personnel affiliated with other UC campuses in Berkeley, San Francisco, Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz.

The lawsuit alleges that the defendants have invaded researchers' privacy, interfered with business practices and intentionally caused emotional distress, among other unlawful activities. The lawsuit asks a judge to prohibit the defendants from committing violence or threatening violence against UCLA personnel who conduct or support animal research; vandalizing or threatening to vandalize their property; violating local noise ordinances; and posting on Web sites — or otherwise disseminating — personal information about the UCLA personnel. It also asks a judge to order the defendants to post information on their Web sites indicating that the restraining order prohibits certain activities relating to the UCLA personnel.

In 1989, UCLA filed suit against different animal research opponents and received a permanent injunction after extremists held unruly demonstrations outside the homes of researchers. UCLA is cooperating with the FBI and the Los Angeles Joint Terrorism Task Force in criminal investigations of the attempted firebombings and other activities directed at UCLA personnel. UCLA and various law enforcement units are offering a combined \$170,000 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of those responsible for the attempted firebombings. "The criminal investigations continue, and we are hopeful that the rewards will ultimately lead to charges being filed against those who have committed illegal acts against some of the country's most prominent researchers," Block said.

(UCLA Newsroom, 2/20/08)

### **Animal Rights Activist Pleads Guilty to Charge Related to Arson** By Greg Moran

A well-known animal rights activist pleaded guilty yesterday to a charge of showing people at a speech in San Diego four years ago how to make a destructive device with the goal of having someone commit a violent crime. The plea by activist Rodney Coronado ends a controversial case that involved free-speech rights and an unsolved arson case in University City in 2003.

Coronado's case went to trial in September, but the jury could not reach a decision and a mistrial was declared. Some on the panel said afterward that the majority was leaning toward acquitting Coronado. Coronado's lawyer, Jerry Singleton, said that as part of the guilty plea, the government will not pursue two other cases against his client. One in Washington, D.C., involves the same charge stemming from a speech Coronado gave at American University there. The second case is in Arizona, where Coronado was charged with illegally possessing feathers of eagles, a protected species. Coronado is of American Indian heritage. Outside court, Singleton said Coronado

accepted the deal to move on with his life and raise his family. Coronado already spent four years in federal prison for committing arson at animal research labs in Michigan. "I needed to do what is best for my family," Coronado, 41, said after he entered his guilty plea. He is free on bond until his sentencing in March.

The rarely used federal law Coronado pleaded guilty to carries a maximum of 20 years in prison. But Coronado and the government have agreed to ask Judge Jeffrey Miller to impose a sentence of a year plus one day in federal prison, Singleton said.

The charges stem from an Aug. 1, 2003, speech Coronado gave in Hillcrest. In response to a question from the audience, he showed how to start fires with a homemade device. Undercover federal agents were in the audience and heard the exchange. The speech came hours after an apartment complex under construction in University City had been destroyed by arson and an extremist environmental organization had taken credit for it. The fire caused \$50 million in damage and remains unsolved.

Based on his comments at the speech, Coronado was indicted two years after the blaze. Critics said the government was punishing Coronado for exercising his free-speech rights and was trying to intimidate activists. Singleton tried to get the case thrown out by saying the law infringed on free speech, but Miller rejected that before trial.

Prosecutors said they were not trying to squelch speech or chill Coronado's political activities, but were prosecuting him because they believed his intention was to incite others to commit crimes. "The law does not protect those who cross the line to advocate violence by providing the tools and the road map for others to commit arson in the name of radical environmental causes," U.S. Attorney Karen Hewitt said.

(San Diego Union Tribune, 12/15/07)

### **When Workers are Targeted** By Kristen B. Frasch

A recent firebombing at the home of a UCLA faculty member by animal-rights activists has once again sounded the security alarm among academic, corporate and research organizations intent on protecting researchers and other employees. The Feb. 5 incident -- in which an incendiary device charred the front door of Edythe London, a UCLA professor of psychiatry and molecular and medical pharmacology -- was the second time in four months that London has been targeted for her use of monkeys in the study of nicotine addiction. Members of the Animal Liberation Front claimed responsibility for the attack.

In the first incident, in October, the group claimed responsibility for flooding London's Los Angeles home using a garden hose, causing \$30,000 worth of damage. Both incidents are currently being investigated by the university and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as are earlier acts of intimidation at UCLA by extremists. "For several years, members of the UCLA faculty and administration have been subjected to violence,

harassment and other forms of intimidation [including threatening phone calls, e-mails and property trespass and damage," said the university's chancellor, Gene Block, in a recent statement.

Experts and consultants working closely with HR and security officials say this latest incident underscores the need for employers to be more proactive in monitoring outside threats and ensuring that all employees, customers and clients -- even those indirectly associated with animal research or other controversial activities -- are informed of potential problems. These incidents have grown due to Web technology, are intensifying in degree of violence and are continuing, says Bruce T. Blythe, CEO of Atlanta-based Crisis Management International.

While there are federal and state laws that deal with terroristic tactics, there is still a great deal employers and organizations can and should be doing to secure their businesses and protect their workers. HR should more aggressively use background screening, pay more attention to suspicious behavior by "moles" and be more communicative with employees. "If your company in any way deals with research animals and/or deals with any company that deals with research animals, you're a potential target and all your employees are potential targets," says Dr. John S. Ellis, executive director of the Pennsylvania Society for Biomedical Research, based in Camp Hill, PA. Several years ago, he says, protesters went so far as to show up at the home of a University of Pennsylvania bookkeeper who only provided informational services to a team of animal researchers at the school.

HR executives, particularly those at larger pharmaceutical and biomedical companies where animal research is performed, should be aware of the sophistication of animal activists, especially at securing Web-accessible information on research projects and individuals or organizations associated with those projects, says Mary Hanley, executive vice president of the National Association for Biomedical Research in Washington. Many activists even become "moles" for their groups, she says, applying for jobs on the very projects they aim to destroy. Some hide cameras on their bodies to capture evidence and feed security information to their groups. "These absolutely are terrorist cells," says Hanley, whose group works with businesses and institutions to help protect scientific research.

Many HR professionals "are not well educated in these issues," Hanley says. And security personnel are often frustrated, she says, at the availability of information on projects and employees, and the lack of adequate background screening. "HR and security people should really get together on all this and start dialoguing in meaningful ways," Hanley says. "We always tell them they need a team - HR, IT, security - to [establish the proper policies and protocol to] fight against hackers into their systems."

Human resource practitioners also need to be much more attuned to the potential for physical infiltration, according to Hanley. One suspicious signal is the eagerness of job applicants to work at night.

"These people go *after* these jobs," she says. "We've found at some [infiltrated] institutions, if HR had just tracked the applicants' information down, if they had just done normal screenings," activist connections would have been discovered.

Another proactive move HR could make is to inform employees about controversial projects their company is involved with, although the tendency is often is to keep such projects quiet. "We always think it's a good idea to keep everyone in the know," so individuals who are only slightly associated with the project are aware of the need for caution, she says. Communication is also important "because it's good business practice to have your workforce informed about your product and feeling good about your work."

Blythe says organizations should go on the offense -- as well as the defense.

In the UCLA case, the university has filed a request for a temporary restraining order and permanent injunction prohibiting three named groups and five individuals from harassing -- or facilitating the harassment of -- employees. "Enough is enough," Block said in announcing the court action. "We're not willing to wait until somebody is injured before taking legal action to protect our faculty and administrators from terrorist tactics, violence and harassment."

Blythe offers some other avenues, including encouraging companies that suspect infiltration to hire and train people who can join the suspected extremist group and filter information back. "Call it espionage and counter-espionage if you want," he says.

Also at HR's disposal is a relatively new linguistics-deciphering tool called scientific content analysis, or SCAN, which serves as a viable lie-detector test based on patterns of speech and word choice. Training in this technique, Blythe says, is intensive, but can provide employers with potentially life-saving information. Blythe also stresses the need to properly inform -- and even market -- the company's notification system to employees, and ensure their confidentiality. "More times than not," says Blythe, "employees hear things before anyone else does."

Yet another option for companies is to donate to local animal shelters or Humane Society branches, making it clear to suspected extremist groups that the contributions will end -- and the group will be publicly blamed -- if violence occurs or threats continue. "Trust me," says Blythe, "there are ways of fighting back."

The federal Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act, passed in 2006, and some similar state laws, have elevated acts of violence and property damage by animal-rights extremists to criminal status. There are also federal laws that very thoroughly dictate and govern proper and humane procedures for animal experimentation, but, Ellis says, "many of these [extremists] aren't interested in ensuring that research animals are well-cared for, according to [these] stringent federal guidelines. They just don't want the animals in there at all."

(HR Executive Online, 2/20/08)

## PETA Infiltrates Primate Center

By Bryan Denson

For the second time in a decade, an animal-rights activist has slipped past employment screeners at the Oregon National Primate Research Center, taken a job as a monkey handler and accused the facility of routinely abusing animals. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, a national animal-rights group, planted one of its undercover investigators at the Hillsboro center from April 9 to July 25, officials at the nonprofit told The Oregonian.

The investigator, whom neither PETA nor the primate center would identify, took a job as an animal husbandry technician and secretly took notes and shot video to document her complaints. PETA will formalize her accusations today in a complaint to federal regulators. "We are an open facility," declared Michael Conn, the associate director and acting head of the primate center's Department of Animal Resources, in a response Monday. Regulators have inspected the primate center three times since February, finding the facility in full compliance with federal law, he said. "There are no secrets here."

PETA's complaint to the U.S. Department of Agriculture accuses the primate center, a wing of Oregon Health & Science University, of violating eight provisions of the Animal Welfare Act, a federal law intended to guarantee humane treatment of research animals. Among PETA's allegations: Primate center officials failed to provide timely or effective veterinary treatment for monkeys suffering chronic vomiting, diarrhea and kidney stones. The center failed to ensure that employees were qualified to perform medical procedures, allowing a worker with palsied hands to give hypodermic injections that caused blood to spurt from a monkey's arm. Workers failed to prevent monkeys from suffering trauma, behavioral stress, physical harm and unnecessary discomfort, sometimes putting sedated animals into group enclosures that exposed them to falls or attacks from other monkeys. "The actions of (the primate center) staff show a flagrant disregard for the law and for the animals for whom they are responsible," the complaint alleges.

Similar complaints from another animal rights infiltrator in 2000 were investigated by the USDA, and the center was found not to violate the law. Conn said he would be "absolutely shocked" if the new allegations were substantiated. Oregon's primate center, with annual research grants of \$33.3 million, performs experiments on many of the 4,200 monkeys in its care, putting the facility in the cross hairs of groups such as PETA.

The key purpose of the Norfolk, Va., nonprofit is to protect animals from being used for food, clothing, entertainment or medical research. In 1998, Matt Rossell, a former PETA investigator, went to work as an animal welfare technician at the center. He spent more than two years taking notes and photographs, secretly videotaping screeching monkeys, including one that had chewed a large gash in its own arm.

The Animal Legal Defense Fund, in Maryland, formalized Rossell's observations in a Sept. 6, 2000, complaint to the USDA. It accused the facility of caging animals in filth and abusively small enclosures; conducting needless surgeries; and letting unskilled workers give monkeys injections. Rossell also complained that the center's method of extracting sperm from monkeys -- a process called electroejaculation -- caused them pain.

The USDA sent six officials to investigate Rossell's complaints. Four months later, they cleared the primate center of violating the Animal Welfare Act, although inspectors did recommend the center improve conditions for 1,201 monkeys then kept indoors. The center has spent much of the past seven years developing one of the nation's best "psychological well-being" programs for monkeys, said Kristine Coleman, who heads the center's behavioral sciences unit. Today, Coleman said, monkeys get more fruits and vegetables, which stimulate their natural foraging instincts.

The primate center also improved its method of extracting sperm, a process, taped by Rossell, which had burned the penises of two monkeys. Pain and injury have been halted by giving the animals a light sedative and an analgesic, said Dr. Gwen Maginnis, the center's chief attending veterinarian. Primate center officials were caught off guard seven years ago, after learning they had hired Rossell, who champions a belief that animals are sentient beings entitled to legal rights against exploitation.

The center, which hires about 50 employees a year, improved job screening by adding a full criminal background check and asking applicants and their references whether they think animals should be used in medical research. "If they come here with a clean criminal history and they lie about their interest and the reason they're here," Conn said, "there's not a lot you can do."

PETA's director of research, Kathy Guillermo, defended the group's use of undercover investigators at biomedical facilities. "If the laboratories would open their doors and let us in, we would certainly rather do it that way," she said. "Unfortunately what we find over and over and over again is that the doors are shut tight."

(The Oregonian, 11/13/07)

## Covance Foes' Suit Against City Dismissed

By Luci Scott

A lawsuit filed by Covance opponents against Chandler - alleging the city violated open-meeting laws in allowing the controversial drug-testing company to build on its site near Chandler Municipal Airport - has been dismissed. The plaintiffs, who asked for the dismissal, were Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine and several residents of Chandler. The defendants, Chandler and Covance, agreed to the stipulation to dismiss.

The original defendant was the city, and Covance joined the case to support the city. Last month, Maricopa County Superior Court Judge Paul McMurdie dismissed four of five counts in the original lawsuit. Those parts alleged the city had violated zoning laws. "That left us only with the open-meeting law violation claim," PCRM attorney Dan Kinburn said Friday. Pursuing that aspect of

the lawsuit would have required at least a year. "Even if we won, by the time a trial came around, the Covance building would be up and operating," Kinburn said.

PCRM has now asked the state Attorney General's Office to reopen its investigation into whether Chandler violated the state's open meeting law. PCRM had earlier asked for an investigation by the Attorney General. That probe was shelved when PCRM filed the lawsuit.

Covance is a multinational research company that tests drugs, cosmetic ingredients, food additives and pesticides. A huge facility that will likely include test animals is under construction at Gilbert and Ryan roads and is scheduled to open next year.

Covance spokeswoman Camilla Strongin expressed satisfaction that PCRM had asked for the lawsuit's dismissal and that all parties had agreed to the stipulation to dismiss it. "Covance has always believed that the entire lawsuit against the city of Chandler brought by animal-rights extremists was meritless," Strongin said.

PCRM and other opponents have fought the company not only on animal rights grounds, but also have cited environmental concerns. Patrick Sullivan, a spokesman for PCRM, still maintains that the Chandler City Council violated the open-meeting law. The parcel at Gilbert and Ryan roads "was rezoned in secret," he said. The site "was rezoned with only the City Council knowing that Covance intended to use it," he said.

(AZ Republic, 2/22/08)

### **Research's Best Friend**

By Marie McCullough

Eileen Eisenhower noticed the golf-ball-size lump on the hind leg of her beloved dog and immediately knew it was a cancerous lymph node. At age 8, Kyra was in late middle age, prime time for lymphoma to strike. What's more, one of the Rhodesian ridgeback's siblings had recently undergone chemotherapy for the disease.

Eisenhower and her husband, Brian, were reluctant to put Kyra through such toxic treatment. Even if it worked, they knew the cancer would probably return and kill her within a year. But then the Pennsauken couple read online about an immune therapy - a supplement to chemotherapy - being developed by the University of Pennsylvania's School of Veterinary Medicine and its Abramson Cancer Center. If this novel "cancer vaccine" worked well in dogs with lymphoma, it would eventually be tested in children with the human equivalent, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

Kyra became the first dog to test the vaccine. Now, almost two years later, the sleek, honey-brown hound with a ridgelike cowlick on her back seems to be cured. Of nine other dogs treated so far, three have been healthy for more than a year. And their humans are doubly happy. "I'm a nurse and I've taken care of children with lymphoma," Eisenhower said last week, stroking Kyra. "Maybe someday I'll be giving the vaccine to a child."

Penn oncologist Robert Vonderheide, a leader of the vaccine study, said, "Dogs and humans share a lot of the same biology. Like the vet school motto says: 'Many species. One medicine.'"

Man's best friend is becoming increasingly important to the study and treatment of human cancers. One indicator is a new research program launched by the National Cancer Institute in 2003 to improve human cancer-drug development by using dogs and cats as comparative models. As part of this "comparative oncology" initiative, the institute set up a new consortium of veterinary medicine schools - including Penn's - that will conduct clinical trials of experimental treatments. "Dog cancers capture the 'essence' of the problem of human cancer in a manner not possible with other animal model systems," notes Chand Khanna, head of the cancer institute's comparative oncology program.

Cancer researchers have long taken advantage of the similarities between canine and human anatomy and physiology. A big difference has also been beneficial - dogs age faster, so studies produce results more quickly. Fifty years ago, dogs helped pioneer the concepts and techniques for human blood stem-cell transplants, also known as bone marrow transplants. "The dog has contributed to a legacy that saves thousands of patients annually," Seattle cancer researcher Rainer Storb wrote in a recent article about cell transplantation in the journal *Veterinary and Comparative Oncology*.

While comparative oncology goes way back, several recent advances have spurred the field. Experts point to the sequencing of the canine genome in 2005, and the advent of "targeted" cancer therapies for humans. Targeted drugs disrupt the molecular machinery of cancer cells; conventional chemotherapies, by contrast, poison fast-dividing cells, both healthy and malignant. Chemo is more toxic, but easier to test in humans.

The National Cancer Institute says dogs can help researchers figure out dosing, side effects, and, most of all, whether a targeted drug is hitting its molecular mark - or not worth pursuing. Unlike laboratory mice, which are genetically manipulated and induced to develop human cancers, dogs are naturally affected by prostate, breast, bone and other cancers that closely mimic the human versions.

In addition, the potential pool of needy canines is vast. Of the estimated 70 million pet dogs in this country, four million are diagnosed with cancer each year. Many humans are willing to go to great lengths - not to mention expense - to prolong the lives of their four-legged family members. "Why not transform the cancer toll in pet dogs from something that is only a sorrow today into a national resource, both for helping other pets and for aiding people?" Purdue University comparative oncologist David J. Waters wrote in a *Scientific American* article last year.

Lymphoma, one of the most common and aggressive canine cancers, takes a particularly high toll. Without treatment, dogs usually die within a few months. Even when they receive the same chemotherapies as humans - at a cost of up to \$5,000 - most have just a brief remission and die on average 11 months after diagnosis. Only about 15 percent are cured with conventional therapy. Kyra's sibling was not one of the lucky ones.

"The point is, we need more than chemotherapy," said Karin Sorenmo, chief of oncology at Penn's vet school.

She and a colleague, Penn veterinarian Nicola Mason, were eager to see if Vonderheide's cancer vaccine could be used after chemotherapy to keep the cancer from coming back so soon. A number of drug companies are developing therapeutic cancer vaccines for humans, but none are yet approved in the United States. Unlike conventional immunizations, which prevent disease by priming the immune system to attack an infectious invader, the new vaccines are designed to make the immune system fight cancer *after* it arises.

This is quite a feat because cancer is made of the body's own out-of-control cells; in effect, the vaccine must trick the body into attacking itself. During four years of research, Vonderheide had achieved promising results - but only in lab dishes. Kyra, diagnosed with the most advanced stage of lymphoma, was the real deal.

After getting approval from an ethics review committee at Penn, the researchers removed infection-fighting B cells from a sample of Kyra's blood. Then they extracted genetic material called RNA from their furry patient's lymphoma cells. With a bit of molecular technology, they slipped this RNA into the B cells.

They hoped that these modified B cells, when returned to the dog's body, would act like tattletales, telling her immune system how to recognize and attack any lurking lymphoma cells. And that's what apparently happened. "We were incredibly delighted," Vonderheide said. "We know we can improve the vaccine. But to have promising results with our very first formulation was very encouraging."

The treatment - three vaccine shots a week for three weeks, plus various scans and tests - was free to the Eisenhowers. By the end, Kyra had regained most of the 10 pounds she lost while undergoing four months of chemotherapy. She was her usual squirrel-chasing, sofa-crowding, bacon-begging self. "She's very sweet," Eisenhower said last week as Kyra sat obediently - waiting to be rewarded with a bit of bacon.

Six dogs in the trial did not respond to chemotherapy, so they did not receive the vaccine. Four of the nine dogs who got the shots, including Kyra, have been in remission for a year or more - a better rate than would be expected with chemo alone.

The numbers are too small to draw conclusions, but good enough to expand the study, which is being funded by the nonprofit Alliance for Cancer Gene Therapy. "We have a long way to go, but we're encouraged," Vonderheide said. "If this works, it's possible the approach could be used in kids and adults with any type of cancer."

(Philadelphia Inquirer, 11/12/07)

### **Toward Tolerating Transplants**

By Josh Goldstein

Organ transplantation is one of the crowning achievements of modern medicine, but surgical success comes at a price. Recipients must take powerful drugs -

with not-infrequent serious side effects that include infections, kidney damage and cancer - for the rest of their lives to prevent rejection of the new organ. Even so, one-third of them will need another transplant within 20 years because their donated organs wear out. So ever since the first successful transplants five decades ago, finding a way to get patients to accept their new organs without the need for immune suppression - known as graft tolerance - has been a key goal for medical researchers.

At Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Australian-born pathologist Wayne Hancock is pursuing a solution that so far has had promising results, at least in mice. "We can induce tolerance," he says - at least in transplanted laboratory mice.

Working on the most basic level of the immune system - the genes that control T cells, the body's main line of defense against alien invaders - Hancock and his team have succeeded in getting mice to accept the transplants as their own following a brief course of drugs that are already approved for other uses. After two weeks, they were drug-free. "Immune suppression causes really all of our other problems," says Elizabeth Rand, medical director of Children's Hospital's liver transplant program. "Inducing graft tolerance is really the Holy Grail of organ transplantation."

Hancock's latest research, published two months ago in the journal *Nature Medicine*, has potential beyond transplantation. It could lead to treatments for autoimmune disorders ranging from inflammatory bowel disease to multiple sclerosis, and perhaps even the asthma and diabetes that afflict millions.

That would be a big plus, but Hancock is most interested in helping the nearly 30,000 Americans who have transplants each year and currently require lifelong immune suppression. Researchers all over the world are seeking a better approach. Just last week, three brief reports in the *New England Journal of Medicine* examined inducing tolerance in small numbers of transplant patients under special circumstances. "Taking the immune system out of the equation would be a big improvement," Karl L. Womer, a physician-scientist at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine whose research focuses on transplant immunology, says of Hancock's work. "There is definitely a long way to go."

Hancock knows it's one thing to succeed with mice, which lead relatively germ-free lives in the laboratory, and quite another with humans, who are exposed daily to myriad bacteria and viruses. Still, his approach is promising enough to garner a five-year grant from the National Institutes of Health. Hancock's goals are simple - to "contribute to the development of more effective and safer ways to . . . prevent transplant rejection with less toxicity and side effects," he writes in a grant proposal. And he genuinely wants to do good. A nice side benefit is that the hunt for answers is intellectually stimulating and just plain exciting to the Aussie.

In the early 1990s, things seemed much more bleak. He had lost his U.S. visa and was forced to return to Australia, where he was working in a pathology lab. Then one Sunday morning in 1992, as Hancock lay awake in bed contemplating a dull future reading routine patient test results day after day after day, the phone rang.

Harvard wanted him back in the States to search for solutions to the problem of immune suppression. Sixteen years later, after a foray into industry with a biotech firm and now with his own lab at Children's Hospital, the 53-year-old pathologist thinks his team is closing in on a real, broadly applicable approach.

Hancock's research is focused on a subset of T cells known as regulatory T cells. Although they are an integral part of the immune system, the balancing act assigned to T-regs is to suppress it, thus preventing the body from attacking itself. So, for example, tissue samples from mice with a form of inflammatory bowel disease - an autoimmune condition characterized by ulcers in the lining of the colon - reveal very few T-reg cells, and those that are present are not active. To treat these mice, the researchers injected a type of drug known as an HDAC inhibitor. The mice then produced more, and more effective, T-reg cells. Likewise, mice that had heart transplants and were then treated with HDAC inhibitors developed increased numbers of T-regs. After two weeks of treatment, the mice had accepted the new organs and required no further immune suppression.

The drugs - histone deacetylase inhibitors - were developed for cancer treatment and approved by the Food and Drug Administration for clinical use. Hancock's research shows that the HDAC inhibitors act on a key gene and the protein it produces to increase T-reg numbers and function. Now Hancock and his team have begun testing their approach on monkeys.

Hancock's findings suggest another possible use beyond treatment: Measuring the numbers and function of a patient's T-reg cells in blood or tissue samples might eventually be used to diagnose autoimmune problems and organ rejection. So far, his work with regulatory T cells has gotten to the point that others in the field might call intriguing. "It is an interesting idea and potentially practical approach that awaits confirmation," says Terry Strom, a professor of immunology at Harvard Medical School. "The approach merits serious review and critical follow-up experiments."

(Philadelphia Inquirer, 1/28/08)

### **Animal Research Saves and Prolongs Human Life: A Real Life Example** *By Becky Altmann, CRL*

I have worked in animal science for almost 10 years now, and I have always believed in the necessity of using animals humanely in research by following Russell and Burch's Three Rs Principles (Reduction, Refinement, and Replacement) to benefit both human and animal life. We have all heard these words, "Thanks to animal research, scientists have discovered ways to save and prolong human life."

Colorectal cancer generally occurs in one out of every 20 individuals at some point in their lifetimes. Approximately 150,000 new cases are diagnosed each year in this country. This is about 15% of the total number of new cancers diagnosed. Colorectal cancer

causes about 56,000 deaths a year in the U.S., although this number appears to have declined over the past 20 years. When colorectal cancer is detected early, survival rates are much higher. For example, 92% of patients who receive early treatment are still alive after 5 years. Colorectal cancer metastasizes to other organs (liver, then lung, etc.) and when adjacent organs or lymph nodes are affected, 64% of people survive five years. If the cancer is carried to distant organs, the rate drops to only 7%.

Over two years ago, my 58-year-old father, who I am very close to, was diagnosed with one malignant polyp in his colon. It was removed immediately; six months later he was diagnosed with the cancer in his liver. Within a few months, he went from a stage 1 cancer patient to a stage 4 cancer patient. Stage 5 cancer patients are terminally ill. My father had 50% of his liver surgically removed (up to 85% of the liver may be surgically removed because the liver will regenerate)—a fact scientists discovered when researching rodent, beagle, and primate livers. Since my father's first surgery, he has had two other surgeries and is currently receiving chemotherapy and radiation at high doses.

Recently, I read in the *Charles River Works* newsletter an article entitled "FDA Approves First-of-a-Kind Cancer Drug." The article talked about Avastin, a colon cancer drug that promises to attack cancer by choking off its blood supply. This drug was tested reproductively at my facility. Avastin can extend the lives of patients with advanced colon cancer (stage 5) by about 5 months, the Food and Drug Administration cautioned. After reading this article, I shared this information with my parents and they talked to their oncologist about it. If my father reaches a stage 5 colon cancer, he will be requesting to have Avastin administered by his doctors.

I always knew what I chose for a career was an excellent choice. Family and friends who know me have always asked, "Why do you do what you do if you love animals so much?" My answer is this: Look at the benefits that animals give to us and look at what we can learn from them. Knowing this, we must treat each research animal with the highest level of respect. It is great to be a part of the science when working with the animals, while at the same time ensuring that the animals are treated in the most humane way possible.

So, I take this opportunity to thank all of you who work with these animals daily and ensure their well-being. Thank you to those who do it well and see its importance just like I do. Thank you to the scientists who have dedicated their work specifically to cancer research. In the past two years I have learned that these words are true: "Thanks to animal research, scientists have discovered ways to save and prolong human life."

(Tech Talk, October 2004)

## **Animal Research Saves Lives!**

**Coalition For Animals & Animal Research - CFAAR  
2008 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!**