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Kindness Still Counts

How many animal advocates know that Be Kind to Animals Week has been observed the first full week of May since 1957? That makes it the oldest designated week on the calendar. The concept of a time to focus on the nonhuman world began about 1910 with a campaign by animal protectors to persuade churches to sermonize about kindness to animals. "Merry Sunday," the idea didn't prove popular with the clergy. Instead, the annual convocation of the American Humane Association (AHA) in 1916, a nationwide movement to establish a "Humane Sunday" and a "Be Kind to Animals Week" was born. Humane Sunday was to concern itself with kindly treatment of both animals and children, with the following week devoted only to animals. A vigorous campaign began with special ceremonies, formed viable alternatives to the use of animals for accomplishing the goal in each state, and after the first observance the following year, it was declared a big success. AHA is still the sponsor of Be Kind to Animals Week.

As we near the end of the century, the word "kind" has fallen into disuse within the humane community, and instead we talk about the more sophisticated concepts of "respect" and "compassion." Talk of being kind to animals seems a little corny these days. Perhaps it's a bit bizarre that a society which condemns daily atrocities against animals would designate a week to honor the virtue of being kind to them. Nevertheless, Be Kind to Animals week is, and we should be glad to have it. Thinking of ways to capitalize on it shouldn't be difficult: What better reason is there for asking the mayor for a proclamation? Or how about asking the public library for display space? Or approaching school principals or teachers with an offer to speak to students about animal issues? Or requesting an editorial in the local newspaper? The creative possibilities are many.

In this issue

It's been almost three years since Don Barnes began talking about his involvement with a movie going into production about primate research. Because of Don's background (he spent sixteen years performing medical and surgical procedures on nonhuman primates for the U.S. Air Force), the producers sought his technical advice.

So well, Project X is finished, and it made a powerful statement against animal research. It will undoubtedly deepen a impression on everyone who sees it, and bring new animal advocates into the fold. However, we boycott the film: it must face the fact that real chimpanzees look different in the movie. The animals were not abused during filming, but it is possible—in the opinion of primate experts—that objectionable methods were used in training them for the performance.

According to Wally Swett of Primarily Primates, the sanctuary where the chimps now live, all the animals evidenced some degree of psychological damage for which they are undergoing rehabilitation. But they will live out the remainder of their lives in the semi-natural environment provided by Primarily Primates. Had they not been used in the movie, they would still be in the laboratories and zoo from which they were bought for their roles in Project X. Though we don't approve of the exploitation of any animals, we recognize that the performances by those particular animals are a full two other chimps held captive in research laboratories, and other species as well.

The appearance of strong pro-animal messages in popular culture media like motion pictures may prompt rapid and long-term growth of modern society's much repressed sense of unity with the rest of nature.

Meeting our deadlines

We often receive irate phone calls and letters from activists and organizations who wonder why their announcements and news items weren't printed the same month they were sent in. They do not understand that THE ANIMALS' AGENDA's deadline is the first week in May for our May issue. Postmarks are not acceptable changes to The ANIMALS' AGENDA. Addressee changes to THE ANIMALS' AGENDA, P.O. Box 5274, Westport, CT 06881.

Typography by Alphabet Soup, Fairfield, CT.
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Editor's Note: A fund similar to the one you suggest already exists. The American Fund for Alternatives to Animal Research (AFAR) gives grants to scientists for developing alternatives. Write AFAR at 275 West 12th St., Suite 36, New York, NY 10011.

Incentives Needed to Speed Alternatives Search

It seems to me that we could all contribute to the compilation of a list of experiments conducted on animals with specific details of what kind of research they are trying to accomplish. Next, we could publish the list and suggest that people contribute to a fund which we could create for each experiment. The fund would then be used as prize money for the scientist or organization which can come up with viable alternatives to the use of animals for accomplishing the goal in which we are trying to obtain. It would make sense that the more these experiments, the more people would contribute to this fund and, therefore, the greater the incentive for searching for alternatives. This would also constitute an official invitation to good science to participate in the animal movement which, in my opinion, is an essential step toward reaching solutions.

I realize that alternatives already exist in many cases, and that the management and adjudication of the funds would not be without problems, but perhaps it is worth consideration.

—Dr. Linus Vereen University of Oregon Eugene, OR


The bottom line of the whole issue of vivisection is simple: we already know that torturing animals is an immorality which should not be tolerated by any civilized society, but since the justification advanced by the researchers for using animals in not a moral one but rather a "scientific" one ("animal research saves human lives," "all medical breakthroughs are due to vivisection", etc.), the whole issue boils down to this question: "Does animal experimentation work? The answer should be simple: either it works or it doesn't. If it doesn't work, it is a scientific method based upon true science. It should be crystal clear to anyone that it works. But this is not the case. The health situation in this country—and in most countries in the world—is a disaster.

The message of "Hidden Crimes" is that animal research cannot work simply because experimental research involving life cannot work. You cannot reproduce disease in a laboratory animal in the same way that you would in a human. In assuming that you can reproduce what you do not understand—and then compare it to the disease that appeared spontaneously in a different species. But experimental research cannot work with the same species either. If we were to give cancerous tumors to a healthy human being, these tumors could never compare to the tumors which grow spontaneously within another human being.

Besides, animals used in labs are often other things that make them different from us—quadrupeds, which obviously affects not only the skeletal structure and physiology but also their cardiovascular, circulatory and nervous systems. One reason which makes them themselves is that they have more alternative methods for which we could create a list of experiments that we could fund for each experiment. The fund would then be used as prize money for the scientist or organization which can come up with viable alternatives to the use of animals for accomplishing the goal in which we are trying to obtain. It would make sense that the more these experiments, the more people would contribute to this fund and, therefore, the greater the incentive for searching for alternatives. This would also constitute an official invitation to good science to participate in the animal movement which, in my opinion, is an essential step toward reaching solutions.

I realize that alternatives already exist in many cases, and that the management and adjudication of the funds would not be without problems, but perhaps it is worth consideration.

—Dr. Linus Vereen University of Oregon Eugene, OR

A Mailbox Stuffed With Mailings

As a regular contributor to several animal rights and environmental organizations, I'd like to make a general comment regarding the cost effectiveness of these groups.

On curiosity; I saved all my mail for six months. In that time, I received 14 letters asking me to help stop dog and cat slaughter in Southeast Asia despite my having responded to the first letter. One group must have really wanted me to have a merry Christmas; it sent me four cards wishing me one. One group has sent me enough panda bear stickers to paper a good-sized room. From another received sweeps entry forms. And so on.

I truly appreciate the valuable work those organizations do, and I'm happy to contribute what I can, when I can. But it's frustrating to see contributions wasted on excessive repeat mailings with pre-stamped envelopes I won't use. Further more, if I want the prizes offered in a sweepstakes, I'll buy them. I'd rather see animal groups spend their money helping animals.

—Linda DeFolliet Madison, WI

SUSTAINERS 1987


A VOICE FOR CHANGE:

Country Joe McDonald now rose to fame in the 60’s with a protest song, “I Feel Like-I’m Fisin-To-Die Rag.” According to McDonald, “that humans treat animals the same way we treat our human enemies. The war against coyotes as predators is a parallel to the war against the National Liberation Front in Vietnam. The tools are the same—guns, flame throwers, poisons. We are waging a war on animals, the land, and each other with the same attitude.”

McDonald’s awareness of war began at an early age. “My mother is Jewish and I grew up with full knowledge of the Holocaust and World War II.” His parents subscribed to a lot of radical left newspapers, so I was aware of conflicts in America with blacks and with the labor movement. I saw the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) and Nazis. I observed the battle between capitalism and communism, imperialism and anti-imperialism, as a form of war—although not military. I saw the military as an extension of government and a source of enforcement of its status quo.”

Robert Jay Lifton, in his book Home from the War described McDonald as “the unofficial Poet Laureate of the Vietnam generation.” The 1965 “I Feel Like-I’m Fisin-To-Die Rag” carried the message of the futility and stupidity of war. McDonald spent seven years doing everything he could think of to end the Vietnam War, even to the detriment of his musical career. He has since emerged as a voice for the Vietnam veteran.

It wasn’t until years later that he realized that he was a veteran. He had spent three years in the early 60’s in Japan as a flight dispatch clerk. “My service time fell into the Vietnam era, so part of what I had done had, in effect, supported the war. It’s one thing to empathize with someone’s problem, and another thing to realize you are part of the problem. I also came to realize that my view of war—particularly with regard to the role of women in war—was incorrect. I discovered that women have always participated in war.

“When you realize your mindset is incorrect,” said McDonald, “to remain sane, the rule is change or perish. I believe it’s important to make sure your philosophy and rules for behavior respect all life. Give it a rest. Is my action racist, sexist, speciesist? We have to address the sexism in our language. Our usage of ‘mankind’ and ‘mankind’ as generic pronouns is incorrect. We can’t use oppressive language to describe a nonoppressive philosophy such as animal rights. If our concerns about language are not examined, our ethic is weak.”

McDonald first became involved in animal rights when a friend gave him a copy of Farley Mowat’s book A Whale for the Killing. “I found myself to be ignorant about a very important species,” he says. In 1973, McDonald wrote “Save the Whales” as part of his Paradigm shift at Ocean Veneur album. He met Paul Watson and Robert Hunter in Vancouver, and they asked him to do some singing for Greenpeace. The next year he went to New Zealand and Australia, and met later with the Whales groups there. He would arbitrarily learn about one animal or another and write another song.” His album Animal Tracks, produced in England by ANIMUS, contains songs about animals and the environment. According to McDonald, “the animal rights movement is the most radical group at the moment, and will remain fairly exotic for the rest of this century.”

“I have a fairly nonromantic approach to anti-vivisection stimulated by knowledge I got from work with vets and studies of war.” He claims, “In studying combatants—that is, people whose job it is to kill—it has been found that the more a soldier kills, the less a soldier will kill. The nature of the job puts the person out of a job. A person can only be a combatant for a limited period of time before a mindset appears. The person will disconnect from the job and become dysfunctional, functionally insane. With deprogramming, this person will survive psychologically and return to society. If, however, a person continues to kill after experiencing doubt about what they are doing, psychosis will occur or psychophysiological dysfunction, such as uokers or cancer.”

“When we observe, we can observe the civilian counterpart that parallels combat in the military—those who take lives as a job to provide food, data, or products in slaughterhouses, medical research, product testing. As in war, the cost is not just in casualties, but also the combatants, refugees, and those asphyxiated in their families and communities. Killing is bad for everyone.

“It is now obvious to those in the health services that denial of feelings causes health problems. Those in jobs where inflicting pain and death is part of the daily task must deny the horror of their task. This denial as a coping technique is detrimental to the health of the person performing the job and those around them, causing cancer, ulcers, chemical dependency, in some cases. An intimate person full of denial is a lethal weapon and an expensive problem. It is a case of self-preservation to adopt an anti-vivisectionist philosophy. If you think animal research benefits you…”

PROFILES

My philosophy tend to be tempered with what is practical. I try to examine the repercussions of all my actions, passive as well as active. You can participate by killing by sitting still and paying taxes. Everything we do has an effect on the world. The main problem is that we don’t know the full extent of the effects of the actions of our existence. In order for us to be alive, other living things must die. We may lose ourselves if we don’t keep ourselves and as many other things alive as possible. Humans are the key to leading our lives in a way that is consistent with our philosophy. I’m still putting together my philosophy. It is not neatly packaged.

“As a child I raised animals and broke horses. We farmed in our backyard. I person-ally slaughtered animals for eating. I fished and cleaned fish. I think that people should be directly involved in those things that are necessary to sustain their own life and the lives of the people and animals in their care. I use as a guideline that I will only eat what I am willing to kill myself. I am seldom in the mood any-more to kill or prepare any fowl or mam-mals. I do eat fish. I have a problem eating eggs and milk because of factory farming. At the moment that is how I live. I cer-tainly not pure.

“Very few of us are pure and correct. Almost all of what we do is incorrect. We continue on until the end.”
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The singer and friend during military service in Japan in the early sixties. Those were more in-nocent times.
A Discussion of Movement Finances

Much contention in America arises from an uneven distribution of assets among individuals. Nonetheless, unless we wish to overlook the foundation of our economic system, uneven distribution of assets will be forever with us. It is also a characteristic of our society that many worthy projects will always be unfunded or underfunded. The problem is that there are too many projects and not enough funds. Also, one person’s worthy project may not be someone else’s. One question that should be answered when evaluating choices made by funding sources is: “How differently could these sources allocate their funds?” The answer may surprise you.

Those who criticize well-endowed humane societies for not liberally sharing their reserve monies with smaller, less financially secure groups typically misunderstand the technical meaning of endowment and the legal restrictions and consequent fiduciary responsibilities of a governing Board of Directors. "Endowment" is the first of three basic components of a not-for-profit corporation's reserve fund. It provides "in perpetuity" to the corporation only those monies that are annually earned through investment. State Attorneys General (the overseers of compliance with nonprofit law) typically consider Boards irresponsible when they aggressively—rather than conservatively—invest endowment assets, since an aggressive strategy runs the risk of losing the initial endowment. As a consequence, many endowments are invested in fixed income securities. In today's fixed income market, this means approximately $607,000 in yearly spendable earnings for each $1 million invested. Thus, "huge" endowments are illusory; by law, their capital cannot be invaded and all that is available to the organization are annual earnings on conservative investments.

"Restricted" funds, the second component of a not-for-profit's reserve fund, are inhibited by the specificity of the giver. In many older humane societies, the giver's specificity often involves the care and treatment of dogs and cats, not animals generally. Many restricted funds solely support veterinary services and adoption programs. A Board of Directors is not legally empowered to use restricted monies for any other purpose than for what the donor indicated as a condition to the donation. The third component is a "general" fund, and this is comprised of donations that can be spent at the Board's discretion to the degree that the corporate charter and "statement of purpose" allow. Although most of us involved in the Board-mandated field of fundraising typically seek monies for a general fund, what the giver designates to the restricted fund or to the endowment is seldom turned away. And Boards frequently treat even general funds as endowment monies, giving their legal obligation to protect their respective organization's long-term fiscal well-being.

To say, therefore, that large humane organizations should divest their endowments is to give evidence of little or no understanding of what the legal constraints are on endowments and reserve funds generally, and the inherent fiduciary responsibilities of a Board of Directors to oversee the monies given to a specific organization for that organization and its existing and future programs.

The result: Many organizations do have some money which might well be allocated to projects undertaken by others. This determination, however, must be made on a case-by-case analysis and at the discretion of a legally constrained and thus appropriately cautious Board.

What some may see as a "scandal" may well be evidence of legally mandated fiscal behavior on the part of Board members and in the opinion of those state Attorneys General who review Board actions.

It is worth remembering that all of the so-called "wealthy" organizations were once themselves "grassroots". Last anyone looked, for the Local Treatment of Animals (PETA) itself now possessing a sizable reserve fund, is still considered by many as "grassroots". Some of those most upset by the uneven distribution of resources among humane societies...
Bill Manetti
Animal Rights Front
New Haven, Connecticut

A ll the handwringing over a splintered movement runs on the fact that disparity and conflict are not peculiar to our time, or our movement. A century and a half ago, for example, a nascent animal protection movement (embodied by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) occupied itself with interminable feeds over money, power, prestige, and political power. And two decades ago, we saw within the U.S. civil rights movement moral chicanery, rivalry, betrayal, and avarice at least equal to anything that exists within the animal rights movement.

This tells us that the sources of conflict within our movement transcend the movement. Resolution of conflict, therefore, requires actions distinct from, and in most cases broader than, animal rights activism. Even the question of whether the salaries drawn by the leadership of wealthy organizations are unjustifiably large is necessarily part of the more fundamental question of why—under our economic system—corporate CFO’s, military contractors, and brain surgeons (to name a few) make more money than the person who washes toilets for a living. That is an important question for animal rights activists, to be sure, but not one placing on them a special burden. We would be self-important if we believed otherwise.

Should we attempt to resolve conflict privately? Yes, but not always. However unpleasant washing our laundry in public may be, it is sometimes necessary if we are to avoid becoming a monolithic, incoherent, flaccid community like that of, say, the medical establishment. Granted, this may preclude unity. But unity is not essential to our success as a movement. Far from it. Success—in our or any other movement—depends on decentralization, as opposed to centralization. That means eliminating from the bottom up rather than the top down. It depends on diversity, not conformity, and it requires individual initiative, rather than paying large organizations to act on our behalf.

Where unity is not superfluous to these elements of success, it is injurious to them. What’s more, unity facilitates a grotesque concentration of power, it often prepares the way for turpitude and corruption.

Finally, the argument that wealthy organizations have a moral obligation to share resources with poor ones must be tempered with the knowledge that such entanglements often lead to suppression of dissent within the movement. Too, the argument itself encourages idolatry of money and overlooks the fact that, small, less well-funded organizations are almost always far more efficient than big, wealthy ones.

Thus our movement need not so much the poor organizations taking money from the wealthy ones as it does the wealthy organizations taking lessons from the poor ones.

Holly Jensen
Independent Activist
Gainesville, Florida

The current crisis in confidence is not a problem unique to this movement, but rather an accompanying aspect of professionalism. Three phases have been identified in the development of movements for social change. An understanding of this process is essential in appreciating how movements are often co-opted. The first is the spontaneous phase, and it is at this time that the movement is most energetic. In the second stage, the people organize themselves, and there may still remain a balance between energy and organization. The final phase involves the infusion of professionals and bureaucratization.

The structure which initially emerged to meet certain needs becomes an end in itself. Once it becomes entrenched, the focus shifts from use of service to self-service—with the foremost characteristic of maintaining, promoting, and expanding the organization.

There is a major division within the movement. On the one hand are the large entities with incredible expertise at fund-raising. Much of the money is used for stockmarket speculation (which may not be socially responsible). Their central activity involves massive mailouts telling of atrocities with the subliminal message “send us your money and we will absolve you from guilt”. They are mostly frequent by executives, who may surround themselves with admirers and have little contact with what’s really going on. The most financially rewarding jobs are usually filled by men. On the other side are the local groups who are doing the work. These are mostly operated from homes, and staffed by women who hold full-time jobs to fund their activities.

One of the most destructive aspects of centralization—and the often accompanying “hero worship” phenomenon—is that it encourages common individuals to have their work done through paid surrogates rather than getting involved themselves.

Centralized power should be used only to empower local groups. The well endowed organizations owe accountability. They have a moral obligation to refurnish monies into efforts which will make a difference.

HOLLY JENSEN

Coming Soon

• ANIMALS ARE USED BY THE MILITARY to test the effects of bombs, other explosives, chemical and biological weapons, and radiation. These animal experiments don’t pretend to be saving human lives—the object is to devise new means of killing people. Soon animals will be the first victims of advanced “Star Wars” weapons. They’ve been killed in war games since mustard gas was developed in the early 1900’s, and peace for the animals is nowhere in sight.

• VISITING A SLAUGHTERHOUSE is a disturbing experience for any sensitive person. A college student, sent to an abattoir on a journalism assignment, tells how he was changed by what he saw.

• ARE ELEPHANTS CAPABLE OF PRODUCING ART good enough to impress critics? The art world was surprised when Siri, an elephant kept in the circus zoo, started drawing—since creation of art has often been thought of as something uniquely human. Find out why zoo officials took away Siri’s paper and pencils, and tried to stifle news of the elephant artist in their midst.
A PROPOSAL TO BUILD A FUR CENTER in the College Point Industrial Park in New York City's borough of Queens is under consideration by the City Planning Commission. The center would house many of New York's fur-reared businesses, which are losing customers as the demand for fur declines. The proposal is seeking to reverse the fortunes of the industry by creating a space that would attract consumers and boost sales.

The council has unanimously recommended that the proposal be approved, stating that the project will create jobs and provide a much-needed boost to the local economy. The council also expressed concern about the impact of the proposal on the community and urged that the project be carefully monitored to ensure that it is sustainable and environmentally friendly.

The council's recommendation is expected to be approved by the City Planning Commission, which will then consider the proposal further. If approved, the project could begin construction within a few months, with the first phase expected to be completed in two years.

The proposal has sparked some opposition from local residents, who have concerns about the impact of the project on the environment and the community. Some fear that the project could lead to increased traffic and noise, as well as increased pollution.

Despite these concerns, the council has voted to support the proposal, stating that it will provide much-needed jobs and boost the local economy. The council has also expressed confidence that the project will be carefully monitored to ensure that it is sustainable and environmentally friendly.

The project is expected to create hundreds of jobs and provide a much-needed boost to the local economy. It is hoped that the project will also help to revitalize the area, which has been struggling in recent years.

If approved, the project will begin construction within a few months, with the first phase expected to be completed in two years. The project is expected to create hundreds of jobs, which will provide a much-needed boost to the local economy. It is hoped that the project will also help to revitalize the area, which has been struggling in recent years.

If approved, the project will begin construction within a few months, with the first phase expected to be completed in two years. The project is expected to create hundreds of jobs, which will provide a much-needed boost to the local economy. It is hoped that the project will also help to revitalize the area, which has been struggling in recent years.
**ANIMAL NEWSLINE**

**Animal Airlifts**

No "Merry Christmas" for reindeer ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND—While advertisements celebrated Santa's mythical reindeer last Christmas season, real-life reindeer were being harassed—many of them to death—by low-flying helicopters and dart gun-firing "wildlife experts" who wanted to relocate them from Newfoundland to Maine.

It was a classic example of a conservation effort gone wrong through the use of inappropriate technology. The off-spring of the captured reindeer, more properly called "woodland caribou," are to become the beginnings of a replacement herd at Baxter State Park in northern Maine. The relocation was conducted by the privately financed Maine Caribou Reintroduction Project.

The native Maine caribou herd was hunted to extinction around the turn of the century, a source of some embarrassment to residents of the nearby town of Caribou.

First, the helicopters separated individual caribou from the Newfoundland herd of about 5,500, built up through 20 years of legal protection. The idea was to chase them toward barren ground, where they could be easily rounded up. The caribou, however, didn't cooperate. As they fled, heller-helter, the gunners tried to shoot them from the air with tranquillizer darts. The tranquilizer proved too weak to bring many of the caribou down, so some were shot repeatedly. The others got away in a severely weakened state. When fallen caribou were spotted, they were transported to a nearby staging area in cargo slings. There, heavy media presence and a considerable crowd of caribou-lovers contributed to the animals' stress. Any fallen caribou who weren't found might have suffocated beneath snowdrifts or become easy prey for predators—nobody knows for sure.

In all, 35 caribou were used over three days, December 4-7, before heavy snow grounded the helicopters. The roundup had been held in snowy weather in hopes that the drifts would make the caribou easier to spot from the air and outtake. Of the 35 captives, eight died within 24 hours from exhaustion and fright, and four died en route to the chartered helicopter. In the end, only 27 caribou, or 16%, survived the move. By comparison, 100% of 24 caribou went to Montana in 1980, and 91% of 40 caribou survived their move to Minnesota in 1981.

Of the remaining 22 animals, 20 are does, most of them already pregnant at the time of the round-up. A gene pool of only two stags normally wouldn't be considered large enough to ensure a healthy herd, caribou-keepers hope additional genetic diversity will come from the fawns of the does who were impregnated while still in Newfoundland. An estimated 10-16 calves are expected to be born by mid-May.

Recent newspaper accounts have reported five additional deaths out of the remaining 27 caribou. A similar attempt at restoring the Maine caribou herd failed in 1963. A much larger group of caribou was transported directly to Baxter State Park then. Although hunting is illegal there, they were promptly wiped out by poachers, predators, and disease.

**Relocated moose fare better**

ALGOQUIN PARK, ONTARIO—While nine out of 36 caribou died in the Newfoundland/Maine relocation, 58 out of 65 moose survived similar lift-offs from Algonquin to Michigan.

According to Algonquin Park biologist Dan Strickland, the Ontario/Michigan team just lost the first moose they ever tried to transport, back in 1985. They immediately changed their methods. In all, five of 54 moose that died that year were caused by death injuries inflicted by angry transmitters and one was caused by strongvation in a cargo sling. This year, the increasingly experienced and cautious crew was more successful.

The Ontario moose—an equal number of bulls and cows—are being moved to Michigan's northern peninsula to increase the genetic diversity of a native herd nearly extinguished by hunters. Like the Newfoundland caribou, they must endure helicopter rides of up to 25 miles, and then a 16-hour truck ride to their destination. But there are major differences in how the animals are transported. Instead of chasing the moose, the Ontario/Michigan crew helicopter at the same time for a moose to be already on a frozen lake, or very close to one, where access will be easiest. As in Newfoundland, a veterinarian then shoots the animal with a moose knife.

Relocations of animals may at times be desirable in order to encourage the return of some species to areas where they are very rare. For example, the caribou and moose have shown one of these precautions was taken, when, being substantially reduce the animals' risk of injury and death.

—Merrill Clifton

**Animal NEWSLINE**

Left: 58 out of 65 moose survived an airlift from Ontario to Michigan. Above: More than a third of the caribou captured in a Newfoundland to Maine relocation project died from exhaustion, fright and stress. If precautions are taken in capture and transport, such deaths may be prevented.
**ANIMAL NEWSLINE**

**Valentine's Day Actions For Animals**

Traditionally thought of as a day to acknowledge our human loved ones, Valentine's Day can also be an occasion to remind us that animals deserve love and consideration as well. Two innovative efforts by activist groups—one in New York, the other in Ohio—sought to drive that point home this past February 14.

Macy's Valentine's Day Anti-Fur Parade
Macy's Herald Square store in New York City was the target of a Valentine's Day action organized by Trans-Species Unlimited (TSU). Other participating groups included Animal Rights Front, Lehigh Valley Animal Rights Coalition, and more. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (Southern New York and New Jersey chapters), Friends of Animals, and Pennsylvania Animal Protectors Association assisted. Sporning the Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade, activists marched through the busy store, chanting and carrying heart-shaped signs which read, "Have a heart for wildlife, don't wear fur—make Macy's a fur-free zone." A simultaneous picket outside the store (coupled with a sit-in in the fur department by a small group of activists a few minutes before the parade) caused sufficient confusion among security personnel to allow the main body of protesters to proceed with the parade through the store to the fur department on the third floor. There, 50 parade participants sat-in, and were arrested and charged with criminal trespassing.

The action was the latest in TSU's ongoing "Campaign for a Fur-Free America," aimed at pressuring major department stores to stop selling fur garments. Throughout the campaign, Macy's has been the primary target. Store officials have admitted that they've received so many letters on the issue, they are no longer attempting to answer them. Macy's public relations director Patricia Barry said in a prepared statement, "We are proud that in the American tradition of excellence, the merchandise we sell...is produced in compliance with both the laws of the land and those of human decency." Readers are urged to join in boycotting Macy's until they stop selling fur, and to let the company know this by writing to Art Baine, President, Macy's, 151 W. 34th St., New York, NY 10001.

**IS THIS WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN LOOKING FOR?**

Seeds of Peace provides the motivation, nutrition and tools you need to transform your hopes and dreams into a wonderful reality. It accomplishes this by giving you the hows, whens and why's you need to succeed. Isn't this what you want?

Each issue of Seeds of Peace is packed full of indepth interviews, exciting investigations, stimulating profiles, channeled messages, book reviews, art, prose, and more. You get all this for less than a cup of coffee per week. Discover how affordable and exciting success can be by ordering a sample copy of Seeds of Peace today. VISA and Master Card holders can order Seeds of Peace by calling 1-800-USA-2000  ext 805. Or, send $3.00 to: Seeds of Peace P.O. Box 37021, S-5, Denver, CO 80237.

**A FARM ANIMAL REFORM MOVEMENT**

Box 70123, Washington, DC 20088

**ANIMAL NEWSLINE**

**New Looks From Paul Penders.**

With The Old Pure Magic.

Silky, all natural handker, dramatic mascaras and rich, cream-based lip colors. From $1.95

NATURAL COSMETICS
AND BODY CARE

**NOT TESTED ON ANIMALS.**

**AFM Press.**

P.O. Box 37021, S-5, Denver, CO 80237.

Fortune.

**Announcing Focus on Animals**

A resource center for films and videotapes about animal rights. Issues include hunting, the fur business, laboratory animals, vegetarianism and vanishing wildlife.

Send for our free catalog and become an educator in your area! Many videos come with broadcast rights for use on local cablevision.

Videotapes and films are suitable for donation or lending to schools, libraries, civic club program director, scout troops, churches and synagogues.

FREE CATALOG:
P.O. Box 150, Trumbull, Connecticut 06611 (203) 377-1116

**Cruelty-Free Awareness Day**

In a cooperative effort with General Nutrition Centers (GNC), Trans-Species Unlimited (TSU) and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) Cincinnati, Ohio chapter used Valentine's Day as a chance to promote the use of personal care and household products not tested on animals. Information tables staffed by PETA volunteers were set up in GNC stores and shoppers were given information on product testing methods—such as the Draize Eye Irritation test and the LD50 toxicity test—which claim hundreds of thousands of animal's lives each year. GNC supported PETA's efforts by offering discounts on cruelty-free products, and by giving additional discount cards to shoppers who became members of PETA.

The community took a great interest in "Cruelty-Free Awareness Day"; official proclamations were passed in seven cities/counties, several radio and TV stations ran stories on the campaign, and about 20 newspaper articles and editorials on the product testing issue appeared. According to PETA's Jayn Neiman, all of the coverage was very positive. Other groups should consider launching similar campaigns; high visibility of a positive, upbeat campaign, tapping some of the attention normally given to major holidays, can bring animal issues before the public in an interesting and nonthreatening way.

**ARE YOU REALLY THAT HUNGRY?**

Bobby is an 14-week old "real" calf. Right after birth, he was separated from his mother, chained by the neck in a 2 1/2 ft cage in total darkness, and fed a liquid diet designed to make him sterile. This produces the pair soft flesh so prized by butchers.

Bobby will be able to stretch, to walk, to mingle with other calves, and to see the sky red soon now—on his way to the slaughterhouse and an end to his misery.

Nearly five billion warm-blooded animals will suffer Bobby's fate this year in the U.S. alone.

ARE YOU REALLY THAT HUNGRY?

Tax exempt contributions to bring this message to the American consumer should be sent to:

FARM ANIMAL REFORM MOVEMENT
Box 70123, Washington, DC 20088

HELP US STOP THE SUFFERING!

All contributions will receive an information pack. Contributions of $25 or more will also receive a copy of Animal Pamphlets, at $11.50 value.

Name
Address
City, State, Zip

MAY 1987

The ANIMAL'S AGENDA

25

MAY 1987

The ANIMAL'S AGENDA
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David vs. Goliath in Salt Lake City

Utah is one of the last six states with a mandatory pound seizure law, requiring public animal shelters to turn over unclaimed dogs and cats to researchers for use in experiments. For several years, concerned citizens and public officials have worked for legislative progress to repeal the law mandating pound seizure, despite fierce opposition from the local "Goliath," the University of Utah.

The same state law requiring the release of pound animals to researchers also states that the animals must first be made available for adoption, even if the university has already requested them. This interpretation of the law was confirmed by the Salt Lake County Attorney's Office and has allowed the director of the Salt Lake County Animal Services (SLCAS), Michael McFarland, to refuse to release animals to the university. In 1985, a change in deans at the university's medical school coincided with a new hardness attitude by university officials. They demanded unrestricted access to animals at the SLCAS shelter, while privately admitting that they did not really need the animals. The university, while claiming a shortage of shelter animals for their research, actually sells some of these animals to the Utah Biomedical Testing Laboratories.

In response to increased university pressure, a statewide coalition of humane societies, animal control agencies and private individuals formed to seek repeal of the state law and to find homes for the dogs and cats the university wanted to take. The Coalition Against Mandatory Pound Seizure (now the Citizens' Animal Management and Protection Society—CAMPS) is directing both efforts. Although legislation has not yet been passed, the adoption program has been very successful. More than 75% of the animals the University of Utah had claimed "nobody wanted" and "were going to the axe" have been placed in caring homes. The remainder are in foster homes or taken to the local humane society, which is exempt from the state's mandatory pound seizure law.

In February of last year the CAMPS repeal bill was favorably reported out of the Utah State Senate Health Committee. The university responded emotionally, arranging for heart disease patients to protest in the halls and energetically organizing the members to rally last week. The bill was defeated on the final vote on the legislation. University interference with the legislative process also included influencing the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst. The 1982 fiscal impact report on the CAMPS bill reflected only the university's position, ignoring the financial information provided by the bill's sponsors. This year CAMPS gave comprehensive information to the fiscal analyst, who ignored it and reamended the previous year's analysis, even forgetting to change the date on the "new" report.

University personnel are not above direct intimidation of CAMPS members. University police have attended several CAMPS meetings, photographed members, including license plates, maintaned surveillance of CAMPS members and monitored university police cars. Representatives of the university also walked into the local humane society and demanded the release of animals housed there.

The university's harassment of Michael McFarland has primarily involved pressure on his supervisors and manipulation of the local media. These efforts reached a peak in February, when McFarland was suspended for three days without pay and placed on probation for six months. Presumably these actions are in preparation for a formal dismissal. All this has happened because he had the courage to do what was ethically and legally correct, in the best interests of the animals in his shelter and the citizens of Salt Lake County.

In addition, McFarland has been the sole representative of a major national organization, the Association of Shelter Directors of America, for the last seven years. A national conference was convened in Salt Lake City to discuss the problem of pound seizure in the state. McFarland's suspension has been a major inconvenience to the shelter directors from around the country who were in Salt Lake City to discuss the problem of pound seizure in the state. McFarland's suspension has been a major inconvenience to the shelter directors from around the country who were in Salt Lake City to discuss the problem of pound seizure in the state.
Help...

stop the slaughter of Alaska's wolves, including aerial wolf hunts and "aerial trapping," support balanced wildlife policy and nonconsumptive use of wildlife in Alaska.


For more information, merchandise and sample newsletter contact:
The Alaska Wildlife Alliance P.O. Box 190953 Anchorage, AK 99519 (907) 277-0487

a nonprofit organization, all annual membership $10 for First Class Mail outside of Alaska

ANIMAL FILMS FOR HUMANE EDUCATION by DALLAS PRATT

ARGUS ARCHIVES' NEW REFERENCE WORK WITH DESCRIPTION AND REVIEWS OF THE 19 BEST FILMS, VIDEOS AND FILMSTRIPS FOR HUMANE EDUCATION

Other Features:
- Women in the Movement
- Selected Films, videos & filmstrips
- Index

$8.95 postpaid, 248 pages, 1986

To order, send check to: ARGUS ARCHIVES, Dept. AP-2 228 E. 49th St., N.Y., N.Y. 10017

ANIMAL ACTIVITY Bob Barker refused to host this year's "Miss U.S.A." pageant unless producers agreed not to use fur on the show.

ANIMAL NEWSLINE

Bob Barker's Pageant Stand

In our April issue, we reported on Bob Barker's refusal to host the "Miss U.S.A." pageant a few hours before the show was to air live on television if fur coats were used in a production number on the program as planned. The show's producers yielded to Barker, in spite of advertising arrangements which had been made with furriers. Simulated furs were substituted for use in the pageant, though a mink coat was still provided as a prize to the pageant winner. Thanks to Barker's perseverance, and the cooperation of George Horchak (president of Miss Universe, Inc.), furs will no longer be worn onstage or be offered as prizes in any of the company's three pageants—Miss U.S.A., Miss Teen U.S.A., and Miss Universe.

Barker says that 576 telephone calls received by pageant officials, only eight callers expressed disapproval of his action. Out of "stacks of letters," only one was critical. All of the disapproving sentiments came from individuals who financially benefit from the fur industry's exploitation of animals.

The fur industry was infuriated by Barker's action, and called on furriers to withdraw their advertisements from affiliatees of CBS, the TV network which aired the pageant. For Age Weekly, the fur industry's highly emotional taskade, has lately been filled with letters and articles condemning Barker.

A story in People's Hair Daily (February 26, 1987) reported that the simulated fur company whose coats were used in the pageant plans to ask Barker to act as their spokesperson. Barker has mixed feelings about endorsing simulated furs; many activists feel that these garments only help to perpetuate the "mythology" of real fur. "But," says Barker, "if everyone wore simulated furs, there would be no animals killed." Barker says he has made no decisions yet about endorsements.

Barker's Pageant Stand

ANIMAL NEWSLINE

A New Wave for Animal Rights

If there's one thing the Sixties ought to have taught us all, it's that music can be a powerful force for social change. Songs may move us in ways that words alone cannot, allowing deeper insights to sink in. The humane community is starting to take notice of the power of music as another tool to be used in the struggle for animal rights. In recent years, musicians and activist groups have collaborated on projects to produce albums and singles with pro-animal messages. One of the most ambitious and exciting of such projects is the album Animal Liberation, a joint venture between Wax Trax Records and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA).

Described as alternative/new music, the album features songwriters Anna Hagen and Lena Lovich, Shrinkback, Howard Jones, Luc Van Acker, Colortrue, Attraction, Chris & Corey, and Captain Sensible. On overseas versions of the album, the Smiths and Siouxsie and the Banshees will also be featured. Release permission couldn't be obtained for these U.S. versions, however. The songs examine such issues as vivisection, hunting, meat production, and the fur industry; most of them were written specifically for the album. In addition, each track includes either a full color, animal rights poster, and an insert featuring items offered by PETA. The inspiration for the project came from PETA's sales and promotions coordinator Dan Mathews, who describes the album's message as "...very upbeat, not downbeat, not preachy at all. It just states it like it is. People can make up their own minds."

Plains are in the works for music videos based on the album's songs, and benefit record-release parties are planned for several U.S. cities. All profits from the album's sale will benefit PETA. Animal Liberation should already be available at your local record store; if not, copies may be obtained for $5 each, including postage, from PETA, PO. Box 48216, Washington, D.C. 20015.

Another musical endeavor on behalf of animals is Their Eyes Don't Lie, a 453-minute extended-play record produced by the Student Action Corps for Animals (SACA). The record features four New Wave animal rights songs written and performed by Atrocity, Stark Kend and Subtle Oppression, groups comprised of socially active undergraduates aged 13 to 20. The songs focus on the brutal treatment of factory-farmed animals, presenting a strong case for vegetarianism. Says SACA's Rosa Feldman, "We wanted people to think about how their own choices and attitudes contribute directly to exploitation, and to see that they can take steps to change things—just by looking into their own lifestyles." A poster which includes lyrical sheets and a wealth of information on animal rights issues is included with the record; the poster may be purchased separately for $1.50. The record and poster set is available for $3.75, including postage from SACA, PO. Box 15086, Washington, D.C. 20003.

ANIMAL LIBERATION

Battling the Greyhound Racing Industry

Death is imminent for thousands of greyhounds and small animals if states legalize dog race gambling, according to Robert Baker, field investigator for the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). "We are unluckily opposed to dog racing, not only due to the cruelty and abuse inflicted on the animals in racing, but also because of the use of live lures in training," says Baker.

Currently, greyhound racing is legal in 43 states: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Hampshire, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont and Virginia. Dog racing is the sixth largest spectator sport in the United States, with over 23 million people visiting the tracks, according to George Johnson, Jr., executive director of the American Greyhound Track Operators Association. In 1984, about $176 million went into state treasuries as a result of pari-mutuel betting on legalized greyhound racing, according to the National Association of State Racing Commissioners. Kansas recently legalized greyhound racing, despite the efforts of animal rights and anti-gambling organizations. At the time of writing this was the only state to do so.

Continued on next page
Greyhound Racing
Continued from previous page

pari-mutual betting are pending in Ohio, Minnesota, Missouri and Pennsylvania. The
state constitution on the issue will be held in Indiana and Texas this year. And
by the time this article is published, Wisconsin voters will have decided whether or not to legalise
greyhound racing in their state. Other states in which dog racing proponents are actively
working to legalise the activity are Illinois, Maryland, Ohio and Oklahoma, said Baker.

The use of small animals as bets in training greyhounds to race continues to generate
outrage among humane groups. Most owners and trainers believe using

training greyhounds. "Only three out of
ten greyhounds trained with live jack-
rabbits are school-coded to race," said
LaBarrera. "Recent studies indicate that
when mechanical means are used in
training, the percentage of school-
qualified dogs drops to 1.5 dogs out of
ten; with recently deceased jackrabbits as
prey, the percentage drops only to two
or 2.5."

"Other evidence points to the problem of
overuse of live lures by breeders and trainers.
In the November 1986 issue of Greyhound
Planning, papers are urged to support Rep.
Dornan's bill. Baker points out that, "It
is ironic that the industry contends that
dog animals are rarely used in the training
of racing greyhounds and yet simultane-
ously opposes Representative Dornan's bill."

Greyhound racing hurts not only the small animals used as lures, but also the
dogs themselves. About 40,000 grey-
hounds actively race in the United States.
The greyhound industry estimates that
about 25 percent of these dogs must be
replaced each year. Thus, to produce the
10,000 new dogs needed to reach the track
each year, an estimated 30,000 to 50,000
dogs must be born—given the 20 to 40
percent survival rate for dogs who are
able to compete at the track.

A spokesperson for the greyhound in-
dustry reveals a callous attitude toward
the industry-produced problem of over-
breeding, which adds to the nationwide
problem of dog overpopulation: "There's
nothing wrong with destroying unwanted
animals," said Gary Guccione, secretary/
treasurer of the National Greyhound
Association. "The animals, whether dogs or
humane societies kill 15 to 20 million dogs
each year."

Acknowledgement:
The author wishes to thank Robert Baker, field investigator, department of investigations,
Humane Society of the United States, Wash-
ington, D.C., for providing much of the in-
formation of this article.

The Animal Activist

◊ Infurbers others as to how animals are raised for food in
factory farms
◊ Has adopted a vegetarian diet, or is on the road to it
◊ Avoids or limits consumption of dairy products and eggs

— Carla Bennett

TOWN AND COUNTRY RATS

Upgrading an Image

BY ARTHUR HIRSHORN

The rat, along with the chicken, snake, is surely one of the world's most disliked animals. Down through the
ages, rats have been held responsible for millions of human deaths. During the 13th and 14th centuries,
more than 20 million Europeans succumbed to the Black Death or bubonic plague, which was spread
throughout the continent by fleas-infested rats.

The rat that city dwellers know and hate is known in scientific circles as Rattus norvegicus, or more
commonly as the Norway rat. Other printable names it is known by are the brown rat, sewer rat, house rat, and
swab rat. Naturally, you would assume that its native land is Norway. Not true. In fact, the Norway rat is
a native of the Orient, coming from the frigid plains of northern Asia. They were given the name "Norway" rat because many
were spotted disembarking from Norwegian commercial vessels in the ports of Great Britain and the
United States.

Norway rats are burrowing rodents, constructing their homes in subsurface areas. In rural environments, their
underground shelters protect them from predators like weasel and great horned owl. Moreover, their pre-
ference for living underground is not surprising when you consider that in Siberia and Mongolia (their ancestral homes), winter
temperatures can fall to 40 degrees below zero.

In New York City, they have retained their subterra-
nean lifestyle to avoid detection

by people rather than to escape the cold. They are commonly found in cellars, sewers, subway tunnels, and
in underground burrows in public parks and vacant lots. Although there probably are as
many Norway rats in New York City as people, they are rarely seen. Because of their incon-
spicuous gray-brown coat, silent and rapid movements, wariness, and nocturnal feeding habits, they are
usually glimpsed as fleeting shadows at dawn and dusk. Early-morning and late-after-
noon joggers in Central Park can attest to this fact.

Norway rats are similar in length and weight to their tree-dwelling city relative, the gray squirrel. However, their
long, pointed faces and naked tails are quite distinct

ive. In addition, their hind legs are much longer and
stronger than their forelegs. This characteristic makes them good jumpers and leapers as well as excellent
swimmers. Longhaired men with the skill of the wharf rat, especially its ability to swim underwater for up to three
minutes.

In the city, food availability
poses no problem for the rat. Like us, the rat is omnivorous, which means it can
digest both vegetable and animal material.

Further, when a food short-
ages occur, they will even eat leather, glue and soap. Unfortunately, they also

Inadequate grain warehouses and silos, eating and spoiling millions of dollars worth of corn, wheat and oats each year in the United States.

Another troublesome char-
acteristic of the Norway rat is its extremely high rate of reproduction. Females

become sexually mature at three to five months, and
are capable of giving birth to as many as 80 offspring in a single year. Fortunately for
New Yorkers, the lack of adequate rodent control measures prevents a "rat population
explosion." In any case, the adoption of the "rat-proof" house is the only solution to this
problem. When their numbers increase to too many, their adolescent females remain
infertile. Their uterus becomes firm, and their ovaries cease functioning, resulting in malnourished offspring.

The Norway rat offers a solution to this problem for humans who cannot bear children. The "rat-proof"
method of birth control has all the advantages of the animal's method.
NEWS SHORTS

Edited by Leslie Pardue

Turtles are victims of shrimpmen’s nets.

Good news from Europe: the European Parliament has voted to issue directives to the European Commission calling for an end to animal experiments by 1991 and reforms in the intensive farming industries of member nations. Members are religion, Denmark, Spain, Great Britain, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, and West Germany. The next step is for the Commission to put the Parliament’s directives into legislative form, after which they will be returned to the Parliament for a formal vote and then sent for final approval by Council of Ministers. Though far from enactment, the directives are a major step forward.

A bill to ban live bird shoots has been introduced in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives by Rep. Frank Pistella (D-Pittsburgh). In our November 1986 cover story, we reported on the annual Fred Coleman Memorial Shoot in Hoggs, Pennsylvania—the largest single-day live bird shoot in the world, in which some 2,000 caged birds are gumed down. Such events would be banned by the new bill (H.B. 435). Pennsylvania residents are aware that the state Department of Natural Resources is in preparation for a ban on the shoot. The bill is currently pending in the House of Representatives.

University of Oregon research director Greg Stickford menace a tiny monkey.

In its fourth annual “State of the World” report, the Worldwatch Institute warns that human population growth and economic expansion are pushing the ability of the earth’s natural systems to cope with such activity to the very limit. The Washington-based research group said in its report that the earth’s natural systems are already beginning to decline in food and fuel production, the destruction of natural habitats, and greenhouse gas emissions. The report also noted a 30 percent increase in the world’s population since 1950, raising the possibility that the earth’s natural systems are unable to cope with the pressures on the environment continue. The report named four factors: depletion, climatic change, and loss of biological diversity as the three most pressing environmental problems. “A sustainable society satisfies its needs without diminishing the prospects of the next generation,” the report states. “Most measures contemporary society fails to meet this criterion,” said Worldwatch, in a case of notable understatement.

If President Reagan has his way, federal funds will be cut from programs protecting animals, and funding for wildlife-killing programs will increase. In this year’s budget proposal, Reagan calls for a million-dollar reduction in funds for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to enforce the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act. He has also recommended a more than five million reduction in funds for the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) over last year’s appropriation.

The APHIS is a federal agency charged with inspecting thousands of labs, zoos, circuses, and puppy mills nationwide. Consequently, the President has concluded that no $1 million in federal funds for the USDA’s division of Animal Damage Control, the agency responsible for carrying out a wide range of unreconstructive predator control programs (including trapping, poisoning, and other inhumane methods of killing) for the purpose of exterminating coyotes and other animals perceived as four-footed villains by wildlife investigators. Readers are urged to write the members of their House and Senate Appropriations Committees in express opposition to Reagan’s proposals. A list of the subcommittee members may be obtained from the Humane Society of the U.S., 2300 L St., Washington, D.C. 20037, (202) 432-1100.

If President Bill Clinton has his way, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or Superfund, may be moribund. Clinton is recommending a $50 million increase in funding for the program, which is authorized by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or Superfund.

Coca-Cola has come under fire recently from environmentalists and animal rights advocates for the corporation’s plan to destroy some 22,000 acres of tropical forest and wetlands in Belize to make way for its proposed “plastic plant.” In a letter sent to Roberto Goloueta, chairman of Coca-Cola, the environmental group Friends of the Earth accused the corporation of misleading the public about the scheme’s threat to wildlife, falsely claiming assurance from the Belize Audubon Society, and refusing to carry out an environmental impact assessment of the project. The area of the project is known to contain a wide range of wildlife, including several species listed as threatened. Considered the most vulnerable major habitat type, tropical forests are home to about half of the world’s plant and animal species. Such forests are being destroyed around the world at the rate of 20,000 square kilometers each year. Coca-Cola, also criticized as a major corporate sponsor of the brutal “sport” of rodeo (aided by the parent company of Merck Garnson Productions, the producer of TV’s “Wheel of Fortune,” on which fences are offered at prize money), produces the following brands of drink: Diet and Thirst-Quencher, 7-Up, Alladin, High-C, and Minute Maid. Readers are urged to boycott these products, and to write directly to Roberto Goloueta, Chairperson, Coca-Cola Company, P.O. Drawer 3754, Atlanta, GA 30309, and to Coca-Cola president Robert McNamara, whose company’s toll-free consumer relations line is 1-800-GET-COKE.

The Clean Water Act has been extolled by its supporters, thanks to a veto override by the Democratic-led 100th Congress. True to form, President Reagan vetoed the Act’s reauthorization last month. His advice should be adopted by those who feel that it is time for a new environmental policy. Instead of a “do nothing” approach, the government should take a proactive role in protecting the environment. This will not only benefit future generations, but will also ensure a sustainable future for the planet.

University of Oregon research director Greg Stickford menace a tiny monkey.

A series of shocking photos removed by the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) during a raid on the University of Oregon’s animal research labs in October (see our January/February 1987 story on the break-in) have revealed numerous violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the National Institutes of Health’s guidelines for the care of laboratory animals. Several photos, apparently staged for the amusement of the researchers, show university research director Greg Stickford menacing a terrified newborn monkey. The staging of the shots was apparently meant to suggest that the monkey was “born” by Caesarian section to a human “mother” lying on a table in the foreground. (In a statement to Oregon news media, Stickford said that the photos “were in bad taste. I regret having participated in” the actions, he said. Stickford’s bizarre laboratory behaviors have prompted activists to call for his firing by the university, as well as full-scale investigations by state and federal agencies into animal research at the University of Oregon and other institutions. Other gruesome photos removed by the ALF come from a slide presentation used by the university. The photos, which university officials claim were shot at other institutions, reveal researchers’ manipulations of the gestants and use of brutal handling techniques to forcibly subdue animals.

The Clean Water Act has been extolled by its supporters, thanks to a veto override by the Democratic-led 100th Congress. True to form, President Reagan vetoed the Act’s reauthorization last month. His advice should be adopted by those who feel that it is time for a new environmental policy. Instead of a “do nothing” approach, the government should take a proactive role in protecting the environment. This will not only benefit future generations, but will also ensure a sustainable future for the planet.

University of Oregon research director Greg Stickford menace a tiny monkey.

A series of shocking photos removed by the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) during a raid on the University of Oregon’s animal research labs in October (see our January/February 1987 story on the break-in) have revealed numerous violations of the Animal Welfare Act and the National Institutes of Health’s guidelines for the care of laboratory animals. Several photos, apparently staged for the amusement of the researchers, show university research director Greg Stickford menacing a terrified newborn monkey. The staging of the shots was apparently meant to suggest that the monkey was “born” by Caesarian section to a human “mother” lying on a table in the foreground. (In a statement to Oregon news media, Stickford said that the photos “were in bad taste. I regret having participated in” the actions, he said. Stickford’s bizarre laboratory behaviors have prompted activists to call for his firing by the university, as well as full-scale investigations by state and federal agencies into animal research at the University of Oregon and other institutions. Other gruesome photos removed by the ALF come from a slide presentation used by the university. The photos, which university officials claim were shot at other institutions, reveal researchers’ manipulations of the gestants and use of brutal handling techniques to forcibly subdue animals.

The Clean Water Act has been extolled by its supporters, thanks to a veto override by the Democratic-led 100th Congress. True to form, President Reagan vetoed the Act’s reauthorization last month. His advice should be adopted by those who feel that it is time for a new environmental policy. Instead of a “do nothing” approach, the government should take a proactive role in protecting the environment. This will not only benefit future generations, but will also ensure a sustainable future for the planet.
Quakers Aren't Always Quiet.

In fact, they speak out often on important issues, offering a unique perspective on the world. Everything from the spiritual self to global peace: from family interaction to international relations: from the meaning of life to our way of life.

NEWS SHORTS

**Animal rights advocates and environmentalists are fighting the California Department of Fish and Game in an effort to prevent the lifting of a 14-year moratorium on trophy hunting of mountain lions in the state. The department has recommended that the California Fish and Game Commission open a 79-day hunting season and issue permits to kill 210 mountain lions each year. In 1985 a state bill was passed which would have extended the moratorium, but the bill was vetoed by Governor George Deukmejian. At press time, the commission had already held two public hearings on the issue, with the third scheduled for April 10 in Sacramento. It is expected that a decision will be made at that time, though it might be postponed to a later date. Readers may write the Mountain Lion Preservation Foundation at P.O. Box 1996, Sacramento, CA 95809 or call (916) 442-2666 for information on the current status of the proposal to lift the moratorium. California residents are urged to make their views on the issue known to the California Fish and Game Commission, 1416 9th St., Sacramento, CA 95814. Also write Governor Deukmejian, State Capitol, Sacramento, CA 95814.**

**A plan to export 270,000 sheep to the U.S. for slaughter is being considered by the government of New Zealand, reports the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA). The plan to ship live sheep in ten shipments of about 27,000 animals each has been stalled by the U.S. government, which will not receive the shipments until the ships are equipped with refrigeration units to store the bodies of animals who die in transport. The sheep are shipped live because freshly-killed meat has greater consumer appeal, says WSFA's John Walsh. New Zealand sheep ranchers are android to make double what they would make if they marketed the meat, reports the U.S. Walsh reports. Conditions suffered by sheep during live shipment (lasting several weeks) include severe crowding and lack of sanitation, resulting in suffocation, starvation, extreme stress, respiratory diseases, and other illnesses. Thousands typically arrive dead at their destinations. Readers are urged to express their opposition to this cruelty by writing to: Wallace Russell, New Zealand Ambassador to the U.S., 37 Observatory Circle, NW, Washington, DC 20008.**

California's 14-year moratorium on mountain lion hunting may soon be lifted.

**Five dogs died recently in experiments conducted at the University of Pennsylvania in which the dogs' back muscles were used to fashion "auxiliary hearts." Researchers Michael Acker and Larry Stevenson constructed artificial pumping chambers from the latticework donated dogs' back muscles, and connected them to the dogs' aortas. Pneumatics were then used to stimulate the chambers to beat in time with the dogs' hearts. Two dogs subsequently died of blood clots, a frequent complication of heart surgery. The other dogs died from "technical complications." Similar experiments on humans have been conducted in Pittsburgh and Paris, though these operations entail a patching of the heart with back muscles rather than the construction of separate chambers. The University of Pennsylvania experimenters plan to continue the research in spite of the deaths, tutoring the operation as a possible alternative to artificial heart and heart transplant. In fact, several weeks ago, a case involving a 71-year-old woman in which a temporary artificial heart was inserted. Evidence has been mounting over the past few decades which indicates a strong association between heart disease and lifestyle factors such as smoking, obesity, a high-fat diet based on meat, emotional stress, and lack of exercise. Despite these findings, most heart research continues to focus on high-tech surgeries and procedures rather than preventative health care.**

**Legislation aiming to increase the authority of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) in the Animal Welfare Act has been introduced in the House by Representative Toby Roth (Ill., H.R. 241). The bill, H.R. 241, would allow the USDA to obtain restraining orders or injunctions against animal dealers, carriers, exhibitors, and handlers charged with violations of the Act. The legislation stems from a recent Wisconsin case involving animal dealer Ervin Steblane, who since 1972 has sold more than 20,000 dogs and cats to researchers. Charged with numerous violations of the Animal Welfare Act spanning a five-year period— including improper disposal of dead animals, deficient housing, lack of food and water for the animals, and inadequate sanitation—Steblane was nevertheless released each year to continue operating as an animal dealer. The proposed legislation, if enacted, will empower the USDA to act on such cases in the future. Readers should write to their Representatives (House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515) urging co-sponsorship of H.R. 241.**
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Animals in the Movies

Thoroughbred films like Project X can deliver a strong pro-animal message, much too often unwilling animal actors are pressed into performances which result in serious injuries or death.

BY BARBARA PEQUET

We Americans love the movies. Whether we see them in theaters or at home on television and video cassette, we idolize the stars and follow the careers of favorite actors and directors. In 1986, over one billion tickets (totaling about $3.7 billion) were sold for admission to the movies. Many of us spend more time each week watching television and films than we do in conversation with friends and family. In recent times, cinema and television have become so much a part of our lives that we are on a first name basis with characters like J.R. and Alexis, Lucy and Desi, and Roy and Dale—and also with animal actors like Benji, Morris, Flipper and (hi-ho) Silver.

The difference is that while we can assume Jane Fonda or Tom Cruise are protected by contracts, stunt artists, safety and employment laws, and the best lawyers money can buy when those protections fail, we cannot assume the same for animal actors. In fact, abuse and misuse of animals in the motion picture industry occurs many more times than the public suspects.

In many cases, the realism we marvel at on screen may be too real. In this age of technological advancement, from the gimickery of James Bond to the spectacle of Spielberg and Lucas, we could expect state-of-the-art film production to be so advanced as to have eliminated the actual suffering, and even death, of animals without sacrificing realism. Hollywood is, after all, the epitome of illusion—the master of the sleight of hand.

And yet, in The Killing Fields a live ox was bled at the neck in front of the camera. In Apocalypse Now a live water buffalo was machine-gunned to death in a ritual sacrifice scene. In Reds several horses were intentionally tripped with wires to create a spectacular fall. In the battle scenes.

Michael Cimino’s 1980 Heaven’s Gate was not only a financial disaster but a human one as well. At least five horses were reportedly killed during production. Running W’s (tripwire devices which can be rigged to pull the legs out from under the horse) were used and cockfighting was staged. Allegedly, more than a dozen live chickens were decapitated so that their blood could be smeared on actor’s bodies for close-up scenes.

Unfortunately, these are not isolated examples. Other films with shots of abused animals include Patience, The Missouri Breaks, The Mountain Men, and Lion of the Desert. And scores of more animals suffer before and after their “performances”. Many of the less sensational abuses go undetected and unreported.

Recently, a new area of abuse to animals in films came to light: the culprit: nature and wildlife films. The very thing, which pretend to revere animals—and the cruelest irony is that the abuse is sometimes perpetrated by seemingly sensitive producers like Disney Studios and Marlin Perkins’ Wild Kingdom. Amid shots of habitat and commentary on the awesome but delicate balances of nature, animals have been mistreated and exploited to assure action-packed footage.

According to an article appearing in the New York Times (2/24/86), “faking is a fundamental tool of the wildlife film industry.” For those of us who have marveled at the patience and dexterity of camera operators who have captured once-in-a-lifetime shots, marvel no more. Patience and skill are often out: fraud and contrived-for-action scenes are in. For instance, live chickens may be dangled before big cats to agitate them. The backs of rabbits may be rubbed raw and turpentine poured on the wounds to make the animals run fast and straight so that cameras can follow easily.

U

fortunately, cruelty and abuse have been a part of the film business for years. According to the American Humane Association (AHA), one of the first major “film animal” scandals was documented in 1939 when a public outcry arose over the treatment of a horse in four films. In that film, Tyrone Power’s horse was galloped over a 70-foot cliff to his death. In response to the public protest engendered by the stunt, the Hays Office on Censorship (using AHA guidelines) set in place a mandatory code for making motion pictures. Outlawed was the Running W device, prior to its invention, horses were made to fall by digging deep pits orrenching piano was across a set.

But, in the mid 1960s, when competition from television for more violence on the screen joined with nationwide antipathy to censorship, the Hays Office was abolished and, with it, all mandatory standards for animal treatment. AHA, as it had done since the 1930s, offered to review scripts submitted on a voluntary basis and visit movie sets. Predictably, however, all but the most ethical directors refused to participate in this toothless screening process. Animal abuse in filming escalated.

Although AHA has neither the clout nor the funding of a government authority, it has devised over the years two measures to bring some accountability to the industry. First, it sends humane officers to movie sets to check for animal abuse. Second, it has developed a rating system for movies. AHA’s Hollywood office screens films and distributes a monthly list of “unacceptable” ones to the media, representatives in the movie industry, and humane societies. In the past nine years, AHA has rated approximately 60 films an unacceptable because animals were intentionally killed, injured, or mistreated during shooting for the sake of dramatic action.

But these ratings reflect only whether or not animal abuse occurred while the film was being shot. Equally important are the handling animals receive when they are being trained to perform, and the living conditions they experience.

In Conan, The Barbarian, a 1982 Dino De Laurentis production, horses were tripped and other animals were physically abused.

Legislative Action Could Protect Animals in Movies

The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) is developing legislation to help protect animals used by the entertainment industry. One aspect of the legislation will be to prohibit the injuring or killing of animals used in making films. A similar law already exists in England. Another aspect of the legislation will be to amend the federal Animal Welfare Act to state more clearly that farm-type animals used for exhibition purposes (and experimentation) are covered under the Act. Although it is ASPCA’s contention that these animals are already protected under the Act, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has not interpreted the law this way.

The proposed legislation will be completed and ready for sponsorship and endorsement by members of Congress soon, and the ASPCA will be organizing grassroots support. Readers interested in helping can contact: The ASPCA Entertainment Project, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Suite 418, Washington, D.C. 20036.
Continued from previous page

The solution to these problems is
harder to find than it might
seem. Within the States, anti-
 cruelty statutes always need stronger,
more aggressive enforcement. Due to
the non-public nature of picture mak-
ing, instances of abuse may not be im-
mediately detected, evidence may be
hard to gather, and witnesses may not
be forthcoming.

Cruelty abuse in movies made
abroad is even more difficult.
However the harm done to animal actors
is closely bound to the showing of
the film; conveying these harms, hinting
at the distribution and showing of the
film might be one possible legislative
solution. Another approach might be
to broaden the scope of obscenity to
include movies containing sequences
where animals were intentionally
misused or injured. As an obscene
movie, the film could then be
regulated by the government.

Of course, getting such legislation
enacted will not be easy. There are constitu-
tional questions regarding the First
Amendment that must be addressed,
and as with other animal protective
legislation, legislators will have to be
educated about the seriousness of
the problem.

Meanwhile, there are a number of
actions and measures which could con-
tribute to stopping abuse of
animals by film production companies.
Among the proposals: expansion of
the current F-36 rating system to in-
clude the criteria of violence to
animals; adding a tag or trailer at
the beginning or end of each movie
showing “No animals were harmed,
injured, or unduly stressed in the
production of this film”; formation of
an organized citizen movement to in-
teract with film critics about the
problem and ask them to speak out against
it; development of an industry-wide
agreement not to exploit animals in
producing films (in the U.S. or abroad);
and boycotting and letter-writing of
movies listed as “unacceptable” by
AHA.

No matter how much one may per-
sonally enjoy the movies, it is neither
amusing nor morally acceptable to
contribute to animals in the name of enter-
tainment. Unfortunately violence
“sells” and it will continue until
knowledge of animal exploitation in
films is followed by action to stop it.

Barbara Pequot is Director of Government
Relations for the American Society for
the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
(APSCA).
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PROJECT X

A box-office hit exposes the ethical dilemma of animal research on the silver screen in a story about a top secret military experiment using non-human primates.

BY DONALD BARNES

After being ordered by Jimmy (Broderick) to stay on the scale for a weight reading, Virgil tries to play with him by stepping on and off, reminding Jimmy that he possesses a mind of his own.

Primary Primates has set up a special Chimpanzee Fund for the purchase of chimpanzees. Though Twenty-First Century Fox funded part of the expense of building comfortable enclosures for the animals, Primary Primates experienced a $15,000 deficit. In addition, funds are needed for the future maintenance of the young chimps who have a life expectancy of about 50 years. Primarily Primates' address is: P.O. Box 15306, San Antonio, TX 78212.

PROJECT X is fiction but, like all good fiction, based upon events which have actually occurred or which could occur in real life. I have neither the skill nor the space to enumerate the many reactions I experienced upon viewing the final version of this film, suffice it to say that exposition eventually outpaced the competition of other emotions, i.e., anger, sadness, consternation, and even glee. Even so, my partial identification with Dr. Carroll (the callous researcher) and Jimmy (the friend and savior of the chimps), combined with my memories of observing and participating in similar experiments, served to conjure a myriad of emotions whirling against the backdrop of the present.

Although I believe that Project X will contribute significantly to positive attitude change toward nonhuman animals, I also realize that the impact of this movie on the humans who see it is irrelevant to Willy (Virgil), Harry (Ginger), Oko, Arthur, and Luke. Whatever concerns I share with other animal activists about the use of nonhuman animals in entertainment, it is assured that the five chimpanzees "actors" of Project X will never again face the depressing environments of a zoo or be faced with the very real possibility of viral infection or other horrors of the laboratory.

If you like Project X, encourage your friends, acquaintances, co-workers, relatives, etc., to see it. In short, help make these five chimpanzees' effort an important one.

Twentieth Century Fox has prepared a "Study Guide" on Project X for distribution to high schools for teachers to follow with their students in examining the issues raised by the film.urge and directed to high schools for teachers to follow with their students in examining the issues raised by the film. URGED AND DIRECTED TO高 schools for teachers to follow with their students in examining the issues raised by the film.
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Feeding an Epidemic

The overuse of antibiotics in both routine prescriptions and animal husbandry has resulted in the appearance of bacterial strains virtually invulnerable to modern wonder drugs.

BY KENNETH P. STOLLER, M.D.

T

er is a medical nightmare going on in this country that few know about. It is an infectious disaster waiting to happen that could affect all our lives. When it does occur, it will be the result of the indiscriminate use of antibiotics by agriculturists that raise animals for human consumption. And physicians have been aware of this danger for years.

Many doctors used to prescribe antibiotics for almost any cold or flu symptoms, but this practice is rapidly vanishing. Most colds are caused by viruses, and antibiotics have no effect on viral particles. Antibiotics work against infection either by breaking the cell wall of a bacteria, or by disrupting bacterial metabolism. Unfortunately, because of overuse, some bacteria have become resistant to antibiotics by developing an enzyme that blocks or destroys the chemical structure of the antibiotics. As a result, the bacteria can pass among groups of bacteria in minutes, even if they are not of the same species. As a rule, if bacteria are exposed to an antibiotic long enough, resistant strains will survive and thrive.

In 1955, strong agriculture lobbying overcame Food and Drug Administration (FDA) reluctance to permit the use of antibiotics as food preservatives. Ten years later, the FDA Commissioner appointed a special committee to determine whether its questionable decision of 1955 was indeed wise. The committee made its report in 1966, but by that time a number of researchers had confirmed a disturbing development: animals who ingested antibiotics were producing resistant bacteria, and these resistant strains of bacteria were being transmitted to humans through the animal products they ate. Over 20 years ago, The New England Journal of Medicine warned: “It appears that unless drastic measures are taken very soon, physicians may find themselves back in the pre-antibiotic Middle Ages in treatment of infectious diseases.” Today, antibiotic usage in “food animals” accounts for about half of all antibiotics produced in the United States. The overcrowded conditions of factory farms where the animals are raised are made possible only by the routine addition of antibiotics to their food. In 1979, the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) reported that 99 percent of all poultry, 90 percent of swine, and 70 percent of cattle and veal calves routinely receive antibiotics. Currently, antibiotics such as tetracyclines, penicillins, sulfa drugs, streptomycin, and macrolides are added in subtherapeutic amounts to animal feed for growth promotion and/or prophylaxis (prevention of disease). Placed in a situation which would normally make an otherwise healthy animal sick, this subtherapeutic administration of antibiotics keeps them disease-free and fat—because the antibiotics don’t have to waste any energy fighting off a disease he won’t get.

Mother’s advice to drink chicken soup when illness strikes becomes humorous if you expect to see penicillin residue in every spoonful. However, there is nothing funny about the bacteria Staphylococcus aureus, which is infamous for causing skin, bone, and wound infections as well as pneumonia and food poisoning. When penicillin was first introduced, fewer than 10 percent of staphylococcal strains isolated from patients and carriers were resistant to penicillin. Now 90 percent of staphylococci are resistant to penicillin.

Review of salmonella-inoculated layers in the United States from 1971 to 1983 showed that “food animals” were the source of 69 percent of the outbreaks caused by resistant salmonella, and 42 percent of these resistant salmonella infections were fatal (Science 1984; 225:833-5). A 1983 salmonella outbreak in four midwestern states was traced to eating hamburger originating from South Dakota beef cattle fed subtherapeutic chlorotetracycline for the purposes of growth promotion (New England Journal of Medicine 1984; 311:612-22). In 1986, a Seattle study found that almost a third of all poultry carcasses at local retail outlets were contaminated by either the bacteria Campylobacter jejuni, coli, salmonella, or yersinia (American Journal of Public Health 1986; 76:403-4).

According to Dr. Mitchell Cohen at the Center for Disease Control (CDC), infections frequently develop enteritis from these antimicrobial-resistant organisms. The babies aren’t eating the meat, but their parents are. While preparing the meat, the bacteria get all over countertops, utensils, and hands of the babies’ parents, and is then passed to the infant by his or her unsuspecting parent. The infant’s immature immune system cannot handle the opportunistic bacteria, and many times a severe enteritis ensues.

Most of the time, the resistant organisms reside as members of the intestinal “flora” in healthy human beings, having been deposited there by contaminated meat. Their numbers are usually held in check, thanks to the other normal bacteria that make up the gut flora in human intestines. However, should one of these healthy humans become ill and require antibiotics to treat an infection, all hell can break loose. The antibiotic will make the normal nonresistant organisms in the gut, leaving only the resistant bacteria to divide and multiply unchecked. Therefore, on top of whatever was being treated in the first place, the individual may now experience anything from a mild diarrhoea to pseudo-membranous colitis, or death.

In an intelligent move, Great Britain and the European Economic Community (EEC) banned the use of antibiotics for growth promotion over ten years ago. But in 1979, just as the evidence became compelling that animal products were passing resistant bacteria to humans, Congress prohibited the Food and Drug Administration from restricting antibiotic use in raising animals for food.

In 1979, just as the evidence became compelling that animal products were passing drug-resistant bacteria to humans, Congress prohibited the Food and Drug Administration from restricting antibiotic use in raising animals for food.

In May 1987, the Animals’ Agenda reported on antibiotic use in the milk and meat industries. Soon after, the FDA began testing milk from dairy cows fed antibiotics. In the same year, the CDC published a report on antibiotic use in the beef industry. Meanwhile, antibiotic use in livestock production continued to increase.
ANIMAL OPPRESSION:

The Old Ideology Rides On

BY PATRICK GRENVILLE

In spite of our efforts, animal exploitation seems to be on the upswing... 

ANIMAL INTELLIGENCER

A decade of work for animal liberation, one might imagine that a growing respect for the dignity of animals would exert some influence throughout society to make at least some ventures involving the suffering of fellow creatures much less likely. After all, in the U.S. alone, where every year billions of animals are forced to undergo all sorts of tortures and pains in the name of knowledge, food, profit, national security, and entertainment, an impartial observer might conclude that the outer bounds of exploitation had been reached. Well, not so. As demonstrated by the growing viability of entrepreneurs—new and old—who supply the market with totally superfluous products and services on the basis of animal abuse, catering to the callous consumer is an increasingly lucrative proposition. This failure on our part to shut off new forms of animal exploitation (or block the viability of the more vulnerable ones, such as hunting or fur) underscores a serious question facing the humane movement. Why is it still so ineffectual in punching a hole in the overall legitimacy of animal exploitation? 

Speciesism resurgent

consider the following examples. (Anyone can compile his or her own list by just scanning the local paper.)

Item 1: The fur industry reboots. The Fur Vault Inc., the parent corporation for the “Fred the Purr- rier” outlets, reported record revenues and earnings for the last quarter of 1986. With almost $5 million in sales, the firm registered a 46 percent increase over the previous year. But still profits confirm that the belief that mass marketing would open the road to survival and prosperity. About twelve or so years ago the fur industry was in a dire strait, its sales plummeting, its image properly tarnished. Today the picture is more complex, yet the bottom line tells the same story: the industry had in 1986-87 one of the best seasons ever. How come?

Item 2: New frontiers of free enterprise. The February 1987 issue of Venture magazine carries an in-structive profile on page 8. The subject is Foottech, a two-year-old firm operating in the relatively new field of “specialty food distribution.” Led by entrepre- neurs Mark Chapman, 43, and James Angel, 40, Foottech, based in Alexandria, Virginia, is now aggressively pushing buffalo meat as yet another menu choice for the well-heeled eater. (The firm already supplies major hotel chains such as the Marriott with exotic poultry and game bought from trappers in New Zealand and Canada.)

Item 3: The case of the brilliant proposal. In terms of sheer high-handed speciousness, few schemes to which those bathed jointly by government bureaucrats, academics and the private sector. An example of this came up last February, when the institute of the Rockies, a Montana organization for the protection of academic and business leaders, floated the “Big Opex” proposal, which envisioned the turning of 120,000 square miles into a game preserve for hunters rivaling those in Africa. According to Robert Scott, who was essentially the driving force behind the organization, the program would cover 12 percent of Montana, and sustain 30,000 wild animals, in- cluding game favorites such as elk, antelope, and antelope. The program is being proposed as a solution for the economic troubles besetting this region; the expenses of running a farm or ranch have risen steeply over the years, but the prices ranchers and farmers get for their cows, hogs, sheep and wheat have remained about the same. As reported by the New York Times, “in 1949 three fat steers, or 500 bushels of grain, would buy a new car, but today it takes ten times as much.” This, of course, reflects a much larger problem, the general deterioration in the terms of trade between the competitive (small farmers) and oligopolistic (agribusiness and equipment sup- pliers) sectors of the economy, chiefly as a result of the latter’s awesome political and market clout. But Montana’s 24,000 farms and ranches, a full half are expected to fail by 1990. But no matter. According to Scott, the ranchers would stand to make a lot more money “raising” wildlife (actually letting them roam) than they do now raising “food animals.” The Shoshon Ranch out of Boxman, Montana, is already doing that, raising elk and selling three- day hunts for $500.

There’s no question that plans such as these bespeak of a profoundly sick culture; in a world where even a large segment of humanity lacks elementary nourishment, the powers that be are thinking of putting a big chunk of agricultural real estate aside for a service of affluent “hobbyists”, with the animals, naturally, footing the bill. By any measure, this is a tragedy for all, but the question remains why is it that a callous “solution” such as this can be peddled around with total impunity in our society? Where are the editors denouncing so cynically an exploitation of animals and nature?

Fighting today’s wars with yesterday’s weapons

Maybe the answer lies in the tools the humane movement has chosen to influence the prevailing morality. Relying heavily on pamphlets, spot demonstrations (quite costly in terms of humanpower and preparation), direct-mail appeals, erratics, media coverage, time- consuming legislative drives of uncertain promis- e, and isolated campaigns, our message does not reach more than a few hundred thousand—or at the most a couple of million—people in any given month, plus a few local and national legi- slators. Meanwhile, as anyone can see, the speciestist system simply cloths us. Day in, day out, animal exploiters blanket the mass conscious- ness through a combination multimedia barrage worth hundreds of millions of dollars a year. For whether the object is to push burgers, milk, broilers, fans, leather goods or any other produc- t or service born of animal suffering, the underling message is always the same: exploiting animals is O.K., and it’s fun! But there’s another point. As the reigning ideology, speciesism drains terrorific nourishment from its own legality. Today it takes merely a stroke of the pen by a government bureaucrat or “imaginative” entrepreneur to launch yet another animal abuse scheme. It surely takes a lot longer for us to undo the damage unleashed by such acts. Can’t we improve matters a bit by changing the laws? Yes, we can, and we’re working on that, but here is a Catch-22: No animal defense legislation can prove too helpful unless it reflects a major change in the way people think about animals. It’s simply very difficult to legislate un- popular behavior.

What, then, are we to do? For starters we should begin examining our goals and methods of achieving social change, and stop using peashooters and gallant “cadetly charges” when more modern tactics are in order. Why not use television, for example, to help repudiate speciesist behavior in its more glaring manifesta- tions? Why have we so meekly conceded this ex- tremely powerful medium? Our timidity in this field is simply unjustifiable.

Space considerations do not allow me to pre- sent here a full discussion of our movement’s potential in regard to television, but those who will inevitably push this course of action should rethink their prejudices. For only the audiovisual medium can deliver the kind of audi- ences that will turn the tide of speciesism. Mean- while, each day we fail to deploy our resources more creatively, each day we fail to seize the initiative and educate the public at large, is another day we let mainstream humanity march on, playing its funereal dirge for the rest of creation.
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The Operation Was a Success, But the Species Died

Understanding the cultural factors that often cripple ambitious conservation efforts

BY VICTORIA SELMIR

High-quality field research does not always insure the survival of endangered species. It is not difficult to find, in the biological archives, many examples of successful research operations preceding a decline in the incidence of the subject endangered species. I submit that there are often cultural and political reasons for the failure of conservation projects.

Most endangered species are the "property" of the nations in which they reside. Conservationists have learned that governments need to be convinced that it is profitable and popular to protect endangered species. In other words, the major obstacle is probably human greed; in poorer nations, greed is joined by need.

As a result, the existence of species other than humans is in dire jeopardy practically everywhere on earth. There is room for some optimism, however, as the ruling classes of nations have responded to the increasingly sophisticated efforts on the part of international conservation organizations. All over the world, we find endangered species declared "preserved" and habitats pronounced "preserved." Yet, conservation efforts find that politicians are often slick, and that edicts and rhetoric do not a successful conservation effort make.

People are learners who know that money is sometimes well spent on saving the world, but "tribe money" is not always properly placed for effectiveness. Many a bagman from affluent nations (like the United States) has thrown cash away by paying off the wrong person. Sometimes the funds are best spent by throwing them at the top of the governmental hierarchy, but by subsidizing some underprivileged government employees who are effective proponents of conservation. The "compend biter" has studied the culture and understands how things are done. The right gift to the right person, given in an appropriate way for the right reason is also a strategy to be applied as assiduously as effective bribing. Valuably bestowed gifts are often as wasted and wasted as those thrown to the wrong officials.

When field research sites are located in the rural or wilderness areas of poor nations, the affluent scientist en-

How I Came to Recognize the Poverty of Predesism: A Veterinarian's Perspective

BY GARY COTTON, D.V.M.

I was in the midst of realizing my almost lifelong dream. It was my third year in veterinary school, and we were just getting ready to palpate (check rectally for pregnancy) about 30 Holstein cows. This experience was our first contact with large animals. The class was excited, but the cows were a little less enthusiastic. Up to this point in my life, I was an avid carnivore. My family was the usual meat-and-potatoes type. During college, when times were lean, so was the meat life. I came mostly from wild animals I hunted. During my sophomore year, I took an entire course entitled "Meats 125," in which I learned to butcher all kinds of animals. I also learned the "vernacular" of a meat diet, and was taught that it is morally correct, economical, and efficient to consume our animal friends. I participated in a debate, and took the position that humans had evolved to be carnivores. Yet now I'm a vegetarian. Those 30 Holstein cows taught me a lesson. While I learned them, I noticed that each one reacted differently: some stood still, some swooned, a few moaned loudly—some softly, and one kicked like hec. Those cows were feeling beings with unique personalities. That realization hit me like that kicking cow's foot.

How I Came to Recognize the Poverty of Predesism: A Veterinarian’s Perspective

Unfortunately, those Holstein cows were culled from area dairies and were headed for slaughter after our class was over. How cheaply we valued those unique individuals. I thought— they had no value to us except as hamburger meat.

As a veterinarian, I am committed to the welfare of animals. Veterinary schools, however, have been teaching double standards. They say to treat cows and pigs as economic commodities, but to treat "pet" animals as members of human families. The hypocrisy is blinding. Is a cow less than a dog, or a pig less than a cat? I couldn't eat a cat; therefore, I cannot justify eating a cow.

Most veterinary students fail to relate the contradictions. They save a dog's life one day, and go hunting to kill deer the next. Cost is of lesser concern when reaping a cat's fructified leg as compared to the broken leg of a pig who is usually destroyed for reasons of economy.

I knew this basic conflict could cause considerable moral confusion to lend evidence to another person—or else harden him or her in a self-protective mechanism. Many of my colleagues have become victims of the latter, and have lost that basic compassion that led them into the profession originally.

So I quit eating meat because of a moral concern, but have since gained a much healthier lifestyle. Yes, I still treat cows and other "food animals" destined for slaughter. Sometimes I wonder why I bother, but then realize that these animals will be cared for—if only for a fleeting moment in their lives—by someone who sees them as more than just a big, dollar sign.

Dr. Cotton practices veterinary medicine in Myrtle Point, Oregon.
Of Coconuts & Chemicals & The Planet Earth

Most cosmetics are made of synthetic chemicals. Turn around the bottles and tubes in your bathroom, and you’ll see what I mean. No matter what kind of picture of herb or flower or rejuvenating natural ingredient the manufacturer claims to use, you’ll see the natural ingredients written down on the label and the synthetic soaps or mineral-oil-based creams at the top. Some cosmetic companies claim that their synthetic chemicals come from coconuts: you’ll read ingredients like “triethanolamine” followed by, marked off coyly in parentheses “(from coconuts).” This maligns the coconut and misleads consumers.

Chemicals Don’t Grow On Trees!

In fact, the life cycle of the coconut is quite different from that of the “coconut chemicals.” Coconuts are picked or fall off the tree. If left on the ground, they rot, and new life is fed by their decay. Chemicals are born in laboratories; they are poured into rabbits’ eyes (for the Draize test) and forced-fed to rats (the LD50/60 test). They are sold to cosmetic manufacturers who usually don’t analyze test results but apply them wholesale for consumers. In your homes their lack of safety and wholesomeness is being proven every time you pour or rub them on your body because the public, not the animals, is the real testing ground. The “coconut chemicals,” like the coconut, wind up in the ground and water, but the chemicals pollute. The coconuts don’t.

No More Chemicalization!

The annual report of the Washington-based Worldwatch Institute, State of the World 1987, says the environment has reached its limits: damage to the air, water, land, and forests is permanent. Population growth and the resulting economic expansion and chemicalization has brought about a world contamination of the atmosphere, ozone layer, radical climatic changes, a mass extinction of plant and animal species, and a long-term decline in the quality of life. The Third World is particularly vulnerable economically, politically, and ecologically.

A Stand Against Animal Testing Is A Stand Against Chemicalization!

Aubrey Organics is aware of this problem and we have, for this reason, been writing articles to encourage everybody to do everything possible to support animal protection, wildlife sanctuaries, products that do not use petrochemicals and hydrocarbons which pollute our environment, cosmetics without synthetic chemicals, petrochemicals, coal-tar dyes, and other toxic materials which not only affect our own bodies but also the environment in which we live.

Animal testing is one area that releases chemicals into our environment pronounced as “safe,” but they are NOT SAFE. This is just one area that needs a closer look, not simply based on the morality of torturing animals, but the long-range effects this will have on our ecosystem.

Standing Up for Animals on the Job

The working class encompasses almost everybody nowadays. A job can take a substantial amount of time and energy, and for many of us it requires leaving our personal lives and interests at the elevator door. It is possible only to a certain extent, though, and few offices harboring an animals rights activist are unaware of that fact. Just knowing they’re “on board” causes co-workers to discover and appreciate issues which might not have otherwise, and many an animal rights champion has been introduced to the cause by someone at work.

That doesn’t mean that keeping true to principles from 8 to 5 is necessarily easy. Career choices themselves can sometimes be complicated by convictions. For example, my husband embarked upon a new profession in chiropractic medicine when he was past thirty. Why? He had been a biologist and when the uselessness and brutality of vivisection dawned on him, he had to find another profession.

Then there was an activist who couldn’t work in his town’s major industry, a steel mill, because steel-rod work shoes were required, and they were unavailable in a non-leather fiber—so he spent two years driving a taxi at below minimum wage. He now has a graduate degree, but can’t pursue a teaching career because of a “loyalty oath” required by a state, which he sees as opposing his belief in animal rights, total rights, and pacifism.

My first job was writing ad copy for a department store. I refused to write for ads knowing that I’d also refused to write leather shoe ads, I’d be looking for a vegetarian soup line. I’m now on the staff of a local magazine that appeals to the wealthy and fashionable. When the editor suggested I do a story promoting fur, I had to make my stand known. The editor, my immediate boss who already knew my feelings, backed me totally and told the publisher that my “heart wouldn’t be in it”—a very mild statement given my strong convictions on the issue, but I learned the importance of having at least one fellow worker understand where I’m coming from.
The direct action investigations of Lifeforce, an animal rights organization based in Vancouver, British Columbia, have exposed the covert operations of laboratories in Canada and the United States, documenting unethical and scientifically fallacious experiments. Since 1982, Lifeforce has been investigating the University of California (UC) system, unearthing controversial research conducted at campuses throughout the state. In this article, Peter Hamilton, founder of Lifeforce, offers a peek at what happens behind the doors of UC's vast biomedical domain.

In 1986, four years after Lifeforce began investigating University of California laboratories, information was obtained which indicated that over 100 experiments were being conducted on cats and kittens at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). The next day, December 30, 1985, the investigation was completed, and the original suspicions were graphically confirmed.

In April 1986, a 45-page report outlining the major problems of the research was submitted to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR). The report included 23 pages of photographic evidence, and was followed by a supplement report in June. In August, OPRR was provided with videotapes taken of the animals undergoing the experiments. NIH, typically conducted what was considerably less than a comprehensive investigation, and concluded that there were no improprieties. NIH refused to take any action towards UCLA's own response to charges leveled in the report. Included were admissions revealing violations of NIH guidelines, some resulting in "unnecessary" pain and suffering to research animals. Specifically, UCLA's response supported the following claims documented by Lifeforce:

1. Kittens, and to continue to be subjected to painful medical procedures through weak anesthesia. UCLA concedes that it used "anesthesia" only for the sake of "safety" for the animals. UCLA's report claims that they died after an undisclosed person helped them die.

2. UCLA concedes that it had used the surgery room itself for "preparing" animals. Yet NIH guidelines state that "functions for veterinary surgery should include a separate surgical support area, an operating room or rooms, and an area for intensive care and supportive treatment of animals." Violation of this provision may have led to infection and suffering.

3. Poor post-surgical monitoring was not provided. UCLA concedes that there is no one present while the cats "dynamite" recovered from surgery on January 6, 1986. Yet NIH Guidelines for Post Surgical Care and the Animal Welfare Act, 3.10(a), state that "post-surgical care should include observing the animal to ensure uneventful recovery from anesthesia and surgery." Additionally, Dr. Buyukmihci points out that proper post-surgical monitoring must include observing the animals until they are able to maintain themselves in a normal (not sick) condition. Animals should not be left to die with pain relief.

In December, Lifeforce protested NIH's failure to act on the evidence, and NIH Director James Wynyard and Dr. Robert Rossetti, Assistant Director of Veterinary Services at the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) which has responsibility for enforcing provisions of the Animal Welfare Act. A 40-page document, "Response to NIH Inquiry," was sent to NIH and both agencies. In addition, another investigative report (including 12 photo pages) was submitted which documented further violations by UCLA in the conduct of alcohol and drug experiments on animals. In May 1987, a Press conference was held in Los Angeles at which NIH was represented by Dr. Kazuo Inoue, and Lifeforce was represented by the Attorney General's head investigator.

The "Broken Promises" Campaign

The UCLA spinal cord research investigated by Lifeforce was the subject of a greater campaign called "Broken Promises," an examination of the weaknesses of the animal research industry. The hope it raises among people with serious diseases and disorders, in particular, is misleading. The actual results of the animal experiments waste research funds and raise false hopes among the millions of disabled people throughout the world.

An increasing number of people are confined to wheelchairs because of spinal cord injuries due to automobile, diving, and other injuries. Diseases of the spinal cord and birth defects caused by chemicals in the environment, just a few of the many. Drugs taken during pregnancy. Other disorders of the central nervous system result. In paralytic conditions may be caused by side effects from spinal surgery, or from drugs (like methadone) which were deemed "safe" through tests on animals. Many people who have suffered spinal cord injury are alive today and have improved lifestyles due to treatments and aids developed from research without animals. Treatments developed through human clinical studies have prevented pressure sores, improved sexual function and potency, and corrected urinary problems in the disabled. Technological advances for aiding or treating the handicapped developed without the use of animals include functional electrical stimulation (FES), neural prostheses for hand control, diaphragm pacers, Helium-Neon cold lasers, stereo cameras, electronic microscopes, X-rays, and imaging and spectroscopic techniques.

Stopping spinal cord experiments with animals will not only prevent the suffering of animals, but also help the handicapped by redressing funds for humane and beneficial projects. Improvements can and should be made in perinatal care, geriatric care, surgical treatment, trauma centers, rehabilitation centers, and in vitro (non-animal) research employing human nerve cell and tissue cultures, and the use of human cadavers show great promise.

-- Peter Hamilton
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which might be directly applied to the human condition. As with other areas of biomedical research, the mystery of human physiology has been and will continue to be understood only by the study of human physiology.

The "Broken Promises" campaign also focuses on a new concept: lifeforce calls "Health Rights," the principle that sentient beings—both human and nonhuman—are entitled to a healthy life. It calls upon researchers to study naturally occurring maladies in people and animals through clinical and epidemiological studies. The philosophy underlying the "Broken Promises" movement reflects the worldwide interest of Lifeforce, which, since its birth in 1983, has stressed the importance of the re-evaluation of many issues facing society through examining the interrelationship between human, animal, and environmental problems.

Properly conducted investigations of research facilities are essential in providing documented evidence of animal abuses and scientific fraud to the general public. Such investigations should uncover the weaknesses of the animal research system and focus on issues which people will relate to and support. The research community cannot be entrusted to "police" itself. Charles McCarthy, Director of NHI's OPRR, has stated: "It

Now available, two new books by the acclaimed author and Lois activist Cona K. Solier, with appeal for all ages.

FOR LOVE OF HENRY is about the struggle of a housewife to provide shelter for Henry, a noisy, rambunctious rooster and his harem. Easter and Easter, amid troublesome zoning restrictions that frown on such pets, GREYHALL, a center on a strange, hand-knitting struggle to be normal in a Noah's Ark of other animals, seems to have inexperience "people" cope with their first rental difficulties.

FOR LOVE OF HENRY $5.95 per copy, postpaid
GREYHALL $6.95 per copy, postpaid
Order directly from the publisher
Dorrance & Co
838 Lancaster Avenue
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010  

Spinal Cord Experiments on Animals Conducted Nationwide

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) has designated five U.S. centers for spinal cord injury research:

1. New York University is the center for acute spinal injuries, using cats as models for humans. Principal investigator is Eugene Flamm.

2. Yale University is the center for acute spinal cord injuries, using cats and rats. Principal investigator is William E. Collins, Jr.

3. The Medical University of South Carolina performs "fundamental studies in spinal cord injury" on rats, cats, dogs, and monkeys. Principal investigator is Phaoro K. Pern.

4. The University of Florida at Gainesville studies "functional spinal cord regeneration" in cats. Principal investigator is John B. Munson.

5. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill studies "recovery and regeneration after neuro-injury" in experiments using cats, monkeys, frogs, and rats. Principal investigator is Edward R. Pern.

The NIH also funds spinal injury research on animals at many other universities and medical institutions not designated "centers." For example, activist Bob Russell of the group Protect Our Earth's Treasures (P.O.E.T., P.O. Box 3256, Columbus, OH 43201, 614-451-3605) has accumulated data on spinal injury experiments at Ohio State University on rats, dog, cats, frogs, and opossums.

The Human Animal Liberation Front (HALF, P.O. Box 1960, Cathedral Station, New York, NY 10025) has prepared a brochure describing in chilling detail the experiments performed on cats at the Spinal Injury Clinic at New York University. Contact HALF for a copy of that report.

is the goal of OPRR to assist institutions in complying with established policies, not to find them guilty of wrongdoing" (Lab Animal Magazine, July/Aug, 1984). While OPRR continues to protect the experimenters and not the animal subjects, the effects of junk research—experiments which are ill-conceived and poorly conducted—will continue to cause immeasurable suffering to millions of animals as well as provide fallacious results which ultimately harm the unsuspecting public.

Lifeforce trains special investigative teams. Concerned animal activists who support non-violent actions may contact Lifeforce for information on such training programs. People must be prepared to document the problems without interfering. Contact Lifeforce at 6310 Main Post Office, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6B 3N6 (604-299-2822).

A "Broken Promises" Education Package is available for a donation of $45.00 (U.S.) which includes a videotape (VHS and Beta 1/2), an individual use, 3 1/2" for television stations), photographs, and written documentation. Brochures are available for 20 cents.
LETTERS

Indifference to the Future

Can we realistically expect people to have concern for animals when it's obvious that they don't care about the most serious issues affecting their own lives — toxic waste, mattered dubbed, dubious drugs, Star Wars' weapons systems, acid rain, etc.? How many people will have to die? How many catastrophes will occur before there is enough public outrage and concern? The indifference to the future of our environment and all it contains clearly indicates some deep moral malaise. The destructive attitude toward the environment and animals has now progressed to a "shock" regarding the possibility of annihilation. The shock says receive the public that somehow we'll survive.

Let's inform the people who claim we only care about animals that they don't even care about the imminent possibilities of disaster for all living creatures. What should they do about it? They could start by developing some sensitivity to animals. Once they can 'feel' again, maybe they'll understand their connection with all living creatures, and cooperate with us for a meaningful survival.

— Jean Leeves
Philadelphia, PA

ALF Violent

In your January/February 1987 Comment section, you state "the movement is somewhat divided on how it views the activities of a group that uses "violent tactics" in defense of ALF actions constitute violence?" If there is anyone who still believes that ALF actions do not constitute violence, they should read the article on page 20 of that same issue. That article states that the ALF raised an animal facility at the University of Oregon and caused an estimated $1 million of damages. Their motives were clearly those of a violent organization, and I believe that the movement would be better off without it.

— Kevin McDonald
Yalefield, RI

Label "Vivisectors" Apologist Dogmatic

Although aspects of Michael Allen Fox’s pro-animal biomedical experimentation stance deeply concern me, other aspects were worthy of serious consideration and morally dictated a review of his book The Case for Animal Experimentation by The ANIMALS’ AGENDA. I subsequently learned that you had, in a matter of policy, decided to ignore this and other such books is that why you did not review Oryvile Schall’s pivotal and detailed expose of "the biurocratic abuse that did not take the absolutist 'Mist is Murder' form of censorship as an integral part of the animal rights movement indeniable.

Now your March 1987 issue devotes more than half a page to a letter by Fox to the Scientist recounting certain of his views. In March 1987, in The Ecance and some three decades as a book publisher, I have never heard of or heard of a book being devoted to the assaultor; it is the kind of moral and intellectual honesty and sheen courage that left this reader flabbergasted. The ANIMALS’ AGENDA is to be commended for that re-print. I urge that you follow this up with a far greater scrutiny, including possibly an article by Fox and/or an interview with that was held.

Your presentation of that letter, beginning with that blaring headline's label "Vivisectors’ Apologist" is to put it kindly—misleading. In the first place, that label fails to make a distinction between the "know-nothing-call-us-anything-goes" vivisectors and persons like the old Fox who advance reasonable and defensible arguments in favor of some experimentation on a strictly limited and controlled basis. Second, your reply defines a policy of notqualification of dogmatists who dub all dissenters with polemics as "vivisectors" who dub all dissenters with polemics as "vivisectors". Below your reproduction of the book's front-cover jacket appears your summary caption. The other caption, which has now recanted the arguments he put forth to support the use of animals in research is more than misleading. It is distortion and misrepresentation. True, the possibility of worthless and humanly superior to other forms of life. But even at this point Fox still defends his argument that all animals may have no moral rights, a central tenet for absolute prohibition. He also still holds that we humans cannot speak for our "anti-hypocritical" standpoint, another sine qua non for the absolutist. Finally, nowhere in his letter does Fox state or imply that he now favors an end to all such biomedical work.

On too many matters Fox may still be perplexed, but obviously this is the world "science" that is shady, and most probably still provo- to influence the style of an important paper in the Social Sciences, which has major implications for all of society.

What is involved is not exclusively Fox's book, or an individual, but the whole complex of major theses. The real issue is: Shall a journal that purports to advance a higher morality and sounder ethics (as did the early Marxists, in response to the horrors of capitalism and its policy of not-talk and property (if at all) reviewing books like Fox's, and thereby embrace dogmatism? Shall it resort to censorship, suppression, distortion, and misrepresentation to advance its cause?

If such praxis is upheld, a desperately needed movement and its often marvellous and courageous journal may yet have to face history's bitter lesson. That in the long run, dogmatism (buttressed by censorship, etc.) perverts the truth's good cause and unnecessarily tunes out, alienates, and antagonizes those who could and should be on its side, possibly as genuine dissenters—not "fascists" and "Vivisectors’ Apologists"—souls.

— Benjamin Blank
The Amorylis Press, Inc.
New York, N.Y.

PETA Claims Facts Not Checked

By the time this issue of The ANIMALS’ AGENDA is out, the New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAWS) election will be over. The new directors have yet to be announced. Cutting the list of candidates for the offices of 33 people to act in unison is almost a miracle. In the next few months, I believe that the new directors will agree that the new NEAWS can be much more helpful to animals in laboratories than the NEAWS of the last several decades.

This brings us to The ANIMALS’ AGENDA. This issue has more than a few people in it being discussed. Before going to print. In its narrow article on recent developments at NEAWS, you stated that People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) had "rejected to discuss" six candidates for ur "platforms of plans... drawn up by an ad hoc committee of New England activists," but "subsequently incorporated most of the plan's provisions into their own 10-point program.

In fact, PETA was never presented with, let alone refused to discuss, any other six candidates forming a slate, and no other platform or even plans was suggested to us at any time.

— Ingrid Newkirk
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals
Washington, D.C.

Editor's Note: At a meeting requested by PETA leaders on January 18, 1987, at the New England office of the Fund for Animals, it was confirmed to the editorial staff that NEAWS, the Canadian, Dogwood, Missouri, Patrice Grenelle, and all the others that you mentioned. England activist was presented, and its "platform" for changing the direction of NEAWS was discussed. At that meeting (attended by Alex Pacheco, Ingrid Newkirk, Cleveland Armstrong, Gary and Mary Jo Fales, Kim Skowled, Neil Scaini, Richard M. Welser, Vicki MacNeil, the Canada, Dogwood, Missouri, Patrice Grenelle, and all the others that you mentioned) the leadership repeatedly asked for information about their plans for NEAWS after they gained control. However, they refused to discuss their plans, and indicated that they had not yet formulated a concrete program for managing NEAWS and its $150,000 in assets. A few days later, PETA announced its 10-point plan, which included most of the provisions of the program drawn up by the committee of New Englanders.
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Searching for the Way Out

Alternatives to Current Uses of Animals in Research, Safety Testing, and Education—A Layman’s Guide

By Martin L. Stephens, Ph.D.
The Humane Society of the United States
86 pages, $13.95 paperback
Order from HSUS: 2100 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037

This 86-page booklet should be on the shelf of every individual and organization concerned with the problem of animal experimentation. Many anti-vivisectionists, especially those without scientific knowledge, are often in hot water when confronted by skeptics who press them on the question of what science could and should not accomplish with non-animal replacements.

Stephens’s ultimate goal is the replacement of all animals in research by non-animal means. But because full replacement may still be many years in the offing, the volume includes a discussion of many interim steps. Thus, along with the replacement of animals, Stephens analyzes ways of reducing the numbers of animals used, and of refining the current standards of care and use of animals with a view to reducing pain and deprivation. Whether reduction and refinement should legitimately be called alternatives is a good question—classifying them as such has already led some people to think that this is just another means of changing animal defense—but there is little doubt that those steps should not be neglected. A powerful reason for this is that they sometimes lead into replacement.

Work for reduction or refinement can involve a full-fledged animal rights activist in concentrated efforts, but all too many people convinced that some animals should be exploited—though as few as possible. Evidently, there are two sides to some issue. Commonly, even though they may differ seriously in some other aspects connected with the issues. A full animal rights supporter would look on refinement or reduction as only steps to reduce suffering, whereas an animal welfareist might look on these goals as final ends. A number of researchers have decided that such is the case in animal laboratories. Two such laboratories, one at Rockefeller and the other at Harvard, have decided that the number of animals used for research would be reduced and that the animals would not suffer pain, stress, or discomfort.

The high-fidelity fallacy A “high-fidelity” experimental model (for humans) is the creature most precisely resembling a human, or at least a mammal. But in certain cases, “low-fidelity” models provide specific information better than their “high” counterparts. One example is the horsehair crab, which discriminates human fever response better than a rabbit. Though the crab has less human blood than a human from a rabbit, in this case it is a more discriminating model.

Tissue culture, in particular, appears extremely promising. The study of viruses in tissue culture has allowed researchers to concentrate viruses and to screen drugs for anti-viral activity. Tissue culture in AIDS research has isolated, identified, and concentrated the AIDS virus, a major contribution to the struggle against this disease. Currently, this technique is a great and still largely untested potential.

In addition to the obvious advantages of using tissue culture, the emerging field of mathematical and statistical models, Mathematical models for both the LSD and Daze tests have already been developed by Health Designs Inc., as well as a software package (TOPKAT), which can predict toxicological endpoints. The method is now just being introduced to the scientific community.

Alternatives in education

The science advisors of the American Fund for Alternatives to Animal Research (AAAR) think this volume should be recommended to high school biology majors, biology teachers, and college students who write to all federal defense societies requesting information, and to libraries even here serving young publics. It would be desirable to prepare a simpler version for the general high school student.

It is noteworthy that animals are used for surgery practice in most countries except in the United Kingdom, where the use of animals in education has been forbidden. Animals have been learned from observation and “apprenticeship”—one senior medical craftsman “passing on his basic knowledge” to a younger one. The approach seems to be perfectly adequate; a study made in 1984 comparing British with American surgeons showed no significant differences in their level of proficiency. For microsurgery, which does need practice, placental from full-term human births have been fitted with surgical pumps providing artificial circulation.

Although many neurexians have been widely used in medical college, veterinary students are only beginning to use a few (Rhesus-Dog and Beagle-Dog). A few high school biology majors now have the opportunity to learn tissue culture in 10-week summer courses in Washington, D.C., at the Center for Advanced Training in Cell and Molecular Biology at George Washington University. This training, too. The more common aids, such as videos, films, computer simulations (Operation Frog), electronic photography and microphotography need to be more widely used.
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to the gamut of animal exploitation, but more importantly it
pushes a variety of fundraising buttons.
The groups I like most are the ones with more specialized
fields of attention, with tangible and well defined goals. They
can’t so easily hide behind their newest campaign. Like the
"Animal Agency of the Month" clubs. And they can’t take credit
for something in which they were only minimally involved as
it would be clearly false.
Fundraising one-upmanship has got to stop. Money
honestly raised will be money honestly used.

O
ur movement is at a critical crossroads in its develop-
ment. Before animal rights became a mainstream con-
cept, most of the individuals working in the field had
a more or less united sense of purpose. The opposition was
so formidable that there was a clear awareness of the need to
work together toward at least one major goal: to plant the
seed of awareness in the general public.

Even by those who oppose it, animal rights is now accepted
as an issue that must be reckoned with. The movement has
been successful. With this limited success, however, comes a
little sadness. The clarity of the "us against them" struggle is
no longer so obvious, and the camaraderie that characterized
the early period threatens to give way to internal squabbles
and turf wars.

It is critical for us to understand the new demands that
the maturing of the movement place on each of us in our own
specific context. The demands and responsibilities of a small
grassroots organization are different from those of a large na-
tional organization, and both of these are far different than
those faced by primary care givers at animal shelters, wildlife
refuges, and the like.

I do not have a simple answer to the questions posed
by this Forum. In fact, as points of view become more diffused,
such questions will become more and more difficult to answer
simply.

Sat. Koros

Animal Rights Kinship
Austin, Texas

="A Daily Prayer for the Poisoned, the Blinded, the Trapped, the Shocked, the Sacrificed ..."

The old book says that Adam named them before
he was cast out, that Noah herded them
into the God-driven ark so they might live.
We are no flesh in Eden, but afterwards,
when things got hard, we forgot
the peaceful kinship of that ancient kingdom.
As our teeth sunk into their flesh
we had to deny them. So we said:
they had no souls, no reason, no thumbs,
no speech. We were so different. We made
so many things to protect us—fire, medicine,
our locking houses, many kinds of clothes.

And we renamed them—farm product, far crop,
renewable resource. I pray that we will see
their faces again in the mirror of creation,
the miracle of animals, their clear eyes
meaning more than profit to our future.

—Jean Pearson

Pearson is an "eco-poet" and animal advocate whose work has appeared in many journals and collections of poetry. She is currently editing an anthology of prose and poetry about the earth.
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The Cookbook for People Who Love Animals
Over 350 Vegan Recipes
NO Meat, Eggs, Dairy or Honey
Beginner to Gourmet easy to follow
Introduction and Nutritional Guidelines by Michael Klaper M.D.
Excellent for weight loss and special diets
Low fat & sodium. High fibre.
CHOLESTEROL Interpersersed with reading in support of animal rights and special chapter on feeding your pets vegetarian
A MUST FOR PEOPLE WHO CARE ABOUT ANIMALS special discount and want to be healthy Now $7.00

There are more Gentle Products which include stationery and hand painted shirts - for info write Gentle Dept. A P. O. Box 1418
Umailla, Florida 32784
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CONCERN FOR ANIMALS COOKBOOK
Mehla dishes (without meat); dressings, dips, bread, pies, cakes, etc. Non-profit animal welfare organization recommends this book.
"Cookbook", P.O. Box 7506, Olympia, WA 98506

COLOR ME PROUDNESS
Ms. Proudness, a cute Cocker Spaniel character, will teach children to care for dogs while they color the picture book pages. Each page has an easy-to-understand "lesson". An adorable book! Great for gift. $2.95. Order by phone or postcard.
Inquiries to: HUNGRYWOOD ENTERPRISES, P.O. Box 104, Rainier, OR 97048, $4.25. Dealer inquiries welcome.


Send $5 to The SAGE Management Co., 1217 N. Lake St., Chicago, IL 60622. $6.75 for $7.95.

EMPLOYMENT WANTED
CLASSIFIED

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES

PLEASE READ THIS Four years ago we developed a valuable, humane concept for animal boarding. We make a good living and don’t have someone telling us what to do from 9 to 5. Our work is delightful and we are especially pleased it has social significance. Want to know more? We’d enjoy talking with you. Paws Are Inn: 1-800-228-PETS.

BOARDING

HARMONY KENNELS Vacaville, CA, Boarding dogs and cats by appointment only. (707) 448-4646.

SERVICES

ANIMAL PORTRAITS, SATISFACTION GUARANTEED. For details write Jan Rogers, PO Box 684, Gardnerville, PA 19432.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEA SHEPHERD. We’ve stopped more marine mammal slaugher than any other organization. Receive our newsletter. Box 7000-S, Redondo Beach, CA 90277.

VEGETARIAN PACK TRIPS. Enjoy the spectacular mountains of northern New Mexico from a remote high camp. Gear packed by human. Gourmet vegetarian meals provided. Eight days, $328. Arcturus Institute, PO Box 4711-C, Santa Fe, NM 87502. (505) 983-3653.

ANIMALS NEED PURE WATER, TOO! Water Box 2793, Dunwoody, TX 77030 for details about MULTI-PURE Drinking Water Systems.

YOU CAN BE A VETERINARIAN! Advice from a Cornell veterinary student. Send $5.00, name, address, to: Vet, PO Box 5661, Clevelanid, NY 14416.

FREEDOM ANIMAL SANCTUARY FUND. We are a group of people who are putting all our savings into buying an animal sanctuary. Any donations received go directly towards the sanctuary as we have no overhead. Please send donations to: Freedom Animal Sanctuary Fund, 126 Dudley Road, Tumbridge Wells, Kent, T.N.I, U.K.

THEIR EYES DON’T LIE

Their eyes don’t lie is a 745 destroyed woman and the text contains all of animal justice information. With a focus on farm animal liberation and the links between human animal exploitation. Through how ‘we’ use violence, deep-thinking lyrics and uncommitting words and graphics, socially concerned young people ask the question: How much longer can we oppress and exploit humanity? In order to act on the questions. 953 U.S. dollars (postage) to: Student Action Corps for the Animals, Box 203, Washington, D.C. 20003-0580.

Pound seizure – It’s a subject on which just about everybody has an opinion. Some people think that selling unclaimed pets to research labs is a good use for animals who will “die anyway” in shelters and pounds across the nation. Others don’t like the idea of using dogs and cats in research, but fear that medical science will be harmed if these animals are not available. The ASPCA believes that using former pets as research subjects is an outrage. Pound seizure perpetuates the tragedy of pet overpopulation by turning unwanted animals into “resources” to be exploited. It also destroys public confidence in animal shelters. But perhaps the most compelling argument against pound seizure is the ethical one. How can a society which loves and values companion animals condemn those same animals to death in research labs?

In 1985, the ASPCA and ten other humane organizations agreed to set up and fund the National Coalition to Protect our Pets (ProPets) for the sole purpose of hastening the end of pound seizure. In the two years since its formation, ProPets has been involved in scores of state and local initiatives to ban this practice. It has also produced educational materials designed to raise public awareness about pound seizure, including a provocative videotape of medical doctors commenting on why pound seizure must end.

If you’d like information on the ProPets coalition, and on what you can do to help stop pound seizure, contact:

Dr. Michael Giannelli
The National Coalition to Protect our Pets
3123 Cahenga Boulevard West
Los Angeles, California 90068

or

ASPCA/Humane Education Department
441 East 92nd Street
New York, New York 10128

With your help, we can keep pets from ending up in laboratories.

The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
America’s First Humane Society

A Rose By Any Other Name May Smell As Sweet...  
But It Won’t Benefit The Skin and Hair Like Rosa Mosqueta®

Rose hips from the Rosa Mosqueta® grow high in the Andes Mountains where they were used to make jelly. Now medical researchers from Chile have shown in documented clinical studies that the fragrant golden oil extracted from these rose hips promotes healing and reverses the signs of premature aging.

Why is Rosa Mosqueta® Rose Hip Seed Oil so beneficial to the skin and hair? It is high in polyunsaturated fatty acids, at least 80%. The high percentage of fatty acids is important because these substances encourage the synthesis of important prostaglandins that regulate the health of your skin and hair. When used topically, fatty acids allow the skin to retain its moisture and keep the hair lustrous and silky. Fatty acids also provide an occlusive film that attracts moisture to the skin and hair. Aubrey packages pure Rosa Mosqueta® Rose Hip Seed Oil in a roll-on bottle, but you can use this fragrant oil in the four other 100% natural products pictured above for anti-aging Rosa Mosqueta® rejuvenation from head to toe.

Rosa Mosqueta® Natural Method of Skin Care

Just three simple skin care steps will keep your skin beautifully clear and soft! Cleanse your face with Aubrey’s new delicious-smelling Rosa Mosqueta® Complexion and Body Soap. This delicate soap contains four anti-aging herbal extracts: Rosa Mosqueta® Oil, alfalfa extract, borage oil, and St. John’s wart oil. Follow the cleansing with Rosa Mosqueta® Oil on areas of premature aging and then Rosa Mosqueta® Rose Hip Moisturizing Cream. You can add more steps to your Natural Method, but do these three every day!

Rosa Mosqueta® Natural Method of Hair Care

Your hair can also benefit from Rosa Mosqueta Oil, and Aubrey has formulated two superb natural products that will enhance your hair’s health. In Aubrey’s Rosa Mosqueta Herbal Shampoo, pure Rosa Mosqueta Oil is compounded with herbal extracts of coltsfoot and horsetail—both high in the hair repair amino acid cystine—in a natural coconut soap. And, after your shampoo, apply Rosa Mosqueta® Conditioning Hair Cream with the same herbal extracts and amino acids for hair regeneration.

Each new Aubrey Organics’ Rosa Mosqueta® product wears two names you can trust: Aubrey Organics for the best natural hair and skin care products around, and Rosa Mosqueta® for the pure natural oil with proven results.

Available in Better Health Food Stores Everywhere

AUBREY ORGANICS

4419 North Manhattan Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33614