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More Facts and Less Fanaticism

As John McArfield points out in "Animal Research: Sorting Out the Facts From the Fiction" (p. 86 in this issue about roadkills), however, I think one very important action was omitted. The most fundamental way to reduce the number of roadkills is to drive less, not at all. Using mass transit reduces the number of vehicles on the roads and kills the few instanteously. Further, in Sweden, the leginsane may cut down on the immovable object; rather, it has a drag which slows the fox's travel but avoids the panic that is engendered by a steel-strap trap firmly rooted to the spot. The fox cut in the Swedish leginsane is still killed, but the difference is that he didn't experience long, drawn-out agony and terror before death. There is no such thing as a completely humane trap to catch a wild animal alive. What do exist are a number of methods that are hundreds of times less painful and terrorizing than steel-strap traps and neck and body snares.

-Anti-Cocaine PSAs

Fraudulent

The melodramatic anti-cocaine public service announcements sponsored by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, feature a rodent in the convulsive spasms of death. In a country where vivisection and animal product ingestion have caused more human illness and suffering than illegal drugs ever have or ever will, Partnership for a Drug-Free America confusingly ignores the thousands of legal drugs—the adverse effects of which are more insidious than those of cocaine. What is this partnership? It is the Advertising Council, Inc. (253 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022), presumably taking the odds against at tempting to do (or convince people it is doing) something socially responsible. The 15 to 30 second ad is built on the premise that politics should not be driven by fashion, and that ignoring it will bring it to the attention of society.

-Ghostly Tales of Trapping

You performed a valuable service in telling readers how to release an animal from a steel-strap trap in the October 1986 issue. A companion article tells of the terrible pain this trap inflicts. The illustration of the steel-strap trap (taken from a brochure of one of the organizations) completes the ghastly tale. It was regrettable, however, that you also chose as illustrations three images of leginsane when the text of the article referred to rock and body snares. The animal pulling against the wire causes it to tighten securely around the neck or body. Leginsanes cannot catch animals around the neck or body. They are alternatives to the cruel and painful neck and body snares and to the steel-strap trap itself.

-Knows Why They Hunt

The article "Why They Hunt" in the November 1986 issue brought back memories of some years ago when I taught primary school for a year in a rural area in the British Isles. I was teaching a teacher friend and I would go to the local coffee shop for breakfast. There was a steady stream of men who had been still drunk from the night before—red-faced and staggering. Many of them were trying to improve the waistlines with their load-stuff stories. I thought then how pathetic they were and how ugly compared to the beautiful, gentle deer they were out to prove their "manhood" with.

Less Driving Would Reduce Roadkills

I was gratified to see the practical advice given in the October 1986 issue about roadkills; however, I think one very important action was omitted. The most fundamental way to reduce the number of roadkills is to drive less, not at all. Using mass transit reduces the number of vehicles on the roads and kills the few instanteously. Further, in Sweden, the leginsane may cut down on the immovable object; rather, it has a drag which slows the fox's travel but avoids the panic that is engendered by a steel-strap trap firmly rooted to the spot. The fox cut in the Swedish leginsane is still killed, but the difference is that he didn't experience long, drawn-out agony and terror before death. There is no such thing as a completely humane trap to catch a wild animal alive. What do exist are a number of methods that are hundreds of times less painful and terrorizing than steel-strap traps and neck and body snares.

-Anti-Cocaine PSAs

Fraudulent

The melodramatic anti-cocaine public service announcements sponsored by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America feature a rodent in the convulsive spasms of death. In a country where vivisection and animal product ingestion have caused more human illness and suffering than illegal drugs ever have or ever will, Partnership for a Drug-Free America confusingly ignores the thousands of legal drugs—the adverse effects of which are more insidious than those of cocaine. What is this partnership? It is the Advertising Council, Inc. (253 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022), presumably taking the odds against at attempting to do (or convince people it is doing) something socially responsible. The 15 to 30 second ad is built on the premise that politics should not be driven by fashion, and that ignoring it will bring it to the attention of society.

-Ghostly Tales of Trapping

You performed a valuable service in telling readers how to release an animal from a steel-strap trap in the October 1986 issue. A companion article tells of the terrible pain this trap inflicts. The illustration of the steel-strap trap (taken from a brochure of one of the organizations) completes the ghastly tale. It was regrettable, however, that you also chose as illustrations three images of leginsane when the text of the article referred to rock and body snares. The animal pulling against the wire causes it to tighten securely around the neck or body. Leginsanes cannot catch animals around the neck or body. They are alternatives to the cruel and painful neck and body snares and to the steel-strap trap itself.

-Knows Why They Hunt

The article "Why They Hunt" in the November 1986 issue brought back memories of some years ago when I taught primary school for a year in a rural area in the British Isles. I was teaching a teacher friend and I would go to the local coffee shop for breakfast. There was a steady stream of men who had been still drunk from the night before—red-faced and staggering. Many of them were trying to improve the waistlines with their load-stuff stories. I thought then how pathetic they were and how ugly compared to the beautiful, gentle deer they were out to prove their "manhood" with.
Broom Hilda

**LETTERS**

**THE ELEPHANT-PHILANTHROPIST OF THE LAST AFRICAN PLANt**

HE IS A CAPABLE LABORER, A LIGHT-HEARTED ENTERTAINER, AND A PRODUCER OF VALUABLE INK!

AND NOW, MAN HAS A NEW PLAN... ANOTHER GIANT... GENTLE GIANT...

THAT'S NICE—EXTINCTION!

Continued from previous page...

A double standard was in effect: less-developed nations, despite their very limited enforcement capabilities, are fair targets for commerce; developed nations are not. As distancing the vote was, however, the more important issue is the role the U.S. can play in persuading its closely allied, fellow consumer nations to take their CITES obligations more seriously. It is important that the defeat of the resolution not be perceived by Austria, France, and Japan as tacit approval of the qualities of their CITES implementation.

*The Humane Society of the United States* 2109 1st Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037

**Interests, Rights, and Compassion**

I would like to make a few comments on the interview with Peter Singer in the September 1987 issue. Singer distinguishes between "interests" and "rights," stating that while he believes animals have interests, he doubts they have rights. He considers the matter to be the same as a philosopher, but as a lawyer, I think it is important to note that—"from a legal point of view—rights are based on interests. Interest is the right of animals to be protected or to be free. If animals have interests as they do (certainly do), they also have rights to the extent to which the law protects the interests. By whom the animals' rights are defended and depends on whom the law recognizes as their defenders. There seems to be no doubt that it is proper and indeed necessary to speak of animals possessing rights or being entitled to possess them if we accept that, as living beings capable of enjoyment and suffering, they possess interests deriving from that condition.

Singer says that Schweitzer's "reverence for life" ethic does not furnish a good basis for the cause of animal liberation, because it values life more than freedom from suffering. As far as Singer is concerned, this is not the case. He expressly states that the "principle of not killing... must not aspire to be independent, but has to serve and subordinate itself to compassion," which means that in "many cases, to follow blindly the commandment of not killing is less useful to compassion than disobeying it." Schweitzer definitely accepts euthanasia. Coining the phrase the "brotherhood of those marked by suffering," Singer stresses that to prevent, alleviate, and even to eradicate suffering is the foremost concern of the followers of his philosophy of "reverence for life." The fundamental experience of the unity of life is the door that leads to identifying oneself with other living beings and to the empathy that is the condition sine qua non of compassion for and solidarity with animals. It can hardly be denied, therefore, that this philosophy offers an adequate basis for the endeavor of animal liberationists.

Singer contends that plants have no intrinsic ethical significance and hence no interests, because they lack sentience and consciousness. I wonder if we can be so categorical. In fact, the borderline between the animal and vegetable kingdoms is less marked than the one between human and nonhuman at the present stage of evolution. We should accept gradualism as the guiding principle for acknowledging the presence of sentience and interests, and should make some allowance for our still subsisting ignorance concerning matters like sentience in beings far removed from ourselves, without leaving them in some way the benefit of doubt. As regards identification and empathy, I wonder if it is not easier to have this kind of relationship with an old tree than with an amphibian.

—Godfredo Stutin
Santiago, Chile

**Editor's Note:** Mr. Stutin, an attorney, is Chile's foremost animal rights advocate and a prominent voice for the defense of ecology and social justice.

**MAY 1986 ISSUES NEEDED**

If readers have uncorrected copies (in good condition) of the May 1986 issue, we can use them. Please send them to: P.O. Box 5324, Westport, CT 06881. We'll be happy to send these for other uses.

**Force Politicians to State Positions**

Activists can take advantage of the current campaigning of Presidential candidates by contacting local and national political representatives. This can be done by phone, letter, or even by gathering signatures on a petition that demonstrates their stands on animal rights issues. This would serve several purposes. It would further introduce animal rights into politics; it would let the politicians (one of whom will one day be President) know that animal rights is a serious issue among voters of all political persuasions; it will force them to take a stand if they haven't already.

I recently called all the announced Democratic and Republican candidates and asked to be sent their statements on animal rights. The last office I called was "Bush for President" (a horrid thought). The man on the other end of the line expressed surprise, and informed me that hardly anyone had called about animal rights. He went on to say that, perhaps, if 30 to 40 people called, Mr. Bush might take notice and formulate an opinion. To 407 hell, let's give him thousands!—Michael D. Garrett
Washington, D.C.

**The Star Trek Ethic**

I have been a long-time fan of Star Trek, and have often wondered if its ethic included all animals. A recent episode of Star Trek: Next Generation, "Lonely Among Us," which aired November 8, 1987, proved it does. Officer Riker, second-in-command, states, "We no longer enslave animals for food purposes." He goes on to explain how "meat" is synthesized in their transporter beams. In the 24th Century, people are vegetarians! Bravo to Star Trek and its creator Gene Roddenberry.

—Cynthia H. Grimaldi
Medford, NY

**Prison Better than Losing Dogs**

I am an inmate at the infamous San Quentin prison, serving a four-year sentence as a result of escaping from a county jail and breaking my beloved golden retrievers out of a pound where they faced a most unpleasant fate. I had been arrested on traffic charges and my dogs, who were with me at the time, were placed in the local pound. I was unable to post bail and, being new to the area, knew no one who could pick my dogs up from the pound. After two weeks I was informed that the dogs weren't picked up within a week, they would be disposed of.

I was frantic, knowing that if any harm came to my girls it would haunt me until the end of my days. Employing chisel and hook and a blade, I cut through the window and bars. Using a hand-braded rope, I lowered myself to the ground. Three officers entered the cell. Under the midnight sky, I raced to the animal shelter on the outskirts of town.

Once there, I scaled two barred-wire fences and ran down the row of kennels, wishing mightily that I could liberate all the unfortunate housed there. Spotting my girls, I unlocked their "cells" and carried them over the fence. By the time my absence was discovered, I had already been sent away on parole for another year.

—William L. H.; San Quentin State Prison

---

**You've never experienced a soap that soft, this moisturizing.**

New MoistureBar by Reviva Labs

100% Pure Vegetable Soap. No Animal Ingredients.

Here's a new experience in soaps. Softer, more luxurious than the $10.00 "department store soaps", $3.50 MoistureBar smoothes, and helps skin look, like a moisturizer. Doesn't dry skin, like most soaps. In fact, helps overcome dryness.

As if its pure vegetable base isn't enough of a rarity (most soaps have animal tallow base), new French technology has activated vegetable extracts ("olitolets") to create a beauty bar with exciting new benefits. It not only silken skin, it maintains moisture and healthy skin balance — which protects against bacteria.

What's more, it has added features almost incredible for a soap—with anti-irritant and soothing qualities. All ages—from 1 month to 100 years—will love it on face or body. In fact, if you ever suffer from flakiness, itch, or sensitivity, MoistureBar will be a revelation.

MoistureBar ... not just a cleansing bar. It's an experience. An exclusive vegetable-and-plant-extract formula produced in France for Reviva Labs; the brand that offers the Best Results in Skin Care.

---
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The Philosopher Who Came In From The Cold

An Interview With Michael Allen Fox

BY MARLY CORNELL

Turning away from deeply-held convictions is always difficult, but publicly recanting a position one has defended for years requires unusual moral honesty.

Michael Allen Fox is a professor of philosophy at Queen's University in Ontario where he lives quietly with his friend Louise, sons Jason and Tim, and cat Panther. He is also the man who spent a decade defending the use of animals in research. He wrote the only major philosophical book on the subject, The Case for Animal Experimentation: An Evolutionary and Ethical Perspective. Yet several months after its publication in 1986 Fox reversed his position. He now favors abolition of the use of animals in research, although he still struggles with some unresolved aspects of the issue.

Fox agreed to be interviewed by The ANIMALS' AGENDA in order to tell us about his change, to correct misconceptions generated by the media, and to indicate some remaining areas of confusion and uncertainty in his views. At his home in Kingston, surrounded by art--from contemporary paintings to 700-year-old Japanese sculpture--he discussed the events leading up to his change in view.

Why did you write The Case for Animal Experimentation in the first place?

The book was not meant to be a direct rebuttal of any specific book. My initial work on the subject started with a critique I wrote in 1976 of Peter Singer's Animal Liberation. Then, after years of writing on the subject, I expanded my argument to full length.

What effect did the opinions of the scientific establishment have on your early doubts?

My disinclination was partially offset by the praise scientists offered me. I feel now that I was not sufficiently self-critical. I imagined my book as a helpful tool for members of the scientific community.

What were the benefits of their approval?

In the inner circle of their activities, I was allowed to inspect animal experiments and ethics review committees and to view experimental surgery. I was called on for consultations, asked for advice on prepared documents, and invited to attend conferences as a speaker.

What triggered your initial misgivings when you were writing the book?

I attempted to address the most controversial experiments in the book. I talked about Seligman's learned helplessness experiments, Selye's stress research, and Harlow's maternal deprivation work, for example. I was uncomfortable trying to justify those experiments, but my approach was to explain the context in which they were done and to point out that critics often neglect to see experiments as part of an ongoing process leading to results.

What influenced you to change your mind?

Reviews that attacked the quality of my argument and the issue of humane treatment of animals affected me most. Jerome Tannenbaum wrote in The Scientist that I was betraying or in conflict with what seemed to be the humane thrust of my book. I was also bothered by the fact that a feminist acquaintance beamed scorn on the book for its inhumaneness and its at...
Join Our Television Team!

Continued from previous page
tempt to justify a power relationship of humans over the rest of nature—a relation-ship that is similar to the one that has generally prevailed between men and women. One group has power over another and can therefore do whatever it wants to do with the other, disregarding it with a "justification." It was a shocking experience that made me sit up and take notice of my emerging doubts. I began to see that there was a suppression of feel-ings in the book.

What is the major change in your thinking in this book, and how does what is in your book?

In the book I tried to elaborate a general justification of animal experimentation from an ethical point of view, and I no longer believe that this is possible. Instead of giving a blanket justification to animal experimentation and then finding possi-ble exceptions, I now think it is the other way around. Only exceptional cir-cumstances might allow the justification of animal experiments; otherwise, I'd have to say they are not justified.

In a letter to The Scientist in December 1986, you wrote that you agreed with Thomas Aquinas's argument that "if pain is the only punishment" and "if ... final punishment?"

I felt that I had to go on record indicating that I was rethinking my position, rather than justifying it. I was not enough to keep it to myself. I had this confession urge that I had to satisfy. I did not think about the benefits I would lose by going public. I was aware that I would surprise and maybe upset many scientists.

What did happen after you went public?

The Whig-Standard newspaper in Canada got hold of the letter to The Scient-ist, and printed an editorial. That dismayed me, for it was then that I real-ized that this was big news and that I would be called to account for my views. I wasn't prepared for that. One scientist friend called me right away after reading the editorial, saying, "It's true, isn't it? When I confirmed that it was, he asked if I was all right, as if he thought a stroke must have fallen on my head or some-thing. I began to be concerned about being attacked and pulled. I felt that the scientific community would view me as a traitor, and the animal rights commu-nity would want to claim me. I felt that

There is a lot of truth in the feminist criticism of the profession of philosophy which notes that it is carried out in an adversarial manner.

I had been co-opted to some extent by the scientific community, and I didn't want this to happen in the other direction.

How has the substantial media interest in your change of viewpoint affected you?

Being a center of attention appeals to one's vanity, and it is nice to get credit for doing something you think is right. But I greatly feared, and still fear, that the media would misrepresent and sensa-tionalize what I did—portray me as grandstanding for attention, and lose track of the issues. The focus needs to be on the issues; they are the important thing. I am an abolitionist, but I also have some reservations about that posi-tion, and I have not yet resolved them. In the media, you never get to time to develop a thought.

What reactions did you get from the scientific community?

I am part of the Working Group on Research Involving Animals, a subcom-mitee of a standing ethics committee of the Medical Research Council (MRC) of Canada. MRC, the Canadian equivalent of the National Institutes of Health, sets standards for animal care and use. When the committee met in January of 1987, I was nervous, expecting them to ask me to quit. A couple of members were a bit cool but most were interested in talking more with me. The non-scientists were full of praise. Fortunately, I think the com-mittee is open-minded. The challenge, for example, is a judge who is also a medical doctor, and he has left open the idea that it is possible to conclude that animal research cannot be justified. The commit-tee is hearing testimony on animal research and it would like to find out why one wants to get on with it. Basically they feel I have a useful perspective.

I have also served on the Ethics Review Committee at Queen's, but I realize my future with that committee is uncertain. I have always been strict about the ap-plication of Canadian ethics codes to research done at Queen's (perhaps my misgivings were showing even earlier than I suspected). My goal now is to influence people toward abolition by ar-ticulating and defending that point of view, and by asking skeptical questions about people's research.

Do you think you were a bit naive in your acceptance of the value of so much past research involving animals?

Yes, though assessing the value of this research is somewhat like trying to decide which of two conflicting interpretations of the Bible is correct. Both scientists and anti-vivisectionists tell convincing stories of the necessity of medicine from diametrically opposed standpoints.

How do you envision achieving abolition of the use of animals in research?

I believe that the whole question of the use of animals in experiments is tighter monitoring of research and improved guidance to researchers. It is worthwhile and what yields benefits. Complete abol-i-tion in my view is possible within 15 to 25 years, but a target of 50 to 100 years from now is more realistic and feasible. There will probably be advances in that direction, but there will still be a place for animals in research. There will still be a place for them. I am optimistic.

It has been almost a year since you changed your mind, and you have said that your views are still emerging. How would you describe your current attitude concerning the use of animals in experimentation?

For me, the principal issue of animal ex-perimentation is not the balance of the benefits it actually or allegedly brings to humans against the harms it causes to animals. It is the absence of a standard of ethics that recognizes the harms against harms—harms of omission when harms (and sometimes nonhuman animals) are denied the fruits of research, and harms of commis-sion when research procedures are permitted to be carried out and procedures that cause suffering and are not necessarily of any conceivable benefit to themselves. I don't see how anyone can suppose that this conflict can be resolved in an absolutist fashion. But the intractable nature of the conflict points toward the abolition of animal experimentation as a goal, since this seems the only way to bypass the conflict and adhere to a full commitment to humaneness. It should be remem-bered, however, that humans will always rely on the use of animals to promote their own ends, to better their own lives. We should not suppose that we can ever wholly eliminate our dependence on animals and our impact as a species on the rest of nature.

Does the general method of teaching thinking in the profession of philosophy restrict the analysis of these moral issues?

There is a lot of truth in the feminist criticism of the profession of philosophy which notes that it is carried out in an adversarial manner. The purpose is to engage in debate to defeat an opponent, and it is not generally practiced as a cooperative exploration of ideas. A different model of philosophical discussion is needed and debate would be useful to get beyond that confrontational approach. The best care is more interdisciplinary studies and exposure to new ideas, with cooperative efforts to solve problems. Emotional and moral sentiments need culturing so that we can care more about the world around us, the fate of the planet, and the species. The philosophical system does not address these things.

You are a member of Canadian Philosophers for Peace and several other animal organizations. Do you see your views regarding animals as consistent with these concerns?

I am a member of the anti-nuclear movement, including a book Nuclear War: Philosophical Perspectives. Most of my activism has been in this area because time is short for the world as a whole. I see the treatment of animals as a subclass of issues in environmental ethics. I recently rebuffed my envi-ronmental writing career and wrote a book, Conceptual Foundations of Environ-mental Ethics, because my original environmental writing came from an anthro-pocentric perspective. I now think that those biocentrists who are interested in the welfare of all species and think the anthropocentric view is no longer ade-quate or satisfactory to the survival of the planet are offering a more thoughtful criti-cique of society. I see a cloaked parallel in my repudiation of anthropocentric environ-mentalism to my emerging views on an-imals—the same views in a wider context.

Do your emerging views encompass a different conception of animals?

I have a goal of vegetarianism for health and moral reasons. It is hypocritical and inconsistent to be critical of animal research and uncritical of factory farming. Consistency is not the highest virtue, but it is important. It is also nonsensical and rational. I tossed a slaughterhouse and found it repulsive—not so much the kill.

Continued on next page
INTERVIEW
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ing of animals as such, which in many ways is bad enough, but the mechanization that degrades the animals and the people who work on them. It was sterile, highly efficient, mass in scale, distant from emotion, dehumanizing. I am not convinced it is wrong to eat other organisms, since we are part of nature, but it is wrong to cause suffering if you can avoid it, and it is wrong to waste life. I am interested in finding a simpler lifestyle with a greater use of non-animal products, more self-sufficiency, and a wiser use of resources. I don’t know how fast I will accomplish this. Being part of nature is being part of a process.

What is your view of the animal rights movement?

There is a wide collection of views and ideologies, providing good input into developing defensible philosophical positions on the moral status of animals. A lot of sophistication has gone into tactics and strategies. There is a lot of ferment and lots of groups, and it’s hard to know who speaks for the movement. But ferment is a sign of creativity. It causes difficulties, but it is an important part of such a process.

Where do you see potential advancements in the struggle for animal rights?

I am optimistic about using the law in a more sophisticated way to protect animals. I think there will be breakthroughs and advances there as well as conceptual breakthroughs. This is often the case when issues of social justice and equality are being examined by a society. It was said during the civil rights movement that you can’t legislate morality, but with a law you can make a difference— as with forced desegregation, where the process started to bring about a change in thinking and attitude. If the notion of animal rights is established in law (legal standing for animals is a Christopher Stone) then people will start thinking about the moral status of animals.

What is your opinion about the use of illegal tactics?

I am of two minds on this. The law doesn’t provide adequate standards of morality. There can be immoral laws that it could be morally right to disobey. Just as we should be our colleagues to disobey, but when and how they are to be broken is hard to decide. It seems to me that if there is something unscrupulous going on, there must always be a way to expose it legally. Civil disobedience is important. It is undeniable that the gathering of information by illegal means has turned the tide in some cases, as with the Pentagon Papers. But it is a hurdle. But should we also support illegal actions for other causes when we disagree with the cause? Can we adopt a consistent position on this issue? If not, we are in trouble.

Perhaps some individuals choose illegal means to help animals because other efforts have been frustrated by a system that doesn’t work.

It is a serious dilemma when people who are disturbed with conditions and feel powerless to change them. I am suspicious, though, of the claim that those who want to help animals in research are “frustrated by a system that doesn’t work.” I am concerned about the dangerous tendency on the part of researchers to engage in or to condone illegal acts in the name of an allegedly “higher moral” that would otherwise not be brought about. Changing things have not been explored fully and exhausted.

What are your professional goals and career ambitions now?

I simply want to do a competent job in a life-promoting way. I want to seek alternative lifestyles that are respectful of nature, that promote peace and international cooperation. I do not want to be viewed as a “disguised figure,” a cliche. I want to be someone who helps others sort out what they are going through by providing a “midwife.” This is how I try to teach. Socrates used to impart his wisdom not as a philosopher should be; a midwife who helps people draw out of themselves ideas or conclusions that are within them but that they have not been fully exposed to. That appeals to me very much.

Animals are suffering... and you are paying for it

60 million defenseless animals are killed every year. Most are not given anesthetics or pain relievers. Many will be “recycled” through a series of experiments before death finally releases them. And many die in excruciating pain.

This shameful waste costs taxpayers five billion dollars annually. Besides being costly, animal tests are crude and unreliable. Products tested “safe” on animals have caused birth defects, illness and even death to human beings.

The American Anti-Swinection Society

Address

City

State...

Send me an l.r. postcard c/o Animal Rights — click below.
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Animals are suffering... and you are paying for it

We didn’t have Lumen pack then... People used to eat real animals.

“People used to eat real animals.”

Every generation in the Scientific Age has brought us new knowledge about ourselves—our physiology, psychology, pathologies... and more recently, the intimate relationship between our diets, our health and our increased risk of premature death due to degenerative disease.

Just 30 years ago, tobacco products were advertised in leading medical journals as harmless... And only a few years ago nutrition was considered secondary in the role of preventative health care...

Until recently, most doctors didn’t even bother to ask their patients what they ate?

Today we know better. Tomorrow we will again realize how little we really knew.

Lumen was designed for those who don’t want to wait.

After hundreds of scientific studies connecting high-fat, high-cholesterol meats with our society’s near epidemic rates of cancer and heart disease, we’ve created an alternative.

Lumen Meatless Meats!” were marinated and cooked in a "pre-cooked" cooking meat.

We have put together an introductory sampling we know you will enjoy. For just $18.50 we will send you five nutrition Lumen samples. Beef Fillet, Canadian Bacon, Pepperoni, Rotten Sausage and Chicken Fillet.

Each package contains approximately one pound of "meat." In addition, we will send you a copy of our book, "Lumen Food For A New Age," which contains the latest knowledge of the "optimum diet," plus 56 exciting, easy-to-make recipes. You will use it again and again.

Lumen Food Corporation

409 Scott Street - Dept. AA 588 Lake Charles, LA 70601

Yes, please rush me your Lumen Introductory Package priced at only $18.50. For my free sample of Cajun Jerky, I am selecting one of the four flavors below:

1. Cajun Jerky - Beef Style
2. Cajun Jerky - Hot Pepperoni Style
3. Cajun Jerky - Spicy Italian
4. Cajun Jerky - Sliced Ham

Method of Payment (Check one):

[ ] Check/MC ___________________ [ ] VISA/MC ___________________ [ ] Personal Check __________ Money Order ______

To: Lumen Food Corporation

Address: __________________________

State: ____________

Phone Orders: (318) 436-6748

Please ship to:

Name: __________________________

Stree: __________________________

Phone: __________________________

FREE GIFT:

For every order now, we will send you an additional free sample of our delicious Cajun Jerky, "The Jerky Snack That’s Good For You." (Pick from among four mouth-watering flavors listed below.) Plus, we will send you $10 worth of coupons good toward your next Lumen purchase. Do order today!

Lumen Food Corporation

409 Scott Street - Dept. AA 588 Lake Charles, LA 70601

Yes, please rush our Lumen Introductory Package priced at only $18.50. For my free sample of Cajun Jerky, I am selecting one of the four flavors below:

1. Cajun Jerky - Beef Style
2. Cajun Jerky - Hot Pepperoni Style
3. Cajun Jerky - Spicy Italian
4. Cajun Jerky - Sliced Ham

Method of Payment (Check one):

[ ] Check/MC ___________________ [ ] VISA/MC ___________________ [ ] Personal Check __________ Money Order ______

To: Lumen Food Corporation

Address: __________________________

State: ____________

Phone Orders: (318) 436-6748

Please ship to:

Name: __________________________

Stree: __________________________

Phone: __________________________

FREE GIFT:

For every order now, we will send you an additional free sample of our delicious Cajun Jerky, "The Jerky Snack That’s Good For You." (Pick from among four mouth-watering flavors listed below.) Plus, we will send you $10 worth of coupons good toward your next Lumen purchase.

Order today!
This is Art?

An art teacher at Harvard University recently misled her students to adopt a live chicken for a day, then took the animal to a slaughterhouse, watch it, or her body was killed and processed, and cooked and cut the chicken, before making a sculpture out of the bones. "This experience will inspire [the students] imagination and understanding," said Ritsuko Togo, the professor in charge of the project. "The All-American "Renewable Swine Kit" features the customer’s choice of a lamb, or goat kid, complete with a kit ("wrapped in a sheep’s pelt") which includes instructions on raising the animal and turning it on her own into pinata. Though Neiman-Marcus claims to be using a sourcing process to check out potential lamb and goat breeds, the animals are shipped by air freight and may end up in situations where their long-term care is uncertain. Another feature item in the catalog is a day for two as members of Ringling Bros. Barnum and Bailey Circus, a prominent target of animal advocacy groups who oppose the abuse of animals for human entertainment. Artists may presume three separate catalog offerings by calling Neiman-Marcus toll-free at 1-800-NEMO, or by writing the company, P.O. Box 2964, Dallas, TX 75222.

Summer Fellowships Available

The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship and the Center for Advanced Training in Molecular Biology are making available two summer fellowships for the summer 1988. The fellowships are intended to provide well-motivated students in biology or medicine an opportunity to obtain specialized training in advanced and intense scientific techniques. The leadership of the college, junior senators, and graduate students majoring in biology or related disciplines. The deadline for application is April 1, 1988. For more information, contact Dr. Roland M. Noeller, director, Center for Advanced Training in Cell and Molecular Biology, University of Virginia, Washington, D.C. 22203, (202) 687-4801.

Jane Goodall receives Schweitzer Medal from Senator John Melcher.

Goodall Receives Schweitzer Medal

Jane Goodall was named Albert Schweitzer Medalist for 1987 by the Humanitarian work benefitting animals. At a ceremony in early December, Senator John Melcher (D-MT) presented Goodall with her medal on behalf of the Animal Welfare by good food. Schweitzer Medalist is the author of the provision for the psychological wellbeing of primates included in the improved Standards for Laboratory Animal Welfare Act.

Environmentalist Paul Watson Sees Shepherd Disbands

B.C. Chapter

Environmental activist Paul Watson has announced that he is dissolving the British Columbia chapter of his Sea Shepherd Conservation Society. Watson, who established Sea Shepherd ten years ago while leaving Canada, said that he was disillusioned by the lack of public and government support for the group's efforts on behalf of wildlife. Watson says that U.S. and British Sea Shepherds chapters will remain operational, and that he will continue to be active but will "no longer be in a leadership role," since he has begun a series of direct action campaigns in behalf of whales, including the sinking of two illegally whaling vessels and the destruction of whale processing equipment at a plant in Inverness Bay.

North Star Dining in Boston

The New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEWS) has compiled a list of restaurants in the Boston area for vegetarians. Included are some of the city's animal rights activists. These dining or traveling in the Boston area should contact NEWS for a free survey of vegetarian restaurants, as well as those that offer the tofu or soy-based products of the city's animal rights activists. These dining or traveling in the Boston area should contact NEWS for a free survey of vegetarian restaurants, as well as those that offer the tofu or soy-based products of the city's animal rights activists.

Stop Pound Seizure

A coalition of some 20 animal advocacy groups declared December 1 "National Stop Pound Seizure Day," and held a rally in Los Angeles on that day to coincide with a Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors meeting during which the practice of releasing dogs and cats from local animal shelters for use in research was debated. Other events held in Florida, New York, Michigan, Massachusetts, Utah and elsewhere focused attention on local pound seizure laws and the national Pet Protection Act (H.R. 778) approved by Congress. The National Stop Pound Seizure Coalition would like to hear from groups around the country in the form of statements to be submitted for possible inclusion in the next event, to be held sometime in spring. Contact the coalition at: 9262 Carson, New York, 10095, CA. 1982: 725-7047.

Art for cruelty’s sake.

Compassion Campaign 88

In an effort to increase the attention given to animal rights issues in the political arena, several organizations have combined forces to launch "Compassion Campaign 88" in conjunction with the race for President and the general election in November. Organizers are working to educate presidential candidates and their staffs about animal issues, and are hoping to have concerns about animals addressed in the platforms of both major parties. For information on how you can help, contact: Compassion Campaign 88, P.O. Box 7021, Washington, D.C. 20034, (202) 423-9542.

EndTraps’s Andrew Mikkel presents 7,000 signatures of Verminators opposing to halt leghorn traps.

Watch Out for NAPP

In past years, we have warned readers not to respond to fund- raising solicitations from the National Animal Protection Fund (NAPP). In an apparently less legible “animal protection” organization which is conducting mass direct-mail campaigns using a sweepstakes and other "gifts" to mail contributions. Judging from the number of inquiries about NAPP we have received recently by the tape mailer response, NAPP apparently does not bother the animal protection work the group is currently involved in investigation by several members of Congress as a possible violation of the law. Remember any group you doubt desiring cash or your check is worth checking out first.

Corrections

In December News of the New England Anti-Vivisection Society on the current correct date for the killing of animals in the Maine public schools announced that a bill introduced in two houses of the state legislature to bar the leghorn traps. Musician Paul Winter was on hand to speak in support of the legislation, and over 7000 petition signatures in favor of the bill were displayed. The group is encouraging Vermonters to contact their legislators—and Speaker of the House Ralph G. Wright (D), P.O. Box 370, Montpelier, Vermont 05601, (802) 254-3671—in support of the two bills. Interested parties may be reached at: 1 Thomas St., Shelburne, VT 05482 (802) 425-3661.
Chucking Zoo Animals Overboard
How and Why Noah Culls The Ark

By Merritt Clifton

We must ensure that every animal has the best possible lifestyle for its species, whether this be in the wild or in captivity. For many of the larger and most spectacular animals there is no simple solution. Ideally they should all be in the wild, untroubled by man, but this is increasingly unlikely and ultimately impossible. No amount of common sense seems capable of stopping the population explosion of Homo sapiens.

— Desmond Morris

Though even the best zoo is something of a prison for animals, the overcrowding of the earth and the rapid destruction of wilderness areas may make them the last stand for many species. Though the original purpose of zoos was to provide living specimens for the education and enjoyment of the populace, today’s zoos liken themselves to Noah’s Ark—collectively conserving species while habitat destruction wipes out a hundred a day. But Noah’s Ark only lasted 40 days and 40 nights. Zoos must conserve species indefinitely, in finite space with finite budgets. That means breeding while replaceable animals are in their prime, and “culling” those past their prime (along with unneeded “genetic duplicates”) to make room for the healthiest from the most varied gene pools.

From a detached viewpoint, one with no concern for the lives of the individual animals, culling seems sensible. Yet zoos breed and cull excessively. Charged former Minnesota Zoo caretaker Donald Fornberg, in a recent letter to the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, “Baby animals are known to be a popular attraction, so numerous species are mated for this purpose. Management knows that the offspring will be difficult or impossible to sell...thus the young will be put to death when they outgrow the cute stage.”

“Graham regularly allows lions to breed,” Michigan Coalition for Animals president Ann Klionski adds, “and then euthanizes the cubs as soon as they mature and begin to show signs of aggression toward their mothers. He has stated that he will continue this practice because he believes it is important to show pressure led to a sale to the Indianapolis Zoo instead. Klionski bluntly calls Graham “a monster.”“We would like to find suitable homes for all our animals,” Graham has written in his own defense, “but we sometimes find that other zoos do not have room because they are breeding their animals, too.” According to Graham, the Indianapolis Zoo previously passed up the snow monkeys before finally agreeing to take them.

All of these supply animals to research laboratories not just through culling but as a lucrative sideline. “We do not maintain records on those animals that go to medical research,” the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums (AAZPA) executive director Robert E. Wagner says, “but I assure you that the number is frightening.”

Nonetheless, Friends of Animals (FoA) has recently fought a battle to prevent Tufts University from taking over the Dorchester and Stoneham Zoos near Boston for fear this would lead to more lab supply. The Tufts plan had been advanced by Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis as a cost-cutting measure, but legislation has since been introduced which would create a nonprofit corporation to manage the two zoos. The Los Angeles Zoo was handed two years ago in an effort to establish a primate research observatory funded by the University of Southern California.

Animal rights groups supported the project, including the Fund for Animals, The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) — on grounds that the primates

Above: polar bear and cub; Right: black rhino and calf; Below: African loanes and cubs.

Visitors the bonding process between mothers and cubs—Soon after taking charge of the zoo, Graham shot three “surplus” Siberian tigers. In 1982 he sold a colony of over 30 crab-eating macaques (monkeys) for use in a terminal laboratory experiment. He tried to sell five female Japanese snow monkeys for terminal research in early 1987, but public
Surplus zoo-born animals are also frequently discovered in the possession of abusive entertainment agencies, circuses, unaccredited roadside zoos, hunting preserves, and private owners. Experiments involving surplus animals on zoo premises continue as well. Bob cites a case involving two elephants from Lion Country Safari in Laguna, Calif., who were given LSD every day for two months during 1984 by University of California researchers. The experiment was later repeated at a zoo in Oklahoma City, where an elephant on an acid trip died of a heart attack. Surplus zoo-born animals are also frequently discovered in the possession of abusive entertainment agencies, circuses, unaccredited roadside zoos, hunting preserves, and private owners. Both zoos and animal dealers claim to have ceased sales to unaccredited parties, but the crackdown is recent. Many zoo-born animals and their descendants remain at large. Bob Lafleur of the Toronto chapter of ZooWatch says he monitors about 20 Ontario roadside zoos which "mainly sell to private individuals or other roadside zoos. Some of their surplus animals have been found at game farms and guarding the property of criminals. Each example calls into question the whole "ask" analogy.

On the one hand, argues Shirley McGreal of the International Primate Protection League (IPPL), "Zoo has a moral obligation to their animals. She likens the case for culling the animals to the case for euthanizing elderly, diseased, and handicapped humans. If zoos haven't the space and money to keep "unproductive" animals, McGreal states, "it's up to them to go out and raise the money. If they want to keep them, they could try to find a private person to help keep them."

 Allegations are frequent that zoos supply animals to research laboratories not just through culling but also as a lucrative sideline.

"Humanized animals" refer to Montreal dealer Ken Chinsholm. "They're not living in the real world...[they're] full of ideas that don't work. Like in the case of surplus polar bears which came up recently. Send them back to the Arctic. Send polar bears back to the Arctic where they have been kept in captivity for 20 years in a warm climate. They don't know how to swim, they don't know how to hunt, they don't have any fat—they're going to freeze or starve to death before you fly home."

Chinsholm agrees that it would be nice if surplus zoo animals could live out their lives in comfort and dignity."

Continued on next page
Some tricks they'll never learn.

If animals were responsible for their own birth control, there might not be a need to kill 13.5 million unwanted dogs and cats each year. That's the cost of not having your pet spayed or neutered. Fixed.

Even bringing a litter of puppies or kittens to an animal shelter is no guarantee they'll find a home. Before time has to be made for them. Having your pet spayed or neutered is the only way to reduce the sad number of ownerless dogs and cats destroyed this year. And it will also increase your pet's chances of living a longer and healthier life. That responsibility is yours alone.

You'll never stop your pets from acting naturally. But if you love them, you'll have them fixed.

Talk to your veterinarian. Or contact the MSPCA for a free information packet on birth control for your pet.

MSPCA on the move for animals
Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
150 South Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02130 (617) 736-7100 (in the Springfield area, call (413) 736-2992)
For membership information and a free copy of our magazine, Animalité, call or write the MSPCA.

ZOOS — THE DARKER SIDE

Surplus zoo-born animals are also frequently discovered in the possession of abusive entertainment agencies, circuses, unaccredited roadside zoos, hunting preserves, and private owners.

Continued from previous page

“...and I don't even call that monstrosity we have a walk — the city administration will spend $30,000 for the mayor's grand piano, but they won't even properly feed and house the animals in what they call a walk,” Chisholm charges. “Only 20 percent of all zoos have appropriate facilities. Are you going to tell all these zoos that they have to keep more animals when they can't even take care of the ones they have?”

McGred returns that this is a good argument for abolishing zoos. But if zoos were abolished tomorrow, something would have to be done with the animals in U.S. zoos alone. 39,385 manatees, 50,300 birds, 20,025 reptiles, 4,384 amphibians, 138,366 fish, and 485,385 invertebrates according to the most recent AAZPA census (32/31/85). In BBC wildlife magazine December 1987, social anthropologist Desmond Morris wrote, "For those who feel that we should be purist and remove all zoos from our civilization, let me state a few brutal facts. The human population of Africa is doubling with every generation. This means that in 60 years' time, when our children have reached retirement age, the wild animals of Africa will have only a quarter of the space they now enjoy. And so it will go on until Africa, like Europe, will have nearly eliminated all its large fauna. Similar trends will occur elsewhere in the world. The wild places everywhere will, by then, have shrunk to the size of, dare I say it, large zoos. In a few centuries, wild animals will survive only in zoos, because that is all the space they will have left, anywhere. So perhaps we should start to plan our 'ideal zoos' rather than be emotional about the concept of captivity. Then we will be ready for the ever more crowded future."

Responding to the inevitability of species extinction, the AAZPA has prepared a "Species Survival Plan" (SSP) which is supposed to "strengthen and coordinate captive programs so that zoos can help the worldwide effort to preserve vanishing species."

"Recommended Disposal Procedures"

Yet while some animals are purposefully bred, others are thrown off the "tramp" every day by the thousands. Where they go depends upon their species. In July of 1987, AAZPA published a position paper on "Euthanasia of Zoo/Aquarium Species", updating their previous single sentence policy in their code of ethics: "Make every effort to assure that exotic animals do not find their way into the hands of those not qualified to care for them properly."

Now AAZPA offers their "Recommended Disposal Procedures." Sale or trade with other zoos comes first, followed by sale or trade to accredited dealers. Transfer through breeding loans and SSP agreements are next. Then re-introduction into native habitats (if possible), followed by "gifts" of specimens to qualified institutions and "loan of single species to qualified institutions for exhibit purposes." Last are the most controversial methods: "Sale or loan to USDA licensed (United States Department of Agriculture) research facilities for humane research" and "euthanasia. Specifically, the sale, trade or give-away of the AZA's paper, "When all other disposal possibilities have been exhausted and inbreeding, injuries, the existence of abnormalities detrimental to the species, or inhumane conditions caused by overcrowding, euthanasia may be employed as a management option."

The easy out for zoo directors is to sell to dealers. Following unspecified precedent, the AAZPA ethics committee reaffirmed on December 20, 1984, that zoos are not responsible for whatever dealers do. Former Kansas City Zoo animal handler Margaret Cook had charged zoo director Ernest Hagler with misconduct in six cases in which surplus chimpanzees and orangutans turned up outside the accredited network. Dismissing Cook's case, AAZPA ethics committee chairperson Ed Schmitt (also general curator of the Denver Zoological Gardens) concluded by chiding Cook for making her allegations public.

But dealers don't want surplus animals any more than zoos do. As Chisholm explains, dealers recognize that... Continued on page 21.
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seven animal classifications that in turn govern where—and if—they can make a sale. First, there are "domestic beasts of burden" like camels, llamas, and water buffalo. "Technically any farmer can keep them," Chisholm says. Second, there are "ranching animals," including elk and buffalo, who are commercially raised for meat. Most zoo animals in these categories come from ranches; any "surplus" is slaughtered and fed to captive carnivores. A third category covers wild animals not normally ranched but who can nonetheless be kept on ranches—Chisholm cites several varieties of Asian antelope. "A lot of zoos used to sell to hunting preserves," Chisholm admits about a practice he personally decries. "Now many have policies against it." Some of these animals have become endangered in the wild, but are thriving on ranches. Category four includes animals who can't be legally hunted or killed for meat. Thus, the black buck antelope who is "highly endangered in India, won't bring $300 a pair in North America. There are ranches in Texas that have many more of all India, and they can do anything with them. They won't fetch as much as a common domestic nanny goat."

"Then we come to the problem category, the fifth category," Chisholm continues. "This includes your cats and your primates, the animals people identify with. Most major zoos have to show these, but they've often been highly endangered in the wild. They breed like houseflies in captivity and can live three times longer than they would in the wild. Nobody who could take care of them wants any more of them. The humanans don't help much," he adds in a caustic aside. "One example is the Siberian tiger. There are only 400 left in the USSR, but we have 750 captive in captivity, and as many as $3 million a year to house and feed. The humanans convinced CITES (Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species) to make it Appendix I, ["most endangered species"]; so now it requires so many permits for a zoo to sell one that it's not worth the work."

In fairness to "humanans," however, permit requirements did not prevent the Minnesota Zoo from experimentally drugging three Siberian tigers in 1985 to observe the effects of naloxone (an opiate blocker) on their appetites. They first "discovered" that undrugged tigers not fed for 48 hours were

While the best zoos put the welfare of the animals first, most zoo animals are still living in virtual prisons.

America's Worst

BY MEGAN MURPHY-HAMILTON

Zoo, love them or hate them, have been around since King Tut's cruising days. Solomon had his monkeys, and Nebuchadnezzar his lions. In those times, animals were kept as curiosities in well-tended manegers. Sadly, in the supposedly enlightened 1980s, many animals are forced to live in prisons where they have no privacy—subject to the whims of unscrupulous zoo directors and teenage vandals. Instead of campaigning against the zoo concept, which may be a futile effort, animal advocates might focus on revolutionizing the entire approach to the keeping of captive animals.

The best zoos place the safety, health, and happiness of their animals first, and pleasing the crowds of tourists is almost an afterthought. Unfortunately, this type of zoo is very short supply. According to the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), there were approximately 1,450 exhibitors licensed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) as of October 1986. Of those, only 12% (174 per cent) were accredited by the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums (AAZPA).

There are also 1,000 roadside menageries in the U.S., most of which are not even registered with the USDA. According to David I. Herbet, captive wildlife specialist for HSUS, "These roadside menageries are often pits of indescribable cruelty. Unfortunately, these menageries are in a constant state of flux. Their names and locations often change. Some do eventually close and then, at times, reopen under the same or different names."

In a "contest" for America's worst municipal zoo, a frontrunner would be the Prospect Park Zoo in Brooklyn, New York. Prospect Park is the one where police officers used to shoot with 20 shotgun rounds after they discovered the bears devouring the remains of 11 year old Juan Perez. Other tragedies have occurred at this zoo, where the animals are easily accessible to the public. An especially noteworthy incident was when a zookeeper, Horace L. Canty, fatally scalped a stump-tailed macaque with a blast of 80 degree water because the monkey pulled his beard.

Zoo Atlanta, formerly named the Atlanta Zoo, had been considered one of the ten worst zoos in the nation as recently as 1984. The tigers were filthy, its inmates were deceitful, and tales were told of animals mysteriously dying, being sold off to circuses, or victimized by unrestrained workers. In 1984 an elephant named Twinkles died after being sold to a small travelling circus. Two Kodiak bears on loan from the zoo were killed at a roadside menagerie in North Carolina. Nine animals died under suspicious circumstances, and in an almost incredible example of egotism, a parks crew accidentally poured concrete into the burrows of the prairie dogs exhibit. Today the Atlanta Zoo has made a dogeous exhibit, and according to many animal welfarists—some of whose protests succeeded in shaming Atlanta city officials into action—is on its way to becoming one of the world's best.

Megan Murphy-Hamilton is an animal advocate living in Madison, Calif.
Continued from previous page

hunger than those who hadn’t eaten for 24 hours. Then they starved them again for 48 hours and drugged them, using darts before offering them food. The experimenters concluded, “Subjectively, we can say that tigers’ aggressive intentions towards those who aggravate them with blow darts is not greatly altered by opiate blockade.”

Permit requirements didn’t protect Magumphani, a rare white rhinoceros, either. Loaned by the San Diego Zoo to Oregon’s Wildlife Safari for breeding purposes, she died from the stress of transportation. After undergoing a 38-hour trip up the West Coast, she spent two more days in a ten-by-four-foot trailer. Discussing the deaths of the rhino with the Associated Press, Jeff Jospeit of the San Diego Zoo expressed disappointment, but added, “She was not the first to die in shipping, and no doubt she won’t be the last.”

The sixth category covers reptiles. Nonpoisonous reptiles such as turtles may be sold as “pets.” Surplus poisonous reptiles are usually killed before they hatch. At the Detroit Zoo, and probably many others, baby yellow anacondas are allegedly frozen and fed to other snakes. A few snakes, Chisholm acknowledges, “go to venom research.” He claims that “snakebite kills more people in many Third World countries than AIDS does here.” The Canadian Zoo in Quebec recently sent 72 newly hatched box constrictors to an Ontario laboratory researching reptile reproduction.

Birds are the seventh category. “Most zoos that have rare birds work with private collectors to get them,” Chisholm states. “Some of these people have avaries that are better than anything the zoos have—and zoos will unhesitatingly turn back any surplus birds to them.” Although there’s considerable trade in bootlegged rare parrots, who are coveted as status symbols, Chisholm believes most of these are captured in the wild or privately bred and do not come from zoos.

The special trade in primates

In October 1987, several hundred animals, including endangered and threatened species, were put on the auction block as New England Playworld (a private New Hampshire zoo) closed its doors after 65 years of operation. Representatives of the New England Antivivisection Society were on hand to protest the sale, but could do nothing to prevent it. Most of the buyers refused to identify themselves, but animal dealers and the operators of small zoos and game farms were in attendance.

Top: two primates cling to each other, probably in response to both the cold weather and the closeness of the crowd; Middle: a serval spent the day huddled in a mobile cage, unattended at times, with no way to escape the tenants of the crowd; Bottom: outdoor workers and bidder.

World Laboratory Animal Liberation Week

April 18 - April 24

Coast to Coast • Campus to Campus

World Laboratory Animal Liberation Week is only weeks away ... we need your help. Now.

We want the upcoming demonstrations, marches, vigils and other protests to be the largest direct action demonstrations in the history of our movement. And the largest show of support for the animals. Ever.

Direct Action - one of the most effective tools we have for stopping animal torture and mutilation - depends on you. Last April 24, thousands of people who care about animals demonstrated ... and hundreds were arrested during nonviolent direct action for the animals.

This year’s protest can be even bigger and more effective ... but only with your help. We need more individuals and organizations to join us. Whether it’s as a protester for just one day or as a regional contact or coordinator for the entire week. And of course, we need additional financial resources to help us escalate the campaign on behalf of the animals.

Please, contact your local animal rights/protection group or:

In Defense of Animals
21 Tamal Vista Blvd • Corte Madera, CA 94925 • (415) 921-4454

Yes! I want to help In Defense of Animals and the April 24th Coalition make World Laboratory Animal Liberation Week a success.

[Check the boxes for options]

[] Please send me information on how I can help.

[] I’m interested in serving as a local contact.

Name:

Address:

City, State, ZIP:

Telephone (Day) (Evening):
Agribusiness Strikes Back
Farmers react to animal rights campaigns

NEWS COMMENTARY BY LESLIE PARDOU

The animal rights movement in the United States has, for the most part, concentrated its energy on achieving improvements in the lives of animals who are used in laboratories, trapped for their fur, or regarded as pests. The plight of farm animals, despite the fact that they comprise roughly 95 percent of all the animals exploited, has largely been a back seat. Perhaps this is due to groups' fears of being branded as "too radical" for taking a stand on the animal rights issue which strikes closest to home for most people—the issue of raising and killing animals for human consumption. However, a few national groups concentrate their attention exclu- sively on farm animals. And many small grassroots animal rights groups—as well as a few of the larger, long-established animal welfare organizations—are now following suit by developing and growing their advocacy campaigns of their own.

Some of these groups claim that their development—many or all of them are focused on the containment of mass meat, dairy, and egg industries, and that general dietary trends away from animal products and towards vegetarianism—have created an upsurge in agrobusiness resistance circles. Pursuing large-scale consumer backlash against the consumption of animal products in the years to come, the animal industry is preparing itself, in the estimation of their annual reports to the National Animal Health and Compliance Office—which, rather than encouraging appropriate health regulations (as the name would suggest), exists for the purpose of "directing programs to help meat producers protect their property from" of defensive and offensive strategies to counter activist's destructive publicity efforts.

The NPPC, meanwhile, displayed the thousands of cards they'd received from their members at their annual convention to "put the fear of god in the heart people" in the meat industry: "According to NPPC President and CEO, Patrick Haggerty of the NPPC reports that the group has established an "Animal Violence Task Force" to respond to criticisms of their industry, and invited Christine Stevens of the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) to speak at a reception. In an effort to dissuade the meat industry groups from taking such a stance, the group has established an "Animal Violence Task Force" to respond to criticisms of their industry, and invited Christine Stevens of the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) to speak at a reception. In an effort to dissuade the meat industry groups from taking such a stance, AWI's position, according to Stevens, is: "We don't take a vegetarian point of view. We're not attacking the industry, just the worst among the industry. For this reason, we're more acceptable to the animal industry than the consumers." However, AWI's push has not been met with enthusiasm by the meat industry. According to Christ program, which is the first of its kind for the meat industry.

Meat industry publications are sitting up and taking notice of the animal rights movement.

(FARM), the group which coordinates the Great American Meatout and World Farm Animals Day campaigns each year, has been a favorite target of the nation's meat industry's wrath. The group has been singled out for mention in numerous meat industry publications, and in speeches by Senators and Representatives from Western cattle-raising states, as a force to be reckoned with. The California-based Humane Farming Association and the Delaware-based Farm Sanctuary have also received coverage in the meat industry. The industries are particularly disturbed by the increased consumer awareness of factory farm conditions brought about by the educational campaigns of animal rights groups. More than anything, the meat industry fears informed consumers.

"Beefing Up" Security

The actions of various animal liberation groups—including the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), Band of Mercy, Farm Freedom Fighters and the Animal Rights Militia—are also causing considerable concern to farmers, who are responding by tightening security and issuing dire warnings about "animal rights terrorists." The American Farm Bureau Federation obtained a copy of an ALF booklet containing pointers on how to carry out break-ins, and has sent it to members of the farm press, including the general media, and law enforcement agencies. The meat industry is using the booklet in its ongoing efforts to convince media representatives not to cover news of animal rights protests and other actions.

The American Farm Bureau Federation obtained a copy of an ALF booklet containing pointers on how to carry out break-ins, and has sent it to members of the farm press, including the general media, and law enforcement agencies. The meat industry is using the booklet in its ongoing efforts to convince media representatives not to cover news of animal rights protests and other actions.
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Help This Magazine Grow!
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Reformers are also encouraging farmers to eliminate animal advocacy groups and attempt to influence that stands on farm animal issues.

On the Defensive

In response to various efforts on behalf of farm animals, the American Farm Bureau Federation has formed yet another industry group: The Farm Animal Welfare Council (WAC). comprised of some 30 dairy, beef and egg industry associations, is certainly not what its name would imply. The Farm Bureau's Hugh Johnson and the American Feed Association's Steven Koopera get, two leading anti-animal rights' representatives, speak on behalf of the coalition. Another meat industry group, the Wisconsin Agribusiness Council (WABC), responded to FSUS and several other groups' campaigns by announcing the formation of a coalition of farm associations, furriers, Department of Agriculture officials, and private industry representatives into what they call the "WABC Animal Care Forum." The public relations booklet created to "counter the serious threat animal rights pose to agriculture," is distributed initially to high school social studies classes. Industry

The meat industry is looking for new ways to package and market meat to further dissociate it from once-living animals.

… putting out the line that animal advocates are a bunch of sentimental city-dweller who act out of ignorance of farm conditions. In an article in Meat Processing, Koopera get assured that "people have less and less contact with farm animals, they have to realize that we are not living in a Lassie and Timmy world...." In fact, it is not ignorance but knowledge of conditions for farm animals that has spurred action by animal advocates. The marketing efforts of the meat industry, in its attempts to dissociate animal production from the meat industry, it's coming to the minds of the general public, that have led people to promote idealic conditions for farm animals. In an article in The Helper magazine, a trend analyst offered the following advice to the meat industry: "First and foremost, you don't want to get too close to the animal...presentation is one of the big areas where meat still needs some help. It still looks sort of savage...meat is gross looking. It looks too much like the animal it came from...make it convenient, smaller, prettier and more interesting." Towards this end, the meat industry is looking for new ways to package and market meat to further dissociate it from once-living animals in the minds of the public. An additional industry strategy is to downplay the health risks of meat-eating, emphasizing "lean" cuts and so-called "lite" meats (witness the NPFCC's "Pork for the White Meat" ad campaign). The trend in the use of brand names on meats is another play by the industry to bolster consumer confidence in products which are coming under increased scrutiny by health experts, frustrated by the American Heart Association's lack of support for health professionals. Meat producers are also working on clearing up the image—promoting more use of meat in combination with heart disease and other ailments.

A Wave of Action Against Fur

On November 27, 1987, "Fur-Free Friday" demonstrations were held by animal advocacy groups in some 30 locations around the country. The actions, organized as part of the Spies-Triplets Unlimited's (TSU) campaign for a Fur-Free America, drew media coverage from WABC-TV, CNN, UPN and AP wire services, and numerous local newspapers, television and radio stations nationwide. More than 700 activists marched in New York City along a route which passed through the heart of the city's most prominent fur-sellers. In San Francisco, ten people were arrested in a protest at a Neiman-Marcus department store. Other protests were held in Philadelphia, Dallas, Chicago, Seattle, Washington and many other cities and towns—including several where no anti-fur activity had previously occurred.

Despite fears fur sales in the past few years, the increased level of awareness and protest is having an effect on the fur industry. The Fur Retailers Information Council (FRIC) is now refusing to provide spokespersons to debate the issues with animal advocates on television and radio talk shows, and is instead lobbying behind the scenes to try to convince media people not to provide coverage of anti-fur activities. A FRIC confidential letter to furriers dated December 1987 reported the findings of a survey conducted for them by Gallup, and concluded: "... any time the animal is direct related to the coat in advertising or publicity, the most lasting impression is anti-fur... any counter or debating anti-fur messages merely reinforces the issue......."

In the trade paper Fur Age Weekly, FRIC announced that in preparation for TSU's day of protest, they would be alerting major newspapers and wire services, providing them with "a statement which will draw press attention to us, so that we can turn the spotlight away from us. We are hammering home our message that these furs are radicals outside the mainstream, who want to stop the use of animals for entertainment, food, research and clothing." The work before the peace fur front is not easy. Locked furriers that violence and serious vandalism may accompany the demonstrations... These are not just plain animal lovers... these are criminals, who must pay the price paid by criminals. Fond of referring to the movement as the "Animal Rights Pretend Industry," FRIC encouraged the media to cover the move by attempting to portray all animal advocates as "anti-sports fanatics."

Despite years of anti-fur work by animal advocates, fur sales continue seemingly unabated. TSU attributes the present high volume of fur sales to several factors: 1) vast increased advertising and promotion by furriers; 2) establishment of the well-funded FRIC, created expressly to counter the impact of anti-fur activism; 3) increased marketing of furs to middle-class professional women; 4) marketing of much cheaper furs, including designs for children; and 5) selling of furs in major department stores such as Sears and Macy's. However, Women's Hour Daily reports that some furriers are predicting a decline in fur sales in the months to come, due to stock market fluctuations. The fur industry has long attempted to placate consumers with assurances that their furs are ranch-raised; increased attention by animal advocacy groups to the treatment of animals on fur ranches is now exposing that strategy for the whitewash that it is. Groups are also making more use of print, TV, and billboard advertising to counter the barrage of ads pushing fur to consumers. The animal rights movement is no longer simply calling for bans on animal testing, but increasingly is targeting the whole business of killing animals for their skins.

FRED "THE FARRIER" FURRY'S NEW YORK STORE WAS ONE OF THE TARGETS OF TSU'S "FUR-FREE FRIDAY" MARCH.

Please visit us... our catalog of cruelty-free products!

KINDNESS IS ALWAYS FIRST CLASS!

Buy Cruelty-Free Products!

My Brother's Keeper Catalog makes available products from over 20 different companies which do NOT use animal testing. Just look for the letter "F" which stands for "Free of Cruelty." We carry over 35 different cruelty-free vegan goods such as soaps, lotions, and shampoos. My Brother's Keeper Catalog is a cruelty-free catalog.

Please send me... Catalog of Cruelty-Free Products!
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Mail this coupon to:

MY BROTHER'S KEEPER, INC.

125 S. 12th St., Pittsburgh, PA 15212.
TELEVISION FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS—
THE TIME HAS COME

THE VOICE OF NATURE NETWORK

The most powerful communications medium of our time...hasn’t been used more aggressively to educate the public about human abuse of the natural world.

VNN was created with the idea of expanding the animal rights presence on television. VNN shows already exist, but much more is needed in order to turn the tide of public opinion in regard to animals—while there is still time.

The Voice of Nature Network plans to produce and distribute:

- commercials on fun, hunting, wildlife slaughter, and animal experimentation
- public service announcements [PSAs] on rodent, pet overpopulation, and similar topics for cable and regular TV stations.

Additionally, we will work to insure the widest possible audience for animal rights films and materials already on hand, and provide technical support to animal organizations intending to use television in their own campaigns.

VNN is seeking individual, organization, and foundation support for an ambitious project. Please let us hear from you by returning the coupon below.
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Here’s a contribution to help the keep. Keep on the mailing list and please send me more information about VNN.
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The Natural Choice for Healthy Living

America's leading alternative health monthly.

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

Each month East West will help you get healthy and stay healthy using natural methods such as acupuncture, diet, herbs, homeopathy, and exercise. You'll learn about traditional healing practices from the East and West—both ancient and modern. Plus, we'll cover just about every aspect of health—from nutrition and diet to body and mind.

Our recent features have offered timely information on the threat of irradiated foods, the no-win war on cancer, health hazards in the workplace and our animal best and worst natural foods awards. Our monthly departments feature a regular "Holistic Doctor" column and include practical and informative articles on natural healing, whole foods cooking, gardening, beauty, fitness, spirituality, culture, and much more.

SPECIAL 50% SAVINGS

East West is valuable, informative and fun. We think you'll like it. And at the price of only $12 for 12 issues—you really can't afford to miss us. That's a 25% savings off the newsstand price of $24. You save $12! Find out why East West is the natural choice for a healthy life. Simply fill out the coupon and mail it back to us. We'll both be glad you did.

YES! I want to receive East West and save 50%. Send me one full year—12 big issues for only $12.

$12 payment enclosed  Bill me

Outside the U.S. there is extra postage. Canada add $5 per year. All other countries add $7 per year. Payment must be in U.S. dollars drawn on a U.S. bank. Allow 8 weeks for the first year issue.

Send order to East West, P.O. Box 6769, Syracuse, NY 13217

NEW DATA ON CORPORATE ANIMAL USERS

The November 1987 issue of News for Investors, a publication of the Investor Responsibility Research Center Inc. (IRRC) contained a special report on commercial users of research animals. Interest in the study was sparked by the shareholder initiatives sponsored in 1987 by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) at the annual meetings of Procter & Gamble and Greyhound (the parent company of Armour-Dial). While the Greyhound resolution received 68 percent support—a good vote for a new issue area—the same proposition was supported by only 23.5 percent of the shares voted at Procter & Gamble. In an effort to appeal to a larger number of shareholders in the future, PETA may drop a request in the 1988 resolutions that companies phase out products that legally require animal testing—asking only that they halt any animal testing not required by law, and identify products tested on animals in painful procedures.

Through a Freedom of Information Act request, IRRC collected data submitted to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) by all research and testing facilities in 1986. By law, laboratories experimenting on animals must report to USDA annually the number of regulated animals (dogs, cats, rabbits, guinea pigs, hamsters, and primates) used, and the number used in painful experiments—whether or not they receive anesthesia. The figures are significantly understated, however, as the USDA does not require facilities to report the use of mice and rats (who account for about 80 to 90 percent of laboratory animals) of other non-regulated species.

The data show that drug and chemical companies are the major commercial users of research animals in the U.S. Animal use is concentrated among the top users—with the top 30 companies accounting for 35 percent of all reported animals, and the top 100 companies for 67 percent. Data on companies using outside laboratories is unavailable. In addition to identifying the top corporate users, IRRC also looked at the activities of noncommercial labs—including universities, hospitals, and nonprofit research institutes—and determined that they used about 78,000 regulated animals in 1986.

The issue of painful experiments has been a major concern of the shareholder resolution campaigns. Examination of USDA data shows that 60 percent of the animals were subjected to nonpainful experiments, and approximately 34 percent of all reported animals received anesthesia to relieve the pain and/or distress of the experiments. Facilities reported that the remaining 6 percent of the animals were used in painful experiments in which no painkillers were administered. (They claimed analgesia would interfere with the purpose of the test or procedure.) Corporations conducting the greatest number of painful tests without pain relief were: Bayer AG, Ciba-Geigy Animal Health, IC America, Hoffman-La Roche, Eli Lilly, A.H. Robins, American Cyanamid, Pharmacia, Upjohn, Grand Laboratories, Boehringer-Inglehein Ltd., Minnesota Mining & Mfg., Dow Chemical, Distillers, Becton-Dickinson Diamond Scientific, E.I. DuPont De Nemours, Proctor & Gamble, Schering-Plough, and Johnson & Johnson.

The University of California topped the list of noncommercial labs, reporting the use of 1,921 animals in experiments involving unrelied pain, followed by: Carnegie-Mellon University (63), the University of Texas (520), Texas A&M (372), Baylor (221), the State University of New York (241), the University of Missouri (303), Battelle Memorial Institute (251), the University of Michigan (154), Cornell (220), and Colorado State University (114). The remainder of the noncommercial facilities reported less than 100. Corporations reported a far higher proportion of experiments involving unrelied pain than their non-commercial counterparts. About one of eight tests by commercial users were in the unrelied pain category, compared with roughly one out of every 20 experiments at noncommercial facilities. Therefore, businesses accounted for roughly half of total reported animal use and 90 percent of procedures involving unrelied pain.

THE ANIMALS' AGENDA

A CUTE ANIMAL?

That's not the point. Acute suffering—that's the point.

HEA believes all sentient beings, regardless of whether they are judged by others to be "cute" or "intelligent," deserve to be treated with compassion.

CAMPAIGN TO BAN BATTERY CAGING

Now there is a way for everyone to participate in the national campaign to end the horrors of factory egg production.

Please join us!

HUMANE FARMING ASSOCIATION
1550 California St., San Francisco, CA 94109
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FREE: All new supporters receive HEA's new and powerful consumer alert: "Anything Goes as Long as It's Free." Along with our monthly newsletter, and more.
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Accommodating Ethics in the Classroom

In recent years, there has been a steady increase in awareness among young people about animal rights, demonstrated by the large number of students who are refusing to participate in vivisection or dissection of animals in the classroom. Students are seeking to undertake alternative study projects out of opposition, but because of a deep sense that it is wrong to cause the death of an animal to study something which can be readily learned by nonviolent means.

Unfortunately, the willingness of educational institutions to accommodate the ethical convictions of these students hasn't kept pace with the students' moral development. In fact, some official policies regarding the use of animals in classrooms indicate a trend in the opposite direction. In 1985, for example, the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) revised its standards to allow "greater latitude in the use of animals," permitting pre-college students to perform painful surgery on animals in classrooms.

National attention was focused on the use of animals in scholastic settings last year when Jennifer Graham, a 15-year-old high school student and animal rights advocate in California, refused to dissect a frog. Graham requested an alternative project, but was told that she would have to receive a lower grade for refusing to dissect. She subsequently filed a lawsuit against her school district, something that would not only give all pre-college students the explicit right to say "no" to dissection, but would also require that students be informed that they have that right. After extensive testimony in favor of the bill, and with no teachers or teachers' association testifying against it, the state legislature's joint Committee on Education unanimously voted to endorse the bill. The state Senate subsequently passed it on a voice vote. Although neither publicly opposed the bill, both the NSTA and the Massachusetts Teachers Association (MTA) began to work against it when it was sent to the state House of Representatives. They succeeded in having the bill struck from the joint committee before the House could hold a final vote.

The bill has been refiled for 1988. CEASE's vice president Cindy Haigh, who coordinates the group's legislative work, is optimistic that it will pass in the new session. She points out that the "Education Committee is describing which is incredibly strong support for the bill. Despite NSTA and MTA lobbying, a majority of the committee's members are co-sponsoring the refils. Last year, the bill almost went through with only one sponsor, it has nine sponsors for this season."

Despite the moderate scope of these efforts to accommodate students' ethical concerns for animals (neither the California nor the Massachusetts bills seek to prohibit dissection, and both leave alternative assignments up to the teacher), the issue has stirred up a fur among those who are opposed to reducing the use of animals in biology teaching. When Apple Computer, which markets a computer program that simulates a dissection, recently aired television commercials featuring Jennifer Graham, California Biomedical Research Association (CBRA)--a group which lobbies against lab animal protection programs--sent out "action alerts" urging researchers and their supporters to write letters of protest. Apple, CBRA director Sandra Bressler wrote that the ad "advances the cause of fanaticism" and contributes to "dangerous and simplistic thinking." According to Carol Scherman of the Association of American Universities, the ad was "a cute marketable commercial for anti-vivisection." Apple Computer subsequently withdrew the commercial as a result of the pressure.

Hopefully, the legislative efforts in California and Massachusetts will inspire similar bills in other states. Residents of the two states are urged to write to their legislators and governors in support of the bills. Both CEASE and PHS need to hear from teachers in their states who support the legislation, and from individuals who have had problems trying to opt out of performing dissections.

Please contact: Kim Stuyla, Peninsula Humane Society, 12 Airport Blvd., San Mateo, CA 94401; (650) 340-8129, or Cindy Haigh, CEASE, PO Box 27, Cambridge, MA 02238, (617) 825-6700.

---

Creation
Earthly spirituality for an evolving planet

A magazine which explores and illuminates the spiritual context for rescuing the earth and all its creatures in today's culture. Leading spiritual thinkers contribute features on ecological, anti-nuclear, meditation, ecology, psychology, science and mysticism. You are invited to join us in exploring and resonating cosmic spiritual dimensions.
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When you let your pet bring unwanted animals into the world...

Fight Pet Overpopulation
With "Prevent a Litter" Posters From The Humane Society of the United States

You can help spread the message about the tragedy of pet overpopulation—and what to do about it—with these dramatic posters from The Humane Society of the United States. Order them now to display in April (National "Prevent a Litter" Month) and throughout the year. Posters are black and white, 12" x 18". I poster, $1.50; 5 posters, $1 each; 6 or more, 50¢ each.

The Humane Society of the United States
200 L Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

Tel: The HSUS, 200 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037
Please use this form to request "Prevent a Litter" posters. Filled out by us, posted to HSUS, in the amount of $____

Name
Address
City
State
Zip
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The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspec-
tion Service (APHIS) recently proposed new regu-
lations for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. APHIS, in its role as the Depart-
tment's Animal Welfare Branch, is responsible for ensuring the welfare of millions of animals in research, exhibition, and recreational activities. The proposed regulations would provide a more uniform approach to the inspection and enforcement of the Act. These regulations would apply to all animals used in research, exhibition, and recreation, including those housed in zoos, circuses, and other public displays.

By LESTER PISCHE

A battle over bighorn.

A series of confrontations pitting bighorn sheep hunters against animal rights and environmental activists occurred this past December in the Marble and Old Dad Mountains of the Mojave Desert in southern California. The state legislature approved a limited hunt when the 115-year-old ban on hunting Nelson bighorn sheep expired last year. Nine hunters held the privilege of killing one bighorn sheep each; the first permit, allowing the holder to begin hunting some two weeks before any other hunters, was for $375. Some 20 activists from Earth First, Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, and the Hunt Saboteurs Association were on hand to disrupt the hunt, emerging from hiding places to blow whistles and hoot when hunters had sheep in their sights. Several times, the activists were successful in causing bighorn sheep to flee moments before they would have been shot. Numerous citations were issued to the activists, who reportedly clashed with Dr. Loren Lutz, a retired dentist and president of the Society for the Conservation of Bighorn Sheep, who was acting as a guide for hunters. Charged with disturbing the peace, the activists may face a civil lawsuit against Lutz stemming from his actions against them. Cats and dogs face a number of challenges in their daily lives. The proposed regulations would provide a more uniform approach to the inspection and enforcement of the Act. These regulations would apply to all animals used in research, exhibition, and recreation, including those housed in zoos, circuses, and other public displays.

The Chief of the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), F. Dale Robertson, recently released a report on the status of the U.S. wilderness. The report highlights the need for increased wilderness conservation efforts. The USFS has identified 60 wilderness areas across the country, each with unique ecosystems and wildlife habitats. The report calls for increased funding and support for wilderness management and protection.

This year's American Meatout, a nationwide day for encouraging the public to eat meatless meals, will take place on March 20. Thousands of events and activities, beginning March 1, will lead up to the Meatout, coordinated by the Farm Animal Reform Movement (FARM). Celebrities Dori Day, Casey Kasem, and Harvey Milk will participate in the campaign, which aims to raise awareness about the humane treatment of animals. The Meatout campaign also aims to promote vegetarian and vegan lifestyles as a way to reduce the environmental impact of animal agriculture.

Doris Day, one of the national chairs of the Meatout campaign.

Two fires, apparently set by animal rights activists, gutted meat company facilities in Northern California in late November 1987. On November 25, a fire destroyed an empty cattle feed barn at Ferrs Meat Company in San Jose; the Animal Rights Militia claimed responsibility. Another fire occurred on November 28, destroying a poultry warehouse in Santa Clara County. The California Department of Fish and Game, which investigates animal cruelty cases, is investigating the fires. The activists criticized NSAL's use of funds gathered through national fundraising efforts solely for the operation of a single shelter on Long Island, while local and state wildlife agencies continue to face budget cuts. The Animal Rights Militia, a group of activists who claim to use violence to protect animals and the environment, has been involved in a number of similar incidents in recent years.

The North Shore Animal League (NSAL), one of the oldest and largest animal welfare organizations in the country, has come under fire by animal activists for its methods and leadership. Relations have been strained between NSAL and the Animal Rights Reform Committee—negotiations last December and January failed to reach an agreement. The activists criticized NSAL's use of funds gathered through national fundraising efforts solely for the operation of a single shelter on Long Island, while local and state wildlife agencies continue to face budget cuts. The Animal Rights Militia, a group of activists who claim to use violence to protect animals and the environment, has been involved in a number of similar incidents in recent years.
NEWS SHORTS

An initiative petition campaign mounted by the Coalition to End Animal Suffering and Exploitation (CEASE) to establish minimal humane standards for farm animals in Massachusetts appears headed for the November ballot. In order for an initiative to appear on the ballot, signatures of 50,000 registered voters are required. Campaign volunteers easily surpassed that mark, collecting a total of some 300,000 signatures and certified by the state — the Humane Farming Initiative in second place out of 15 initiative campaigns. The next step under the proposed law will be the Massachusetts state legislature, where lawmakers will have until May 4 to adopt the measure. If they fail to do so, another 8,421 signatures will have to be collected between May 4 and June 27 to place the initiative before the voters on Election Day in November. The initiative calls for implementation of humane standards addressing the housing, transportation, feeding, and surgical ablation of animals on farms within four years after the law's passage. The first stage, which would be implemented after one year, would ban the use ofveal crates, require the use of humane procedures during surgery, and prohibit the suctioning or grinding of baby chicks in the egg industry's hatcheries (a common method of disposing of unwanted males).

In addition to collecting signatures, more than 1,000 people participated in a Solidarity Rally for Animal Rights held on July 7. At the rally, a group of animal rights activists gathered at dawn on November 21, 1987 to protest hunting and to attempt to prevent hunters from killing any deer on the opening day of muzzle-loading deer season. Activists reported that they found and pursued more than 25 hunters, who were able to get off any clean shots at deer. In the fall of 1986, during a similar protest, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) officers arrested 14 activists, whom a judge later acquitted for violating the state's 'hunting harassment' law. On the opening day of 1987, DEP officers made no arrests — but did arrest six activists who disrupted the hunt on its final day, December 19. Among them were two nonresident islanders who each had to post $100 bond in order to gain release. Animal rights activists argue that the 'hunting harassment' law is extremely vague and offers unique and unjust protection for a special interest group, thereby putting limited freedom of expression and recreational activity of hunting critics. Similarly, they have argued that there is a conflict of interest in the enforcement of the law. The DEP, deriving revenue from the sale of hunting licenses, is no disinterested observer, but an agency with an interest in shielding the income of lucrative duck- and moose-hunting constituency. As we go to press, the latest group of ansees are making their first court appearance in Damariscotta, Conn. on February 1.

The Endangered Species Act's 1D positions were eliminated in the move. Endangered groups and some scientists within the endangered species program fear the reorganization will hamper efforts to protect endangered species. John Fitzgerald, a representative of Defenders of Wildlife, said that regional Fish and Wildlife offices are highly susceptible to pressure by local political and economic interests, and are less likely to act to protect wildlife when local interests would upset local special interest groups. One scientist who worked for the Endangered Species Office continued that a major reason for the breakup of the Washington staff was that it had defined political and economic interests in various parts of the country in order to protect endangered species.

The Yale-Meyers forest in northeast Connecticut has become a target for ongoing confrontations over the issue of deer hunting. In an action organized by the New Haven-based Animal Rights Front, more than 75 activists from three states gathered at dawn on November 21, 1987 to protest hunting and to attempt to protect deer from hunters during the opening day of muzzle-loading deer season. Activists reported that they found and pursued more than 25 hunters, who were able to get off any clean shots at deer. In the fall of 1986, during a similar protest, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) officers arrested 14 activists, whom a judge later acquitted for violating the state's 'hunting harassment' law. On the opening day of 1987, DEP officers made no arrests — but did arrest six activists who disrupted the hunt on its final day, December 19. Among them were two nonresident islanders who each had to post $100 bond in order to gain release. Animal rights activists argue that the 'hunting harassment' law is extremely vague and offers unique and unjust protection for a special interest group, thereby putting limited freedom of expression and recreational activity of hunting critics. Similarly, they have argued that there is a conflict of interest in the enforcement of the law. The DEP, deriving revenue from the sale of hunting licenses, is no disinterested observer, but an agency with an interest in shielding the income of lucrative duck- and moose-hunting constituency. As we go to press, the latest group of ansees are making their first court appearance in Damariscotta, Conn. on February 1.

Like many of the dogs at McCarthy's shelter, this animal had virtually no body fat left.

In the state and federal courts, McCarthy, who is charged with two counts of animal cruelty, has been able to stay free on bail. He has been granted a bail of $100,000 for the first count and $50,000 for the second. McCarthy's attorney, John McCarthy, said he will appeal the decision and that he will seek a new trial. The next hearing in the case is scheduled for February 1. The Federal District Court in Conneticut is also considering a motion to dismiss the charges against McCarthy.

In what may be the biggest cruelty to animals case ever, the Animals Farm Home Inc., a nonprofit animal shelter located in Warren, New York, was raided by police in November. Hundreds of mange-infested dogs were found starving and cannibalizing one another at the G.A.操作 room. Some 175 dogs, believed to be too weak and sick to survive, were euthanized on the premises by officials from the Ulster County SPCA and other local humane societies. The owner and operator of the farm, Justin McCarthy, is being charged with inhumane treatment of impounded animals — a misdemeanor punishable by up to a year in jail and a $3,000 fine. The Ulster County District Attorney's Office is also attempting to ascertain whether any fraudulent improprieties occurred in McCarthy's operation (despite his plea of poverty). McCarthy's shelter showed an excess of more than $56,000 in income over expenses for the year ending January 31, 1990. McCarthy could be charged with grand larceny if evidence exists that he used donations for purposes other than those for which they were solicited. McCarthy, who for years has been referred to by locals as a "Dr. Doolittle" and a "dognapper," has admitted to taking in homeless animals, and feeding many of the dogs a meat diet composed primarily of white bread donated by a local bakery. Though authorities are pushing either for the shelter to be closed down or for McCarthy to be prohibited from continuing to run it, at present he is still in charge. Police were tipped off to the situation at the farm after Justin McCarthy's nephew, John McCarthy, spent a week working on the farm in October and documented the deplorable conditions suffered by the animals there. Following extensive local media coverage of the case, numerous individuals converged on the farm in attempts to locate animals they had entrusted to McCarthy's care.

In These Times may become the fountain-head of a new movement, but people also read it now because it contains information hard to find anywhere else... The paper...exceeds in in-depth medium-length features...

—Studs Terkel

"In These Times... is one of the most thoughtful critiques of establishment policies, especially as they relate to working America... Most of the pieces are simply good journalism."

—Harold Henderson, The Reader

"I care about In These Times because In These Times cares about the truth."

—Alice Walker
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OUT OF CONTROL

A breath of polluted air

Flicking a toothy grin, clutching an omnipresent cigarette, he bounds into the studio, dispensing high-fives to his mausoleum with the sound of a contender molding his way to the ring. As if on cue, his entrance ignites an adulatory chant: “Mort... Mort... Mort!”

An adopted son of the commission is Sean Morton, Downey Jr., host of “The Morton Downey Jr. Show,” former presidential candidate of the ultralight American Independent Party and TV’s latest insulator. Rude and overbearing, Downey has established, in just a few years, a name for himself on the New York area’s worst TV, an impressive reputation for outrageous behavior. Michael Manning—a media critic who was the target of one of Downey’s outbursts back in November—thinks he’s simply a bully. “The right I was on,” Manning told The New York Times, “I was right. He was out of control.”

That may be putting things too kindly. On any given night Downey—backed by his audience of locally recruited nudes—is likely to interrupt his guest repeatedly; spout mild obscenities at anyone foolish enough to cross him; fire off misspelled barbs at the slightest provocation; in dudgeon in all sorts of rightous rantings; wag a finger perilously close to the face of his opponents or simply shout down his interlocutors. Guests have entertained on-air comments such as, “The Morton Downey Jr. show is a ghastly, shahkh, and at least one (representing gay and lesbian communities) is using assailant... Andrew Humm claims that during a heated exchange Downey slapped him after warning him, “Keep your goddamn hands to yourself!”

But you may ask, why do so few bother with this charming character in these pages? Simple. On the evening of December 1st, it last, with scheduled guests Cleveland Amoray and futurist Stephen Boyrow, Downey mounted a frontal attack on animal rights. Many of those who attended for our side thought the entertainment unmerited, and that even those who attended for his side had been a total waste, if not an error. I don’t agree. In my view the Downey show was a refreshening course on the subject of animal rights. And, of course, watch us as we live long enough to be proud of that.

A commongotch of the show had been a total waste, if not an error. I don’t agree. In my view the Downey show was a refreshening course on the subject of animal rights. And, of course, watch us as we live long enough to be proud of that.

The hunting season was one of our finest moments. D.V. Smith, president of the National Hunters Association, and billed by Downey as a “big-game hunter who goes after his biggest catch—animal rights,” proved a dud. Maybe it was the weight of the ten-gallon hat he was wearing, or the strong studio lights, but something was impeding his capacity to put together a complete sentence. He simply stood there, gripping the shotgun and his words and those of his fellow hunters who are out there in the city, who are out there on the outside of this piece of mental tape he’s been obviously trained to regurgitate. “Hunters... hunt for many different reasons...”

Downey kicked off the show in his usual dispassionate manner. “One of the issues Reagan and Gore ought to discuss at the historic summit meeting taking place in Washington this week,” he intoned, “is human rights, because all humans are human rights.” OK. I understand that—only one of the issues that... they’re not going to discuss is animal rights—BECAUSE ANIMALS HAVE NO DAMN RIGHTS!” The small animal rights contingent cringed. The rest of the audience cheered, revelling in their “superiority.” Downey’s not one to use a napkin with a glove when a club will do.

Early on, probing for a way to deride animal rights activists, Downey said, “Downey: All right, one aspect of the issue is animal husbandry. Domestic animals—we’re eventually going to be slaughtering and using food, food, food, etc. It doesn’t bother you, does it?”

Cleveland: Yeah, it bothers me a lot. (Lot of boozing, nervous laughter) There, all life... (more jeers) All life on this earth has a certain right... even if it’s just the right to a decent death.

Maybe it was the boldness or sheer naiveté of that that amused the crowd in the tracks. The hooting subsided, and there was a moment of embarrassed silence. Soon after, the unsuitability returned.

Anatomy of a TV show

With the benefit of hindsight, it would seem that all of the topics debated, hunting (and trapping) presented the easiest flank for us to attack, animal experimentation one of the hardest, at least, and factory farming (at least in terms of asking for a video product) the most acceptable to survival—as in “filmmaking drugs”—and deeply ingrained habits (eating hamburgers), of course, trapping, factory farming, here’s also some inherent complexity of some issues. Showtime television, geared to keep things moving fast, tends to simplify everything, sharpen in our favor. That’s almost always a formula for disaster. Those who down the status quo have much less explain-

ing to do.

The hunting season was one of our finest moments. D.V. Smith, president of the National Hunters Association, and billed by Downey as a “big-game hunter who goes after his biggest catch—animal rights,” proved a dud. Maybe it was the weight of the ten-gallon hat he was wearing, or the strong studio lights, but something was impeding his capacity to put together a complete sentence. He simply stood there, gripping the shotgun and his words and those of his fellow hunters who are out there in the city, who are out there on the outside of this piece of mental tape he’s been obviously trained to regurgitate. “Hunters... hunt for many different reasons...”

Downey: “Go have some bacon and eggs, baby.”

Amoray: “All life... has the right to a decent death.”

Picking up the pieces

Was anyone converted to animal rights just by watching the show? I doubt it. Although the question mark may or may not be fair. The Downey show is not a normal environment. It was for us—the some planners call it “the work of a lifetime.”-a better presentation of our philosophy. Still, the show yielded (or confirmed) some useful insights.

One is that in television the quality of argument can be so much or so less than the ability to present an argument on time one’s delivery. TV is a media medium on those who don’t project the right image, or talk out of turn. People in our move-
menl structure should organize video workshops to let activists see how they actually come across on the tube.

Second, it’s obvious that all activists appearing on TV (or radio, for that matter), should carefully prepare themselves according to the audience profile they’re likely to encounter. There is no “set” spiel that can cover all bases. Each medium—each station and locality—may call for a separate analysis. It’s amazing how many people disregard this elementary step.

Third—and this is quite important—activists should try to introduce visual footage of animal abuse whenever the host or the show’s producers will allow it. Images of hunting, medical experiments, trapping, factory farming, slaughterhouses, speak for themselves. They can swiftly equalize the grounds for debate, if not tilt them in favor. Much of the animal protection movement is quiet and respectful when Lynda Smith was showing her placecard. What would this image do? It would likely prevent some of the behavior with which footage of animal abuse had been shown at the beginning of the program?

What’s the evidence supporting? All the evidence would support, but none of those libelous charges that we only care about animals! At one point, looking at Cleveland, Downey sternly declared: “How much of the money you raise for animals you give to people who do not believe in the benefits of a vegan lifestyle?...”

Downey: “And I look as well as you do, baby.”

D.V. Smith, the “Louie,”

Downey: “You have some bacon and eggs, baby.”

Mutter under his breath: “I’m a vegan... A VEGAN...”

Downey: “And I look as well as you do, baby.”

Amoray: “All life... has the right to a decent death.”
BURNING UP AND BURNOUT: Hazards of Human Work

BY MICHAEL W. FOX, D.V.M., Ph.D.

"Burnout," becoming exhausted, devoid of enthusiasm, and feeling worn out by one's work is a common theme among animal rights activists. Many join the humane movement full of enthusiasm for high ideals, only to burn up in the shooting stars—briefly illuminating the sky with their compassion and commitment. Then they burn out and fall to earth, leaving their movement and taking their disenchantment with them. They leave behind the unfinished and seemingly never-ending work for the seasoned disheartened and zealous novitiates. It is easy to burn up in this work, which can be a consuming passion that to outsiders seems like a lunatic obsession. And the more intensely one burns, the more likely one runs the risk of burnout.

So how can burnout be avoided, and with it the feeling of personal failure which is often (rightly or wrongly) redirected towards others in the movement? How can we help prevent burnout in our associates and, most importantly, how can we recognize it? It tends to creep up insidiously, as when the dedicated worker starts to take on more work and more work, can't say "no," and becomes over-extended and over-committed. This is the prelude. It is difficult to differentiate from other enthusiasm and passionate dedication initially, but the tell-tale signs are as follows. The last to notice the pending sign of burnout are often the victims themselves.

Veterinarian A.D. Elkins in Veterinary Forum (August 1985) describes burnout as "a process so complex that an exact etiology is difficult to trace. It follows a confrontation with reality in which the human spirit is pitted against circumstances which appear insurmountable by change. One continues to work, but the emotional investment that transforms a task into a satisfying human activity is lost."

The initial enthusiasm of the animal rights worker to help change the world can quickly extinguish itself because the wholesale abuse and suffering of animals seems endless. And the perpetrators of animal cruelty and those social institutions that support industries of animal exploitation (from the fur industry to factory farming to the pet trade and laboratory animal experimentation) "appear insurmountable to change."

Primary Burnout Symptoms

PHYSICAL
- Exhaustion
- Insomnia
- Gastrointestinal tract problems
- Head, neck, and backaches
- Lowered resistance to infection

BEHAVIORAL
- Abuse of alcohol, drugs, caffeine, food too much or too little sleep
- Withdrawal from social contacts
- Inability to focus/centrality
- Irritability
- Inability to relax
- Punitiveness towards others
- Inability to complete task
- Loss of enthusiasm/humor

EMOTIONAL
- Depression
- Frustration
- Anxiety
- Isolation
- Grief
- Apathy
- Defensiveness
- Powerlessness
- Helplessness

A sense of humor can help one deal with these seemingly insurmountable odds. But humor can be used cynically, which can eat away at enthusiasm without one realizing it. Victims of burnout often fall to recognize that they are having problems, and their solutions to coping—like becoming more cynical or more engrossed, or working even harder—may isolate them from others. After all, they are not vegetables, and what they need is the support and encouragement of others, as well as recreational activities to help rejuvenate body and spirit.

Becoming demanding and hypercritical of one's self and others are additional signs of imminent burnout. Feeling that one is totally indispensable, and that in one's absence the work will never get done, is a sign of over-involvement. Some emotional detachment and objectivity is essential, otherwise slow progress may become ever more frustrating (and exhausting) and failure to accomplish various tasks may be taken to mean personal failure and hopelessness can then take hold.

All persons involved in humane work need to be sensitive to each other's needs. The work at hand is no less important than the people involved—and no person involved in the work is more or less "important" than any other. With mutual care, support, and commitment, the movement as a whole is strengthened and its members are less likely to become disillusioned because of how others treat them.

Time is needed to share frustrations, grievances, anger, and aspirations with those of like mind and spirit. Involvement in an out-of-the-way sub-culture is challenging and can be a lonely road without good peer support. Hence, the importance of workshops, conferences, retreats, and regular talk sessions.

In their book How Can I Help? Stories and Reflections on Service, Ram Dass and Paul Gorman list the ways in which "the mind reacts to suffering [of others] and attempts to restrict or direct the natural compassion of the heart."

**CHICKENS AND FARM ANIMAL PRIORITIES**

**Breaking the Vegetable Barrier**

By WAYNE PACELLE

Despite all their squawking, chickens don't get much attention from animal rights advocates. Of course, most ad

Dr. Fox is a vice president of The Humane Society of the United States.
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Scratching out maximum profits

If not for chicken historians, few people would know that today's standard factory chicken descends from a streamlined, aggressive, and wild Southeast Asian chicken. Agricultural financiers, seeking to "improve" on Mother Nature's chickens, have selectively bred for and genetically engineered "super race" of chickens. These super chickens are not marvels because they can fly or cackle louder than their wild antecedents, but because they have bigger thighs, breasts, and other body parts than any one could have dreamed of years ago. Described for their health, but for maximum human profit, these birds have chronic physical and pains problems. One result of their selected overdevelopment is that the不平衡, quick-growing birds are barely capable of standing on their own feet. If these birds were in the wild, natural predators would eliminate them faster than you could click a doodle-doo.

Yet even if they were able to run and flap their wings as well as their wild counterparts, today's chicken could not be offered the chance to demonstrate their physical prowess. Today's egg-laying hens (see "A Crack in the Shell," Sept. '87) and meat chickens (broilers), though they have different lifespans and surroundings, share lives of physical and emotional deprivation. They're confined with too many others in too small a living space, denied unrestrict social interaction, and routinely mutilated (e.g., debeaked). The results of their thorough exploitation are curmudgeon and disease. It's a clear case of misery not loving company.

Sad to say, there is more misery than we can even imagine. According to Figures from the Public Health Safety Inspection Service of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), chicken producers slaughtered 4,772,213 chickens in 1986. A mere 460 companies are responsible for producing and slaughtering nearly all of these 5 billion birds. The top four broiler companies (Tyson Foods, Conagra, Perdue, and Holly Farms) monopolize a third of total industry production, the top eight a half, and the top 20 three-fourths. Of all the industries in the country, the broiler industry is the most vertically integrated.

These corporations invest millions of dollars in intensive factory production systems that literally send the birds flying through the processing plants. Tyson Foods of Arkansas, the largest by a comfortable margin, produces 45 million pounds of "dressed" chicken per week. Almost entirely mechanized assembly lines provide transportation from point to point in the factory. The toils, though rather pricey for the birds who, to qualify as dressed, lose their heads, feet, and heads and legs. Unfortunately, the processors offer the birds only one route. And while the number of eggs consumed per capita may be on the decline, the amount of chicken flesh consumed is in-

The scope of the problem and only guesses about how the bacteria are transmitted. The solution, the poultry industry understands its problem all too well. Actually, only a small percentage of the birds are infected by bacteria prior to slaughter, and the problem is not with the birds themselves. It's after slaughter that bacteria spread to so many other hosts. Specifically, processing machinery rips out the entrails of chickens and spreads fecal matter—ripe with microorganisms—over their remaining body parts. If that doesn't infect many previously uncontaminated chickens, the rest step probably well. After evisceration, all chickens are bathed in a common pool—a "focal soup"—to wash off visible excreta in order to assure a presentable carcass. Clean in appearance, the chickens emerge coated with bacteria. In fact, in a 60 Minutes expose ("One in Three," March 1987) of the chicken industry, Diane Sawyer reported that a thirteenth of the weight of store-bought chicken is comprised of this "focal soup." Overall, the USDA reports that more than a third of chickens who go to market are infected with salmonella. Independently-conducted studies reveal a 50 to 60 percent industry-wide infection rate.

A dose of antibiotics fed or injected into the chickens is no solution to this problem: in fact, intensive use of antibiotics is part of the problem. The oversupply of intensive chicken farms routinely punish the chickens full of antibiotics to limit the spread of disease and infection from bacteria. Antibiotic-resistant bacterial strains develop in time, and a biological arms race begins. It's a battle that can't be won, and one that gets more dangerous over time. As expected, the resistant strains that ultimately survive are generally more virulent than their precursors.
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Sorting Out the Facts From the Fiction

BY JOHN MARBLE, PH.D

It is the rarest thing in the world to hear a rational discussion of animal experimentation or vivisection. Those who disparage it are commonly accused of insensitivity, but the other side lies open to the exact same charge: both appeal to the emotion of pity. The real question remains: whether it is right or wrong.

-C.S. Lewis in "Undeception"

A prominent activist recently observed that the animal rights movement is maturing into a more sophisticated, knowledgeable, professional, and influential force for social change. One simple indication of this is that the media no longer put the term animal rights in quotation marks. With the increased acceptance comes an increased need for accuracy. Animal advocates no longer have the luxury of being able to make outrageous claims and questionable assumptions about areas of animal exploitation such as vivisection.

Many of the problems encountered in discussing and debating the subject of animal experimentation arise from: 1) unfamiliarity with the history, evolution of, and related public attitudes toward biomedical research; 2) scientific popular but erroneous information on problems with vivisection; 3) confusion between the concepts of care and use of animals; 4) failure to distinguish between the four principal areas of use of laboratory animals; and 5) irresponsibility with the factual evidence on fiscal issues, alternatives, and simple common sense that really support the vivisection position. In particular, the continued use of wholly or partially invalid arguments and vivisection mythology only serves to decrease our effectiveness and ability to end the suffering of laboratory animals.

The historical perspective

During the early 19th Century, when the term vivisection was coined, the use of animals in experiments routinely involved pain and suffering of a magnitude that could lead to criminal prosecution today. The availability of anesthesia was not a reality until the mid-1800s, and only then for use in human patients. Use of general anesthesia in some animal experiments came later.

Such vivisectors as Claude Bernard and Francois Magendie, revered today by biomedical researchers as the founders of experimental physiology, were characterized as being among the most prolific butchers and torturers in the history of biology. In one series of experiments, Magendie nailed or tied more than 1,000 young dogs to boards and cut into their backs to sever muscles and nerves. That was, however, the past.

Such obvious and pervasive cruelty prompted the activities of the early anti-vivisection movement, which received widespread public and professional support. This was possible because the suffering in the experimental laboratories provided no medically useful information and, in large part, was attributable to no more than a perverse and intellectual curiosity. Those individuals and organizations opposed to vivisection concentrated on the use of animals, not their care—which was marginal at best.

The introduction of anesthesiology and welfare-oriented legislation in the late 1800s did little to alleviate the concerns of anti-vivisectors. However, during this time experiments using animals to study and treat diseases began to produce some tangible results that could be promoted as "benefits" of animal research. Although then, as now, they were limited to a very small percentage of experiments, the clinically useful results did help some sick patients. Despite making only a negligible contribution to improving the overall health of the population, they were sufficiently impressive to begin the process of changing the image of biomedical researchers from villains to protectors of the sick and injured.

The shift that occurred had two major impacts that hindered efforts to end the suffering of laboratory animals: the coalition of animal protection groups opposing vivisection changed, and research on animals was legitimized in the public's perception. Anti-vivisectors retained their stand against the use of laboratory animals, but their opposition to vivisection was lost, on the one hand, as the public perception of the use of laboratory animals in experiments, but more importantly on the laboratory welfare societies observed a de facto truce with the researchers and shifted their concerns to either traditional companion animal welfare or the care of exploited animals (mainly horses and other draft animals). In part, this shift in focus explains the failure of existing laws and regulations to adequately protect laboratory animals and the perceived failure of some humane societies to address the vivisection issue. Although the truce was broken in the 1980s when the biomedical research establishment began raiding animal shelters—demanding unlimited and unrestricted access to the pet cats and dogs, the care of the laboratory animals is now as important to others. Typically, this myth is used to indicate a lack of applicability of vivisection to human health concerns.

With respect to product development and safety testing, the concept of scientific fraud is valid, and most of the examples cited by anti-vivisectors come from this area of usage.

Overall, however, testing does not represent the largest single category of laboratory animal consumption. This distinction is reserved for basic biomedical research. Within this latter category, the concept of fraud is only applicable to that small percentage of laboratory animals that are used to investigate human diseases. If an invalid animal model is used (for example, in studying Alzheimer's, AIDS, psychopathology, etc.), then fraud is involved. Basic research, in general, is done to acquire basic knowledge, with most investigators readily admitting that there are no apparent animal or human clinical benefits. Furthermore, fraud is not a factor for the three to five million animals killed every year in educational demonstrations. Though it is possible to view projects as fraudulent that continue to use animals when alternatives are available, a more accurate way to classify such experiments is negligence.

Fraud does exist in basic biomedical research in the continued use of research procedures that deliberately falsify or fabricate data, claim results when none exist, fail to publish results, or submit grant applications for projects they know are meaningless variations on a theme or useless intellectual exercises designed merely to secure funding and protect their laboratories and jobs.

"Vivisection has never benefited anyone"

This is a panicky absurd statement that, even if it were true, would not be believed by the general public. Historically, vivisection has been much like a slot machine: no one can say what it will do, or directly lead to human injuries and deaths. Some of the confusion on this issue comes from a failure to distinguish between the concepts of mortality and morbidity. Mortality rates (the number of people dying from...
of various causes) in the developed countries have decreased dramatically. We have more humane and scientifically sophisticated clinical and experimental methods. Although the vast majority of animals used in biomedical experiments, testing, and education have helped one way or another, it is not correct to extend that reality to all past and present uses of such animals.

"All biomedical researchers are sadists"

This type of overgeneralization assassination seldom works, and only creates hostility and disbelief where it is neither needed nor productive. Activists can accomplish more with the legislation, media, and public by dropping the name-calling and developing a genuine understanding of the problems involved in vivisection. Although some may exist, of the thousands of researchers I have met and the hundreds of laboratories I have visited, I have never encountered an experimenter who was deliberately cruel or sadistic. However, I routinely witnessed cruelty and suffering resulting from their arrogance, ignorance, indifference, and insensitivity.

"There are alternatives for all uses of laboratory animals"

When discussing alternatives, one should always use the "5 R" concept: reduction, refinement, and replacement. For each experiment, test, or demonstration, the first questions are whether or not fewer animals could be used (reduction); the care and use could be more humane (refinement); or the use of animals could be entirely replaced. All rights of use of animals can be reduced or refined, but replacement is a more difficult goal for some types of usage. Interestingly, both anti-vivisectionists and biomedical researchers tend to focus on replacement, ignoring the immediately achievable goals of reduction and refinement.

Animal advocacy is often remembered to remember that such alternatives as cell, organ, and tissue cultures utilize living material that will—in many cases—mean the death of an animal. For that reason, even a total shift from vivisection to alternatives will not eliminate all uses of laboratory animals. Claims that we already have alternatives for all uses of experimental animals are overly optimistic and often associated with an excessive faith in what computers can accomplish. The extent to which alternatives are available depends on which area of usage is involved. There is no longer any justification for using animals for teaching, training, and in our education system—at any level, from grade school to postgraduate. Alternatives such as audio-visuals, projections, and clinical demonstration remain necessary for all safety uses. The alternatives are less expensive, more appropriate, and help to promote more humane attitudes among the students.

The use of animals in the production of biologicals such as vaccines and hormones is a valid concern. The production of genetically engineered mammalian and microbial culture methods. This is the area in which the concept of replacement has had its most immediate, obvious, and successful results. For instance, yellow fever vaccine—formerly produced using laboratory animals—is now produced in cell culture. Using animal tests to determine the risks associated with human exposure to various chemicals and products has always been questionable. Such traditionallv utilized and useless tests as the Draize (rabbit eye) test and the classic LD50 (Lethal Dose 50 Percent) test, in which a group of test animals are given increasing doses of a substance until half of them die) can be replaced immediately—both because of inutility and the existence of cheaper and more reliable alternatives. Because they are basically redundant and mechanistic, the remaining toxicity and safety tests are ideal candidates for replacement. This will not happen immediately, but it is an achievable goal. Since there are manufacturers of household products and cosmetics that conduct no animal testing, companies continuing to do so have no valid defense. They are, however, under pressure from their insurers, lawyers, and some bureaucrats in regulatory agencies to continue the outdated animal-based tests. In the case of highly toxic compounds like pesticides, federal regulations specifically require animal tests. But if anything will act to accelerate the speed of the abandonment of animal-based toxicity cannot handle the new products, let alone the backlog. Only the quicker, cheaper alternatives have any chance of protecting the public.

A more significant problem involves the use of animals in basic biomedical research. Although animals are indispensable and necessary for many modern research studies and treatments, animal-based research are used to test all such uses, the possibilities for replacement vary between the different specialties. For example, vivisection from traditional vivisection to alternative methods, while new surgical techniques continue to be developed and tested on experimental animals despite available alternatives. If the project involves a hogs animal model, as the majority of medically-related experiments do, then abstinence becomes the appropriate alternative. The principal area of difficulty is the relatively large and diverse group of projects described as "searches for basic biological knowledge." Since no immediate, direct human benefit is evident or claimed, the most reasonable and humane course of action for such experiments is to either first develop new methods or postpone the work until replacements are available. Both the public and researchers need to realize that knowledge is not value-free. Laboratory animals cannot afford the luxury of the "search for truth."

Exaggerated factual statements

A remarkable variety of statistics and "facts" are quoted by animal advocates that are not supported by evidence. For example, pro-animal literature routinely cites the figure of 200 million animals killed every year in the U.S. labs. The actual number is difficult to determine and depends on whether or not animals used as breeders and their offspring are included in the general public. Most defend the use of vivisection to continue on rely on fear tactics and their own social status to gain public support. They are, however, defected with a few legitimate samples. Animal advocates must remember that in any discussion, debate, lecture, or testimony, it does not matter how good you present the statements you make. What is important is the reaction of the those listening to you. Resist the temptation to use simplistic slogans and easy answers. Vivisection is a complex issue that requires serious consideration and responses. Ethical, factual, and scientific evidence all support the eventual abolition of vivisection. With such information available, there is no need to use any of the anti-vivisection mythologies of the past.

Dr. McAllister is Scientific Director for the New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAVS). This article originally appeared in the NEAVS publication, Reverence for Life.
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Leaving the Land of Milk and Honey

BY VICTORIA MORAN

The urge to clean out the kitchen and dispose of every animal product makes sense to most animal rights advocates and anyone who thinks through the logic of it. Most of us know enough of what goes on in our local supermarket to see that the meat we buy on a regular basis is grown on an industrial scale, and that this meat is often produced in ways that are cruel and inhumane. We know that eggs and dairy products are produced in similar ways, and that these products are often contaminated with bacteria that can cause illness or death. We also know that the use of animal products is linked to a variety of environmental problems, including deforestation, pollution, and climate change.

The solution to these problems is to reduce our consumption of animal products. This can be done by eliminating dairy and eggs from your diet, and by buying only meat that is grown in a humane and sustainable way. You can also reduce your carbon footprint by eating less meat and dairy, and by supporting local farmers who use sustainable farming practices.

In conclusion, if you are serious about protecting animals and the environment, you must think about the products you buy and the foods you eat. By reducing your consumption of animal products, you can make a difference in the lives of animals, and help to create a more sustainable future for all of us.
"For Thou Lovest All Things"

Christianity and the Rights of Animals

By Andrew Linzey

Crossroad Publishing (370 Lexington Ave., New York, NY 10017) 1987
$12.95 paperback, 197 pages

Through an anthropocentric view, people would hardly find it compelling. "Christianity and the Rights of Animals is a theological tour de force on the animal consciousness," author, Andrew Linzey, an Anglican (Episcopal) priest and Director of Studies at the Center for the Study of Theology at the University of Essex in England. Using both Hebrew (Old Testament) and Christian (New Testament) scriptures, he builds a construct for the majority of humans to accept the idea that animals have rights, indirectly; that God has rights in his creation. The goal of creation, in a teleological sense, is to "enjoy and live in peace with God in a state of perfect freedom." The case for rights-visions arises scripturally out of the book of Genesis, based on the covenant. Explaining that "dominion" means not destruction but stewardship, Linzey points out that humans were given the special task of helping God care for creatures. He disputes the traditional view that humans are divinely different, but believes that the scriptural basis for animal rights comes from Genesis. Linzey notes that almost every existing human rights rationale—legal, ethical, or religious—has been thoroughly examined from a rigorous theological perspective. The conclusion he has reached is that we have a responsibility to act for the welfare of animals, in recognition of their rights. This conclusion is a clear example of the way Linzey uses his knowledge of scripture to support his argument. He concludes by stating that the animal rights movement is a "calling" that we should all take on, and that by doing so, we will be fulfilling our duty to care for God's creatures.

An unshakable belief in the divine evidences itself throughout the book, but Linzey’s to his credit, has not taken on the role of a deity or prophet. He faces head-on the greatest stumbling blocks to animal rights. He acknowledges that "man is the beginning and end of women," and Linzey draws an apt parallel between the traditionally low status of both women and animals. But while the castigation rather severely (and sometimes rather sarcastically) follows clerics and other Christian men, the book is not disposable to animal suffering, he asks the reader not to judge them too hastily. In an intriguing chapter on scholastic theology, he wonders if perhaps the much-hated (by animal advocates) Rene Descartes was not just trying to vindicate God from a "potential charge of injustice or indifference" by "dispensing with pain and suffering in the animal world" through his denial of nonhuman rationality and sentience. Linzey notes that almost every college textbook on human philosophy—several as well as religious—has dismissed absolutely the claims of animals, with atheism being as guilty of perpetuating speculation as Christianity. It is not so much that Christianity is in favor of animal oppression, he believes, but that the topic has never been seriously considered. The present-day challenge to modern Christians, he believes, is to become a "giving" rather than a "cruel" creature.

Linzey’s discussions cover much ground, yet there remain some problematic biblical passages (e.g., the sacrifices of Cain and Abel) that cannot be reconciled with humane concerns. Not one to advocate a literal or binding interpretation of the "inspired" texts, however, Linzey simply advises modern Christians to use the wisdom of the scriptures in conjunction with (and not in place of) their own developing moral sense.

In the latter part of the book, Linzey discusses means of dealing with the inevitable conflicts between humans and nonhumans, and offers a "plan of progressive disengagement from exploitation" of animals. Anticipating that many animal defenders will take exception to his gradualism, he cautions, "The enemy of progress is the view that everything must be changed before some real gains can be secured."

Christianity and the Rights of Animals is a book enlightening. Animal rights advocates of the Christian persuasion may find in the book a theological vindication of their concern for animals. For those who may have left their church in protest over its callous disregard for animals, may find in the book some hope or solace. Christianity and the Rights of Animals belongs in every church library and on the bookshelves of all serious animal defenders.

—Kim Bartlett

The book can be ordered for $12.95 post-paid from the International Society for Animal Rights, 421 South State St., Clarksville, PA 18411.

Understanding the World Around Us

Man and the Natural World

By Keith Thomas

Houghton Mifflin, Books 1983 $19.95 cloth, 426 pages

Keith Thomas joins the number of historians who challenge human attitudes toward animals and the rest of nature. With great clarity and extensive, detailed footnotes, Thomas leads us through the changes of consciousness that took place in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This was the period when the industrial revolution was gathering pace. It was during this time that the foundations were laid in the Western world for understanding animal and the Natural World is not simply an historical curiosity of no relevance to a late twentieth-century animal rights campaign, but a pervading glimpse into the attitudes of our forebears, revealing why our callous attitudes toward animals remain so irreligious. Thomas shows that in the centuries leading up to Britain's Industrial Revolution, there existed a somewhat non-historical and compassionate attitude towards animals and nature. With a masterly use of original materials, Thomas presents a view of the world that is rarely seen, and often highly amusing. This vision reveals the existence of many ordinary people to live more peacefully within the natural world’s gross commercial and calculated exploitation of animals in factory farms and vivisection laboratories.

In the final chapter entitled "The Human Dilemma," Thomas presents us with a series of choices that urgently summit our future. We can face either a new culture or extinction. It is left to future time to decide which we will choose. Unfortunately, while Thomas speaks of the "contradiction upon which modern civilization can be said to rest," he concludes "its ultimate consequences we can only speculate.

While offering or interest in offering specific answers to today's problems such as vivisection or factory farming, I do hope to provide insight into the importance of ensuring that we recognize this book will emerge a more knowledgeable and understanding person, therefore becoming a better animal rights advocate.

—Kim Skillwood

The minister is executive director of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals.
Regulating Lab Animal Abuse

Effective Animal Care and Use Committees

Edited by E. Barbara Orleans, Richard C. Simmonds, and W. Ivan Dodds
American Association for Laboratory Animal Science in collaboration with the Scientists Center for Animal Welfare (SCAW), 1987
Order from the SCAW, 3805 St. Elmo Ave., Bethesda, MD 20814
(softcover version out of print, but available in libraries as special issue of Laboratory Animal Science, January, 1987)

few exceptions, any institution that conducts research on nonhuman animals is legally required to establish an “animal care and use committee” (ACUC) to oversee the care and use of animals in that facility. An ACUC has several responsibilities, including inspecting the facility’s laboratories and animal quarters and reviewing proposals to conduct research (a procedure known as protocol review). ACUCs are mandated by the Drug/Animal amendments to the Animal Welfare Act and by the Health Research Ex-
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tervention Act. The latter applies to research funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the nation’s largest funder of biomedical research. Both of these legislative mandates were enacted in 1985.

Before passage of this Federal legislation, many facilities already had committees that oversaw the care and/or use of research animals. However, many of these committees were primarily inspection, poorly formulated, or nominal at best. To remedy this situation, the Scien-
tists Center for Animal Welfare (SCAW) held a timely series of workshops during 1984 and 1985 to explore ways in which these committees could operate effectively. Five universities hosted these workshops: Johns Hopkins University, Michigan State University, the University of Southern California, the University of Colorado, and the University of Toronto. Most of the speakers were scientists, veterinarians, and administrators involved in research, but some were ethicists and animal protectionists. Effective Animal Care and Use Committees is a collection of selected papers presented at these workshops.

The volume opens with SCAW’s recommenda-
tions on running effective ACUCs, which are a valuable distillation of the convenors that emerged from the workshops. The bulk of the book is divided into sections: 1) current policies on animal care and use com-
mittees in the US and Canada; 2) objectives and procedures of animal care and use committees; 3) committee protocol and animal pain, 4) roles of committee members; 5) ethical perspectives on care and use committees; 6) training of laboratory staff; and 7) conclusions.

This material provides an excellent introduction to the subject and should be read by everyone serving or considering serving on these committees. As the editors note though, the presentations on national policies are somewhat outdated, given the recent legislative changes mentioned above. This flaw is unfortunate but only a minor drawback to an otherwise all-useful book.

Readers of THE ANIMALS’ ALIEN should be particularly interested in the contribution of Joan Draper Horrander, Pro-
Actors and Others for Animals, entitled “Reflections of a Public Member.” Joan Clark, a prominent Canadian for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, organized a blind animal research lab and actual sale to a private individual for $12,000. Rescued by the Ontario SPCA, her home was

Readers should also be aware that any private citizen, not just those affiliated with a committee or other institution, who research, is eligible to serve on these committees. Both laws mandating ACUCs’ require at least one committee member to be unaf-

filiated with the institution. The Animal Welfare Act goes even further, stating that this member is “intended to provide representation for general community inter-

ests in the proper care and treatment of animals.”

Committees are only as good as the people who serve on them. Some ACUCs are charmed examples of the pitfalls of self-regulation, with committee members rubber-stamping research protocols and turning a blind eye during inspections. However, others are making sincere efforts to mitigate the effects of research on the animals. Dallas S. Sanger, director of the Animal Rights, the USDA eventually took over part of the Oregon’s “fixed” policies and then finally the fate of the animals is unknown.

A young chimpanzee named Bartholomew has recently been the focus of a new project that’s getting under way. The study, which is led by the Taronga Zoo in Sydney in Australia as bringing stock, Bartholomew was sold to a dealer a year later for $6,000 and resold to the Hollywood Animal Rental Inc. for $5000.

One other destination of surplus primates has a high media profile. Over the past decade, Dr. Joan Mary Willard of Helping Hands in Boston has placed an average of one trained primate per year with quadruplets. The Leslie Brummell Rehabilitation Center of Mon-
tral recently established the Seneca Training Institute of Quebec to undertake a parallel program. In August of 1987 they experimented their first trip, an eight-year-old capuchin monkey from the Granby Zoo named Felix. They plan to have 25 primates trained to help the disabled and handicapped by 1991.

But while entertainment and “helping hands” programs make headlines, medical research really does claim the majority of surplus zoo primates. Until recently, lab sales were usually arranged through a monthly newsletter called Private Supply Information Clearinghouse, published by the University of Washington’s Regional Primate Research Center in Seattle with financial support from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Most of the primates listed are being exchanged among labs. However, listings that have appeared in the last year are: 17 accredited zoos (Baltimore, Detroit, San Diego, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis), 5 unaccredited zoos (Roy Santa Barbara, Utah, Salt Lake City, Philadelphia, and Buffalo), 1 in the University of Connecticut, and the Department of Agriculture’s Laboratory Animal Facility.
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These Canadian moose have room to frolic in their habitat enclosure.

A long-term problem forecast

between economic constraints and the necessity of conserving gene pools, Swett acknowledges a problem. “We used to have a situation with zoos where breeding was pretty much accidental. If one of a species died, the zoo would import another one, wild-caught. When wild animals became more scarce and expensive, great emphasis was placed on breeding. Now it’s the thing to publish papers on successful breeding. Breeding is still prestigious, but there’s absolutely no place for male youngsters in most of the zoos they come from.” There is a greater value in keeping females than males, because one male “breeder” can inseminate an infinite number of females.

Since conserving the gene pool of any given species requires a zoo population of 100 to 300, “less than 1,000 species could be cared for on a long-term basis with current technology and facilities,” warns New York Zoological Society director William Conaway. Based on his experience at the Bronx Zoo, Conaway believes zoos can handle an annual reproduction rate of 15 percent. Anything more exceeds the mortality rate. Without more and better facilities, Conaway feels culling is unavoidable. Without better alternatives, culling more and more means killing. But, he admits, “The very idea of culling conflicts with what zoos are all about: the study, appreciation, and conservation of wild animals.”
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advertsied in Clearinghouse are the tip of the iceberg. Usually zoos will sell their surplus primates quietly. For example, the London Zoological Society sent surplus primates to two medical labs without public knowledge until someone anonymously leaked copies of the bills of sale. “There are more surplus chimps going to research than we know about,” McCreae asserts.

Wallace Swett, director of Primarily Primates, is more cautious. “There is a hard core of zoo directors who still believe in selling animals to biomedical research, but the majority don’t believe in it.” He points out that AZA’s policy discourages it. “But zoos are still selling lots of surplus animals to dealers.” Swett continues, and even the most well-known dealers will sell to almost anybody. I’m very skeptical if a zoo director tells me he has ethically placed an animal when the animal has been sold to a dealer. This is especially true of primates, he says, “because the only real markets for chimps and orangutans now are entertainment and biomedical research, and they’re only useful in entertainment until they’re five or six years old. After that they get too hard to handle.” Primarily Primates has received surplus primates directly from zoos. So have several similar shelters—but, like the zoos, the shelters are crowded.

Preventing births

The obvious answer is animal birth control. Castration and sexual segregation have been practiced by farmers for 30,000 years. Fertility-blocking implants have been available since the mid-1970s. But birth control has drawbacks. One is that it might further constrict the gene pool for endangered species. Chisholm notes that lion cubs of diverse genetic stock are now worth $400 apiece, where a few years ago they were “worthless” because so many lions were sterilized during the 1970s. Now, he says, the lion population of genetically desirable lions is fast aging beyond their reproductive prime.

Another drawback of birth control, argues Swett, is that “sterilization of animals, particularly primates, causes rejection in colonies by their own kind.” Primarily Primates practices sexual segregation, which Swett claims works well because the majority of primates “during part of the year form all-male or all-female groups in their native habitat.” If segregated too long, however, animals may never learn reproductive behavior.
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Merrill Clifton is an environmental journalist living in Vermont.
Continued from page 49
Declaring in the November 1987 issue, I am too disagreeable to declaring in principle, but there are times when it is justifiable. Simply it is better than self, think of the cat to a shelter, or abandoning or euthanizing him or her. Declaring, when performed by a qualified veterinarian, should not be more traumatic than any other surgical procedure; otherwise is of particular importance, however.
—Laura Binder
Ottawa, Ont., Canada

Gluetrap Rescue
I work as a bookkeeper in a large grocery store, and last night I rescued a little mouse from a horrible death. All my fellow workers know of my love for all animals, and they told me about a little mouse trapped in a glue trap. Some of them wanted to put the poor thing out of his misery, but I decided to get him unstuck. It took some doing, but I very carefully got him off the glue trap. Being careful not to hurt his little feet, I got his face off first and kept it on a damp paper towel so that he wouldn’t get retracted. It took about 15 minutes to free him. When I finished, I washed him off with water and took him home. He cleaned off the little bit of glue remaining on his hind feet. I’m very happy to say that he is fine now.
—Randy Chernillo
Beachwood, NJ

Refuge Residents Need Protection
The Newsline article in the November 1987 issue about our local natural wildlife refuge provides some insights into what animals must — you pass alert.
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The ANIMALS’ AGENDA welcomes letters from readers, but briefly succinctly-addressed messages are more likely to get published. Please try to restrict letters to 250 words (double-spaced, typed pages). We reserve the right to edit all letters. Address them to LETTERS, The ANIMALS’ AGENDA, PO. Box 5234, Westport, CT 06881.

Dear Mr. President,

I write to express my concern about the increasing use of animals in research. As a caring individual, I believe that it is important to balance the needs of scientific advancement with the welfare of animals. I urge your administration to support initiatives that promote the ethical treatment of animals in research.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

State Support at Demos
When attending large national demonstrations, activists should consider noting the state they come from on the signs they bring. For example, “PENN-SYLVANIA SAYS: Stop Funding Psychol- ogical Experiments!”, “New York activists will know the diversity of support for the protest. Photographers of demonstrators can be sent to their local newspapers after the event along with a write-up of the protest. This form of media coverage is more interested in covering faraway events if there is some local connection.

—Virginia Rate
Springville, MD

A Visit to Woolworth’s
Today I was in our local Woolworth’s store and saw a small fish was being flown loose in the store. None of the people working there made any effort to help the bird or place him or her back in the cage. A boy of about 12 years of age was trying to hit the bird with a huge bag of candy. When I asked the manager what was going on, he said the woman who normally takes care of the birds had staff the cash register. Finally, because of my persistence, he phoned her to come get the fish. She arrived with a net to catch the bird, but her effort failed — in part, I think, because she was not trained in care for such small creatures. She ended up going back to the register, leaving the fish still flying about.

—Laura Binder
New York, NY

LETTERS

That’s what Survival Line is all about. A cruelty-free mail order company that sells products you need for you, your family, and your home. Our speciality is housewares, household cleaners, hair care, accessories, and lots more. NO TESTED ON ANIMALS! Our over 300-page catalog is free. Call now for your free sample. The Survival Line
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I write to express my concern about the increasing use of animals in research. As a caring individual, I believe that it is important to balance the needs of scientific advancement with the welfare of animals. I urge your administration to support initiatives that promote the ethical treatment of animals in research.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

State Support at Demos

When attending large national demonstrations, activists should consider noting the state they come from on the signs they bring. For example, “PENN-SYLVANIA SAYS: Stop Funding Psychological Experiments!”, “New York activists will know the diversity of support for the protest. Photographers of demonstrators can be sent to their local newspapers after the event along with a write-up of the protest. This form of media coverage is more interested in covering faraway events if there is some local connection.

—Virginia Rate
Springville, MD

A Visit to Woolworth’s

Today I was in our local Woolworth’s store and saw a small fish was being flown loose in the store. None of the people working there made any effort to help the bird or place him or her back in the cage. A boy of about 12 years of age was trying to hit the bird with a huge bag of candy. When I asked the manager what was going on, he said the woman who normally takes care of the birds had staff the cash register. Finally, because of my persistence, he phoned her to come get the fish. She arrived with a net to catch the bird, but her effort failed — in part, I think, because she was not trained in care for such small creatures. She ended up going back to the register, leaving the fish still flying about.

—Laura Binder
New York, NY

LETTERS

That’s what Survival Line is all about. A cruelty-free mail order company that sells products you need for you, your family, and your home. Our speciality is housewares, household cleaners, hair care, accessories, and lots more. NO TESTED ON ANIMALS! Our over 300-page catalog is free. Call now for your free sample. The Survival Line

WHAT’S NEW?

Gluetrap Rescue

I work as a bookkeeper in a large grocery store, and last night I rescued a little mouse from a horrible death. All my fellow workers know of my love for all animals, and they told me about a little mouse trapped in a glue trap. Some of them wanted to put the poor thing out of his misery, but I decided to get him unstuck. It took some doing, but I very carefully got him off the glue trap. Being careful not to hurt his little feet, I got his face off first and kept it on a damp paper towel so that he wouldn’t get retracted. It took about 15 minutes to free him. When I finished, I washed him off with water and took him home. He cleaned off the little bit of glue remaining on his hind feet. I’m very happy to say that he is fine now.

—Randy Chernillo
Beachwood, NJ

Refuge Residents Need Protection

The Newsline article in the November 1987 issue about our local natural wildlife refuge provides some insights into what animals must — you pass alert.
CLASSIFIED

MERCHANTISE


DOG, CAT, BIRD LOVERS! See why our customers from New England to Australia love our products! Free sportswear. Free information: EME, Box 28426-AA, Seattle, WA 98118

VEGETARIAN NUTRITION

ANIMAL POWERS, warnings Handcrafted, multi-food signed and dated. Wonderful! Over 200 designs, from $5 to $25. For complete catalog, send $2.00 to: Ralph Viol Cramer Etudes, Box 1162, Menlo Park, CA 94025.

FREERURAL VEGETARIAN HOME AND PERSONAL CARE products. Free catalog. Humane Alternative Products, 8 Hutton Street, Concord, NH 03301.

PET-CAT FARMER, female farm, free brochure. Call for free info: 703-327-3192

FREE GOOD HOME Brochure for CAT LOVERS ONLY

FREE PET BARN, free designs. Send 50¢ to: 706 DEP 5, 309 10222, Maspallos FL 33712

CRAZY-TRUE "PROFESSIONAL" POWDERED LAUNDRY COMPOUND NOT LESS THAN USING SUPERMARKET LAUNDRY DETERGENTS Satisfaction guaranteed. Ten years we have produced home care products for people who are concerned about our animals. Write for free brochure: HOME SERVICE PRODUCTS COMPANY, P.O. Box 269, Round Rock, TX 78680.

PROGRESSIVE PRODUCTS FOR ANIMAL ACTIVISTS FROM TRANSPARENT UNLIMITED & M.A.R.E. Quality teatums, butts, buns, penstackers, books, and education materials. Also full range of cruelty-free household products. All sales support T.V. work. Free brochure: P.O. Box 1553, Willimantic, CT 06226.

HELP STOP THE TORTURE OF MILLIONS OF ANIMALS

FOR THOSE CONCERNED INDIVIDUALS who want to buy cruelty-free cosmetics, hair products, and household products but find it all too difficult. We offer the lowest prices available and will deliver to all of us. Fully guaranteed or your money back. Send $1 for catalog: A Clear Choice, 612 West Lane, Magnolia, TX 77355, (713) 364-7031.

CLASSIFIED

NATURAL BRAND PRODUCTS FOR PEOPLE WHO CARE ABOUT THEIR ENVIRONMENT AND THE ANIMALS IN IT. A liquid laundry detergent free of dress, perfumes, alkalis and phosphates. Other home care products. ALL CREWTRUTH. Send for free catalog: NATURALI, P.O. Box 379, Fremont, MI 49030-0379.

WEAR-NEATHER LESS SHOES. Join the thousands of men and women who want to make the world better for animals. Free catalog: Heartland Products, Ltd., Box 218, Dakota City, IA 51529.

CELEBRATE YOUR SENSES! Healing, beautifying, affordable Aromatherapy for skin care and body care. All natural, cruelty-free. Free catalog: Purely Natural Body Care, 68853 Norcross Creek Road, Berkleydale, OH 44016.

FREE VEGAN CATALOG—TOKU CHOCOLATE, powdered cockroaches, ovals, video cassette tapes, luscious artwork, inspiring poems, novels. Castle World, P.O. Box 1458, Umatilla, FL 32784.


animallove

ALL-NATURAL PRODUCTS FOR OUR FOUR-FOOTED FRIENDS

FREE DEP APE CATALOG, greenpeace, Dept. 14, P.O. Box 1613, Crystal Lake, IL 60014

THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF UTAH offers shelter, adoption, sterilizations, vaccinations, cruelty investigation education. Help us to continue! 6163 So. 8000 W., Salt Lake City, UT 84120.

BOOK ANTHROPOLOGY: NATURE AND ANIMALS YEARS OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH: A book that will help you to take care of your animals better. Send $3.00 to: P.O. Box 2597, 7244 Seward, Sacramento, CA 95824.

YOU CAN HELP AT THE NATIONAL ABOMINAL SHEET HUNTING on July 4th, 6:30 PM. Send your name, address, and phone number to usa.love, 429 Beech Street, Boston, MA 02110

THE RHODE ISLAND ANIMAL RIGHTS COALITION: Tell corporations and law enforcement agencies across the country that S.A.L.F.E. is the only property device of its kind. Send $1.00 to: P.O. Box 1063, Providence, RI 02909 (401) 783-1570.

PRIMARILY PRIMATES, INC. is a unique animal sanctuary that donates its time and care to hundreds of non-releasable wild animals and birds that are often abused, abandoned or "unavailable." Within the last year and a half, the sanctuary has decided it's occupancy, Donors, volunteers and support of all types are always needed. All donations are tax deductible. For more information write: Primarily Primates, Inc., P.O. Box 32306, San Antonio, TX 78212.

CAREGIVING NEEDED for two healthy, beautiful bunnies. Domesticated. Call (207) 776-6509 or write: Jenny O’Neill, 12 Willow Street, South Portland, ME 04106. Will deliver anywhere.

PENNSYLVANIA ANIMAL ACTIVISTS WANTED! We are building a network by state legislative district. Join us! Contact Mobilization for Animals, 6887, Pittsburgh, PA 15212. (412) 301-4623.

HELP BAD ZOO IN WATERFORD, NY. Animals in small cages on a cement floor. Send for postcards to send to mayor in protest. Stamp necessary. Specify quantity. P.O. Box 428, Watervliet, NY 12186-0428.

ACTION VOLUNTEERS FOR ANIMALS is a strong animal rights group based in Toronto, Canada. We are the only Canadian group with an anti-fur message in the subway system. Join and help us grow. 3 Brockfield Road, Willowdale, Ontario M3G 1L1, CANADA. (416) 481-9461.

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

TATTOOING, BEST PROTECTION AVAILABLE for pets against loss, theft, rabies, etc. Use 99¢, documented recoveries. Join Tattoo-A-Pet world’s largest since 4972. You can provide this service in your area. Easy to paint or take two minutes. Write for more information: P.O. Box 20, 1625 E. Senator Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11235.

Slaughter of the Innocent by Hans Roscher, (citrus), revised 1983. Regularly $1.95. On Sale for $2.95 postpaid. Based on the premise that vivisection is scientific fraud, Roscher explains how medical technology is hindered rather than helped by animal experiments.

Please send me a copy of Slaughter of the Innocent at $2.95 each. (For residents of New York residents add 7.5% sales tax)

Address
City
State
ZIP

Slaughter of the Innocent

SAV-A-LIFE DEER LERT

This unique animal warning system installs easily on your deer feeder or苗ard to help warn the local authorities, corporations and law enforcement agencies across the country. S.A.L.E.F.E. is the only patented device of its kind. Don’t be fooled by cheap no-smoking warnings. Ask about our special order programs for your group or organization.

Please send me:

SAV-A-LIFE DEER LERT.

$10 for one device plus $1.00 for postage and handling charge.

17700 2F Rd., P.O. Box 104, Estes Park, Colorado 80517

(303) 586-4861
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SPECIAL PRICE! HANS ROESCH

SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENT

Slaughter of the Innocent
### Classified

#### Publications

BOOKS, OUT OF PRINT AND RARE on reptiles, birds, mammals, insects, fish etc. Over 4000 items listed. Send $5.00 for postage to: The Reptile Search Service, 187 East Santa Barbara Road, Lindenlark, NY 10937.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE LOCAL ENDANGER, an alternative publication serving Northern California. We can assist those interested in forming their own newspaper, as well as publishing articles submitted by people throughout the nation. $35/year, all proceeds from sales to fund the publication.

### Employment
IN DEFENSE OF ANIMALS seeks an administrative assistant to the President. Must have good organizational skills, writing and public relations skills. Salary negotiable. Contact: In Defense of Animals, (617) 923-4434.

TRANS-SPECIES UNLIMITED is seeking exciting opportunities for committed, hard-working activists to join staff at national office. Movement experience essential. Write: TSO, P.O. Box 8533, Williamsport, PA 17703.

### Personal
VEGETARIAN SINGLE STILL SEEKING that special friend? Meet compatible vegans nationwide. Write for full details: Vego-Dates, Box XL 4228, Laramie, WY 82071.

### Services
IF YOUR TATTOO IS FADING...or you want it to look better, the professional tattoo artists at SNO-TATTOO's will help you. Send for free sample pack or call (212) 692-9301.

### Education
SQUAW MOUNTAIN ACTIVIST TRAINING RETREAT, a weekend transport, occurring twice per month and teaching lobbying, networking, media outreach, fundraising and vegan cooking. For information call (206) 794-9230.

### Original Animal Cards
Whether you're a radical vegetarian, a laid-back animal rightist, or just crazy about animals, we've got the cards to suit your needs.

Send $1.00 for brochure and SAMPLE CARD to:

K. T KREATIONS, Dept AA
245 Stevens St, Lowell, MA 01851

---

### Animals Need a Strong Voice—Your Pledge Can Give Them One.

Publishing a magazine is expensive, and steady financial support from our readers is crucial for survival and steady growth. **Animals' Agenda** Sustainers support this magazine and keep it alive and growing by pledging $50, $100, $250 or more per year. If you believe in the need for the independent clearinghouse of information for the growing animal rights movement and have the financial capability to help us in this way, please make your pledge today by sending in the coupon below. You can send your pledge in at one time, or elect to send it in quarterly installments.

All contributions to **The Animals' Agenda** are tax-deductible. Sustainers receive a quarterly **PUBLISHER'S REPORT** detailing progress with the magazine.

- [ ] Sign me up as an **Animals' Agenda** Sustainer.
- [ ] $100
- [ ] $250
- [ ] $500
- [ ] $1000
- [ ] More

(We'll send quarterly statements for the remainder. Minimum pledge for bookkeeping purposes is $50.)

Name _____________________________
Address ____________________________
City __________________ State ______ Zip ______

**The Animals' Agenda** Sustainers, P.O. Box 5934, Westport, CT 06881

---

### Walkathon for Lab Animals
You can help raise money to finance and develop non-animal alternatives for lab research. Last year's walkathon raised $22,800 for continued work on polio vaccine tests without monkeys.

PAIN: MORE THAN FLESH AND BLOOD CAN BEAR

Ssat, April 30 at 10 AM
2nd & Riverside Drive, NYC
For information and sponsor forms: Call (212) 242-0390 or 628-0959

American Fund for Alternatives to Animal Research (AFAR)
139 9th St., PME, New York, NY 10013

---

### Advertisement

**SNO-E TOFU**
A tasty option to drinking MILK!

Wholesale Prices Through Direct Mail

Only $1.25/2 Qt.

NO Cholesterol!
LOW in Calories!
LOW Fat and Salt!
NO Dairy Allergies!

IT REALLY LOOKS AND TASTES LIKE MILK!

For today's health conscious consumers, SNO-E TOFU BEVERAGE is the perfect option to drinking milk. It's economical, nutritious, very high in calcium, and it TASTES INCREDIBLE! SNO-E TOFU is available in regular and delicious tasting cocoa flavor.

**FREE SAMPLE**

We're so confident that you will love the taste of this revolutionary beverage, that -- for a limited time -- we will send you a No-Quibble sample packet of the regular flavor FREE -- plus nutritional and order information.

Include a $3 check or money order for shipping and handling (USA orders only).

Make checks payable and mail to:

Abercrombie Foods
3240 Explorer Drive, Dept. A38
Sacramento, CA 95827

SNO-E TOFU is unconditionally guaranteed.

---
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No Animal By-Products
No Animal Testing

Until now, all hair care products had to rely on animal protein ingredients to ensure a good source of body and shine.

Now, after years of careful research, Jojoba Farms is extremely proud to offer a pure vegetable protein ingredient which produces the same beautiful body, luster and shine without any animal by-products whatsoever.

Jojoba Farms is committed to bringing you the safest, purest, highest quality products for skin and hair. Your customers will appreciate the extra care of Jojoba Farms.