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Making Connections

Can the rights of non-human animals be guaranteed in a world where humans persecute one another on the basis of superficial differences? Not a chance. Stories of ugly racial incidents are again making headlines in America, just as they did out of the complicity of the police force and reminders of the reality of the racism/speciesism connection. The same perverse desire to exploit and dominate others is at the root of most prejudice. Racism and speciesism are just slightly different manifestations of the same disorder, and only by instilling positive values into the row negatively charged psyche of the human species will we eliminate it and begin to move in the direction of reason and justice.

Working for a world in which no sentient creatures suffer at the hands of humans will undoubtedly benefit human and non-human beings alike. So, is the animal rights advocate called upon to aggressively fight racism with his or her already over-taxed resources? Battling on two fronts—even in the same war—may be more than most of us can do, and it can be confidently asserted that the degree of suffering experienced in the non-human animal world is of a greater magnitude than that now felt within the human realm. However, we can do the very least lend moral support (and a helping hand on occasion) to members of our human family who are yet to receive their freedom and dignity. In so doing, we'll demonstrate that compassion is indeed the ultimate, unrelenting ethic.

A Question of Money

Often it's best to ignore unfounded criticism, but sometimes it must be addressed. The ANIMALS' AGENDA is being criticized by some people in the movement for soliciting financial assistance from humane organizations considered too conservative in philosophy or action. We, too, would like to see more vigorous activity and the way the major groups pursue their goals. However, we find it difficult to understand the logic behind objections to those organizations funding the work of THE ANIMALS' AGENDA, since our critics also lend their voices to the chorus of complaints about groups hoarding money intended for animal work instead of spending it on worthwhile projects.

We would like to explain to our readers the need for raising funds. Your $18 annual subscription fee simply doesn't pay publishing costs! About 45 percent of our operating budget comes from subscriptions, and about 40 percent is made up of donations from saleable contributors. The remaining 15 percent comes from individuals, but many are foundations and animal welfare organizations. Without their help, THE ANIMALS' AGENDA could not be published. While such financial assistance is appreciated gratefully, editorial content of the magazine is not influenced by fund raising considerations. Funds are granted by humane societies whose directors understand that the publication of an independent magazine is an important movement "funding" program. Monetary gifts are offered and received with no strings attached.

Moreover, in most magazines, advertising provides the bulk of revenue—the price per issue merely pays for printing. As a non-profit endeavor, THE ANIMALS' AGENDA does not exist to sell; ads do not provide supplemental income. And while we do endeavor to screen them for content, it is virtually impossible to censor out everything that may offend the most ideologically pure segment of the movement. Advertising, exchanging favorable votes and often juggling the special interests of constituents are but a matter of support. There is no way to substitute "good and bad" members so casually is to demonstrate that compassion, and to accomplish it in such a long-term campaign.

Some legislators who have not been active in animal issues have almost certainly responded to the problem in a less elegant fashion at the federal level. And many who have not been active yet may merely sequences, as those who work on the Hill through one election after another know very well.

In speaking of the D'Amato/Green race in New York, the article fell back on a Democratic/Republican dichotomy. In fact, Congressional action and special interest lobbying are bipartisan activities, and it is highly undesirable to allow potential supporters on either side of the issue.

In the future, I hope that THE ANIMALS' AGENDA's eagerness to further the interests of animal rights will not lead it, or its readers, to rely on such narrow, inflexible, and wrong-headed right to vote a cheap shot often produces an expensive bruise.

Jeff Diner
Washington, D.C.

Giving Proper Credit

In your October '86 issue, you printed an article we wrote "(Liberate Your Language)". We asked you to provide a correc-
tion in your next issue stating that it was written by The Blacker Family with editing by Nooreen Mistry.

The Blacker Family
New York, NY

Editor's Note: We apologize for the assigning credit for authors of your previous issue.

Alaskan Wolves

This is to response to Wayne Johnson's letter in the October '86 issue. There is no question that "land-and-shoot" trapping of wolves in Alaska is biologically, ethically and possibly legally sustainable and that it should be completely stopped. Many, many organizations and individuals in this country have been ignored, neglected and outraged by this practice, and it will take the work of us all to stop it. A thorough court is certainly one tactic which might pressure Alaskans into changing their wolf killing practices. Litigation is another. Defenders of Wildlife has initiated seven different lawsuits on behalf of wolves in Alaska since 1976. Letter-writing campaigns and petition drives have also been successful and certainly must be carried on.

Two winners in October, Defenders and the Animal Protection Institute succeeded in getting the Federal Communications Commission to block the state's use of research dollars to purchase wolves and other members of their packs. And last year I carried 223,000 petition signatures to Alaska protesting Continued on page 36

Deserved Criticism

Despite my initial delight in seeing that the October issue of THE ANIMALS' AGENDA featured a discussion of the forthcoming Animal Rights Week at the point of animal rights issues, I was greatly disappointed by the article itself and concerned for the gross misspent effort that might have on pro-animal legislation in the future.

The author of the article, "Votes that Work for Animals," is unquestionably a dedicated advocate for animal rights. Unfortunately, he lives and works at a philosophical distance from Capitol Hill that is far greater than the physical miles.

The article reduced what has become known as "single-issues politics" to a dangerous extreme, rating particular legislators not merely on their support of animal rights, but on their sponsorship of single bills. Its summaries of certain Congressperson's records were simplistic and even sophomoric. For example, it stated that Alaskan Republican Senator Frank Murkowski has pushed for removal of the North Pacific Fur Seal Treaty because of "his eagerness to see thousands of baby seals clubbed to death." This needlessly melodramatic accusation—disguised as responsible appraising of the record—is based on the omission of Murkowski's constituent needs and autonomy, but overemphasizes his sponsorship of other animal protection legislation.

Such sweeping indictments by animal activists and publications are likely to push Senator Murkowski away from future animal rights legislation. Instead, they may cause him to pursue another flaw in the article. Animal rights legislation can and should be preferable to any other approach. This is also the very law that is in its infancy, and opposing particular bills, and negotiating specific language are all slow and complex procedures which require endorsement of sources and supporters among Congressional staff.

Furthermore, as any thinking person must realize, members of Congress exist in a sphere of mutual accommodation, exchanging favorable votes and often juggling the special interests of constituents are but a matter of support. There is no way to substitute "good and bad" members so casually is to demonstrate that compassion, and to accomplish it in such a long-term campaign.

The state and board of directors of THE ANIMALS' AGENDA are committed to continuing the integrity of this magazine, and we ask for your trust and support. And while we're on the subject of money, we'd like to express our thanks to those of you who responded generously to our holiday appeal with contributions and purchases of gift subscriptions. Please keep in mind that gift subscriptions can be ordered at any time of the year for birthday presents or as special remembrances.

The Editors
Why Jeremy Rifkin Is Saying “NO” to the Age of Progress

Humanity’s growing ability to manipulate the genetic code is ushering in a new age that may test to the hilt our capacity to make the right decisions with regard to ethics, medicine, the environment and even the kind of political systems we live under.

INTERVIEWED BY DAVE MACAULAY

In 1976, Jeremy Rifkin created a stir at a National Academy of Sciences conference of prominent gene splicers by making a prediction and unfurling a banner that read: “Don’t Trust My Genes.” Ten years later, Rifkin, a 43-year-old native of Chicago and President of the Foundation on Economic Trends in Washington D.C., is at the epicenter of a national battle to define the ethical and scientific issues in the emerging age of biotechnology, including the use of non-human animals for agriculture and research purposes.

He has effectively challenged federal and corporate policies on genetic engineering, forced regulatory agencies in various states to rethink the benefits of biotechnology, and won major victories in the courts against the Department of Agriculture, President Clinton, the Environmental Protection Agency, and Department of Defense. His lawsuits have, for the first time, presented the first proposed experimental release of genetically engineered corn into the environment and halted the construction of a bioweapon facility in Utah. David Kingsley, the leading biologist at the National Science Foundation, remarks that Biotechnology companies are “scared to death” because “as soon as they propose an experiment, Jeremy Rifkin takes them to court, and... they don’t want the negative publicity.” His factor in almost every biotechnology debate he has engaged in, Rifkin is an eloquent, powerful voice for what he calls “ethicists, unhealthy and inhumans,” consistently stands up for the rights of non-human animals, and calls for a new, more empathetic relationship with the natural world. The eight booklets he has written or co-authored attest to this philosophy and include Entropy, Algeny—a critique of Darwinism, genetic engineering, and our relationship with nature—Nutrition, Declaration of a Heretic, Writing in Mother Jones magazine. Keith Schneider has suggested that Rifkin has done with genetic engineering what nobody did with the two other primary 20th-century technological developments: psychopharmacological and nuclear engineering. He has raised the debate from the scientific community, shaped it for public service, and handed it to the top of the national agenda.

With these thoughts in mind, it appears wise for the animal rights movement to turn to an area of emotional pain that is clear and imminent: the omenous implications of genetic engineering for all species, and to a man who is fighting the approaching age of biotechnology.

Essentially, what is biotechnology or genetic engineering?

When we talk about genetic engineering, we’re talking primarily about the use of recombinant DNA technology. We now have a technology at our disposal that allows us to splice genes, insert genes, delete genes and combine genes across naturally restrictive biological barriers so we can do it in a way that’s somewhat more efficient. We take genes from one species and put it into the permanent gene code of another. We can take recombinant genetic material from two totally different species and literally stitch or zip them together, creating new combinations.

Genetic engineering is about engineering the genetic traits of living things: microorganisms, plants, animals and humans.

And why do you see genetic engineering as threatening?

We have to realize that the only thing comparable to gene-splicing technology is fire technology, which enabled us to burn, solder, forge, melt and heat inert materials, combining them to create things like steel, glass, cement and synthetics. With genetic engineering and gene-splicing we can split an earth, edit, recombine and program living materials across biological boundaries, creating novel forms of life. Nature has clearly prescriptive limits with what we can do. With genetic technology those limits become irrelevant. The whole idea of a species as a separate, unique, identifiable creature becomes increasingly anachronistic because with gene-splicing there are no boundaries, no borders, no walls that have to be respected in theory. And as practice we can cross some of those borders now.

Genetic engineering obviously represents another potential form of exploitation of animals on farms. What are some of the implications of this technology for agriculture? And what might farming look like ten years down the road?

The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) recently released a report on the future of American agriculture, and they concluded that the biotechnological revolution will mean the end of the family farm in the U.S. The report projected that within 14 years from now, 50,000 farms will be producing up to 75% of all the agricultural output. Over a million farmers will probably be out of business in that time. OTA paints a picture of the future where a handful of chemical, pharmaceutical and energy companies work in tandem with a few giant agri-firms to produce our food and fiber. This has ominous implications not only for agriculture but for rural life as we know it. The biotechnological revolution is the ultimate threat to the idea of rural community and family farms. It also poses tremendous environmental and animal welfare questions. With biotechnology in agriculture we lose more genetic diversity, we increase monoculturing, and we deplete the soil nutrients more quickly in order to meet production quotas. All of this will increase the environmental debt that future generations will have to pay.

In your opinion, is there something inherently wrong with violating species borders? What is the criterion we are to use in assessing the ethics of the use of animals in genetic engineering experiments?

I think we need to be concerned with the violation of species integrity. Let me demonstrate by way of analogy. If someone were to descend onto this planet with superior genetic engineering technology and the ability to colonize the human race, and they were to inject an alien growth hormone gene into our genetic code so that all of our children would grow to sexual maturity at six years of age and grow twice as tall from here until eternity, what would our response be? We would obviously say that this was a violation of our species integrity. We would say that this alien civilization had no right to engineer the genetic code of the human race and undermine our integrity as a species. We would resist and say that this was an ethical question and not just a physiological one. I don’t see why we don’t apply this same logic to our relationship with other animals.

This technology seems to be tied in with a larger worldview which is emerging. Is that an accurate perception?

Yes, a new form of desacralization and reductionism is developing and it’s important to point that out. We’re starting to reduce life to information metaphors. We’re replacing the mechanist reduction of the clockwork universe with the cybernetic reduction of the information universe. Instead of projecting mechanistic terminology onto animals as scientists and philosophers did for years, we’re now projecting computer-like terminology. We’re starting to see animals as pure information codes made up of cybernetic feedback loops and self-organizing processes. We can manipulate them for whatever utilitarian purposes we have in mind. Some scientists, for example, think that we should design a set of programs or instructions that operates through a negative feedback to maintain hormone levels. So, a horse is much more of a system than an organism. A horse has an essential mind, an essential nature and a creature identity that is worth preserving. When we desacralize that horse and turn it into pure information to be manipulated, we do a disservice not only to the idea of a horse but to life itself. Genetic engineering represents the final desacralization of life.

Is there anything positive that you can foresee as coming from a new age of biotechnology, given that it may not be stopped, only controlled in various ways? Might not genetic engineering also lead to drought-resistant crops, new vaccines for animals and humans, alternative fuel sources and so on?

There are benefits to the biotechnology revolution. The question is whether the benefits will ever exceed the foreseen harms. There is no such thing as a free lunch. I wrote a book a few years ago called "The End of Work," and it described various other, non-equilibrium thermodynamics and the fact that we can’t get a free lunch. Biotechnology is designed to increase our production and improve our efficiency. We can’t do that without paying a price, whether it’s depletion of soil, undermining of genetic diversity, or the appearance of various health problems. There are parts of this technology that will be less dangerous than others. I think what we really need to ask ourselves is: “Is this the way we want to organize the age of biotechnology?”

So, would you then distinguish between different forms of biotechnology according to certain ethical principles?

When I say biotechnology, I have a broad sense of it. One form of biotechnology is what I would call experimental technology such as genetic engineering and gene-splicing. Another form of biotechnology is the ecological approach to agriculture, preventive health and solar technologies. These are more holistic and more profound. They forward resources and renewable life at every level.

How does animal rights fit in with all this?

(Continued on page 41)
HOUSPITAL REGULATIONS PREVENTING PATIENTS FROM receiving visits from their companion animals was chal-
leuged by 75-year-old Maurice Gibbel of Jamaica, New York. Gibbel faced abdom-
nal surgery recently at Beth Israel Medical Center. In Flushing, N.Y., and was frustrat-
ied in his attempts to persuade the hospital to allow his dog, Paperclip, to visit his re-
covered son. Paperclip is a 21-year-old basset hound. Gibbel is a retired hospital
worker and is a member of the American Institute for Human Rights. He was
advised that a long separation from his dog could lead the dog to depression and pos-
sible death. The hospital's refusal, Gibbel said, had led him to request repeated
requests, and Gibbel vowed that he would refuse surgery therapy rather than be
separated from his dog. Finally, after trying for months to persuade numerous
hospitals and government officials to help, Gibbel called the Medical Director
of the Borough of Queens, Dr. Charles Robbins. Robbins then called Bother, per-
suading the hospital to allow Gibbel to receive his dog's visits. When completely
recovered, Gibbel plans to start cam-
paigning to have the Health Code in the state of New York changed to allow visits
by companion animals to hospital pa-
tients. Individuals working in companion animal shelters or animal hospitals
decide to long recognized the improved health and lifestyle enjoyed by patients who are
allowed to spend time with dogs and cats—it's time for the medical com-
unity to do the same.

NEW ANIMAL RIGHTS GROUPS include two in the Detroit area and one in Seattle. Defenders of Animal Rights is a Michigan organization which seeks to increase public awareness of animal rights through protest and education. They can be contacted at P.O. Box 946, New Bu-
rner, MI 48047; (313) 527-6212. Animal Rights is another Detroit group, concentrating on educational events as ways to inform the public. Write them at: P.O. Box 9, Warren, MI 48090; or call (313) 820-4179. TRAP, the Animal Rights Alliance, is a group that works to form full addresses of all animal exploitation and to serve as a link among animal rights groups in the North-
western U.S. Write to: 1205 East Pine, Seattle, WA 98112; or call (206) 325-7550.

Correction:
In our November 1986 NewsNotes section, we mistakenly reported that the "Broken Promise" from another organization's campaign was to "rescue" a dog. The video is not available for rental, and is available for sale only through their show. They believe the "Broken Promise" is a true story.

A DEMONSTRATION AGAINST GILLETTE will take place on April 25 at the company's plant in Rockville, Maryland. Philosopher Peter Singer will be a featured speaker. For more information, contact ARK II, P.O. Box 11496, Washington, DC 20004; (301) 957-5692.

A ONE-DAY SEMINAR ON ANIMAL RIGHTS, jointly sponsored by the National Animal Rights Association and the Virginia-based Alliance for Animals, will be held on Saturday, April 23, in New York. Individuals concerned with animals will have an op-
portunity to explore the philosophy of animal rights while learning to translate their own political power into legislative action. The seminar will include an overview of the animal rights move-
ment, speakers, workshops and displays; contact: Doreen Dykes, P.O. Box 8695, Virginia Beach, VA 23455; (804) 664-5284.

Under threat of lawsuit, California At-
torney General John Van De Kamp appealed a court's order restricting his activities, claiming he made inaccurate statements in his office's "Annual Report to the Califor-
nia Legislature," which referred to the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) as one of the three most active "terrorist" organiza-
tions in the United States. By referring to the term "terrorist" to include activists who organize and participate in peaceful direct actions, the report was misleading, Van De Kamp said. Claiming that the ALF was responsible for violence, Van De Kamp also credited the clandestine libertarians with the organization of a protest at the University of California at Davis in 1985. In fact, the protest was organized by the Animal Rights Defense Action Coalition, a Northern California coalition of groups and individual activists. Several activists threatened lawsuits following remarks made by Van De Kamp at press con-
cerences concerning the report, prompting the Attorney General to write letters of apology to the activists.

COLLARS WHICH DELIVER ELECTRIC SHOCKS to barking dogs are being promoted as fundraising items for animal shelters. Kennel Kare Inc., manufacturer of the "Bark Buster" collars, says in its literature: "...figures every year of dogs disposed of or their vocal cords sur-
gerally caused because of their excite-
mence barking. Now your pet can be retrained to be silent. Bark Buster uses classic conditioning in the form of mild electric stimulation to reward your dog not to bark. Bark Buster works auto-
atically and continuously to change your dog's behavior patterns, even when you are away and the dog is alone." In the fine print the manufacturer notes that the de-
vice should only be used on all other means have failed to control the dog's barking, excessive noise and howling may set off the unit causing the dog to experience unencumbered correction... Should animal shelters be encouraging people to elec-
trically shock their dogs into submission? Wouldn't a little patience and one-on-one training go a lot farther toward eliminating the problem and building trust be-
tween dog and human? There's too much potential for neglected people to use this device as a substitute for responsible care and supervision of companion dogs. We would hope that no animal shelters would be affected from being tempted by the financial incentives offered by Kennel Kare and other companies. Any Animal Rights con-
cerned readers may write to Kennel Kare Inc., 11900 E. Pacific Pkwy Suite 108, Denver, CO 80231.

A NATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH on animals is being initiated by the California-based group Animal Rights and Freedom of Animals (IDFA). The campaign's current focus is the multi-million dollar lab animal facility proposed for the University of California's Los An-
gels campus. A full third of this underground laboratory is intended for use in psychological experiments on animals. U.C. Berkeley has a history of abuse and neglect of lab animals, and has been fined repeatedly for its lack of con-
Scquences for these abuses. The campus facility would be an environment for its many violations of animal welfare statutes. The California legislature will be voting on funding for the facility in the third week of March. California acti-
sivists should write their legislators immedi-
ately: non-Californians may write the Governor of the State. All may be written to the State Capital, Sacramento, CA 95814. For more information on the cam-
naign, write IDFA at 21719 Vista Blvd., Corte Madera, CA 94925, or call (415) 924-4445. Also, IDFA is coordinating the April 24th actions against university and college animal labs across the state. The actions will take a variety of forms, some including civil disobedience, others concentrating on leafleting or picketing. Contact numbers are: (415) 924-4445 or (415) 924-4445 (Central U.S.); and (312) 471-3633 (East Coast).

VEGETARIANS WILL BE HAPPY to learn that a major role in the meat indus-
try between the Beer Industry Coun-
cil and the veal producers. The fias-
c was started when the new beef check-off
program began in October of last year. The program assigns a $1 per head to live-
stock producers in order to finance a ma-
ner advertising blitz beginning early this year. With the industry hopes to in-
crease consumer demand for beef. Veal is upset because no special commercials or ads are being planned to promote veal specifically. In a recent issue of The Veal, a veal industry trade magazine, the magazine publishes a "check-off program for "a rip-off for veal" and says veal producers "will be fighting for what we are their competition?" The situation really heated up at the annual American Meat Institute Convention in December when veal producers were asked their views con-
cerning a proposed survey on consumers attitudes toward veal. The meat indus-
tory has been facing a decrease in sales when they learned that the survey was to be used to track the sales of meat, and insisted that all questions related to veal raising practices be deleted.

A STUDENT ACTION COUNCIL FOR ANIMALS (SACA) is a group made up of high school and college students nationwide working to prevent the breeding and selling of animals in the classroom. The group is also concerned with animal rights issues in general, and publishes a newsletter called SAIA News, to keep members updated on student activism for animals around the nation. For more information, write SACA at PO. Box 3588, Washington, D.C. 20008-3588.

AN INSIDE REPORT ON MILITARY-SUPPORTED ANIMAL RESEARCH entitled "Military Madness" has been published by The Na-
tional Anti-Vivisection Society (NABS). Written and edited by Jeff Diner, the 28-page report documents the scientific use and abuse of animals in Defense
Department-sponsored research. In a sam-
ping of 43 studies from Armed Services and university labs nationwide, the report offers a look at military research in the areas of weapons testing, radiation, poisonous, temperature extremes, and chemical weaponry. Copies of the report can be obtained by writing NABS, 300 N. 22nd St., E. Ohio St., Chicago, IL 60611, or by calling (312) 766-4486.

SUCCESSFUL CATS and SUCCESSFUL DOGS are lifelike animal models designed for use in the behavioral analysis (testing, observation) to veterinary students, animal health technicians, and animal shelter staff. The models include indicator lights which provide students with immediate visual feedback on their CPR techniques. A computer software program is also be-
ning developed which will simulate a variety of blood pressure levels and car-
diopulmonary rates, providing lifelike in-
put to students in the teaching and use of CPR. Unlike live animals, the models may be used over and over, cau-
sing the cat or dog to "die" while re-
chasing a resuscit-cat or resuscit-dog, write: Nasco, 901 Janesville Ave., Fort Atkinson, WI 53538.

The Resuscit-Cat
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THE ANIMALS' AGENDA
Dear Friend,

April 20th to 24th, 1987 could be the most important days of your new year. That's when thousands of us will take part in educational campaigns, demonstrations, vigils, and civil disobedience actions at American universities and commercial laboratories, protesting the animal cruelty and abuse that goes on behind those locked laboratory doors. These demonstrations promise to be some of the most dramatic statements yet to be made by a community of people determined to end the senseless institutionalized mutilation and torture of defenseless animals.

Last year, coast to coast, more than 3,000 people representing over 20 organizations joined together under the umbrella of the April 24th Coalition. This year, with your participation and cooperation, we will, at the very least, double last year's numbers and the resulting impact.

Last year's actions were a success. Because of them, changes are happening. But these changes will only continue if our momentum and numbers keep building, and the pressure on our university and research communities becomes greater and greater.

You and your organization's participation is essential. We are ready to send you Direct Action Information Packets, Strategy Guides, Report Animal Abuse flyers, Participation Forms, educational materials and any other specific information you may need to help plan your activities.

You can join us or get more information by writing to the address above or calling one of these numbers:

On the East Coast: Betsy Swart (315) 471-1633
In the Midwest: Vonnie Thomasberg (612) 822-6161
On the West Coast: Dr. Elliot Katz (415) 924-4454

This April, when caring people all over the country once again make their presence and wishes known, make sure that you and your organization are there. It's time for all of us to stand up to greed and institutionalized animal cruelty and demand an end to the laboratory mutilation and torture of gentle, defenseless animals.

For the animals,

Betsy Swart
IDA Direct Action Coordinator

---

Nature's Cornucopia or Pandora's Box?

BY MICHAEL W. FOX

The new technology of genetic engineering, through which humankind has the power to control and re-direct the entire evolutionary process, raises some fundamental ethical and moral questions. One central question concerns the morality of disrupting the inherent nature of animals—their "telos"—for purely human ends. Transgenic manipulation between species can potentially produce far more profound changes in a species' telos than has been possible through selective breeding within species. Is this a violation of the sanctity and dignity of non-human animal life? What of the long-term consequences to the animal kingdom, to the environment, and to the creative process?
When the National Institutes of Health were challenged by Jerold Riklin of the Foundation on Economic Trends and myself to address these concerns, and to suspend temporarily all government-funded transgenic research until the ethics and consequences of developing new industries out of this biotechnology had been fully explored and publicly aired, we were met with united opposition.

I have never felt as alienated from my own kind since, in the spring of 1985, I confronted the National Institutes of Health and the Genetic Engineering Committee. I experienced a sense of vertigo and unreality as the chairman of the committee's large conference room statements from scientists supporting transgenic (gene transfer between species) research. One statement implied that this was a perfectly natural development in human evolution: to play God. Another insisted that animals have no inherent value (i.e., intrinsic worth) because they are from Aristotle) meant final purpose or end. It was reasoned that since an animal's life ends in death or extinction, there was nothing wrong with destroying its final purpose to satisfy purely human ends. None of the academically esteemed scientists and bioethicists on the committee questioned these technologically imperceptible and self-serving attitudes toward life displayed. The most shocking experience I have had in my career as a scientist and spokesperson for animal protection and rights.

The issue of the morality of turning animals into biological machines has been highlighted by a number of other recent developments in genetic engineering. It may be ethically acceptable, for example, to turn bacteria into machines for the manufacture of various hormones and other biological chemicals, and to enhance the utility of various plant species (negative environmental consequences notwithstanding), because these living things are not sentient. They lack the capacity to suffer, to experience pain and emotional distress. If they were sentient, suffering could well result from the effects of various genetic manipulations on their body structure and physiology. But it is ethically acceptable to turn animals, such as mice, pigs, and sheep, who are sentient, into biocomputers for the manufacture of protein (meat) and other biological materials! Especially since, as a consequence of such fundamental changes in nature, there can be no guarantee that they will not suffer. Prior to the perfection of gene-insertion and deletion techniques and the development of the desired animal machines, there will be accidents—deformed and defective creatures born—their psyches imprisoned in alien bodies. Already giant mice have been created by inserting the growth-regulating genes of rats and humans into them while they are embryos.

And this is just the beginning. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has used public funds to apply this same technique of inserting human genes into animals to create giant pigs and sheep. Some of the pigs carrying the human gene are apparently able to live longer, and prone to arthritis, and none have grown bigger or faster as was hoped. Researcher J. Mertz (who has successfully inserted rabbit growth genes into mouse embryos to create mice who grew two and a half times larger than normal) has predicted the development of cattle weighing over 8000 pounds, pigs twice the size of elephants, and one foot long and five feet high. Such monstrous utility are within the realm of possibility within the next ten to twenty years.

These "super animals" will not feed the hungry world—meat is a luxury, no matter how efficiently the animals are raised, and managed to turn them into food for protein for human consumption. A de-emphasis on meat production is consonant with an economically and ecologically sound and regenerative agriculture.

Propagators of genetic engineering argue that humans have, through selective breeding, already modified farm animals to boost productivity, and that there is nothing fundamentally different in these new techniques of gene transfer between species and the old method of selective breeding. This rationalization ignores the fact that these are genetic barriers between species that prevent interbreeding and the exchange of genes from one species to another—precisely the goal of genetic engineering. This is one of nature's laws that may be imprudently circumvented. selective breeding of farm animals to enhance egg and milk production and growth has contributed to widespread suffering, increased susceptibility to infection, and the new and complex diseases in "factory farmed" animals. These so-called "production diseases", which are well recognized by animal scientists and veterinarians, are thoroughly documented and discussed in my book Farm Animals: Health, Suffering, and Interests, and they have been used to offset financial losses from pro-

The technocrat does not question the human right to control nature. When nature was desacralized by modern science, the value limits to human intrusions on nature were removed. The technocrat looks forward to the day when humans will have complete control over the earth.

There is also interest in putting genetically engineered bacteria into the digestive systems of farm animals so they can be used to break down indigestible materials that the animals could not otherwise assimilate and convert into meat, eggs, or milk. But like spraying new bacterial poisons onto crops, such changes in the internal ecology of the animal's digestive systems can open Pandora's box further, increasing the probability of new disease problems and further animal suffering.

Animal rights philosophy holds that animals have inherent value, needs, and interests quite independent of their value and usefulness to us. If we are to exploit animals to satisfy our own needs (even if we have "created", bred, and raised these animals ourselves), then we should give them equal and fair consideration. It is morally wrong to violate the right and entitlement of animals to humane treatment. This ethic is written into law, as witness the federal Animal Welfare Act and state anti-cruelty statutes. Since the genetic engineering of animals may cause them to suffer from physical and physiological changes that have been deliberately, accidentally, or coincidentally introduced by genetic manipulation, it is surely unethical and a violation of humane ethics and legal statutes to subject animals to such manipulation, and to expose them to potential harm.

Introducing the genes of one species into another, regardless of potential animal suffering, also raises the ethical issues of humans' violation of the sanctity of life.

Experiments at Cambridge University in England resulted in this half-goat, half-sheep creature (above). A human gene implanted into a mouse embryo produces a rodent two-and-a-half times larger than normal (left). As the years go by, demonstrations of scientific manipulation of species will become ever more awesome.
Continued from previous page

dition, there is the analogous veil of the industrial-military complex called "national security". The Pentagon is planning to build new types of animals and crops, not to cure the diseases that other production-biologists, manipulating microbes, do not need. This is a misdirection of biotechnology. The paradigm itself needs to be changed from an industrial one to a biologically healthy and regenerative one. The new biotechnology paradigm must be old or trying to learn about farm animals and plants even more productive thus granting improved livestock and fertilizers, hormones, and then correcting the production-related diseases that are potentially increased susceptibility to infectious microorganisms, pests, and parasites. This is circular approach necessitates more research and technological "fixes", such as drugs, vaccines, and poisonous pesticides. Often, additional problems are created, requiring even more governmental oversight and the proliferation of additional costly regulatory bureaucracies to protect consumers and the environment.

and government laboratories which has led to the industrial development and application of genetic engineering. But now, private industry and states, particularly private universities from Harvard to Ohio State are drawing up collaborative research contracts which could lead to unprecedented restrictions on academic freedom. These restrictions would, in essence, act as trade secrets prohibiting the exchange of scientific inquiry and advancement of knowledge. Thus, in spite of the short-term benefits of financial infusions from private industry and academia, the public interest may be short-changed. Furthermore, land grant colleges engaging in collaborative projects with private industry may be in violation of federal law since they were established with public funds to research, education, and advance in agricultural communities. Giant pigs and bacterial pesticides are hardly the kind of advances that will help disillusioned farming communities today.

Implications for agriculture and society

Genetic engineering has many potentially ominous implications for both agriculture and society. There is widespread concern that we are now engaged in an international biotechnological and military biowarfare arms race with Japan and the USSR, respectively. This race is nowhere more conspicuous than in the headlong rush by agribusiness to increase productivity of animals and crops. In addition, the potential for an arms race between those that can and those who cannot afford the technology is nothing new. This is a misdirection of biotechnology. The paradigm itself needs to be changed from an industrial one to a biologically healthy and regenerative one. The new biotechnology paradigm must be old or trying to learn about farm animals and plants even more productive thus granting improved livestock and fertilizers, hormones, and then correcting the production-related diseases that are potentially increased susceptibility to infectious microorganisms, pests, and parasites. This is circular approach necessitates more research and technological "fixes", such as drugs, vaccines, and poisonous pesticides. Often, additional problems are created, requiring even more governmental oversight and the proliferation of additional costly regulatory bureaucracies to protect consumers and the environment.

by the almost total failure of the "green revolution" in which agribusiness "colonial" technology (exported experts, genetically bred crops, irrigation dams, chemical fertilizers, agri-industrial practices, etc.) produced great short-term profits, but destroyed already existing regenerative native farming practices, ultimately decimating small communities as well as the fragile land.

Genetically engineered drought and salinity resistant plants are not likely to be prudent and appropriate applications of biotechnology. More than new crops that can be produced with the use of biotechnology, it is a new technological fix. It is unlikely that genetically engineered technology will be appropriately and reliably applied so long as it remains within the narrow "agricultural paradigm of multinational agribusiness."

In his book The Harvest, Joel Dyer explains the history of biotechnology as it relates to agribusiness. Sparrowed by legislation that has protected the patents of seeds, and the Supreme Court decision declaring that genetically engineered organisms can be patented, multinational corporations (notably petrochemical and pharmaceutical companies, for example) have invested heavily in biotechnology research. Since the major focus of their research is to develop herbicide and pesticide resistant "super crops," they are investing in the development of herbicides and pesticides that will lead to a larger and more dependent human population. This we know already.

Biotecnological dream of creating animals and crops that are highly efficient, productive, and disease resistant. The reality of the agricultural system it has now is that production and health are inversely correlated. If genetic engineering can change this so that animal and plant health are increased by transgenic and other manipulations, will we then have a cornucopia? Will highly transgenic crops be as productive in the long-term as a less intensively controlled biopshere? Predictably not. Increased production through genetic engineering will also more rapidly decrease the land's ability to renew resources and feed a larger and more dependent human population. We know already.

Continued on next page
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**GENETIC ENGINEERING**

The National Alliance for Animals' Educational Rights invites you to attend the third annual National Legislative Seminar for the Rights of Non-Human Beings. **WHERE:** Washington, D.C. **WHEN:** June 20, 21 and 22

This is your opportunity:
- To learn what they are doing
- To discuss strategies with advocates for animals from across the country.
- To meet key people who represent national organizations.
- To meet with your legislators.

Last year over 500 people attended this Seminar. Won't you represent your state and congressional district this year? Plan your summer vacation NOW and join us in our nation’s Capitol for this exciting three-day event.

Please send me additional Seminar info:

Name:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

Mail to: P.O. Box 77186, Washington, D.C. 20033 or Phone: (703) 684-0645

**"This is no joke. It is inhuman. I cannot emphasize in human terms."**

- **Professor Tom Regan**

**ANIMAL FILMS FOR HUMAN EDUCATION by DALLAS PRATT**

**ARGUS ARCHIVES NEW REFERENCE WORK**

**DESCRIPTIVE AND REVIEWS OF THE 19 FILMS, GRAPHICS, AND FILMSTRIPS FOR HUMAN EDUCATION**

**Other Features:**
- Reaction of audiences & selected groups of children to the films
- Direct source of information with each film
- **Index**

85.95 postpaid, 288 pages, 1966

ARGUS ARCHIVES, Dept AF-228, 46-50th St., Item. 2507
ANIMAL MODELS: FIGHTING CANCER WITH A FAILED TECHNOLOGY

BY IRWIN BROSS, Ph.D.

What would happen if a leading scientist stood up at an international meeting on clinical cancer research and reported that the animal models supported by the National Cancer Institute are either bad science or outright fraud? What would happen if he charged that the NCI's reliance on animal models in chemotherapy and in carcinogenesis studies had resulted in many thousands of unnecessary deaths of human cancer patients?

When Dr. Bross agreed to speak on the ethics panel at an international conference on cancer held in Kos (Greece) in May 1986, he didn't know how the physicians would react. He was surprised by the generally positive reaction of the audience.

The following article summarizes his remarks and experiences at this meeting, as well as his suggestions on how to achieve reforms in this area.

The second fact is that for at least 15 years a major new theory called "the mutagenic theory of chronic diseases" has been accepted by competent epidemiologists (although it is still not understood by most physicians). It is important to realize that there is a great difference between the infectious diseases (chiefly caused by germs) and the chronic diseases (which are the main public health problem today and which are caused by mutagens). Chronic and infectious diseases are very different, and must be studied by very different methods.

Clinicians are generally impressed with animal models because of their long historical record of success with infectious diseases. What they fail to realize is that there is also a long historical record of failure with the mutagenic diseases. Thus, there is an enormous difference between the impressive victories of antibiotic chemotherapy and the equally striking failures of anti-cancer chemotherapy.

The mutagenic theory of the chronic diseases is a highly complex theory that has been evolving since about 370 and has reached a new, useful, but not final, stage. Basically, its insights into cancer and other chronic diseases have come since the biochemical nature of the genes was structurally characterized by the double-helix model of DNA. Mutagens are physical, chemical, or biological agents capable of producing "breakpoints" or chemical lesions in this complexly structured structure. Although some claim that this genetic damage doesn't matter because there is a natural repair mechanism, in fact, it is generally the repair of the lesion that produces the permanent genetic damage in the DNA.

Since one cell has little effect on the body economy, genetic damage to a single cell is only the beginning—not the end—of a very involved story. Before clinically detectable health effects can occur, the damaged cell must be cloned. For solid cancers, it takes about 32 "doubling-times" (i.e., a cell population of 2 to the 32nd power) to produce palpable cancer. For doubling-times that roughly average about 6 months, this means a "latent period" of over 15 years.

The specific doubling-time will depend on the type of cell where the mutation occurred, the gene that was damaged, the host-defense systems that control the growth and spread of mutated cells, and various other factors. The modern mutagenic theory of chronic diseases explicitly considers the host defenses as a key component of this complex system. It also considers the very complicated interactions between the mutagen, the mutated cell, and the host defense system that determines if a cancer patient.

Anyone familiar with the degree of diversity in genetic adaptation to the environment and evolution found in different species would expect the human "host defense system" to be very different from these of laboratory animals and, of course, of human patients.

The complex human host defense systems are unique to our species. And because of the high genetic variability within our non-inbred species, the biochemistry of some of the host defense systems is also often unique to individuals or small groups of humans with specific genetic patterns, all of which makes quantitative extrapolation from animal models an exceedingly chancy proposition. The over-dependency on animal models by Federal agencies—especially the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), charged with controlling and elucidating the environment of carcinogens and other mutagens, and the National Cancer Institute—has resulted in a total catastrophe in terms of public health.

Indeed, the data in a recent article by John Bailar in the New England Journal of Medicine shows that the total failure of the NCI "Conquest of Cancer" program equalled in more than 30,000 additional deaths from cancer last year?

Can new technologies help?

One of the favorite plots of those in academia, government and the drug industry is to proclaim that they wish to avoid using animals, but that there is no other way to protect human health, yet, with modern computer technologies there are ways to try out new drugs on people with relative safety. The reliance on invalid animal tests is much more dangerous to humans in actual practice. As the Thalidomide scandal demonstrated, some humans may experience horrible side effects not anticipated by the animal tests.

With today's powerful desktop computers, it is feasible to set up networks for the surveillance of side effects. On one hand, we have sophisticated scientific instruments, computers, and the elegant languages of modern mathematics available for biomedical research. On the other hand, the moral slaughter of animals continues unabated.

This slaughter can serve little or no scientific purpose. Science is not as sick as cancer. Science is not sick as mutagenic diseases such as cancer. Hence serious ethical questions can be raised about the motives of agencies that grant funds for performing this ritual, and of the physicians and scientists who accept money for fraudulent research.

The killing of animals disturbs me, but I am even more concerned about the unnecessary suffering of cancer patients that has resulted from the unjustifiable extrapolation from mouse to man. Quantitative extrapolation from animal models to humans is little more than the implementation of primitive superstitions. What is even worse, the superstitions used to justify the slaughter of animals have also crept into "in vitro" chemotherapy, excessive exposure to ionizing radiation, and other forms of injurious practice in the treatment of cancer.

But why are these superstitions—so much at variance with scientific facts—so difficult to upset? Why are such misleading models so eagerly employed by people who make millions in medical courses? The answer is simple. As long as some superstitions remain useful to an establishment, the establishment will preserve and protect them.

Furthermore, many clinicians—the doctors who routinely treat patients—believe in good faith that most drugs used today in cancer chemotherapy have come from animal studies, despite the fact that all or almost all of the therapeutically effective anti-cancer drugs were first detected in clinical studies. This is fully documented in a recent book by Brandon Reines called Cancer Research on Animals: Impact and Alternatives. (See Review, July-August 86.)

In it, Reines shows conclusively that animal models have contributed nothing but confusion and delays in the area of cancer chemotherapy.

Animal models: a failed technology for mutagenic diseases

To understand why animal models are a failure in cancer research, one needs to know two facts. First, cancer is what is called a "mutagenic" disease—a disease caused by genetic damage. This has been well known for at least 20 years, but it is only recently that the medical profession has realized that muscular dystrophy, heart disease and many other chronic diseases are caused by specific defective genes.
whatsoever—scientific, medical, ethical, or otherwise—for U.S. government agencies to continue funding animal research. The National Cancer Institute has announced plans to phase out the use of animals in cancer research, and the National Institute of Mental Health has already agreed to do so. However, the National Institute of Aging plans to continue funding animal research.

In attempting to understand and mitigate these problems, we need to consider the ethical implications of animal research and the role of the animal research community in advancing scientific knowledge. The animal research community has a responsibility to ensure that animal research is conducted in a manner that is as humane and ethical as possible. This includes ensuring that animal research is necessary, that it is conducted in a manner that minimizes pain and suffering, and that animal research is conducted in a manner that is consistent with ethical standards.

In conclusion, animal research is a complex and controversial issue. While it is essential for advancing scientific knowledge, it is also important to ensure that animal research is conducted in a manner that is as humane and ethical as possible. The animal research community has a responsibility to ensure that animal research is conducted in a manner that is consistent with ethical standards. The animal research community also has a responsibility to ensure that animal research is conducted in a manner that is necessary and that it is conducted in a manner that minimizes pain and suffering.
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals

IS HIRING
If you are sick of working a "regular" job and trying to revolutionize the country after work, perhaps you should consider coming into the movement full time.

PETA is looking for energetic and capable animal rights people to fill various positions within the organization.
PETA offers you the chance to work hard for what you believe in. The opportunities are tremendous.

Please send resume and cover letter to:
Personnel Manager
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Box 42516
Washington, D.C. 20015

A New Alternative in the Laboratory

Most, if not all, biomedical research, safety testing and medical education is conducted for the benefit of humans. Yet, nonhuman animals are extensively studied in these areas. Why? A major reason is the ethical considerations on human subjects. Scientists turn to animals as "models" or surrogate humans despite the scientific shortcomings and questionable ethics of this approach.

Even those who advocate and employ animal models recognize their shortcomings. Stephen Suomi, a psychologist influential for his deprivation experiments on rhesus monkeys, conceded:

"In virtually no case is an animal model a perfect... replica of the human disorder under study... Rather, it is usually a highly simplified, theoretically biased, and incompletely generalized version... An animal model is almost never the "real thing," it is instead only a model of the real thing.

Therefore...

...the primary rationale for creating most animal models lies not so much in any obvious and impressive strengths of such models as in the problems inherent in conducting research with humans as subjects.

Given this state of affairs, any technological developments that increase the scope of ethical human studies would be welcome. One such development has great potential to reduce animal exploitation in biomedical science. It is controversial because it involves brain-dead humans whose physiological functions (such as breathing) are maintained by artificial means. These special cadavers, known as neomorts, are medically and legally dead but resemble comatose patients whose bodies breathe, require food, and eliminate waste.

The technology for sustaining neomorts already exists. For example, the body of a pregnant Indiana woman who was killed in a car accident was sustained by supports until her child could be born by cesarean section several weeks later. In a recent issue of The Fairfield, Dr. Harold Shaine and Walter Daily, M.D., both of Indiana University, argue that this medical technology may be developing faster than our consideration of delicate legal, cultural and ethical questions raised by sustaining the newly dead for science. The authors want to see these issues resolved before the final technical barriers to widespread neomort use are hurdled.

The scientific potential of the newly dead was first advocated by physician and bioethicist William Gaylin in 1974. Gaylin thought that neomorts could revolutionize research, safety testing and medical education. (See box, next page.) New experimental procedures and drugs could be tested and practiced directly on humans.

Experential procedures that proved unworkable in monkeys would be tried on those that succeeded could be used years before they might otherwise have been. Similarly, we could avoid the massive delays that keep some drugs from the marketplace while the dying clame for them.

Researchers would not have to play the guessing game of creating animals. Reading animal data to humans. The only scientific limitation would be the absence of a fully functional brain.

In practice, however, more serious limitations would arise. Could the availability of neomorts. More than two million people die every year in the United States, but Shaine and Daily estimate that the supply of useable bodies would be only about 150,000. These would be those deaths from accidents, suicides or other causes that leave the body substantially intact and disease-free. Furthermore, in some of these cases, the deceased may have chosen, or his or her relatives may choose, not to donate the body to science, especially for neomort studies. If the patient was already plugged into support systems, the family may want to mark the death with a prompt burial.

Patients and relatives might be more receptive if they viewed neomort studies as extensions of donating their organs to body to science, which are widely accepted practices. Gaylin views neomort studies as extended autopsies. He wrote:

"The autopsy, that most respectable of medical traditions, that last gift of the dying person to the living future, could be extended in principle beyond our current reach.

If such studies were widely accepted, then, at least initially, neomorts would probably be dedicated primarily to organ donation, and secondarily to laboratory procedures that would decrease demand for animals. (The current demand for donor organs far exceeds the supply.) However, these two types of studies are not mutually exclusive. Studies could be conducted before—and, in many cases, after—organ donation.

Although the few published discussions of neomorts have a futuristic tone, at least one neomort study has already been conducted. Physicians at Temple University implanted the Jarvik-7 artificial heart into five brain-dead humans. Recently Barney Clark became the first clinical recipient. The physicians wrote:

"...we were confronted with the question of whether or not an artificial heart... successfully tested in calves would fit and function in the human. It was important that we proceed in man with some assurance of success. The human is a unique species with functional capabilities (implanted) blood pumps in brain-dead but homeostatically stable subjects were at risk, so that it is not necessary to learn the fundamentals of fit and function in patients... The relatives of the deceased subjects have been extremely supportive of our experiments. Their hope is that through these studies others may live longer and more comfortably.

Two aspects of this study are noteworthy. First, the successful testing in animals did not provide the researchers with the level of assurance that they sought before the device could be implanted ethically in human patients. Secondly, most of the brain-dead subjects had donated organs prior to this study. Although this study was a follow-up of animal research, the clear implication of neomort studies is that our reliance on animals will be reduced.

Those who advocate neomort studies emphasize the contribution that dead humans can make to living humans, but animal advocates can easily see how this endeavor could help animals as well.

Animal activists should welcome these developments. Individuals may want to inquire at local hospitals or universities about bequeathing their bodies for neomort studies. They may also want to advocate these studies; however, they must be mindful of the sensitive issue involved. Some people may have religious or personal objections. In this regard it is important to note that the major religious groups have endorsed organ retrieval for transplantation, and so may also endorse more extensive manipulations of cadavers.

Animal activists may have been challenged in the past to explain how certain biomedical procedures, such as new surgical techniques, could be developed without using animals. They now have a compelling answer.

Potential Uses of Brain-Dead Humans

MEDICAL EDUCATION
• Practicing routine physical examinations (e.g. retinal examination)
• Practicing standard but difficult diagnostic procedures (e.g. spinal tap)
• Practicing exotic procedures usually not practiced until after medical school (e.g. skin grafting)
• Practicing surgical skills

TOXICITY TESTING
• Virtually all aspects

RESEARCH
• Discovering effective drugs
• Developing effective surgical procedures
• Developing cures after experimental inducing illness (e.g. cancer)
• Improving diagnosis or therapy after experimentally inducing injury

STORAGE
• Of transplantable organs
• Of specialized blood components for transfusions (e.g. white blood cells)

HARVESTING
• Of bone marrow, skin, corneae, cartilage, etc.

MANUFACTURING
• Of hormones, antitoxins, antibodies, etc.
What’s New in Congress?

Animal Protection Bills Need Support

All of the bills described herein were introduced in the 1985-86 session. Some were not enacted. They are all being reintroduced in the current session, the 109th Congress, and deserve the full backing of animal advocates. To express your support, contact your senators or representatives. The U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515, and both of your senators at The United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20503. For more information about the bills, contact the groups named below. More pro-animal legislation is being developed—look for updates in future issues of THE ANIMALS’ AGENDA.

Research Accountability Act

In January, Rep. Robert Torricelli (D-NJ) reintroduced the Research Accountability Act. The purpose of this bill is to stop the duplication of experiments on live animals by using modern computer technology.

The scope of duplication of experiments is not trivial. United States for Animals has counted the number of documents in its files on 60 typical animal experiments, most of which require the use of many live animals. The results: 600 spine-searching procedures, 400 spine-searching experiments, 160 animal drawings (dating back to 279), 650 mercury poisoning claims, and so on. Even some of the staunchest defenders of animal experimentation back at the scope of the duplication.

The Research Accountability Act, if implemented, would: 1) establish a National Center for Research Accountability to conduct a full-text literature search of all research proposals involving live animals (after approval, but prior to funding) to ensure that experiments on live animals are not being duplicated; and 2) require the National Library of Medicine (NLM) to store the full text of all biomedical literature involving live animals from 1980 on, and make this information readily and economically available to the scientific community.

At present, a researcher who wishes to avoid duplication must find the pertinent literature by searching the databases which provide bibliographic references with, at most, a brief abstract. Serious researchers must acquire the full-text documents—a procedure which often involves a time-consuming, frustrating, and costly “paper chase” through medical libraries across the country. The problem is especially acute in toxicology. An official of the NLM stated, “A large fraction of toxicological information is not even in a nonabstracted form needed for ready access. Thus, much of the recent literature in the field of toxicology is not readily accessible.” As a result, a scientist who wishes to test a chemical must first find out what databases must be searched, then devise a strategy to retrieve the data, etc.

The solution to this problem is readily at hand in modern technology. A recent article in the journal Science (volume 212, 19 June 1981, pages 1534-1549), we are in the midst of an “information explosion” and “the proliferation of scientific literature and data files has taxed our ability to store, retrieve, and assimilate information. There is no choice but to use computers and modern telecommunication systems to preserve these data and make them accessible to present and future users.” The Research Accountability Act would make use of modern technologies to stop the duplication of experiments on live animals.

The bill, which was first thought to be too expensive to implement, has been revised, and in its present form is realistic and worthwhile. The proposals are reasonable and moderate. They would save billions of taxpayer dollars (the 1987 budget of the National Institutes of Health alone is over $6 billion) by eliminating redundant experimentation. And the Act would also prevent millions of animals from being experimented on at all. The bill may well be the most meaningful piece of legislation ever introduced to reduce the suffering of animals in laboratories.

—Tom MacGowan
United Action for Animals
300 East 42nd St
New York, NY 10017

Banning the Steel-Jaw Leghold Trap

Most civilized nations have laws against the steel-jaw leghold trap. In fact, 63 countries are ahead of the United States in this struggle to outlaw barbarism. The 109th Congress must be the one to pass such legislation to end the use of this “dabbling instrument”, as a British government report described it shortly before it was banned in the United Kingdom.

A survey by the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies found that 78% of the American public wants the steel-jaw leghold trap banned. But lobbyists for trappers and furriers, the National Rifle Association, the American Farm Bureau, and government wildlife bureaus have paralyzed congressional action after year after year. What is needed is a massive explosion of public outrage at this situation—combined with a massive display of public support for legislation to ban the trap.

The Society for Animal Protection Legislation can provide activists with free leaflets, posters, petitions, and badges to help win the battle.

—Christine Stevens
The Society for Animal Protection Legislation
P.O. Box 3719, Washington, D.C. 20035

The Humane Products Testing Act

The Humane Products Testing Act would, if passed, require federal agencies to re-evaluate their regulations and guidelines encouraging use of the LD50 test, in which as many as 200 animals are force-fed substances until 50% of them die, supposedly establishing a “lethal dose” level. The bill had gained the support of over a hundred members of Congress before the end of the 99th session last December, but the stumbling block to its passage was its referral to the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment. The bill is, unfortunately, expected to be referred to the same committee in this session of Congress. Strengthen interest on the part of members of committee and help to convince Chairperson Waxman (D-CA) that the LD50 issue is serious and worthwhile. Unless Waxman is moved to make hearings and report the bill out of committee, the legislation cannot move forward toward passage.

The “Standing” Bill

Late in the last session, Representatives Charlie Rose (D-NC) and Rod Chandler (R-CA) introduced a bill which would allow any individual to sue the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to demand enforcement of the federal Animal Welfare Act. One of the major problems with enforcement of the Act has been lack of interest on the part of USDA, which has repeatedly asked Congress for “zero funding.” If funds were cut off, USDA would, in effect, be relieved of its responsibility for conducting laboratory inspections and enforcing provisions of the Act—which is the only federal law currently offering any protection to animals in laboratories. In addition, USDA has testified before Congress that it believes enforcement of the Act should be left to humane societies (which have no authority under the law).

Many of the deficiencies in laboratories documented by the animal protection community in the past few years have also been shown up as violations of the Act on USDA inspection reports—however, USDA often has not acted to correct the deficiencies, even for gross violations of this very conservative legislation.

The reintroduced bill is expected to be referred to both the Agriculture and Judiciary committees of the House.

—Synder Brittain
The National Alliance for Animal Legislation
P.O. Box 75136, Washington, D.C. 20033

Live Lures” in Greyhound Training

During the 99th Congress, Rep. Robert K. Dornan (R-CA) introduced legislation that could have helped bring an end to the use of live lures. The dog breed, though the bill was introduced only two months before the end of the session, 12 co-sponsors joined Dornan in calling for an end to the reprehensible practice. Each year, an estimated 100,000 small animals (such as kittens, rabbits, and chickens) are used repeatedly as bait until they are torn apart by greyhounds learning to race. (See “Greyhounds: Baiting for their lives”, THE ANIMALS’ AGENDA, May 1986.)

The Dornan bill would help stop this cruelty by banning the interstate sale and transport of animals intended for use as live lures. In addition, the bill would prohibit those dogs trained on live lures from being transported across state lines for racing purposes. Rep. Dornan is expected to re-introduce this legislation early in the 100th Congress.

—Martha Hambly
The Humane Society of the United States
2301 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037

The Pet Protection Act

Rep. Robert J. Mrazek (D-NY) is re-introducing The Pet Protection Act to establish what is tantamount to a national ban on pet to pet sale. Passage of the bill would spell an end to the taking of an estimated 300,000 companion animals from the nation’s shelters each year for use in biomedical research. The Mrazek bill would prohibit the expenditure of any federal money awarded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for the purchase or use of dogs or cats acquired from animal shelters. Because NIH provides the funding for nearly all uses of companion dogs and cats in research, this legislation would effectively put an end to the practice.

According to Rep. Mrazek, "Shelter animals are not suitable for use in research because nothing is known about their backgrounds. Despite this fact, some federally funded researchers continue to purchase dogs and cats from local facilities, both directly and through intermediaries. These researchers unthinkingly select those animals which appear to be the healthiest, most obedient and most acceptable."

Sixty members of Congress co-sponsored The Pet Protection Act when it was first introduced in the 99th Congress.
Activists Disrupt Thanksgiving Deer Hunt

Deer driving cars? Two-legged deer hunting human hunters with "Macho beer" and then "harvesting" them "prestily-killed" hunters sprawled on the rooftops and hoods of cars? No, unfortunately, the term of "sport hunting" hasn't changed, but street theater has left the city and premiered in the forest. Sylvan theater was used to demonstrate protesters' opposition to the commencement of the third annual Yale deer hunt, which is sanctioned by the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies and managed by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

For the third Thanksgiving in a row, Connecticut animal rights activists from Animal Rights Front (ARF) and the Yale Student Animal Rights Coalition were joined by activists from Boston and Rhode Island to protest the hunt, which took place in a Yale-owned forest in Union, Connecticut. Five activists dressed as angry deer, led by Bambi, the "deer who had it up to here," performed a mock harvest of hunters. Of course, the "deer" maintained that the "hunt" was carried out primarily for ethical and environmental reasons: human hunters had overpopulated their ecosystem and were in danger of mass starvation. In addition, their four-wheel drive vehicles were spewing exhaust and digging up soil, polluting and eroding this once-stable ecosystem. The "deer" reported that this problem could not be solved in a year, and maintained they would have to practice "low-life management" (analogous to wildlife management) for a long while before the problem could be solved.

Dr. John W. Miller, of the approximately 500000 acres of land in the forest, said that this annual event would actually "take" any real hunters. But the protesters were not to be deterred. Yale officials disrupted the real hunt and ruined the day for several hunters. Five deer were killed that day in the Yale Forest, down from the 15 who had been killed on the first day of last year's hunt.

Numerically speaking, the big winners were DEP conservation officers, who nabbed four protesters under the state's year-old "hunter harassment" law. But unlike "beggad" deer who never get a second chance, "begged" protesters may have had the last laugh, as this legal confrontation may give them a mechanism to have this law repealed as unconstitutional. Activists claim that Connecticut's laws give immunity to the hunting community by limiting protest and free speech. A similar law was recently found to be unconstitutional in New Hampshire.

Yale decision-makers have admitted that the hunt was conducted to protect a few desirable "survivors" for food, space, and management of these farms help determine the tactics of conception, birth, and survival. The facts are hunting perpetuates itself upon itself and is a commitment to a permanent problem.

The truth is now starting to come out from the Forestry School. At a recent open forum, activists questioned the Forestry School's claim that unless deer were shot, they'd starve to death. Bruce Larson, associate professor of sculpture, admitted that "starvation" was the wrong word to have used, and that, in fact, the word "undernourished" better described the deer's prospects. His statement demonstrates that the Forestry School has deliberately misrepresented the situation to justify its actions to the public.

In addition, though Forestry School officials point only to the deer as the cause of their problem, it has become clear that there are three other factors in the forest regeneration problem. First, mismanagement by students has "overhunted" some tree stands; second, mountain laurel, a non-native species, has proven impossible to contain; and third, other competing trees that also happen to be more valuable are shading out the slower-growing profitable species.

Despite claims that it is derived from ethical concerns, Yale's policy to institute a hunt has been guided almost exclusively by economic considerations. In a letter dated August 14, 1985, David Smith, said, "timber production, which must involve logging, is the school's primary objective. Wildlife management is a secondary priority purpose." And University policy towards the professional schools has encouraged this system of priorities. Shortly after A. Bartlett Giamatti became Yale's president in 1977, the University mandated that each professional school be economically self-sufficient. This pressured the Forestry School to turn its forests into money-making operations. Faced with that pressure, the Forestry School took the cheapest and most convenient course possible for eliminating the damage caused to seedlings hunting the deer. These revelations indicate that the policy that led to the Yale deer hunt was neither ethical, academic nor scientific, but simply administrative.

Given these financial concerns and the philosophy of professional pro-management environmental schools like the Yale Forestry School, we should not be surprised by Yale's decision to institute a hunt.

Forestry schools are the academic branch of the hunting and trapping industries and the training grounds for tomorrow's wildlife managers. In fact, the various parties participating in the hunt—the intellectual community, the Wildlife Unit of the DEP, and the students themselves—make the Yale hunt an especially attractive target for anti-hunting activists.

Animal rights activists are committed to uncovering the real reasons behind the Yale deer hunt and to exposing those responsible groups for what they are: inconsiderate, deceitful, profit-seeking groups that participate in or are complicit with this ruthless blood sport. Activists have vowed to fight right until the Forestry School adopts non-violent fundraising solutions to what is a purely financial problem. If they allow the hunt to continue, we hope people from all across the country will gather for a Thanksgiving Day Pilgrimage to the Yale Forest next year.

—Wayne Pacelle

"Making creatures available to hunting doesn't hurt wildlife."—Lynn A. Greenwood, Vice President National Wildlife Federation


To find out what you can do to help promote a non-violent diet, call Farm Animal Reform Movement (FARM) at 301/530-1577.
Scandal Rocks New England Anti-Vivisection Society

Although the Boston-based New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAVS), one of the oldest and wealthiest animal protection organizations in the country, has seen its share of controversy over the past several years, recent events have added a new dimension to its 91-year-old society to its very foundations. Last December, reports began appearing in Boston newspapers revealing that Judge Robert M. Ford, president of NEAVS, and his "courtroom cronies" were diverting sales totaling over $100,000 for part-time NEAVS staff positions. Shortly thereafter, a Massachusetts judicial complaint investigation was begun. In the wake of the scandal, a number of animal rights activists began (not for the first time) a push to radicalize the relatively conservative NEAVS and make better use of the organization's approximately $8 million in accumulated assets. An attempt in 1981 to radicalize NEAVS failed, but as a commission head appointed two activists to the board of directors and an agreement on gaining control of the board of the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) and Boston's Coalition to End Animal Suffering and Exploitation (CEASE), to elect more "activist" board members to NEAVS failed in January of 1982. This time around, however, it would seem that activists stand a better chance of gaining control of the board.

The latest round in the battle for control of NEAVS began with the news that Judge Ford had financed a "financial largesse" with the organization's funds. A demonstration held on December 26 by a group of NEAVS and CEASE members calling for the resignation of all NEAVS board members associated with the scandal, in early January, CEASE released a letter signed by activists from various groups, including PETA, calling for Judge Ford's resignation. At about the same time, PETA began private negotiations with the Judge--apparently intended to persuade him to expedite the nominating process for the new board members proposed by PETA. On January 6th, Ford, did, in fact, appoint three "interim" members to fill board vacancies. The three were: Cleveland Amory, president of the Fund for Animals; John Mitchell, board member of the Amish Foundation; and Theo Capaldo, an active member of both PETA and CEASE. Amory, Mitchell, and Capaldo, along with Amory's letter signed by NEAVS members on January 29, as do six other board members whose terms expire.

On the evening of January 13, Judge Ford failed to appear at a scheduled meeting of the board, but sent a brief note announcing his resignation. At that time, Aaron Medlock, then executive director of NEAVS, was elected president of the board, to serve at least until the April 29 elections. Medlock has stated that his role will be to "concentrate on implementing the plan for a new board" over the next three months" until the April elections, and that he hopes to "stick around past April" to help with the "transition to a more active and open society." It is unknown how many current board members will serve on the new board.

PETA has proposed a slate of candidates for the board which includes the three in- terim board members and three others. Proposed as officers are Cleveland Amory, president; John Mitchell, vice president; and Theo Capaldo, secretary and John Mitchell, treasurer. Proposed board members are: PETA lawyer Gary Francione; Neal Barnard of the Physicians' Committee for Responsible Medicine (PETA-affiliated group); Annette Pickett, formerly of Mobilization for Animals and now a PETA area contact person; and Holly Pearson of CEASE. PETA would not release the name of the ninth candidate, but sources indicate that PETA director Ingrid Newkirk will seek nomination to the board. The slate claims allegiance to a 90-point plan to revitalize NEAVS; its provisions include a $100,000 grant for grassroots groups, support for pro-animal legislation, and funding for research into alternative methods of using animals in experiments.

However, there are other people who want to be considered for the NEAVS board. A slate of six other candidates and a "platform" of plans for revitalizing NEAVS were drawn up by an ad hoc committee of New England activists and presented to the NEAVS membership. The committee discussed the nominees, but subsequently incorporated most of the plans's provisions into the new board's program. On January 22, a nominating committee of five, led by NEAVS interim president Medlock in accordance with the Society's bylaws, Committee members are: Mary Churchill of the Medical Research Modernization Committee; Mary Amory, president of the Amish Foundation; and Theo Capaldo, an active member of both PETA and CEASE. Amory, Mitchell, and Capaldo, along with Amory's letter signed by NEAVS members on January 29, as do six other board members whose terms expire.

In an analysis required by the En- dangered Species Act, NMFS found that opening the waters off Baja California to shrimp fishing would lead to the drowning of many endangered sea turtles. This fact has prompted NMFS to begin its 1987 season with a new, more effective program that will provide a sharper focus on shrimp fishing. Sea turtles can escape the nets of shrimp fishermen if the boats are outfitted with shrimp fisher's "rollover devices" (diagram, above); endangered Kemp's Ridley turtles are regularly drowned in the nets left (left).

Turtles Also Victims of Shrimp Industry

Sea turtles may have an even harder time surviving in Texas waters, thanks to a recent action of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The federal agency has opened a huge area off the coast of Texas to shrimp fishing. For several years this area, in which endangered Kemp's ridley turtles, which spend much of their lives in the Gulf, have been found, has been closed to shrimp fishing for several weeks each summer to allow the turtles to grow larger and become more valuable to the shrimp industry. One benefit of the closure is that it prevents the destruction of sea turtles.

Circumventing normal legal require- ments, NMFS made its decision to open the area for shrimp fishing without giving the public an opportunity to comment. The Center for Environmental Education (CEE) led several other conservation organiza- tions in challenging the legality of this action in a letter published in the Federal Register and in the NMFS's Parent agency.

In an analysis required by the En-dangered Species Act, NMFS found that opening the waters off Baja California to shrimp fishing would lead to the drowning of many endangered sea turtles. This fact has prompted NMFS to begin its 1987 season with a new, more effective program that will provide a sharper focus on shrimp fishing. Sea turtles can escape the nets of shrimp fishermen if the boats are outfitted with shrimp fisher's "rollover devices" (diagram, above); endangered Kemp's Ridley turtles are regularly drowned in the nets left (left).

Shrimp fishermen to preserve their ways...

Because of the size of the Texas shrimp fleet and the importance of Texas waters to endangered sea turtles, residents are urged to express their support for requiring the shrimp fisher's "rollover devices" (diagram, above); endangered Kemp's Ridley turtles are regularly drowned in the nets left (left).

Shrimp fishermen to preserve their ways...

Because of the size of the Texas shrimp fleet and the importance of Texas waters to endangered sea turtles, residents are urged to express their support for requiring the shrimp fisher's "rollover devices" (diagram, above); endangered Kemp's Ridley turtles are regularly drowned in the nets left (left).
Do You Support Cruel and Useless Tests on Animals?

Many dedicated animal activists share in the guilt of product testing on animals by helping from communities that still use the Draize and LD50.

ANIMAL NEWSLINE

Whaling Nations Circumnounce Regulations

The good news for the whales in 1987 is that five of the ten whaling nations have finally laid down their harpoons, and by the end of this year the Soviet Union will also have sent out its last commercial whaling vessels. Korea started a research whaling hunt last year, but under pressure from the U.S. it aborted its bogus "scientific" endeavor after killing less than half of its intended quota of 80 minke whales. Iceland, Japan, and Norway, however, are continuing to be obdurate foes of the whales.

Last year the International Whaling Commission (IWC) passed a resolution stating that meat from whales killed under scientific permits should be used primarily for local consumption. The resolution, however, failed to stop Iceland from killing 77 fin and 40 sei whales under the pretense of research. Iceland intended to export 90 percent of this meat to Japan but scaled back this figure to 49 percent when confronted with potential fisheries sanctions from the U.S. Even this large amount, though, could still bring in $20 million in revenue to Iceland from financing a research program budgeted at only $1 million.

Last November two members of the Sea Shepherds Conservation Society sank five of the four Icelandic whaling ships in Reykjavik Harbor and destroyed much of their whaling equipment. The Japanese, however, stuck by their policy of processing whale meat and oil (see the story in our January/February 1987 News Shorts section). The vessels were refloated a short time later, but the ships may not be repaired.

Although some whale protection groups did not condone the destructive tactics, the action did throw an international spotlight on whaling and burning scientists’ labors.

Japan is up to its usual tricks with the killing of the fin whale, which started in March of 1987 and is continuing to the present. In the Spring of 1988, but is already plotting how to avoid the restrictions. They have already started the killing of the North Atlantic minke.

Norwegian whalers were repeatedly harassed last summer by the Greenpeace ship Rainbow II in the North Atlantic. Norway finally agreed to stop hunting in violation of the IWC moratorium on the killing of the 1987 whaling season. When the U.S. threatened to ban Norwegian fish imports, President Bush approved an "independent scientific" evaluation of the status of the North Atlantic minke whale, however, the government has also stated its intention to continue killing some whales for so-called research purposes.

Sea Shepherds, the group that we are supporting to boycott the fish products from Iceland, Japan, and Norway to protest this behavior, agree that whale protection groups are mobilizing their support. They predict that the outcome of the early 1988 general election will have a major impact on the fate of whale protection measures in the IWC.

Vivisectors’ Apologist Reverses Views on Animal Rights

The following is a reprint of a letter which appeared in the December 15, 1986 issue of The Scientist magazine.

In their reviews of my book The Case for Animal Experimentation (The Scientist, October 20, 1986, p. 19, 20, 22), Robert E. Buzek and Jerold Lennarson agree that I am reversing in explaining the nature of scientific research involving animals and in elucidating the requirements of humaneness. Lennarson, however, expresses the opinion that the philosophical argument of the book is "superficially dogmatic and unconvincing" (p. 19).

I would like to offer a curiously unorthodox philosophy that bequeaths to the humane and decent sentiments it would apply in practice,"(p. 22).

I have to agree with Lennarson. Since I wrote the book, I have come to be profoundly dissatisfied with the approach I took, based on rights possession and a narrow definition of the moral community. I have come to believe that attempts to justify the use of animals for experimentation convince me of the science already-conveyed. This is because they rest on a hierarchical concept of ethics and of the relationship between humans and other animals....


EDICTED BY LESLIE PARDUE

This "weal" calf escaped its fate.

"Howie," a calf destined to become veal, was rescued in a novel fashion by members of the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) Arizona chapter. Activists had trapped the Shamrock Dairy in Tucson last July, discovering filthy conditions, piles of dead calves, and many sick animals. They returned in November for another action, this time on Animals Day on the 29th, and to arrange to buy one of the calves and to take delivery on the 22nd. Little did the dairy know that the "customers" were animal rights activists, and the calf was being purchased for purposes of exposing the cruelty occurring at Shamrock. Though stressed and sickly when sold to the activists, Howie has improved immeasurably since his release from Shamrock and will now live out his life in safety and peace. PETA-AZ also rescued 27 calves when, during a visit to Fresh Farms, Inc., they discovered a worker wringing the necks of sick and diseased calves. PETA members simply asked for the calves, and were allowed to take them. All but three of the calves survived, though seven were crippled. In describing the conditions at the farm, the group stated that the group had "visited both of the others...many of them, who were obviously crippled and that could not stand...None of the calves looked anything like a normal chicken...some had no feathers left...all had been de-beaked...many of the calves were panting pitifully from the heat, unable to cool themselves in the high temperature conditions." If you still have any doubts about the suffering of animals raised for food, pay an unannounced visit on your local factory farm.

The pound seizure court victory which occurred recently in Hillsborough County, Florida was a short-lived one for animal advocates. A permanent injunction against the practice of using pound seizures to take animals for pounds has now been issued by Judge Vernon Evans in October (see our story in the January/April issue) and has been appealed to the Florida Supreme Court. The County Commission voted unanimously in November to appeal the ruling. The appeal lifted the injunction, which means that pound animals in the county will still be seized as "orphans." The commission has been given until the end of the year to file an appeal. The Supreme Court has heard an appeal from the county and has agreed to hear the case.

The legislation that the proposed Animal Concentration Camp ["Meat in Murder"] and other measures on against pound seizures. The AFL said that hormones and other additives are given to the turkeys, making them more tender and better for consumption. The turkeys,妇联, after first denying this, admitted to some news media that they did feed antibiotics to the birds, but only "in accordance with federal guidelines." According to Bernie Archibald, manager of the Rambler, "[they] the [AFL] cut holes big enough for people to crawl in and out of" two buildings. She said neither the hole the turkeys worked out of bound, 145,000 turkeys remained at the time of the AFL action. The farm sends its turkeys to Foster Farms.  

The real crate was banned in Britain this past November. The government decided that the use of a crate, which severely reduces calves' freedom of movement, contradicts the wording of the nation's livestock laws and will be phased out. The organization Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) led the campaign against the crate, leafleting in towns and cities, demonstrating, and conducting letter-writing campaigns. Bans are also being sought on the battery cage system for pigs, laying hens and the dry sow/hog stall method of pig confinement.

These young chimps were rescued from a lab conducting AIDS and hepatitis research. It was the first chimpanzee liberation ever.

Four baby chimpanzees slated to be used in AIDS and hepatitis research were rescued last December by the Friend of Apes in Baltimore, Maryland biomedical research laboratory on December 7. Members of the animal liberation group True Friends broke into the SEMA corporation's labs, removing films and documents as well as the chimps in a raid which took place shortly before dawn. The FBI is investigating the break-in, said to be the world's first liberation of chimpanzees. SEMA houses over 700 nonhuman primates from 11 different species; the primates are used in research for cancer, cardiovascular, infectious diseases, including AIDS. Human beings are the only animals who conduct AIDS outside the laboratory. The disease is a uniquely human malady, and the virus can be kept alive in chimpanzees, the animals do not develop symptoms. The stolen animals had not yet been infected with AIDS or hepatitis.

SEMA was targeted for the raid due to the nature of its research and its history of failure to comply with the minimum requirements of the Animal Welfare Act regarding animal care and housing. Inspectors have cited repeated instances of inadequately trained personnel, use of cages which are too small, unsanitary conditions, and excessive numbers of "accidental" animal deaths. Many animals have died in SEMA's labs of starvation, dehydration, poisoning, anesthetic overdoses, untreated fight wounds, infections, blood loss, and hypothermia. A "steam accident" in April 1985 resulted in the deaths of 26 animals -- a plumbing failure caused hot water to spray from the ceiling in an animal containment room, steaming alive the primates inside. SEMA's research is funded by five government grants, totalling about $1 million annually. The rescued toddler chimps had been kept in isolation in barren steel chambers, not for any experimental purpose but simply for "convenience." They are expected to be improving in physical health and very energetic and playful, enjoying the affection and companionship their lives had previously lacked. 

SEMA has also been the target of demonstrations by the Fight SEMA Coalition of groups comprised of nurses, animal protectionists, and gay activists opposed to the use of animals in AIDS research.  

FACING PAGE: Kevin Anderson, 21, an activist who was one of the two who conducted the raid, is seen here with four of the five chimpanzees that were rescued.
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**NEWS SHORTS**

Brooks, one of the monkeys rescued from Edward Taub’s laboratory, died at the Delta Primate Center after being moved there last June. Now there are only 14 Silver Spring Monkeys.

“Brooks,” one of the famous Silver Spring Monkeys, died of pneumonia recently at the Delta Regional Primate Center in Louisiana. Brooks was one of 15 monkeys taken from a laboratory at the institute for Biomedical Research (IBM) in Silver Spring, Maryland in 1981 following the conviction of IBM researcher Edward Taub on cruelty charges. The monkeys were assigned by the court to the custody of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Taub’s conviction was overturned in 1983 on the grounds that state anti-cruelty laws did not apply to federally-funded projects such as Taub’s. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) has been battling NIH since that time in an effort to have the monkeys placed at Primarily Primates, a primate sanctuary in Texas. But instead, the monkeys were sent to Delta to be used as breeding stock to produce future generations of animals for labs. PETA is urging members of the human community to keep the pressure on Congress and President Reagan to relinquish the remaining monkeys to the care of Primarily Primates.

The Reagan Administration is proposing strict new limits on political activities of nonprofit organizations chartered under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. At press time, the proposed regulations are expected to take effect on February 3, barring an IRS extension of the period of public comment, orders for public hearings, or Congressional action to block the new rules. The regulations would vastly expand the definition of grassroots lobbying, a newsletter including information on pending legislation, for example, would be considered a lobbying effort, as would a direct-mail appeal for funds which contains even one sentence about legislation. Charity groups’ expenses on lobbying efforts would be limited to one per cent of their total expenses; the current permissible level is 20 per cent. The regulations would also impose tax liabilities on private foundations making grants to groups which exceed the amount the recipient group can legally spend on lobbying, even if the grant is given for a purpose unrelated to lobbying efforts.

The Reagan Administration, while calling for more private sector initiatives to make up for its deep cuts in social programs, has cut funds available to charities by at least $30 million, according to a study by the Urban Institute. Gary Ross, executive director of OMB Watch (a group which monitors and critiques the federal budget), says, “There is a tremendous fear by most of the nonprofit community which understands the implications of these proposals.” Groups are urged to contact Senators and Representatives immediately to express opposition to the proposed rules. The ANIMALS’ AGENDA will be exploring this issue more fully in April’s Animal Intelligence.
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The Case for Neutering Cats & Dogs

BY KATHARINE BRANT

The fact that animals feel—not only physical responses to pain, hunger, cold, and disease, but emotions both simple and complex like fear, anxiety, depression, and love—is neither recognized by a great number of people or, worse yet, acknowledged but disdained. Life on earth is not an easy business for any of us, but to the most helpless and insensible creatures often falls the cruelest lot simply because they are born in too great numbers into a world unable to provide for them adequately, and one which is, for the most part, completely indifferent to the inevitable suffering they will endure.

Each year millions of dogs and cats are taken to pounds and shelters to be euthanized because there are simply no homes anywhere for them. Countless thousands more are not even afforded this painless passage out of the world; they die under the wheels of cars, freeze in bitter winters, starve, succumb to disease, become subjects for experimentation in research laboratories, or are tortured to death by sadists. There are simply too many more dogs and cats being born all the time than there are caring persons to provide for them.

The fault is not the animals. The breeding instinct is one of the most powerful drives in all species including our own—nature's guarantee that a species will survive. It does not necessarily account the quality of the life that will be created and does not question the necessity, or lack thereof, for continued reproduction.

The blame for the needless suffering of so many innocent animals, then, lies with people who refuse to assume the obligations attending their stewardship of the creatures who have over thousands of generations become human-dependent. These are the individuals who adject pets on the spur of the moment and then abandon them when they cease to be "cute." These are the operators of puppy mills, and other mass producers of baby animals who operate for profit. And they are the pet "owners" in your own neighborhood who may feed, shelter, and exercise their pets, but never think of having them spayed or neutered.

Most people who neglect to alter their companion animals are simply unaware of the size of the problem. A dog can produce two litters a year, a cat up to four. Each litter averages from four to ten offspring. With an average lifespan of eight years, a single female is capable of producing anywhere from 64 to 330 more animals! And this number increases exponentially with each generation, since each female puppy or kitten in a litter also has the potential, as an adult, for producing the same number of offspring. When one traces the line of a single female dog and the seven generations of pups been throughout her reproductive years, the hypothetical total staggering. If, in the first year, she produces only four pups, the number of males, the second-year production of first and second generation females is twelve pups; peak at the third year, three generations of females produce 36 pups, 18 of them females. By the sixth year, six generations are producing 972 pups; and after seven years, one single unspayed female and her unspayed descendants have theoretically created 4,372 more dogs.

The procreative life of a male animal may be less immediately obvious, but nevertheless at least equally appalling in its potential for "filling" life on earth. Creatures who cannot be adequately cared for: an unsterilized male can impregnate literally scores of females during a breeding season and thus be individually responsible for many more times the numbers cited above for the female. People who always insist on taking only a male "so there won't be any babies to worry about," or who don't bother to neuter him, are living a delusion based on the premise that if you don't see something, it doesn't exist.

Thousands of years ago the ancestors of today's dogs and cats were removed from their rightful place in the natural world by our human ancestors who, for selfish reasons, bred out the traits which once made them valuable. The cat is an exuberant independent of human assistance. Because domesticated canines and felines are so completely dependent on humans, we have a collective responsibility to act as guardians for them—a responsibility which may not be as obvious as many believe. Our care and understanding of the animal advocate has no choice but to take steps to mitigate the tragedy of dog and cat overpopulation.

Katharine Brant is Director of Development for the Humane Society of Utah, and also serves as editor of its newsletter. She has been active in animal protection work for ten years, and presently shares her home with four dogs and three cats—all former strays.

Shelters and pounds across the nation are full of kittens longing to be freed from their cages.

Myths and Facts About Spaying and Neutering

Every single argument that people use to justify not altering their pets is a cruel fallacy that ultimately means only misery and suffering for more helpless animals somewhere down the line. The following list has been gathered from painstakingly researched and documented studies done by humane institutions across the country, and should be read and taken to heart by everyone who keeps companion animals.

Myth: Every female pet should be allowed to have at least one litter before being spayed. Fact: Why should she? An animal spayed before her first heat never knows, and never misses, the experience of breeding or giving birth. Furthermore, she will avoid the annoyance of sexual frustration, and the discomfort and risks of pregnancy and labor. She will never get uterine or ovarian cancer, and her chances of developing breast tumors are greatly reduced.

Myth: Spaying and neutering animals alters their personalities. Fact: The only personality changes that may result from altering an animal are for the better. They become more affectionate and calm, and are less likely to wander from home.

Myth: The surgery will be painful for the animal. Fact: The techniques used in modern veterinary medicine are so sophisticated as those employed for human surgery, and both the unaltered animal and the spayed or neutered animal will be just fine.

Myth: The surgery is too expensive. Fact: The cost of the surgery is a one-time investment, whereas when an unaltered animal continues producing litterers year after year she requires extra feeding, the new pups or kittens must be fed, and finding homes for them will entail effort and possible expense. Most importantly, the price of the surgery is a minuscule amount to pay for the assurance that one is not responsible for allowing countless new animals to be born into a life against which the odds are heavily weighted.

Myth: Responsible "pet owners" find homes for their animals' litters, so they aren't contributing to the problem. Fact: There is no guarantee that all placed animals will still be in those homes in a year or so. And those animals will probably have litters, too—how can the original "pet owner" be sure that the second generation will be placed in good homes? Besides, the fact still remains that there are simply too many dogs and cats being born all the time, and only a limited number of homes for them. Those who do find good homes may displace others who might have been adopted from shelters by people seeking companion animals.

Myth: Humane societies will take care of the surplus animals. Fact: Such organizations do the best they can, but, again, the number of unwanted animals is vastly greater than the number of good homes available. Each year in the United States alone, approximately ten million unwanted dogs and cats are destroyed in shelters and municipal facilities.
University of Florida's DEFENDS WHALING SCHEME

I write all the letters you suggest, and received a response from the University of Florida about the Lamberti "whale research program" (November 86 News Briefs). The University denies all charges of wrongdoing, who is telling the truth, and what do I say?

To Stuart Aspy

Stacy Aspy
Long Beach, CA

Editor's Note: The University is trying to prevent its involvement in a scheme to allow Icelandic whalers to continue slaughtering whales under the pretext of scientific research, which would allegedly benefit whale populations. Write back and tell the University you haven't silenced its manipulation.

A Narrow View

Saying that a nuclear explosion results in differing effects on different types of people, the TBI said, "Preventing Nuclear War is an Atomic Rights issue." December 86 didn't tell us anything we don't know: no doctrine, no politics. However, belong in another publication, I wish that you feel that I need to say.

Sending Live Savers

Last night I stopped by the 7-11 on my way home. Over the counter, a young man was teasing the female clerks with a worm in a package. He said he worked in a meat market, and he had taken the worm and put her (or him) in a styrofoam package and wrapped it with cellophane. The package was labeled "meat." He thought for a moment about what to say, but in a very quiet voice, he said, "I'm from Tennessee. I got this worm in the mail, and it's really big. I really want to keep it, but I know I can't." So, he handed me the package, and I took it. As soon as I got to my house, I put the package in the refrigerator, and the worm was frozen. I've been toying with the idea of keeping it as a pet, but I'm not sure if it's the right thing to do. I don't know how long it will live, but I'm willing to try. I'm thinking of taking it to the zoo, but I'm not sure if they'll accept it. I'm just not sure what to do.

Sending Ambulances to the World: A Clarification

Your October Network Notes contained some out-of-date in-store ads with some erraneous information regarding efforts to convince the Israeli government to allow the use of donated animal ambulances into the country without paying the $20,000 per vehicle customs duty, as is presently required. (Jesika N. Perrier Los Angeles, CA)

Editor's Note: According to Victor Watkins in the British office of the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), the Israeli government is considering allowing donated animal ambulances into the country without paying the $20,000 per vehicle customs duty, as is presently required. However, the Israeli government has not yet made a final decision on this issue. The WSPA has been working to promote this issue for some time now, and we encourage our members to continue to support this effort.

Barbie's Inconsistency

Regarding the Mattel, Inc. "Barbie Stays in Line" mentioned in December's Network Notes, did you realize that on the pages preceding the seal-spraying article, Barbie and Ken go to the bathroom to "shave"? (Julie Houston Mentor, OH)

Editor's Note: No, we did not. We believe that the issue you mention is a printing error. We regret any confusion this may have caused. Readers can send out some information about notes cruelities to Mattel, Inc. at S838 Rockville Rd., Hasford, CA 82901.

Product Liability Insurance and Animal Tests

Probably few of your readers are aware of what the industry insurance and their insurers have in providing product liability insurance to businesses using live animals, such as the household product industries, scientific research, and animal husbandry research. It is the insurance industry that provides protection and payment for legal actions concerning injury from products. If a person is injured using cleaning fluids, cosmetics, etc., normally legal actions will be brought against the manufacturer and possibly the insurance company. Insurers normally do not know much about the products being produced by in- house scientists, they will expect the industry to test their products, and live animal testing is the routine way to test products. It is un- til the insurance and reinsurance industry is alerted to the inadequacy of live animal testing and why it is needed that money and life will changes, we will probably be no real change in the position of industry. Insurers must be made to understand that the only way to test is by using live testing rather than live animal testing. It is a point of view that is rare. In this course of events, if the unpretentious man should have some money to protect them from large damage claims. They think however, that they will not have some money, and it is a point of view that is rare. We would suggest that knowl- edgeable parties press for the latest to the highest use of animal testing as a way and, in this course of events, if the unpretentious man should have some money, and it is a point of view that is rare.

Citing various studies, the company believes that the animal testing is a reliable method of assessing product safety. However, they argue that the current system is not fully effective and needs improvement. They point out the limitations of the existing methods and the potential risks associated with them. The company also mentions the need for better data collection and analysis methods to improve the effectiveness of animal testing. In this context, the company highlights the importance of collaboration between researchers, regulatory agencies, and industry stakeholders to ensure the development of more efficient and humane testing methods. In conclusion, the company calls for further research and development efforts to enhance the reliability and applicability of animal testing in product safety assessment. They argue that such efforts are not only necessary for the protection of human health and safety but also for the ethical treatment of animals used in research. The company believes that by investing in alternative and more humane testing methods, they can contribute to the advancement of science and society while respecting the rights and well-being of animals.
A Welcome Time Warp

Star Trek IV—The Voyage Home


There is a space age limerick which goes:

“A voice from the UFO cried
‘The whales are going free ride.
Several men volunteered.
But a whale and two dolphins inside.’

This in essence is the theme of the latest and best of the Star Trek movies, "Star Trek: The Voyage Home." Full of colorful fantasy, far-out special effects, and good-humored satire, this film conveys a powerful "save the whales" message, with lessons for humans in humility and compassion.

Planet Earth in the 21st Century is threatened with disaster because of its inability to respond to a mysterious sound being transmitted from a giant underwater object aimed at the world's oceans. Encountering this overpowering force in its path, the Star Trek is led by Admiral James Kirk and guided by their Vulcan advisor Mr. Spock, can find no way to communicate with this probe emanating from an "intelligence unknown to us.

To the amazement of all, Spock eventually identifies the probe's transmissions as "the songs sung by whales, specifically humpback whales." When asked if this was not a strange way to communicate with the people of the Earth, the probe observes: "There are other intelligent life forms on Earth. Only humans would assume the message was meant for man." Under pressure, according to the film's futuristic storyline, is that humpback whales "have been extinct since the 21st Century," and are "not present in this message." The intriguingly-executed answer is for the Star Trek crew to bring their spacecraft through a time warp back to present-day San Francisco to find a pair of Pacific Ocean humpback whales. When finally transported back to the 21st Century, the whales communicate with the probe and the world is saved!

Because "Star Trek IV" incorporates basically accurate cetacean information and a moving concern for the plight of whales, and a sense of fun enjoyed by hundreds of millions of people around the globe, this one movie may contribute more to public awareness about the wonder and value of whales than the conscientious efforts of many cetacean conservation organizations. (It's some video scenes of whaling) of the kind of explicit gore, mayhem, and bloody violence so characteristic of today's exploitative cinema. And, as usual, the marvelous integrated Star Trek crew works beautifully as a team—with each member smoothly representing some endearing temperamental and national traits.

Leonard Nimoy has done a superb job, not only in interpreting with depth Spock's acceptance of the value of human feeling in addition to Vulcan facts and logic, but as the film's director. He allows his points to be made with class and finesse, and encourages the audience to smile, wonder, cheer, and even weep, but never to take itself too seriously.

Spock: "To hunt a species to extinction is not logical." Kirk: "Whoever said the human race was logical?"

I found especially engaging the humor of the human sequences filmed in San Francisco, showing interactions between 21st Century society members and representatives of the "extremely primitive and paranoid culture" they found in 21st Century America. The use and misuse of "colorful metaphors" is neatly highlighted by Kirk's very observation that, "Nobody pays attention to you if you don't swear every other word. You'll find it in all the literature of the period...Jacqueline Susann, Harold Robbins..." "Ah," adds Spock solemnly, "'The glitz.'"

Although, it is not unique, the humpback whale models used for closeups are remarkably realistic, and a criticism is that more underwater shots of real humpback whales were not used in the film to supplement the footage. I have seen footage of live humpbacks performing almost all of the maneuvers done in the movie. "Star Trek IV: The Voyage Home" may indeed significantly contribute toward making the small, rare, humpback whale a household accomplishment—helping enlightened humans and intelligent whales jointly share the planet. "There can be sightedness." This alone should make "Star Trek IV" a long-term classic.

—Robbie Barseau
Volunteer Executive Director
Cetacea Society International

Editor's note: For readers wanting to send thanks or comments to "Star Trek" producers, the address is Paramount Pictures Corporation, 20th Mirviss Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90038.

Uneven Affections

In the Company of Animals

By James Serpell

James Serpell's In the Company of Animals is an in-depth analysis of western culture's arbitrary and contradictory behavior toward different types of domestic animals. Some animals (for example, pigs, cows, and chickens) are treated like unfettered machines on factory farms. Other domesticated dogs, cats, birds) are pampered as "pets"—cherished, indulged, and generally regarded as part of the family. Serpell uses the exploration of this contradiction as a wedge to break open the whole argument about animals' proper relationship to human beings. What emerges is a profound insight into the human rationalization process and the elaborate psychological footwork which enables us to abuse animals as we do. The book is not a defense of this behavior but rather an expose of it. Once exposed, Serpell believes, the behavior can be stopped.

Much of the work is an analysis of pets and pet-keeping in western culture. Some of us might argue with Serpell that pet-keeping is not benign—but the flip-side of abuse, but exploitation of another kind. We might point to the millions of former pets on streets, in labs, and in pounds as proof of abuse. We might point out that the term "pet" is itself exploitative and dehumanizing. Because it is a term that holds power. He points out that although the culture condones cherishing pets, this caring attitude often has a darker side that is not acknowledged. Serpell believes that this condensory attitude toward loving pets is the basic component of the complex rationalization system that keeps animal exploitation going. We cannot hold two contradictory ideas in our minds at the same time, so "instead of questioning the hardline economic exploitation of animals, we tend...to adopt a condensory attitude to pets." (p. 16). Indeed, our rationalization process is deep and far reaching. To justify our killing, eating, and torturing of animals we have invented "distancing devices"—detachment (from animals and our own feelings), concealment (of animal pain behind locked doors), misrepresentation (of our own motives), and shifting the blame (always away from ourselves).

But what makes us go so far to justify our own greed? What starts the whole process rolling in the first place? Serpell pins the bottom-line cause on anthropocentrism. His book includes a history of speciesism—which is nothing short of terrifying in its scope and breadth. Anthropocentrism must yield to a more benign relationship with the planet. And Serpell believes that we have a chance to change our behavior patterns now while current ecological crises on the earth are forcing us to re-evaluate our relationship to other life forms. In fact, Serpell believes that we'd better change ourselves before it's too late.

The truth is that it is normal and natural for people to empathize and identify with other life forms and to feel guilty and remorse about harming them. It is the essence of our humanity.

But such a change in belief and behavior won't be easy. Serpell points out that we've been deceiving ourselves for so long that changing things is not doing it anymore. The myth has become the reality.

Perhaps it's the final irony that human beings will adopt a more equal and fair treatment of animals only when it's necessary to save ourselves. But, for whatever reason, let's hope that Serpell is right. Let's hope that human beings can come to some compromise with other animals and not just a condensory attitude toward them. The future's in our hands. Our future is in the hands of the animals.
Animal Rights in the Theater

The Others

By Rachel Rosenthal

"The Others," a theater presentation, was written and performed by Rachel Rosenthal. North Carolina State University. The performance seeks to open the audience's minds and hearts to the issue of exploitation. The utilization of music, drama, dance and a vast array of human and animal companions. An on-stage cameraman records the action as it takes place and other images are seen on a large overhead screen. The animals are not required to perform or do tricks. This is no circus. Rosenthal believes that performing animals are an abomination. The audience can see their beauty and evoke the dignity of the animals as individuals. In the program, she writes, "This piece is dedicated to those who have hunted, exterminated, despised, tortured, eaten, neglected and mocked our cohabitants on this Planet Earth, the Animals."

As a child, Rosenthal fled Paris on foot with her Russian parents during the Nazi invasion. Later, in New York, after attending the High School of the Performing Arts, she studied acting, painting, and dance. In the fall, she moved to California and founded the Experimental Instant Theatre and helped found the Watson Cultural Center. Her performances address social issues that have included feminism, anti-nuclear and environmental concerns. She has researched and performed "The Others," Rosenthal has become a vegetarian and hopes her work will inspire the same potential for change in the audience.

"As is the nature of the performing arts, each presentation may differ somewhat. The animal audience involves the audience through the perception of spontaneity. Baby, a fawn, was given free reign to wander around the stage. The viewer's eye was drawn back and forth from the innocent baby deer to the harsh image of a masked Rosenthal as a dismounter, scissors snapping at the rubber bodies of small toy animals. In another scene, the darkened stage lights revealed 14 people wearing realistic animal masks, who stand and scan the audience, moving their heads to encompass everyone there. Two men in chef's gear and transparent plastic smiling masks carry trays of freshly grilled meat into the audience shouting, "Hot dogs, get your hamburgers!" The smell permeates the audience. Don Preston's original score is moving and effective. Rosenthal incorporates stories, arguments, ritual, movement and flashing images, all augmented by the dignified presence of the animals. Her intent is to showcase animals that have experienced abuse and exploitation. Call Helenium of Raleigh spent weeks recruiting local animals. Dorothy, a terrier mix, had been rescued from a frozen pond. Whiskers, a stray, had been found with her throat slashed. Samson and George, a boa constrictor and a burmese python, have scars from cigarette burns by their former owners. A barred owl, blue jay, dead cat and now, a topical fox, a horse left to starve in a barn, a blind guinea pig, a greyhound injured in a race—all were presented in a way to strew, to care for, and to be a partner with our society.

Rosenthal's truth and sensitivity of animals and their human companions for several days before the performance. She says she looks for animals that are "cool, non-stiffly and not easily frightened." Every effort is made to make the animals not stressed by this experience and their human companions are suitable. Adjustments were made rapidly and thoughtfully when a few minor snags occurred during the first performance. A horse was replaced by a more docile, also previously victimized, horse when it appeared that he was not as comfortable as was desirable. Seven of the animals were from the local pound. Rosenthal calls them back on stage after each performance to appeal to the audience to consider adopting them as pets. The seven were all adopted. In a closing scene, Rosenthal is joined on stage by the animals and their human companions. One is impressed with their calmness and stillness as a voiceover and a slow appearance with Henry Bolognini's words, "We need another and a wiser and perhaps more mystical concept of animals...they are not underlying...they are other nations, caught within the growing pulse across the globe...let us think of fellow prisoners of the splendor and travail of the Earth."

Rachel Rosenthal, who fled Paris on foot during the Nazi invasion, shares her head as a memorial to the victims of the Holocaust.

Marly Cornell

I Will Power

Please consider The ANIMALS' AGENDA when you make your will. The ANIMALS' AGENDA is a non-profit corporation, "The Animals' Right Network, Inc." (ARN), our publisher. The address is: Box 5293, Washington, D.C. 20016. If you need more information about ARN, please contact our office.

Jeremy Rifkin

Continued from page 5

this? What is your perception of the movement?" The animal rights movement has been at the forefront of talking about an empathetic approach to society and technology. A new way to address the utility and value of the animal community to humanity's disdain for the animals. Rosenthal and her group are trying to give animals a voice in our society. The animal rights movement could provide an educational context for other constituents, because while animal rights activists are talking about is not just protecting an animal in a laboratory but developing a new, deep ecology philosophy about the sacredness and integrity of life. The animal rights movement is not only an activist movement. It is an attempt to change the consciousness of the culture. And I think the reason why it frightens and alarms some people is because it threatens some of the very basis of the way we think. It forces us to rethink not only our relationship to animals, but our relationship to each other as well.

Do you then see such a change in consciousness as a part of the perception of politics, a new sense of what political is? Most definitely. I think the real agenda for the future is to reshape the dimensions of the political spectrum. The old spectrum right versus left doesn't make sense to a lot of young people. The new political spectrum places the sacredness of life on one side and pure utilitarianism on the other. There is a whole new group of people who are involved in the nature and the rights of the earth, the bio-regional movement, worker self-management movements, the family farm movement, organic agriculturalists and the preventive health movement. In one way or another, all these people are trying to reestablish life and they are flying in the face of the prevailing worldview.

What advice can you offer to people on the "frontline" of life versus death spectrums?

I would like to weave together the principles in each of these movements into a broad, flexible, empathetic philosophy. There is no reason for animal rights to be separated from environmentalists for to be separated from family farmers for to be separated from organic agriculture, or for such farms to be separated from people dealing with preventative health and holistic medicine. Each is involved in its own set of issues, but they all represent a broader philosophical focus that says a little more than just functionality, more than just productivity, more than just expediency. Utility and efficiency. What concerns me is that we not repeat some of the mistakes of the last major movement in this country—the New Left in the Sixties. The New Left was strong on activism and weak in psycho-spiritual underpinnings. We need both. If we have philosophy devoid of action it becomes just an intellectual preposition. If we have action devoid of some kind of substantial intellectual content, it can end up burning out.

Do you have any suggestions for those in the animal rights community in terms of the biotechnology issue?

The ethical questions in genetic engineering are profound. The whole idea of using gene-splicing technology to redesign the genetic code of life is probably the most pressing ethical question the animal rights movement will ever have to deal with. The long-term question is, "Do we have the right to redesign the genetic code of living things?" If we do, what are the implications? This is a question which we are the architects of life. It's not 20 or 30 years from now. It's happening today. Genetic engineering is still crude. I would hope that the animal rights movement is beginning to see—and I think they are—that this is the frontline battle for animal rights as a child in the family. Likewise, I think individuals should start looking into to the genetic engineering research which is going on in major laboratories across the country, and begin to challenge that research. I would be very likely to see people become very involved in the Bovine Growth Hormone case, because that is one of the main events in the animal rights movement to work with other movements and people in this case, in the animal rights movement. We need to look at the genotype and work toward the biotechnical revolution and to advocate alternative approaches to science, technology and public policy. That's a pretty big agenda now.

Dave Macaulay is an Independent animal rights activist and center located in Washington, D.C.
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