

North American Animal Liberation Press Office Newsletter

Volume One Number Four

Table of Contents

News

- 3 HSUS Crosses the Line
- 8 Targeted guinea pig farm closes
- 10 Animal rights and wrongs: The campaign against the Newchurch guinea pig farm may have shocked, but Nelson Mandela would understand it
- 12 Doctors Sue Merck Over Vioxx Animal Tests
- 13 Dictatorship of the drug industry: Drug Companies and Government Conspire to Evade Vivisection Regulations
- 16 Call For An End To Testing On Animals
- 17 Greens Call For A Real Alternative To Vivisection
- 18 Britain Bans American Professor Who Speaks on Behalf of Animal Liberation Front
- 19 Exclusion Or Deportation From The UK On Non-Conducive Grounds: Consultation Document

Featured Articles

- 21 How Like Us Need They Be?
- 33 Benefits of animal experiments no longer exist
- 35 Disease Mongering
- 39 Appreciate animal-rights restraint
- 40 The High Price of Animal Experimentation

This month's newsletter features a long overdue critique of HSUS, which continues to demonstrate divisive and unscrupulous behavior in its attack on the direct action movement. HSUS has regularly condemned tough tactics that have been proven to work for animals, but this time they crossed a line.

In addition, this issue notes the recent important victory of activists over Darley Oaks guinea pig breeding farm. After a six year long campaign against the Hall family for its exploitation of guinea pigs, the breeders finally threw in the towel, thereby becoming the latest in a long string of victories - including Consort Kennels, Hillgrove Cat Farm, Shamrock Monkey Farm, and Regal Rabbits - animal liberations have won against those who supply animals to the vivisection industry. This victory has considerably emboldened the animal liberation movement in England, as it alarms scientists who call for still tougher laws against activists. Slowly but surely, the UK is becoming a fascist police state, as is evident in the recent ban of Dr. Steven Best and creation of new "exclusion bill" (see the link in this issue). The media coverage of the victory over Darley Oaks has been overwhelmingly negative, casting animal rights activists as warped criminals and terrorists, and betraying a complete lack of objectivity or fairness in its Star Magazine tabloid-style "journalism." But the struggle against Darley Oaks takes on a completely different meaning if one bothers to ask about the treatment of thousands of guinea pigs exploited and murdered in UK vivisection labs, and the UK government's collusion with the vivisection industry. Together, the corporate-state vivisection complex in the UK blocks any meaningful legal avenue of change, such that activists have no recourse but to use tactics of sabotage and force. Amidst great struggle and turmoil in England, the only certain thing is that corporations and the state on one side and animal liberationists on the other, are squaring up for a monumental battle over animal rights that will only become more intense.

HSUS Crosses the Line

The animal advocacy movement is richly diverse, and encompasses three major tendencies: animal welfare, animal rights, and animal liberation. Where all animal welfare and most animal rights groups insist on working within the legal boundaries of society, animal liberationists argue that the state is irrevocably corrupt and that legal approaches alone will never win justice for the animals.

Whereas animal liberationists have always urged a pluralist approach and shown appreciation for all tactics including welfare, the converse, unfortunately, has not been the case. Numerous welfare and rights groups have criticized the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) for actions they think hurt the image of animal advocacy and alienate potential sympathizers. In these criticisms, they display an appalling ignorance of the history and effectiveness of ALF actions. Through sabotage and raids, ALF actions have:

- Saved thousands of animals from a horrible fate and found them loving homes
- Freed thousands more to live out the rest of their lives in the wild
- Shut down egregious fur farms and laboratories

- Financially weakened countless exploiters
- Provided valuable video documentation of extreme animal cruelty, much of it done in the name of “science” that espouses “animal welfare” values

Many mainstream organizations have pulled out of conferences pluralistic enough to include direct action speakers. Such divisive actions have less to do with principle than with the economic demands of membership support and fear of being tainted by McCarthyesque tactics that assign guilt through association. The more an organization has to lose, the more it strives to separate itself from militant aspects of the movement. For the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), a small empire is at stake.

HSUS has become more vocal in its criticism of the ALF and direct action tactics in general in a post-9/11 context where dissent of any kind is branded as “domestic terrorism” and animal exploitation industries have gained increasing influence in the state. Spearheaded by the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), a pernicious and powerful corporate lobbying group, 14 states have introduced new “Animal and Ecological Terrorism Act” laws designed to thwart activism against “animal enterprises” and “natural resource” industries. Such bills have already passed in Oklahoma, California, Utah, and Colorado. Like the Patriot Act, the language in these bills is so broad and sweeping that even leafleting against industries can be branded as a terrorist action. Among other things, these new laws increase penalties for trespassing and vandalism, outlaw unauthorized filming of industry operations, ban donations to organizations deemed “ecoterrorist,” and mandate that individuals convicted of such “crimes” have their personal information and photograph posted to a public Internet base.

In our current neo-McCarthyesque era, all forms of dissent are under attack, nowhere more so than in the animal rights movement. Legal forms of protest increasingly are subject to restriction and repression, as evident in the arrest of the “SHAC7,” activists who have been charged with violations of the 1992 Animal Enterprise Protection Act. In June 2005, reminiscent of the 1950s HUAC hearings, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee convened a special meeting against animal rights “terrorism” and their real target clearly was not only the ALF, but also mainstream groups such as PETA and indeed, HSUS.

In such conditions, a fork has opened in the road to the future, and organizations must take one of two roads: the path of self-interest and self-preservation, or the path of movement solidarity. It is unfortunate that the largest animal advocacy group in the country, the Humane Society of the United States, has chosen the path of self-preservation and self-promotion at the expense of movement unity and political principles.

In recent years, HSUS has expressed increasingly open and vocal criticism of direct action and groups such as the ALF. Yet in a recent Newsday article (August 7, 2005), entitled “Feds turn up the heat on `ecoterrorists,’” HSUS crossed a line by demonstrating far more solidarity with the police state undermining animal rights activism than with the animal cause itself. Denouncing the Earth Liberation Front (ELF) and the ALF, Michael Markarian, Executive Vice President of External Affairs for HSUS, stated: “We applaud the FBI and law enforcement authorities for trying to crack down and root out these criminals, but we don't think we need a new law.”

Fully aware of the unreliability of media sources, the North American Animal Liberation Press Office contacted Mr. Markarian to confirm that he was accurately quoted. He replied to us with this message:

Thanks for your email. You are correct that people are often misquoted in the press, and I do appreciate your taking the time to check with me.

In this case, my quote was accurate. The reporter asked me specifically about arson, and I told her in no uncertain terms that the HSUS opposes such actions and we believe that law enforcement agencies have a duty to stop people from engaging in this conduct, no matter what cause they claim to represent. As you know, the HSUS has no quarrel with peaceful civil disobedience, but we have been very vocal in opposing activities such as property destruction, threats of violence, harassment, and arson in the name of animal protection. We ask people to adhere to a code of conduct in how they treat animals, and we should be prepared to adhere to a civil code of conduct ourselves.

We have a tough enough challenge in asking people to accept the idea that animals should be included in our moral calculus. It increases our degree of difficulty when our movement asks people to accept illegal tactics. Finally, I'll add that I believe these actions hand a major strategic opportunity to our opponents. We cede the moral high ground to vivisectionists, factory farmers, and others when we resort to these tactics. If people in our movement didn't engage in these tactics, it would not be surprising to have agent provocateurs conduct similar actions, as a means of undermining the credibility of the organizations and leaders of the movement.

Opposing ALEC and the Senate, HSUS is trying to get the feds off their back, but only to turn them loose on others, as they “applaud” the actions of the police state and cheer the good guys in the “war on terrorism.” What they don’t acknowledge is the important victories for animals achieved through illegal direct action. What they don’t see is that they need the “radicals” and “extremists” as a foil in order to position themselves as “mainstream” and “respectable.” What they don’t grasp is that what happens to any one aspect of the movement happens to all of it, and that once the corporate-state complex goes after the underground, they same machinery will grind away at the aboveground – at least if they begin to grow effective to any degree in protecting animals from the brutality and barbarities of animal exploiters.

In late August 2005, NAALPO solicited a response to the views of HSUS from Kevin Jonas. Kevin is the founder of the Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) movement in the United States, a prominent spokesperson for direct action tactics, and someone who has been shoved around more than a bit by law enforcement agencies and officials. Here is Kevin’s reply:

It has always been my policy that it's not a good idea to air the movement's dirty laundry in public. Disputes, dramas, and squabbles should be reconciled internally and not enjoyed by our opposition and exploited as a divide-and-conquer tactic of the FBI. To this end I have tasted blood on more than one occasion from biting my tongue in response to the cheap and slanderous comments made to the mainstream press by those supposed allies in this social justice struggle.

Believe me, I get it. I understand that the more "reputable" national welfare organizations feel they must keep their distance from the "radical" efforts. Their pursuits are policy and potlucks in hopes to set not only a legislative agenda, but also in attempting a more compassionate culture. In a post 9-11, security crazed, constitutionally-challenged time where animal-abusive industry

lobbyists have adopted the Karl Rove playbook in attack ads, it can almost be forgivable that such large right-of-center mainstream organizations would insulate themselves from the organically grown, uncontrollable, nothing-to-lose, all-volunteer grassroots movement. Whether or not this distancing is a good idea or even if the aims and objectives of such organizations are worthy of the tremendous resources devoted to them is another whole debate.

What's changed though is that it is not just distance these monolithic organizations are hoping to create, but tactical hegemony. By organizing boycotts of what were national movement conferences, by forbidding their many hundreds of employees from even attending certain demonstrations, by slandering the grassroots efforts to their few donors, and by condemning their actions in the press they seek to help the corporate state redefine what are acceptable forms of activism.

As if those fighting for animals didn't already have enough enemies, these actions pick a fight amongst colleagues and divide the movement, striking a lethal blow to solidarity. Organizations such as the Humane Society of the United States have begun parroting the 8th grade rhetoric of George W. Bush with insinuations that you are with them (their politics of the polite) or you are against them (you think and act independently from their party-line approach). HSUS's acquisition of smaller organizations and corporate mergers with other large national groups speaks to this attempt at hegemony and the triumph of a welfarist agenda at the expense of a rights/liberation position.

Still, the actions of the factory farms and vivisection labs are far more egregious and warrant all of the precious little time we have to challenge them. This remains true to this day and always will, but recent statements made by HSUS have given me pause for concern as to where their allegiances truly lie. When on August 7th, 2005 HSUS Vice President Mike Markarian told the New York's Newsday that "We applaud the FBI and law enforcement for trying to crack down and root out these criminals," this was both politically distasteful and very, very personally troubling.

The "criminals" Markarian is referring to are the unknown number of courageous activists who are risking their lives and liberty to free tortured animals and damage the mechanics that cause their suffering. These are the same sort of "criminals" that gave this modern movement it's foundation in the 1980s with the liberation of "Britches" and numerous other animals at Silver Spring, Maryland, the "City of Hope" hellhole in Los Angeles, and so on.' These "criminals" also include activists like myself and six others who are to stand trial in 2006 -- not for taking anything, breaking anything, or even trespassing, but simply for having the goal of shutting down Huntingdon Life Science, a notorious animal-testing lab. In the current political culture, this objective is classified as a disruption and a federal offense under the never-before- tried "Animal Enterprise Protection Act."

In the eyes of HSUS I am criminal because I am young, passionate, take risks, and am unabashed in my criticism of those would ever dare raise a scalpel to the throat of a beagle puppy. I am a proud animal rights activist and apparently do not belong to the same movement HSUS is seeking to homogenize.

When Markarian and HSUS applauded the FBI, they took the right to disagreement a step too far. They are applauding the agency that drew four pistols on my dog and threatened to kill him, the agency that spent six months listening to my most personal and intimate phone conversations with family and friends, the agency that threatened to subpoena my dying

grandfather to a grand jury investigating his grandson, the agency that ransacked my home and stole everything from CD collections to family photo albums. They are cheerleading the agency that is today trying to send me to jail for 23 years for only my speech-related activity with a legal protest campaign.

When Markarian and HSUS clap for the FBI, they are supporting the same agency that tried to ruin Martin Luther King Jr., which framed and even murdered prominent anti-war activists of the 70's, and that covered up the car bombing of prominent environmental activist Judy Bari. HSUS is standing behind a government force that is trying to do the same to the animal protection movement as it has tried (and succeeded) to do to virtually every other social justice struggle in recent US history.

It is a new level of naiveté and treachery that we can find allies amongst the army of the oppressor. It is a position that does not meet the test of history or ethics. It is a position of inconsistency as HSUS does not support direct action for animals because it is illegal and considered violent by some, while applauding the FBI which has a long and documented history of criminal fraud and murder. It is a position almost as incredulous as its belief that we as a movement can tackle the world's single greatest oppression and prejudice (the violent exploitation of animals) by simply being polite and patient where no other human-issued social justice struggle has ever succeeded using such tepid tactics.

I am tired of biting my tongue. If anyone is to be indignant in this argument it should be the volunteers of the passionate grassroots. I don't want to be quiet anymore while executives at HSUS, who take six-figure salaries and some even still eat the animals we are fighting for, condemn the risk-takers and courageous few that gave this movement its birth and its continued hope. This is a debate and dialogue that needs to take place, but sadly you will only find one side willing to sit at the table of reconciliation. HSUS and others like them seek to silence this voice of dissent and retreat behind the same tired platitudes used by animal abusers evading confrontation.

We, as humans, are quarrelsome animals and are never going to agree on everything, but certain common ground and respect can be reached if we can stop the vilification. As a start this is the challenge I give to Mike Markarian, Wayne Pacelle, and all those who represent HSUS: the next time you have the opportunity to comment on militant direct action tactics in a news publication, cast as criminals those lab employees or feedlot operators against those whom we are united in opposition, and spare those who support the tough tactics this movement needs to achieve its goals.

If HSUS is right that through education and legislation alone this movement can win justice for animals (or really, according to their stated goals, improve the welfare of the animal slaves), then why are more animals being tortured to death today than 20 years ago? Why is the movement barely able to do anything more than increase the size of the cages and bring about "humane slaughter"? Why is the movement helping corporations to polish their public image and mitigate consumer guilt over eating murdered animals?

There are lessons to be learned from the recent history of the environmental movement. As Mark Dowie describes in his book *Losing Ground*, the big mainstream US environmental groups that emerged in the 1970s – the so-called "Gang of Ten" – clamored for respectability and political influence as they sold-out, compromised, pandered to power, even thwarted grass-roots

radicals, while growing into bloated bureaucracies that craved MBA students more than acute activists. The same pattern and dynamics has emerged in the animal advocacy movement, and it is a worrying trend.

But just as in 1977 Paul Watson broke with the conservatism of Greenpeace to create the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society and confront the bastards who kill animals with impunity on the high seas, just as in 1980 the founders of Earth First! renounced the futility of environmental mainstream tactics and organizational corruption in order to spawn an important militant direct action approach, and just as the Earth Liberation Front emerged in the 1990s to take the defense of the earth to the next level, so there will always be militant animal rights/liberation tactics emerging in appropriate response to the increasing enormity of animal suffering that is tragically paralleled by the ineffectiveness of mainstream approaches.

Opposition to direct action is the last frontier of speciesism. The ALF, SHAC, and other direct action groups are taking the tough tactics necessary to help animals and they are effective where other approaches fail. Ask any animal “advocate” who opposes the use of high pressure tactics, illegal actions, and sabotage to free animals if they also oppose the use of sabotage and even violence to free human beings in past wars of independence and liberation, and you will find the contradiction that betrays latent speciesist views that animals do not merit liberation “by any means necessary.”

This broad animal advocacy movement needs each and every tactic that helps animals in an effective way. It is time to turn the tables on mainstream criticism of direct action, however, and ask instead whether it is not in fact mainstream approaches that do more harm than good, as they cozy up with corporations, defend the murderous and violent nature of the police state, and trumpet the message that exploiting animals is acceptable if so long as you do it “humanely.”

We’re in this fight for animals together. The underground and direct action movement doesn’t expect solidarity from aboveground and mainstream groups like HSUS, but it does hope at the very least that the noble and uncompromising cause of abolitionism will not be vilified and betrayed by those courting favor with corporations and the state.

Targeted guinea pig farm closes

A farm that has been breeding guinea pigs for medical research for more than 30 years is to stop after intimidation by animal rights activists.

The family-run Darley Oaks Farm in Newchurch, Staffordshire, has been hit by a six-year campaign of abuse.

The owners and people connected with the firm have received death threats.

The family said they hoped the decision would prompt the return of the body of their relative Gladys Hammond, whose remains were stolen from a churchyard.

I just feel so angry that these animal rights activists have won-- Rod Harvey, former farm supplier

The remains were taken from her grave in nearby Yoxall in October.

Mrs Hammond, who was buried in St Peter's churchyard seven years ago, was the mother-in-law of Christopher Hall, part-owner of the farm.

In a statement, a close relative of Mrs Hammond, who declined to be named, said there was now no reason why her body could not be returned.

"Gladys was a relative of the Halls by marriage only and had no involvement in guinea pig breeding.

"She was a kind, gentle country lady who loved animals. She was also friendly, generous and loving and always put her family first."

'Fantastic day'

The Hall family have been subjected to hate mail, malicious phone calls, hoax bombs and arson attacks.

A spokeswoman for David Hall and Partners confirmed that the business, where several thousand guinea pigs are reared, was to stop breeding animals for medical research.

The Hall family is now expected to concentrate on the arable side of the business.

Campaigners who have legitimately picketed the farm over recent years said they would continue their protest until the guinea pig breeding operation officially closed at the end of the year.

Johnny Holmes, a spokesman for Stop the Newchurch Guinea Pigs, said: "This is the most fantastic day of my life.

"It's a victory for the animals and it's a fundamental victory for the animal rights movement.

"Ideally, I wish they would close down today and hand them over. We want those guinea pigs out."

In a statement, the Association of British Pharmaceutical Industry (ABPI) expressed its best wishes to the family and said their decision was "regrettable but understandable".

Director of the ABPI Philip Wright said guinea pigs had been essential in research into respiratory disease resulting in breakthroughs in the development of new medicines.

'Not a victory'

"The activities of a few animal rights extremists have placed impossible pressure on those going about their legitimate business," he said.

"While animal rights extremists are likely to be only one factor in the final decision, it does

underline the need for greater protection of those individuals and companies targeted."

David Bird, from Staffordshire Police, told BBC Radio 4 it had been impossible to give complete protection because the campaign had been so widespread.

"We have had some success in dealing with those responsible. What I would say is that this closure is not a victory for anybody," he said.

"This campaign has done absolutely nothing to further the cause of animal rights."

Rod Harvey supplied fuel to the farm and endured four years of abuse from activists before he was forced to cease trading with the Halls.

The 63-year-old businessman said he received threatening letters, including one accusing him of being a paedophile which was then sent to a number of people he knew.

"In December 2003 a brick came through the window of my front door, hitting my foot and cutting my hand," he said.

"In view of what they (the Hall family) and their staff have had to put up with I'm not surprised that they have stopped breeding guinea pigs.

"I just feel so angry that these animal rights activists have won."

Story from BBC NEWS:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/england/staffordshire/4176094.stm>

Published: 2005/08/23 15:39:58 GMT

© BBC MMV

Animal rights and wrongs: The campaign against the Newchurch guinea pig farm may have shocked, but Nelson Mandela would understand it

Adam Nicolson

Wednesday August 24, 2005

Guardian

No one, I think, would put the attempt to liberate the Newchurch guinea pigs on a par with the anti-apartheid campaign in South Africa. A few thousand - or even a few tens of thousands - of furry laboratory animals is not on the same scale as an entire repressed nation. But perhaps the two struggles are not as far apart as you think.

The Hall family's decision to close down their guinea-pigs-for-laboratories enterprise, and return

to more traditional farming, is a result of terrorism. The family, and almost everyone they know, have been the target of sabotage, bomb hoaxes, hate mail, a paedophile smear campaign, malicious phone calls and arson attacks. Most appallingly, the body of Gladys Hammond, a Hall family relative, was dug up and her bones kidnapped. Electricity pylons have been blown up. There have been demos outside the farm every Sunday and Wednesday for the past five years.

All of these are clearly forms of terror, delivered by people who have thought, and probably rightly, that their campaign for the better treatment of the guinea pigs would not get anywhere if they used more polite, or less violent methods. The science and government establishments have been set against them and, to stay true to their ideals, they have had no alternative.

We all hate terrorists, but as a side-light on this nasty and bitter corner of modern life, it is interesting to read what Nelson Mandela, at his trial for violence and sabotage in October 1963, had to say about those crimes. This was the trial at which he was convicted and sent to Robben Island for life. He admitted quite freely that he was guilty of what he was accused of. "I do not deny that I planned sabotage," he told the court. "I did not plan it in a spirit of recklessness, nor because I have any love of violence. I planned it as a result of a calm and sober assessment of the political situation. Without violence there would be no way open to the African people to succeed in their struggle."

As a small armed wing of the ANC, Mandela had formed Umkhonto we Sizwe, meaning Spear of the Nation, because without such a channel, any violence would have been chaotic and far more destructive. The leaders of the ANC felt they had no other option. Mandela quoted Chief Lutuli, who had led the ANC in the 1950s: "Who will deny that 30 years of my life have been spent knocking in vain, patiently, moderately and modestly at a closed and barred door? What have been the fruits of moderation? The past 30 years have seen the greatest number of laws restricting our rights and progress, until today we have reached a stage where we have almost no rights at all."

It is largely forgotten now but Mandela received guerrilla training in Algeria. The notes he made from the lectures he attended there were produced in court. He studied Clausewitz, Mao Zedong and Che Guevara. He prepared himself, quite cold-headedly, as he told the court, for "guerrilla warfare. I wanted to be able to stand and fight with my people to share the hazards of war with them." It never came to that because he was caught and imprisoned before he could take up arms. The sabotage of government buildings and electricity pylons and setting up the training regimes for recruits was all he was responsible for.

There is, in this comparison, a problem of scale and, to be honest, of seriousness, but there is not a deep or very real distinction in principle. Mandela's term for his control of Umkhonto we Sizwe was "properly controlled violence". Seen simply in tactical and strategic terms, that phrase would be perfectly appropriate for the things that animal rights activists have been doing to the Halls, their friends, families, employees and neighbours. Digging up the body of Gladys Hammond - deeply shocking as it is - is nevertheless a very precisely calibrated act of terror. Not in moral but in these tactical terms, you could see it as a form of "properly controlled violence".

It may be in the future that the use of large numbers of animals to test drugs, for which the motivation is often commercial, not humanitarian, will come to seem outrageous and that the treatment of animals in our society will be thought of as one of our great blindspots. (Nothing

new there: ducks in Tudor England had their feet nailed to the floor so that their flesh would not be coarsened by exercise.) If that does happen, then the campaign to close down the guinea pig sheds at Darley Oaks Farm will surely look like a violent, necessary and ugly step on the long march to freedom.

Guardian Unlimited © Guardian Newspapers Limited 2005

Doctors Sue Merck Over Vioxx Animal Tests

Merck Relied on Animal Experiments Showing Vioxx to Be "Safe," While Ignoring Critical Human Data

WASHINGTON—In a lawsuit filed this week, the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) alleges that Merck & Co. wrongfully relied on tests showing Vioxx was safe in animals while ignoring mounting evidence that the drug is dangerous to humans. Vioxx, a best-selling painkiller, was pulled off the market last fall, after the APPROVE clinical trial showed cardiac risk to humans. This is believed to be the first time a U.S. pharmaceutical company has been sued specifically for relying on animal tests.

"Merck endangered public health by relying on inapplicable animal tests rather than relevant and available human data," says Dan Kinburn, PCRM associate general counsel. The injured plaintiff, Nancy Tufford, a PCRM member from Minnesota, is seeking \$1 million in damages because she developed congestive heart failure while taking Vioxx.

The lawsuit charges that Merck was well aware of the limitations of animal testing—that animal studies are often inconsistent, species-dependent, and not useful in predicting drug safety or efficacy in humans. At least nine of 11 mice and rat studies, for example, showed COX-2 drugs to be beneficial for animal hearts. The suit accuses Merck of using these and other inapplicable animal data to justify keeping Vioxx on the market. It also states that Merck knew of more effective safety assessment methods, such as postmarket surveillance of patient reactions, in vitro tests using human cells and tissues, and computer modeling, but failed to employ these methods.

At a news conference held in Washington, D.C., today, Dallas-based cardiologist and PCRM consultant John J. Pippin, M.D., F.A.C.C., shared the results of his research into the Vioxx tragedy, including a new "smoking gun." Dr. Pippin presented data from an unpublished study on African green monkeys that Merck used as additional evidence of Vioxx's supposed safety.

"Animal tests clearly show Vioxx to be safe, but these tests simply do not apply to humans," Dr. Pippin said. "Merck was wrong to rely on data from mice, rats, and African green monkeys when faced with compelling evidence that human patients are at risk," says Dr. Pippin. "Ultimately, Merck's reliance on scientifically flawed animal tests led to human injury and death."

Muhammad Mamdani, PharmD, M.A., M.P.H., senior scientist and leader of the Drug Research Group at the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences in Toronto, Ontario, also participated in the news conference. Dr. Mamdani, the lead author of a recent human-based study in The

Lancet that links Vioxx to congestive heart failure, has stated that studies with mice and monkeys are not always predictive of a drug's effect in human patients.

Founded in 1985, the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine is a nonprofit health organization that promotes preventive medicine, especially good nutrition. PCRM also conducts clinical research studies, opposes unethical human experimentation, and promotes alternatives to animal research.

Dictatorship of the drug industry: Drug Companies and Government Conspire to Evade Vivisection Regulations

Democracy, as most of us would understand it, means Government by the people.

The Electorate votes for parties on the basis of the policies they say they will implement, such as the animal research policies that Labour promised [copies of these available from Uncaged]. In a democratic society, those promised policies that the public has endorsed through its choice of a governing party are then implemented.

This is the essential core of democracy - Government represents the will of the people.

Question: What happens when democracy conflicts with the interests of the pharmaceutical industry?

Answer: Pharmaceutical corporation executives demand an audience with the Prime Minister, where they tell him that democratic Government policy doesn't suit them, and they want him to investigate how Government can implement their demands to maximise their profits. The following paragraphs are excerpted by the report of the resulting joint Government/Big Pharma 'Task Force', published on 28 March 2001:

"1.1 The Pharmaceutical Industry Competitiveness Task Force (PICTF) was set up following a meeting in November 1999 between the Prime Minister and the CEOs of Astra Zeneca, Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham.

4.1 PICTF met for the first time on 13 April 2000 and drew its initial business to a close on 1 March 2001. The terms of reference focused on:

'The Pharmaceutical Industry Competitiveness Task Force will bring together the expertise and experience of the industry leaders in the UK with Government policy makers to identify and report to the Prime Minister on the steps that may need to be taken to retain and strengthen the competitiveness of the UK business environment for the innovative pharmaceutical industry.'

9.6 On Animal Welfare and Research, it was agreed that the increasing complexity of the regulatory process involved in obtaining licences to carry out animal studies... and the possible implications of the new Freedom of Information Act, have meant that the UK is increasingly perceived by industry as an unfavourable environment in which to conduct research involving animals...

9.7 The Task Force agreed substantial actions to streamline licensing procedures..."

(From Executive Summary, Pharmaceutical Industry Competitiveness Task Force, Final Report - March 2001 (jointly published by the Government and the ABPI)
(www.advisorybodies.doh.gov.uk/pictf/pictf.pdf)

Lord Sainsbury chaired the working group that discussed how to weaken vivisection regulations (Section V - Science Base and Biopharmaceuticals). Just one of the astonishing things about this clique of industrialists and politicians is that it has made unilateral decisions on areas of policy that are the responsibility of other bodies such as the Home Office and the Animal Procedures Committee. Despite the implications for animal experiments, animal protection groups were systematically excluded from even participating in these discussions. It is this Task Force, and the working group chaired by Lord Sainsbury, which is responsible for subverting Government policy on animal experimentation.

Rubber-stamping

Throughout the PICTF discussion of animal experimentation regulation, it is presumed that the regulatory framework is nothing more than a process for simply granting licences rather than a process that actually scrutinises whether licences should be granted or not, as the law stipulates. Thus both the drug industry and the Government have inadvertently confirmed what anti-vivisectionists have been saying for years: the laws are systematically ignored, and the regulatory process is a rubber-stamping process, rather than the stringent, objective or rigorous process the public is lead to believe.

The "increasing complexity" that the drug companies complain of refers to the Labour pledges and policies to:

1. "insist on the highest possible standards of animal welfare"
2. "ensure that they are only used when essential for medical and other scientific research purposes" [we dispute whether it is essential, but that is separate matter]
3. require all vivisection establishments to set up, by April 1999, Ethical Review Processes (ERPs) to monitor vivisection research proposals and practices.

Blocking progress

None of these measures address what we believe to be the fundamental moral and scientific imperative for the abolition of vivisection. But what they did represent was the potential for a gradual increase in the level of consideration given to the interests of animals when licences to vivisect were being considered. After all, the core element of the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 is the cost/benefit assessment (Section 5(4)), which requires the harms that animals will suffer from an experiment to be weighed against the supposed benefit that would accrue to humans from the research.

More animal suffering

The Report claims that "streamlining licencing procedures" will lead to improvements in animal welfare. This is dishonest propaganda which insults the intelligence of the reader: there is no attempt to explain quite how such improvements would be achieved. In fact, by railing against even the tiniest improvements in the regulation of animal experiments, the drug industry in

collaboration with the Government has:

1. undermined democracy by failing to ensure that pre-election promises were fulfilled
2. shown contempt for the rule of law by conniving to evade the requirements of the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 and the crucial cost-benefit assessment
3. set the stage for more experiments of greater severity to be conducted on animals
4. tried to block the application of the Freedom of Information Act to animal experiments.

The PICTF also recommended that the ABPI should be consulted whenever any Government policy that might affect the interests of the drug industry, such as vivisection policy, was being considered - a so-called "no surprises" policy (para 9.7).

Another agreed action plan (no. 50, Appendix 1) was for the drug industry to see how it could dismantle animal welfare regulations blocking the establishment of "whole animal pharmacology course in the UK."

Tony Blair wrote the Foreword to the PICTF report (see above). He stated:

"A key feature in maintaining the UK's attractiveness as a location for investment will be effective partnership at the highest levels between Government and industry. That is why I am delighted at the work and outputs of the PICTF."

The unparalleled access to and influence over political power enjoyed by unelected, unaccountable drug company executives is a chilling example of how democracy is being destroyed by corporate power. The PICTF aimed to pervert policy in a number of important areas in addition to animal testing, such as the way in which the NHS buys drugs, the structure of education, clinical research, and the assessment of the safety and effectiveness of new drugs. Not only will animal testing policy be dictated by the drug industry, but health, education and economic policy are also formulated in the corporate interest rather than the public interest. We don't remember Labour promising that before the last election.

Membership of the PICTF

* **Lord Hunt of Kings Heath**

Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Health

* **Tom McKillop**

Astra Zeneca

* **Lord Sainsbury of Turville**

Minister for Science and Innovation

* **Baroness Blackstone**

Minister of State for Education and Employment

* **Nick Raynsford MP**

Minister for Housing and Planning

* **Stephen Timms MP**

Financial Secretary

* **Nigel Crisp**

Permanent Secretary/Chief Executive Department of Health

* **Sir Richard Sykes**

(then) Chairman of Glaxo Wellcome

* **J-P Garnier**

(then) Chief Executive of SmithKline Beecham

* **Bill Fullagar**

President of Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry (ABPI) and Novartis
UK, President

* **Vincent Lawton**

American Pharmaceuticals Group and Merck Sharp & Dohme

* **Trevor Jones**

ABPI Director-General

Source: p. 17 of PICTF report, and Department of Health Press Release 2001/0155, 28/3/01
"Prime Minister announces results of Pharmaceutical Industry Competitiveness Task Force -
jointly published by the Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry (ABPI)"

Call For An End To Testing On Animals

Author: Nick Gibbens

24 Aug 2005

Leading animal protection organisations from around the globe have joined forces in a call for the use of non-human primates in medical research to come to an end.

The RSPCA, Humane Society for the United States, Eurogroup for Animal Welfare, and the German Animal Welfare Society have signed a statement urging governments, regulators, industry, scientists, and those who fund research around the world to accept the need to end primate use.

The statement calls for an internationally coordinated strategy to replace all experiments on primates with humane alternatives.

"The use of primates in scientific research and testing is a matter of extreme concern to the animal protection community and to members of the public around the world," said Dr Maggy Jennings, head of the RSPCA's research animals department.

"Primates have an awareness of pain and suffering similar to humans and the potential for suffering can begin long before primates reach the laboratory.

"This statement sends a clear and forceful message to everyone involved in testing on primates that it must come to an end."

"Everyone involved in primate use is urged to accept that this is an essential goal and to start working together to replace primate experiments."

On Tuesday, a Staffordshire farm which breeds guinea pigs for medical research said it was to stop after intimidation by animal rights campaigners.

Today, 500 leading UK scientists and doctors signed a declaration pledging their support for animal testing in medical research.

The declaration, which was drawn up by the Research Defence Society (RDS), states that a "small, but vital" part of medical research involves animals.

In response to the statement, the RSPCA said: "The RDS declaration does not acknowledge the pain, suffering and distress that animal experiments cause, nor does it require any positive actions by the researchers who signed it."

"The RSPCA is very disappointed that the scientific community could not come up with a more proactive statement fifteen years after the original declaration."

Greens Call For A Real Alternative To Vivisection

Green Party Animal Rights Spokesperson Sue Baumgardt commented:

"Whilst we at the Green Party utterly condemn the use of violence in support of any cause, we share the protesters frustration and anger that despite clear evidence of the unreliability of animal testing and the availability of viable alternatives, the government continues to support animal testing." (1)

"The scientists who are attempting to represent animal testing as a "small but vital" area of medical research are being extremely selective with their facts."

"It must be remembered that whilst the media focus has been on the medical aspect of animal testing, a large share of vivisection in the UK is actually for products like industrial and household cleaners and even for areas such as germ warfare."

"The numbers of animals being used in experiments has been rising steadily every year since 2001. From 2002 to 2003 the increase was a disgraceful 60,000. Britain also experiments on more primates than any other European country " (2)

Many Greens still feel betrayed by the New Labour government who promised a Royal Commission into the ethics of vivisection whilst they

were in opposition and immediately abandoned the policy once in power.

"At this time we call for the government to keep its promise to the electorate and create a Commission to effectively analyse the alternatives to animal testing."

ENDS

Notes for editors:

(1) <http://www.mattek.com/?ga-atm>
<http://www.curedisease.net/index.shtml>

(2) <http://www.uncaged.co.uk/vivisect.htm>
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4177200.stm>
<http://www.buav.org>

* From Green Party press office, 020 7561 0282.

Published and promoted by Matt Wootton for the Green Party, both at
1a Waterlow Road, London N19 5NJ.

Britain Bans American Professor Who Speaks on Behalf of Animal Liberation Front

Monday, August 29, 2005

<http://chronicle.com/daily/2005/08/2005082905n.htm>

By SCOTT SMALLWOOD

A University of Texas at El Paso professor who supports the Animal Liberation Front has been banned from traveling to Britain because the government there says he is fomenting acts of terrorism in the country.

The professor, Steven Best, teaches philosophy and is one of the founders of the North American Animal Liberation Press Office, which disseminates information about attacks on laboratories and farms by animal-rights activists. The Animal Liberation Front, which got its start in England in the 1970s, has been called one of the leading domestic terrorist threats by U.S. officials.

Mr. Best regularly travels to speak on animal rights. In July he spoke at the International Animal Rights Conference, in England. At that conference, he was quoted by a British newspaper as saying: "We are not terrorists, but we are a threat. We are a threat both economically and philosophically. Our power is not in the right to vote but the power to stop production. We will break the law and destroy property until we win."

According to the newspaper, The Daily Telegraph, he also said activists do not want to "reform" vivisectionists. Rather, he said, "we want to wipe them off the face of the earth."

In a letter informing him of the ban, an official with the Home Office -- a British agency that is similar to the U.S. Justice Department -- cited those statements and others made by Mr. Best in the past. "In expressing such views," the letter said, "it is considered that you are fomenting and justifying terrorist violence and seeking to provoke others to terrorist acts and fomenting other serious criminal activity and seeking to provoke others to serious criminal acts."

The letter to Mr. Best is dated August 24, the same day the Home Office published a new list of behaviors that would lead to people's being barred from visiting the country. Under the list, people who write, speak, run a Web site, or use their positions as teachers to express views that "foment, justify, or glorify violence in furtherance of particular beliefs" will be kept out or deported. The British government described the list, which was announced about six weeks after the July 7 terrorist attacks in London, as part of "its ongoing work to tackle terrorism and extremism."

Mr. Best had planned on traveling to England again in September to speak at an event where animal-rights activists will celebrate the closure of a farm that breeds guinea pigs for medical research.

Mr. Best said he was not surprised by the ban. "It was only a matter of time, especially after July 7," he said. "The climate in Britain is totally unbelievable. It's very fascist. It's becoming a police state."

He said that he had argued with British officials that his statements at the conference this summer had been taken out of context. "I argued that I didn't mean anything violent," he said, "that we'll wipe these guys off the face of the earth through legal means, through boycotts."

British officials considered banning Mr. Best from the country in 2004, but relented after he wrote a letter saying that while he supported the Animal Liberation Front, he did not consider the group to be violent. At that time, Jerry Vlasak, another activist who founded the press office with Mr. Best, was banned from traveling to Britain.

Copyright © 2005 by The Chronicle of Higher Education

Exclusion Or Deportation From The UK On Non-Conductive Grounds: Consultation Document

1. The Home Secretary has powers to exclude or deport non-UK citizens on the grounds that their presence in the UK is not conducive to the public good.
2. These powers apply both to those who are not yet in the UK (exclusions) and to those who have temporary or indefinite leave to remain in the UK (deportation).
3. The Home Secretary must and will act consistently, proportionately and reasonably in applying these powers, having regard to the importance

of upholding UK values.

4. Where the Home Secretary is personally applying these powers to exclude, there is no statutory right of appeal although his decision can be challenged through judicial review. Where he is applying these powers to deport, or where other Home Office Ministers or Immigration or Entry Clearance Officers are applying them on his behalf to exclude or deport, there is a right of appeal.

5. As a general rule these powers have been exercised in the past against those the Government considers represent a direct threat to:-

- National security
 - Public order or the rule of law in the UK
 - Or the UK's good relations with a third country
- and against those who were involved or, the Government has reason to suspect were involved, in war crimes or crimes against humanity regardless of whether convicted

6. The Home Secretary announced on 20 July that he would broaden the exercise of these powers to deal more fully and systematically with those who in effect, represent an indirect threat under the same categories, in particular those who foment terrorism or seek to provoke others to terrorist acts.

7. Because of the need to tread very carefully in areas which relate to free speech, the Home Secretary announced that he would consult on a list of unacceptable behaviours which demonstrate such an indirect threat. This list is indicative not exhaustive and is set out below.

List of Unacceptable Behaviours

The list of unacceptable behaviours covers any non-UK citizen whether in the UK or abroad who uses any means or medium including:-

Writing, producing, publishing or distributing material

Public speaking including preaching

Running a website

Using a position of responsibility such as teacher, community or youth leader

To express views which the Government considers:-

- Foment terrorism or seek to provoke others to terrorist acts
- Justify or glorify terrorism
- Foment other serious criminal activity or seek to provoke others to serious criminal acts
- Foster hatred which may lead to intra community violence in the UK
- Advocate violence in furtherance of particular beliefs

and those who express what the Government considers to be extreme views that are in conflict with the UK's culture of tolerance

8. Anyone wishing to express views on this list should write to exclusionpolicyconsultation@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

How Like Us Need They Be?

The behavioral repertoire of nonhuman primates is highly evolved and includes advanced problem-solving capabilities, complex social relationships, and sensory acuity equal or superior to humans. 1--Thomas M. Burbacher and Kimberly S. Grant

It is a simple question. How much like a human being does a member of another species need to be before hurting or killing them becomes so similar to hurting or killing a human that we are morally compelled to react in a similar manner in both instances? If there is no degree of similarity that will result in similar treatment, then with what are we left? Why not treat people who look differently, differently? Why not experiment on albinos, or giants, or midgets, or dwarfs, or Chinese or Pygmies? It is a simple question. Until those who choose to experiment on the species most similar to ourselves answer this question, we can only suppose that their justifications must be rooted in (an unacknowledged?) bigotry.

Few individuals with more than a passing knowledge of who monkeys and apes are would argue with the observation made above by Burbacher and Grant. But such an understanding tends to segregate people into one of two groups. Either, like Burbacher and Grant, they see the close similarities between human and nonhuman primates as an opportunity for exploitation, or else, like a growing segment of society, they see the affinities between the primate species as cause for concern, especially in light of the ways that those in the first group are taking advantage of them.

When the philosopher Jeremy Bentham wrote:

The day may come, when the rest of the animal creation may acquire those rights which never could have been withholden from them but by the hand of tyranny. The French have already discovered that the blackness of the skin is no reason why a human being should be abandoned without redress to the caprice of a tormentor (see Lewis XIV's Code Noir). It may come one day to be recognized, that the number of the legs, the villosity of the skin, or the termination of the os sacrum, are reasons equally insufficient for abandoning a sensitive being to the same fate. What else is it that should trace the insuperable line? Is it the faculty of reason, or, perhaps, the faculty of discourse? But a full-grown horse or dog is beyond comparison a more rational, as well as a more conversable animal, than an infant of a day, or a week, or even a month, old. But suppose the case were otherwise, what would it avail? the question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer?2

he meant that the similarities between species, even between races, are, in fact, the point on which decisions regarding our interactions with others should turn.

Burbacher and Grant are representative of those who see similarity as an opportunity to exploit without much pause for the ethical questions that, for others, spring so readily to the fore. Burbacher and Grant reinforce their position quite strongly:

Nonhuman primates are capable of advanced behaviors that share important and fundamental parallels with humans. These parallels include highly developed cognitive abilities and binding

social relationships. The behavioral repertoire of these animals makes them valuable models for research on the functional effects of exposure to neurotoxic agents.³

Apparently, the “important and fundamental parallels” and the “highly developed cognitive abilities and binding social relationships” that many primate species share are insufficient, in the minds of Burbacher and Grant, to suggest, by way of Bentham, that these animals should not be “abandoned without redress to the caprice of a tormentor.” The neurotoxic agents considered by Burbacher and Grant include methylmercury, methanol, PCBs, lead, as well as other neuroactive agents such as cocaine, LSD, morphine, and PCP. They comment, “Drugs such as phencyclidine (PCP) produced an overall disruptive effect on all test measures.”

The cognitive abilities of monkeys and apes have increasingly been shown to be strikingly like the cognitive abilities of humans. Some of those uncovering these abilities have realized that there is an implication to such discovery. Fagot, Wasserman and Young, writing with regard to their own work on abstract conceptualization in baboons note: “To be sure, the stakes are high. What is at issue is no arcane point, but the very distinction between the minds of human beings and nonhuman animals.”⁴

As the distinction between the mind of a human and the mind of a monkey becomes more subtle and less easily defined, in all but terms of quantity, it becomes ever more obvious that the moral distinctions we make during our dealings with the two groups likewise must become more carefully considered. This, also, is no arcane point. Approximately sixty thousand nonhuman primates are used in the U.S. alone every year for various scientific and educational purposes.⁵ The methods used to raise, house, and utilize these animals are inherently cruel.⁶ These practices result in much mental duress and, not uncommonly, physical pain and death.

Harry Harlow used the similarity between rhesus monkey and human infants to study the nature of love. He understood clearly, even in 1958, that the two species’ similarities are such that what is learned about the emotions and psyches of one species informs us of the emotions and psyches of the other. He explained:

The macaque infant differs from the human infant in that the monkey is more mature at birth and grows more rapidly; but the basic responses relating to affection, including nursing, contact, clinging, and even visual and auditory exploration, exhibit no fundamental differences in the two species. Even the development of perception, fear, frustration, and learning capability follows very similar sequences in rhesus monkeys and human children.⁷

Harlow used these similarities to the detriment of the baby monkeys on whom he experimented. He showed that rhesus monkeys reared without contact with others – monkeys or humans – developed severe mental problems and behavioral aberrations. He apparently missed, altogether, the most profound implications of his work – the moral implications raised by the similarity of emotional need between the species. He was dead to the implications of the fact that what is learned about one of the primate species’ mind informs us of the minds of the other species and that what would hurt us also hurts them in very similar and familiar ways.

This similarity and familiarity with the minds of other primates is not surprising. Charles Darwin pointed out there should be a continuum of attributes throughout all species, with the most similar attributes being found in the nearest relatives. We should be able to recognize the emotions being experienced by chimpanzees and monkeys precisely because we are all so

closely related. This close relationship means that much about us, about the way we perceive and feel, is the same.

Researchers studying the neurological basis of emotion have exploited our similarities in a manner that suggests that they too have missed the more profound implications of the familial relationship that exists within the primate order. David Amaral, at the University of California, Davis, and Ned Kalin, at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, experiment on the emotion centers of monkeys' brains. The techniques used by these scientists are similar.

The amygdala is the almond-shaped region of the brain involved in basic emotions such as fear, anger and aggression. There is an amygdala in each hemisphere of the brain. Amaral and Kalin destroy or otherwise damage these structures in monkeys' brains and then observe the changes in the monkeys' behavior.

The monkeys used by Kalin and Amaral are macaques. These monkeys have amygdalas both relatively and absolutely larger than human amygdalas. Comparative neurophysiology suggests that the emotions experienced by these animals are more intense and central to their lives than are the emotions experienced by humans. As relatively reduced as emotional experiences must be in humans, they are recognized as being a fundamental part of our innermost being.

Kalin provides a description of one facet of his work:

"In nonhuman primates, we are examining behavioral and physiological correlates of human anxiety. We have identified a fearful endophenotype that is characterized by high levels of trait anxiety, a specific pattern of prefrontal brain electrical activity, and increased levels of stress hormones in the blood and in the brain. We have developed new techniques to selectively lesion the primate amygdala and these studies have provided new insights into the role of the amygdala in mediating acute fearful responses as compared to states of long term anxiety."⁹

Amaral et al. write:

The amygdaloid complex is a prominent temporal lobe region that is associated with "emotional" information processing. Studies in the rodent have also recently implicated the amygdala in the processing and modulation of pain sensation, the experience of which involves a considerable emotional component in humans. In the present study, we sought to establish the relevance of the amygdala to pain modulation in humans by investigating the contribution of this region to antinociceptive processes in nonhuman primates. Using magnetic resonance imaging guidance, the amygdaloid complex was lesioned bilaterally in six rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*) through microinjection of the neurotoxin ibotenic acid. This procedure resulted in substantial neuronal cell loss in all nuclear subdivisions of this structure.¹⁰

Amaral writes to justify one federal grant with an implicit statement of the similarity between monkeys and humans:

[C]omplete amygdala lesions will be produced in neonatal macaque monkeys. The effects of these lesions on mother-infant and juvenile-juvenile interactions will be evaluated. Future studies (when the neonates have matured) will analyze dyadic and tetradic social interactions and thus allow comparisons of the severity of effects of neonatal or mature amygdala lesions on social behavior. During these experiments, the pituitary-adrenal activation of lesioned and

control monkeys in response to social and restraint stressors will also be analyzed. These studies will provide important insights into the neurobiology of normal social behavior and may contribute to an understanding of pathologies of social communication in disorders such as autism.¹¹

The similarities between the primate species' minds, emotions, and social behaviors are being relied on and used as justifications for modern experiments on the brains of awake, usually restrained, monkeys. Commonly, the monkeys are required to perform some cognitive task in order to receive a small food reward or a few drops of liquid. It is a standard procedure in these types of studies to deprive the monkeys of food and/or water in order to motivate them to perform for the vivisector. The clear recognition that monkeys and humans have minds and thought processes that are very similar motivates some scientists to utilize them as experimental subjects in these ways, as at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

The ability to abstract principles or rules from direct experience allows behaviour to extend beyond specific circumstances to general situations. For example, we learn the 'rules' for restaurant dining from specific experiences and can then apply them in new restaurants. The use of such rules is thought to depend on the prefrontal cortex (PFC) because its damage often results in difficulty in following rules. Here we explore its neural basis by recording from single neurons in the PFC of monkeys trained to use two abstract rules.¹²

Advances in technology are allowing scientists to make ever-finer measurements of physiological processes in alert monkeys engaging in cognitive acts. Much of what is known regarding the neurophysiologic similarities of the primates is a result of these technological advances, and an argument might be made that it is only in recent years that the profundity of the discoveries has begun to amass into a noticeable body of evidence. But this is not the case at all.

The close mental, emotional, and behavioral similarities between humans and other primate species has been well known for many years, while careful scientific observation and experimentation have been demonstrating these facts for nearly a century. Wolfgang Kohler, whose investigations Jane Goodall has cited¹³ as among the most important in the literature, wrote in 1925 that: "The chimpanzees manifest intelligent behavior of the general kind familiar in human beings."¹⁴

In the early 1960's scientists were subjecting monkeys, increasingly, to experiments that displayed the emotional vulnerability and cognitive depths of these animals. Harlow's decades-long career as well as his success at inspiring young experimental psychologists, resulted in an explosion of papers associated with maternal and social deprivation and stress, particularly in infants. These scientists were exploiting what they already believed to be true regarding the similarity between the emotional fragility of infant monkeys and humans.¹⁵

Masserman, Wechkin, and Terris published the results of a study that underscores the fact that those who were experimenting on monkeys, even forty years ago, clearly expected them to behave as humans might in similar situations. Rhesus monkeys were trained to pull on one of two chains, depending on the color of a flashing light, in order to receive food. After training, another monkey, held in restraints, was displayed through a one-way mirror.

By pulling the chains in the correct fashion, the first monkey would receive the food reward, but one of the chains now delivered a powerful and painful electric shock to the restrained monkey. It was discovered that most of the monkeys would not shock another monkey even if it meant not being able to eat. One of the animals went without food for twelve days rather than hurting his or her companion. Monkeys who had been shocked in previous experiments themselves were even less willing to pull the chain and subject others to such torment.¹⁶ (The scientists who had seen monkeys shocked, however, continued to strap more monkeys into the chair.)

If evidence for the close similarity between a human's and a nonhuman's mind and sense of self was observed and published so long ago, and if continuing experimentation has contributed to and expanded that understanding throughout the century, why hasn't something been done to bring our treatment of these animals more in line with the guidelines we tend to employ when dealing with those in society less able to care for themselves and assert their own interests?

The answer to this question is moderately complex. Primate vivisection increased rapidly in the 1950's and 1960's. Prior to this time the availability of monkeys was more limited and many fewer researchers were using these exotic animals. This changed largely due to the importation of many hundreds of thousands of monkeys for polio research¹⁷ as well as the U.S. government's decision to keep pace or surpass the Soviet's primate-based biomedical research programs. In the early sixties the U.S. government began funding facilities for the breeding, housing, and utilization of monkeys and apes for research purposes. Today, federally funded projects around the country maintain many thousands of monkeys and make them available to government-funded researchers.¹⁸ A few large private primate suppliers and consumers of primates imported over sixty-four thousand monkeys between 1995 and 2000.¹⁹

Part of the answer to the question lies in the fact that the number and type of experiments on primates has increased to such a degree in such a short time. The public's awareness of the issue was less informed simply because many fewer experiments were being performed and much less information concerning the minds and emotions of these animals was being published. Now, more people are being exposed to, more people are being made aware of, and also more people are deciding to participate in these studies than only a few decades ago.

Another factor is the absence of checks and balances, no bureaucratic or regulatory mechanisms are in place to assess the information or consider the implications of the body of evidence and guide our policies in this area. Without such a mechanism, the federal government continues to promote primate research, provide animals to researchers, make funds available, and invent reasons to use primates in harmful experiments.²⁰ There is nothing built into the system to regulate it in any moral manner, to evaluate current knowledge and consider the implications for new proposals. Those in a position to raise any doubt are themselves financially and professionally interested in seeing the practice continue, and they work within a community of equally interested individuals.

Within the private sphere there are professional organizations that should be monitoring scientific endeavor and providing leadership to lawmakers and the public with regard to the discoveries that animals other than humans have minds and emotions so similar to our own that experimenting on them, that keeping them in concentration-like conditions²¹, that killing them and harming them to further our own real or perceived interests is as unthinkable immoral as it would be if humans were being treated in similar ways. These organizations include the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science, and the American Society of Primatology. They each have members claiming to be

primate experts.

The American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) has not published a position specific to the use of primates in research. The AVMA lumps all animals together and states: “We oppose unnecessary restrictions on the use of animals in scientific research” but remains mute on what “unnecessary” might mean. Given the close similarity between the primate species, it is apparent that restrictions are necessary. Given the Association’s claim that it is the authorized voice for the profession²² and the claim that veterinarians have an ethical duty to: “[F]irst consider the needs of the patient: to relieve disease, suffering, or disability while minimizing pain or fear,”²³ it seems that this possible check on the use of these animals has failed completely. The public tends to view veterinarians as animal experts; the Association’s silence in this area might be seen by policy-makers in Congress as support for the status quo, which it probably is.

The American Association for Laboratory Animal Science (AALAS) is the professional organization for animal technicians and veterinarians working in laboratory settings. The only reasons the organization might be expected to speak out for these animals is the intimacy that the members have with the many ways the animals are harmed and the fact that the public (mistakenly) expects veterinarians to be advocates for animals. But, the members are financially beholden to the institutions for which they work, and it is rare for anyone to speak out since doing so may jeopardize their livelihood. And, the members are generally willing and enthusiastic participants in the experiments themselves.

AALAS has no policy concerning the care of, or experimentation on, primates. AALAS defers to federal regulation in all matters dealing with animal care and use.²⁴ This is akin to the National Educational Association or the National Rifle Association allowing the federal government to decide what their policies concerning education or gun control should be. The public cannot look to AALAS for any leadership in this area.

The American Society of Primatology (ASP) should be the body speaking the loudest about the implications raised by the notable similarities between the species. The ASP counts among its members: Sarah Boysen (“The present findings demonstrate that chimpanzees can classify natural objects spontaneously and that such classifications may be similar to those that would be observed in human subjects.”)²⁵ ; Frans de Waal (“It is really hard for me to imagine that they do not [have an imagination]. Chimpanzees are very innovative creatures - they deceive each other (and us!) all the time and invent many different games for themselves. All of these abilities require some degree of forethought to what might be the outcome of an action.”)²⁶; Roger Fouts (“Humans and chimpanzees differ in their intelligence by degree, not in the kind of mental processes.”)²⁷; Robert Ingersol (“Nim’s last words to me were, ‘Out—Hurry—Key—There.... Key—Out’, very sad. Nim passed away March 10, 2000. I did not expect that he would die at a very young twenty-six years old since chimps usually live well beyond forty years quite regularly. It has taken me this entire year to be able to speak and now write about Nim. He was my friend. Maybe my closest friend. He taught me about right and good, and trust and certainty, and he taught me what true friends are. Life long friendship, and if you had ever seen us together you would know what I mean. I knew Nim for twenty-two of his twenty-six years.”)²⁸; Vernon Reynolds (“There is no satisfactory way to convince ourselves of our separate nature, to be certain we feel or experience something they do not feel or experience; all the evidence points the other way, to commonality.”)²⁹; Duane Rumbaugh (“Although nonhuman primates such as rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*) have been useful models of many aspects of cognition and performance, it has been argued that, unlike humans, they may lack the capacity to respond as predictor-operators. Data from the present series of experiments undermine this claim,

suggesting instead a continuity of predictive competency between humans and nonhuman primates.”)³⁰; and Shirley Strum (“I was constantly struck by how much more like humans the baboons now seemed. They learned through insight and observation, passing new behaviors from one to another both within a single lifetime and across many lifetimes. This is social tradition, the beginnings of what eventually became ‘culture.’”)³¹.

In spite of this thread of understanding within the ASP, the leadership is dominated by laboratory researchers intent on exploiting the similarities nonhuman primates share with us. Often, very often in fact, the leadership is involved in research of questionable value and blatant cruelty. At times it seems that the leadership’s understanding of the complexities of monkeys’ minds, the emotional sensitivity of the animals, and the fragility of their developing psyches is cause for the scientists to devise the most absurd and deviant experiments. A paper published by a current and a past president of the Society is illustrative of this point.

The current (as of 2001) president of the ASP is John Capitanio, a researcher at the California Regional Primate Research Center (CRPRC) at the University of California, Davis. His colleague, also at CRPRC, William Mason, is a past president of the Society and also a past student of Harry Harlow.

The authors write:

Cognitive style, reflected in the generation of novel solutions and the use of identifiable response strategies in problem-solving situations, was contrasted in rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*) reared individually with either canine companions or inanimate surrogate mothers. Four experiments were conducted over a 5-year period, examining problem solving in relatively unstructured as well as more formal situations. Results indicated that whereas the 2 rearing groups did not differ on most measures of performance, consistent response strategies were identified for the dog-raised monkeys. The results were compared with previously published data from the same monkeys demonstrating rearing group differences in abilities to engage in complex social interaction. The animate nature of the early rearing environment may facilitate the development of a cognitive style that influences problem-solving abilities in both the social and nonsocial realms.³²

In the "General Methods" section of their paper, Capitanio and Mason explain that they took six male and six female monkeys away from their mothers before they were 24 hours old. The infants were each isolated with an electric cloth-covered heating pad for 14-18 days. At this time they were each introduced to either "an adult female mongrel dog" or "a plastic hobbyhorse wrapped with acrylic fur around its midsection." When the monkeys were about three-and-a-half years old, they were taken from their "kennel mate," a dog or a plastic hobbyhorse, and again placed in solitary confinement. With this sort of experimentation being performed by the ASP leadership, sanctioned by a NIH Regional Primate Research Center, paid for by the United States government, it should be clear that no change is likely to occur through normal channels.

The ASP leadership is comprised of those who conduct harmful experiments on primates themselves or are employed in the support of such experiments.³³ Many members are similarly employed.³⁴

So, a second part of the answer to the question of why our treatment of these animals is not more in line with the guidelines we tend to employ when dealing with those in society less able

to care for themselves and assert their own interests, is the fact that there is not an official regulatory mechanism in place that would cause or encourage an evaluation (let alone an evolution) of current policies, nor is there a professional organization acting on behalf of the animals – due to a vested economic interest – such as AALAC or the ASP, or else for some other, less clear reason, as the AVMA.

These two factors – the relatively recent mounting of evidence and experiments, and the lack of checks or balances – reinforce the tendency in society to discount the interests of others.

A third part of the answer lies in the fact that we tend not to notice those who have no voice when no voice of protest nor assertion of their rights has been raised. When a voice does arise, those in power tend to work to discount and marginalize it. When the issue of rights has arisen, whether involving race, gender, mental faculty, sexual orientation, nationality, religion or any other category, history is clear that the group in power has resisted the extension of protected status to other groups. Simply, prejudice against others, bigotry, the perceived protection of one's own interests, is a fundamental aspect of human behavior.

How like us do they have to be before the evil we do to them should be termed criminal?

This question deserves an answer. Historically, the segregation of nonhuman animals has been based on premises that have evaporated in step with discoveries concerning the animals' capabilities and characteristics. None of the reasons have been able to withstand close investigation and observation. Whether the claim has been that only humans use tools, make tools, can communicate with language, are altruistic, engage in war, have beliefs, engage in ritual, possess a culture, are capable of abstraction, of humor, of courage, of deceit, or of responsibility to others, the claims have all failed. And they have failed with regard to other primates precisely because, as we attempt to describe ourselves, we also describe those with whom we share such close and intimate ancestry.

How like us do they have to be before the evil we do to them should be termed criminal?

This question deserves an answer, and those with the greatest access to these animals should be required to answer it. And until they are willing and able to do so to the satisfaction of society at large, they should be compelled, legally, to cease their manipulations of these animals.

A common concern voiced by the vivisectors is that if primates are acknowledged to be so like us that we should stop our experiments on them, then where will it all stop? If chimpanzees are given the simplest rights today, and monkeys tomorrow, then how long will it be before dogs, cats, rabbits, rats, mice and flies are similarly protected? The answer must lie in the question: How like us do they have to be before the evil we do to them should be termed criminal?

Those wishing to maintain a sharp distinction between humans and all other species must explain what it is that keeps us apart. Why are compassion, sympathy, concern, and justice concepts we should reserve for humans alone? Why should each of these terms be redefined when speaking of humans or other animals? When we speak of humane care, why should this term be differently applied to human children and monkeys?

How like us do they have to be before the evil we do to them should be termed criminal? How

like us need they be?

The public's awareness of the ethically significant similarities between the species is increasing. More people are becoming alarmed and are demanding that the government act to protect these animals from those who are abusing them. Over 200 organizations – including large national organizations and small grass roots groups – have added their names to a demand for an immediate moratorium on primate experimentation:

A Call for an Immediate Moratorium on Primate Research

During the last 35 years, exploitative primate research has consumed billions in American tax dollars while it has contributed very little to human welfare.

It has diverted funding from non-animal research technology that could have been more productive and from social programs – such as drug rehabilitation, prenatal care, and nutrition education – that could have benefited, directly and indirectly, the majority of the population.

While over three decades of primate-based research has not produced the promised cures for human diseases, it has taught us about the sensitivity of the nonhuman primate subjects. We now know that nonhuman primates have emotional responses remarkably similar to human emotional responses.

Apes who have learned American Sign Language have used this human language to clearly communicate frustration, grief, and other emotions. There are convincing indications that nonhuman primates in experiments suffer as intensely, both physically and emotionally, as humans would suffer in the same experiments. Recognizing this, we are ethically compelled to stop using them in experiments.

We are calling for the creation of a presidential advisory committee composed of primate experts and informed lay people – a panel agreed upon by both pro-animal and pro-research advocates – to critically examine the evidence and make a recommendation to the president and the nation regarding the ethical implications of continuing exploitative primate research.

Until the committee's report is finalized, federal funding for primate research should cease.

Rick Bogle, January, 2002

Notes

1. Burbacher TM, Grant KS. 2000. Methods for studying nonhuman primates in neurobehavioral toxicology and teratology. *Neurotoxicology and Teratology*. Jul-Aug; 22(4): 475-86. Review.
2. Bentham, J. 1823. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Chapter XVII, note.
3. See note 1.
4. Fagot J, Wasserman EA, Young ME. 2001. Discriminating the relation between relations: the role of entropy in abstract conceptualization by baboons (*Papio papio*) and humans (*Homo*

sapiens). *Journal of Experimental Psychology and Animal Behavioral Processes*. Oct; 27(4): 316-28.

5. United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. 1998. *Animal Welfare Report, Fiscal Year 1998*. Table 6. "Number of Animals Used by Research from First Reporting Year (1973) to the Present."

6. Normal social bonding in primates begins nearly at birth between the mother and infant. Normal social situations allow monkeys to interact with mothers, siblings, and peers almost constantly. This is critical to normal social and mental development. Repetitive motions such as twirling, pacing, and flipping are termed stereopathies, and are a recognized result of social deprivation in monkeys. Self-mutilation, or self-injurious behavior, is a recognized result of individual housing and social deprivation in monkeys. At the Washington Regional Primate Research Center (WaRPRC) infants are routinely removed from their mothers at birth and nursery reared. There, infants have contact with other infants for one hour a day, five days a week. At the Tulane Regional Primate Research Center infants are removed from their mothers within three days of birth. It is estimated by the New England Regional Primate Research Center that at least ten percent of the monkeys there self-mutilate themselves to such a serious degree that veterinary intervention is required. At the Oregon Regional Primate Research Center, at least one thousand monkeys are individually housed; self-mutilation is not uncommon there or at the California Regional Primate Research Center. A veterinarian, who worked at the Wisconsin Regional Primate Research Center a decade ago, claims to have achieved pair housing of seventy percent of that facility's primate population. After leaving, he believes that the percentage has fallen to no more than thirty percent pair or group housed. This is the norm throughout the industry.

7. Harlow H. 1958. The nature of love. Address of the President at the sixty-sixth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., August 31, 1958. First published in *American Psychologist*, 13, 573-685.

8. Comparative neurophysiology teaches that the relative size of the regions or structures of an animal's brain explains much concerning their abilities and behavior. Cats possess a better sense of balance than humans because their cerebellum is relatively larger. Dogs have better senses of smell because their olfactory lobes are much larger. That humans are so much better problem solvers is related to our own large cerebral cortex.

9. Kalin N. 2001. "Brain Mechanisms Underlying Fear, Anxiety and Depression." Neuroscience Training Program, University of Wisconsin, < <http://ntp.neuroscience.wisc.edu/faculty/kalin.html> > (as of) December.

10. Manning BH, Merin NM, Meng ID, Amaral DG. 2001. Reduction in opioid- and cannabinoid-induced antinociception in rhesus monkeys after bilateral lesions of the amygdaloid complex. *Journal of Neuroscience*. Oct 15;21(20):8238-46.

11. Amaral D. Neurobiology of Primate Social Behavior. Grant no. 5R01MH057502 National Institute of Mental Health: 1998-2003. CRISP (Computer Retrieval of Information on Scientific Projects) database <http://crisp.cit.nih.gov/>.

12. Wallis JD, Anderson KC, Miller EK. 2001. Single neurons in prefrontal cortex encode

abstract rules. *Nature*. Jun 21; 411(6840): 953-6.

13. Goodall J. 1986. *The Chimpanzees of Gombe: Patterns of Behavior* (p 7). Boston: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

14. Kohler W. 1925 (2nd edition, 1951, p 265) *The Mentality of Apes*. Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD.

15. For an overview of these experiments up until 1986, see Stevens ML. 1986. *Maternal Deprivation Experiments in Psychology: A Critique of Animal Models*. Published jointly by the American, National, and New England Antivivisection Societies. But maternal and social deprivation experiments continue to be funded by the National Institutes of Health today throughout the country.

16. Masserman J, Wechkin S, Terris W. 1964. 'Altruistic' behavior in rhesus monkeys. *American Journal of Psychiatry* vol. 121: 584-5.

17. "Before the race for the polio vaccine, there were an estimated 5 to 10 million rhesus macaques in India. During the height of the vaccine work, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the United States alone was importing more than 200,000 monkeys a year, mostly from India. By the late 1970s, there were fewer than 200,000 rhesus macaques in India," (p. 250). Blum D. 1994. *The Monkey Wars*. Oxford University Press.

18. See note 5. Of these animals, many are held in National Institutes of Health (NIH) sponsored facilities. The eight Regional Primate Research Centers have approximately twenty thousands monkeys on hand at any one time. Outside the RPRC system, other universities such as Wake Forest and the University of South Alabama have large populations, also sponsored directly by the NIH. NIH maintains approximately one thousand monkeys itself at the National Animal Center in Poolesville, Maryland. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has a large population at the National Center for Toxicological Research just outside Little Rock, Arkansas, and owns another 3000 monkeys kept on Morgan Island off the coast of South Carolina. The Department of Defense maintains monkey colonies at various facilities. Of the nearly sixty thousand primates being used every year, a very large percentage must be paid for directly with tax dollars.

19. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service LEMIS [Law Enforcement Management Information Service]. Data tabulated and itemized at the Coalition to End Primate Experimentation (CEPE) website: http://cepe.enviroweb.org/imports_chart.html

20. As a single example among many: NONHUMAN PRIMATE MODELS OF NEUROBIOLOGICAL MECHANISMS OF ADOLESCENT ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM Release Date: October 4, 2001 RFA: RFA-AA-02-006 National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (<http://www.niaaa.nih.gov/>) Letter of Intent Receipt Date: January 21, 2002 Application Receipt Date: February 19, 2002 "PURPOSE: The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) invites applications using nonhuman primate models to focus on the following areas: 1) neurobiological mechanisms and risk factors for alcoholism during late childhood through adolescence; 2) the relative contribution and/or interaction of genetic, environmental, and social factors (e.g., stress, peer influences) with neurobiological mechanisms in the development of adolescent alcohol abuse; 3) evaluation of the immediate

and long-term consequences of heavy drinking during adolescence on cognitive/brain functioning; and 4) the contribution of early alcohol exposure (juvenile and adolescent periods) to excessive drinking and abnormal cognitive and social functioning during subsequent developmental stages.... FUNDS AVAILABLE: The NIAAA intends to commit approximately \$2.5 million in FY 2002 to fund approximately 6 to 8 new and/or competitive continuation grants in response to this RFA...." (Viewable at <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-AA-02-006.html> as of January 1, 2002.)

21. For instance: On December 15-18, 1998, during an inspection of the Oregon Regional Primate Research Center, the USDA inspector, Dr. Isis Johnson-Brown, DVM, noted in her written report that "the area in front of the feeding pads in corral 3 that the animals have to cross to enter the inside feeding area is excessively wet, composed of a mixture of mud, algae, urine and feces, and the same conditions exist in the corners of corrals 4 and 6."

22. American Veterinary Medical Association Constitution 2000 Revision. Article II.

23. Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics of the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), (1999 Revision). Part II, Professional Behavior, paragraph A.

24. American Association for Laboratory Animal Science. Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals. "The American Association for Laboratory Animal Science (AALAS) endorses the United States Government Principles for the Utilization and Care of Vertebrate Animals Used in Testing, Research, and Training."

25. Brown DA, Boysen ST. 2000 Spontaneous discrimination of natural stimuli by chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology* Dec; 114(4): 392-400.

26. DeWaal responding to a PBS broadcasted Scientific American Frontiers viewer's online question: "Do chimpanzees have emotions?" April 17, 2001.
<http://www.pbs.org/saf/1108/hotline/hdewaal.htm>

27. Fouts R. 1997. Next of Kin: What Chimpanzees have Taught Me about Who We Are, p 350 (emphasis in original). William Morrow and Company, Inc.

28. Ingersol B. 2000. (unpublished manuscript) Chimp Friends: Nim Chimpsy 1973-2000.

29. Reynolds V, Reynolds J. 1993. Riding on the backs of apes. In *Ape, Man, Apeman: Changing Views Since 1600*. Evaluative Proceedings of the Symposium Ape, Man, Apeman: Changing Views Since 1600, a part of the *Pithecanthropus Centennial (1893-1993) Congress "Human Evolution in its Ecological Context."* Leiden, The Netherlands, 1993.

30. Washburn DA, Rumbaugh DM. 1991. Rhesus monkey (*Macaca mulatta*) complex learning skills reassessed. *International Journal of Primatology*. Aug; 12(4): 377-88.

31. Strum SC, 1987. *Almost Human: A Journey into the World of Baboons*, p 153. Random House.

32. Capitanio JP, Mason WA. 2000. Cognitive style: problem solving by rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*) reared with living or inanimate substitute mothers. *Journal of Comparative*

Psychology. Jun; 114(2):115-25.

33. Besides Capitanio, a recent past president, Melinda Novak, the current treasurer, Steven Shapiro, and the current executive secretary, Janette Wallis, are all affiliated with primate vivisection. Novak works with the primate colony at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and is a frequent research collaborator of Steven Suomi's, another of Harlow's students. Steven Shapiro is a primate veterinarian at the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center in Houston. Janette Wallis works in direct support of the Baboon Research Resource Program at the University of Oklahoma, a supplier of baboons to "three colleges of the Health Sciences Center, two non-profit research institutions on the Oklahoma Health Center Campus, the three main university medical teaching and research institutions in the State of Oklahoma, and 10 medical centers located throughout the United States," (from CRISP entry for grant# 5P40RR012317).

34. Of the 797 members listed in the ASP's 1999 Directory, 101 were either known by name to this author as primate vivisectionists or listed themselves as affiliated with institutions such as the NIH Regional Primate Research Centers dedicated to the experimental use of primates. Many others were listed as affiliated with institutions known to be involved in primate experimentation, but not exclusively so. Persons from this latter group are not included among the 101. The percentage of ASP members directly involved with the primate experimentation industry is likely significant with regard to ASP policy decisions.

35. Bogle R. 1997. "A Call for an Immediate Moratorium on Primate Research." Coalition to End Primate Experimentation. The current list of signatories is available at <http://www.primateliberty.com/moratorium/index.html>

Benefits of animal experiments no longer exist

Sunday, August 14, 2005

Are we really saving lives?

Animal Liberation Front attacks on vivisection labs are difficult to characterize in terms of how effective they are in achieving their goals. Some would argue such tactics are more effective than given credit for, whereas most would acknowledge that such methods do more harm than good.

But what invariably gets lost in the subsequent emotional fray are questions regarding the usefulness of vivisection. ALF members have a core belief of animal rights that drives them to the extremes of ignoring laws and threatening researchers. But is the emotional aftermath of such action, scientists wailing loudly that cures might have been lost, really an adequate validation of vivisection? If a scientist truly wanted to illustrate the value and efficacy of the animal model, wouldn't the best defense be to show how scientifically valid and analogous such experimental models are to the human condition in question?

Throughout the public debate following the Spence Labs action, University of Iowa scientists offered no scientific evidence as to how the destruction of their work specifically hindered progress to human medicine. Broad, generalizing statements were made about how animal models were necessary and without them people would continue to die. Only this emotionally

charged notion of loved ones dying too early was offered as reason for labeling such actions despicable.

This is part and parcel of the animal model. Vivisectors play the emotion card as a means of acquiring public support for their methods. If there's a chance to glean a cure for cancer from a thousand mice, would not the animals' pain and suffering be worth the sacrifice? Nearly all people would answer that their lives are worth such a sacrifice. But sacrificing even a billion mice will not identify a remedy for human cancer. Why not? What is wrong with vivisection as it relates to curing human disease? The answers lie partly in how vivisection began.

Claude Bernard is hailed as the father of modern medical experimentation. A French physiologist, Bernard sought to apply the rigors of chemistry and physics research to the field of human medicine. To open the doors to the innumerable secrets of human disease, Bernard pushed the physician into the research lab. From there, an investigator used his imagination for hypothesis formulation, but when it came to putting these ideas to the test, imagination was to remain at the door. If a hypothesis wasn't testable it was useless. This rigorous approach fit nicely with Bernard's advocacy of causal determinism. He believed that all events have causes and for numerically distinct but qualitatively identical systems, same cause gives same effect.

Bernard was not without morals. He insisted that using human beings for medical experimentation was profoundly unethical. So, he used what he deemed a qualitatively identical substitute: animals. For Bernard, an animal was the same as a human save for differences in scale. Animals had hearts, livers and kidneys and so on. It was obvious that they were made of the same things that we humans were. All a scientist needed to do was adjust for factors of scale (weight, surface area, volume) and causes applied to animals would elicit the same observed effects in humans. This sounds quite familiar to research proposals of today. Scientists are trying to figure out disease X with respect to this protein so they begin with a mouse that has been artificially induced with a variant of disease X while having the relative gene encoding the questionable protein knocked out for comparison with a wild-type animal.

The problem with using animals as causal analogical models is that the science of today is not the science of Bernard's time. To put it another way, an animal model might have had the resolving power to answer some, if not many, of Bernard's questions. But Bernard had no inkling of the dogma of molecular biology (DNA to RNA to protein), nor of gene regulatory networks that are different for every single living organism. Today we are mired with the complexities of unique individual proteomes, gene up and down regulation that can determine why one human twin can tolerate a certain pharmaceutical while the other human twin treats it as toxic. Bernard's causal determinism using animals as men writ small no longer applies.

Bernard went further by rejecting Darwin's theories of evolution, claiming such hypotheses weren't testable. Bernard, and, more specifically, the vivisectors that followed in his stead continued to ignore evolutionary biology and its implications to studying and elucidating causes of human disease. This trend continues today. Vivisectors assume that species differences are insignificant. Moreover, they do so without even attempting to control for the infinite number of variables that two differing gene regulatory networks necessarily possess. In a sense, the researchers of today have kept the lucrative aspects of Bernard's teachings (using animals for grants, publications and job security), yet have ignored his insistence of leaving imagination at the door and only accepting hypotheses that have passed the most critical scrutiny.

Before proclaiming that a mouse or a rat or a primate is a strong causal analogical model for a man, vivisectionists should be required to prove as such with properly formulated and fastidiously tested hypotheses. Not unexpectedly, the animal model would not pass such scrutiny. The only other option is to never mention how disanalogous a particular animal is with respect to human disease. The only mention made is of loved ones, young ones, dying. These people will continue to die and diseases will remain unsolved until due attention is offered to non-animal based paradigms and the animal model becomes a relic of the past.

Reach Jake Roos, research scientist at Integrated DNA Technologies, at <mailto:jroos@idtdna.com>

Disease Mongering

by Bob Burton and Andy Rowell

The bulk of the world's drug deals are not done secretly in dark alleyways or noisy nightclubs but involve government-approved drugs prescribed by doctors or bought over the counter in pharmacies and supermarkets.

The global pharmaceutical industry--which generated revenues of more than \$364 billion in 2001--is the world's most profitable stock market sector. According to IMS Health, the leading drug industry market analyst, half the global drug sales are in the US alone, with Europe and Japan accounting for another 37%.

While the common image of the legal drug industry is of workers in white lab coats, the reality is that public relations, marketing and administration commonly absorb twice the amount spent on drug research and development. During 2000 more than \$13.2 billion was spent on pharmaceutical marketing in the US alone.

Driving the annual double-digit growth in the legal drug supply are a band of specialist "healthcare" PR companies working for behemoths such as Pfizer, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck and Astra Zeneca. Heading the healthcare PR league table are Edelman, Ruder Finn and Chandler Chicco Agency in the US and Medical Action Communications, Shire Health Group and Meditech Media in the UK.

"Medical education" includes cultivating and deploying sponsored "key opinion leaders" such as doctors. Patient groups too can be created or wooed to assist with "disease awareness campaigns" or provide emotionally charged testimony in favor of speedy regulatory approval of new drugs.

Other lucrative revenue streams for healthcare PR companies can include organizing events such as medical conferences that provide a platform for well-trained "product champions" to announce promising results of drug research. Such results can be reported by medical journalists--who can be hired by PR firms--in medical journals that they can create for their clients.

PR companies also undertake conventional lobbying strategies such as opposing restrictions on

"direct to consumer" (DTC) advertising--currently allowed in the US and New Zealand--that sells drugs using the same techniques used to sell products like toothpaste.

Add to the mix the usual grab bag of tricks in issue management for dealing with dissenting scientists or journalists and you have the world of healthcare PR.

Buzz for Drugs

According to Bob Chandler and Gianfranco Chicco, former staffers at the PR firm of Burson-Marsteller the key to promoting drugs is creating "buzz." In 1997 Chandler and Chicco teamed up to found the Chandler Chicco Agency (CCA), which now boasts offices in New York and London and is ranked among the top healthcare PR companies.

CCA has plenty of experience creating "buzz," having launched Pfizer's \$1 billion-a-year impotence drug, Viagra and the arthritis drug Celebrex for Pharmacia and Pfizer, which last year turned over \$3.1 billion.

In a contributed article to the trade magazine PharmaVoice, Chandler and Chicco explained that "while buzz should always appear to be spontaneous, it should, in fact, be scientifically crafted and controlled as tightly as advertising in the New England Journal of Medicine."

One of the reasons for Viagra's success, they explained, was "Pfizer's sensitive and responsible approach" to encouraging potential patients to talk openly about impotence. To create "disease awareness," they hired celebrities and public officials to talk publicly about "erectile dysfunction," their preferred terminology.

"The buzz spread through the media, virtually eliminating the taboo word 'impotence,'" they wrote. In the US, they hired former Vice President Bob Dole to endorse the product, turning Viagra into "success beyond a marketer's wildest dreams."

Impotence Australia (IA), Pfizer's front group down under, launched an advertising campaign with PR support from Hill & Knowlton. The campaign hit a snag, however, when its undisclosed ties to Pfizer were detailed in separate articles in Australian Doctor and the Australian Financial Review. Ray Moynihan, the author of the AFR story, revealed that Pfizer had bankrolled Impotence Australia to the tune of \$200,000 Australian dollars (US \$121,000). In an interview with Moynihan, IA Executive Officer Brett McCann admitted, "I could understand that people may have a feeling that this is a front for Pfizer."

A later Impotence Australia advertising campaign featured Pele, the Brazilian soccer legend. "Erection problems are a common medical condition but they can be successfully treated. So talk to your doctor today . . . I would," Pele advised.

What Women Want

While some PR firms work to gain media profile for their clients, others work hosing down bad publicity. In January 2003, for example, pharmaceutical companies were caught with their pants down when the British Medical Journal featured an article by Moynihan challenging the use of exaggerated statistics by corporate-sponsored scientists seeking to create a new medical

"syndrome" called "female sexual dysfunction."

Moynihan's article was picked up by hundreds of other publications around the world, prompting a hasty response by Michelle Lerner of the bio-technology and pharmaceutical PR company HCC DeFacto. Lerner, a former business reporter for Miami Today, scrambled to mobilize "third party" allies. She dispatched an email to a number of women's health groups.

"We think it's important to counter [Moynihan] and get another voice on the record," the email stated. "I was wondering whether you or someone from your organisation may be willing to work with us to generate articles in Canada countering the point of view raised in the BMJ. This would involve speaking with select reporters about [female sexual dysfunction], its causes and treatments," she wrote.

As often happens in today's wired world, a copy of Lerner's email was forwarded to Moynihan. He contacted Lerner, who refused to disclose the identity of her client, stating that doing so would "violate ethical guidelines." When we contacted Lerner ourselves, she declined further comment and suggested that we interview HCC DeFacto Director Richard Cripps. All he would tell us, however, is that "I don't want to get into the specifics at this stage."

We also interviewed Moynihan, who expressed disgust with HCC DeFacto's crude campaign. "The participation of the corporate sector in that debate [on female sexual dysfunction] is extremely welcome if it is open. If they are going to try and get their message out there via small community groups without their fingerprints on it, that is just pathetic," he said.

Kathleen O'Grady, the editor of A Friend Indeed, a newsletter for Canadian women in menopause and midlife, was one of the recipients of Lerner's email. She told us that she was "surprised, and then very angry . . . They wanted to use our credibility to bolster their public relations. Under no circumstances would we ever agree to such an arrangement."

Disease Awareness

Writing for the British Medical Journal, Moynihan joined physicians David Henry and Iona Heath in warning that drug company marketing campaigns over-emphasize the benefits of medication. "Alternative approaches--emphasising the self-limiting or relatively benign natural history of a problem, or the importance of personal coping strategies--are played down or ignored," they wrote.

Conventional wisdom says that drugs are developed in response to disease. Often, however, the power of pharma PR creates the reverse phenomenon, in which new diseases are defined by companies seeking to create a market to match their drug.

A decade ago, the late journalist Lynn Payer wrote a book titled Disease Mongering, in which she described the confluence of interests of doctors, drug companies and media in exaggerating the severity of illness and the ability of drugs to "cure" them. "Since disease is such a fluid and political concept, the providers can essentially create their own demand by broadening the definitions of diseases in such a way as to include the greatest number of people, and by spinning out new diseases," she wrote.

Pharma PR practitioners are sometimes quite candid as they discuss the art of creating a need

for a new product. "Once the need has been established and created, then the product can be introduced to satisfy that need/desire," states Harry Cook in the "Practical Guide to Medical Education," published by the UK-based Pharmaceutical Marketing magazine.

Sometimes patient groups are created out of whole cloth to boost a new drug that is about to emerge from a drug company's "pipeline." Most of the time, however, drug companies woo existing non-profit patient groups. "Partnering with advocacy groups and thought leaders at major research institutions helps to defuse industry critics by delivering positive messages about the healthcare contributions of pharma companies," explains Teri Cox from Cox Communication Partners, New Jersey, in a September 2002 commentary in *Pharma Executive*. Corporate-sponsored "disease awareness campaigns" typically urge potential consumers to consult their doctor for advice on specific medications. This advice works in tandem with corporate efforts to influence doctors, the final gatekeepers for prescription drugs.

According to Julia Cook of the Surrey-based Lowe Fusion Healthcare, potential "product champions" and "opinion leaders" in the medical fraternity are critical to influencing doctors' thinking. "The key is to evaluate their views and influence potential, to recruit them to specially designed relationship building activities and then provide them with a programme of appropriate communications platforms," Cook wrote in the "Practical Guide to Medical Education."

Recruiting potential supporters to an advisory committee, she says, allows time to develop a closer relationship and evaluation of how they can "best be used." However, a delicate touch is required. "Credibility can also be undermined by overuse," Cook warned. "If you front the same people to speak at your symposia, write publications, etc., they will be inevitably be seen as being in your pocket."

Obtaining favorable coverage in medical journals is also an important element in pharmaceutical marketing. An investigation by the *Journal of the American Medical Association* article found that it was a commonplace practice for articles to be "ghostwritten" for well-respected medical researchers.

Based in Oxford, England, 4D Communications is one of the PR firms that helps, in the words of its web site, to "mix experienced scientists with marketers and creatives to create memorable educational and commercial programmes." According to Emma Sergeant, 4D's managing director, PR companies can help with the "creation of authoritative journals." Indeed, drug company-sponsored publications are so lucrative that in 1995 Edelman established a subsidiary company, BioScience Communications, to "meet the education needs of major pharmaceutical firms."

Journals, though, can achieve far more than touting the benefits of a new drug. Publications can be used to create a market "by creating dissatisfaction with existing products and creating the need for something new," wrote Harry Cook from ICC Europe in a medical publishing guide. "Reprints [of journal articles] can be a very powerful selling tool, as they are perceived as being independent and authoritative." Indeed, this perception of independence and authority is precisely what healthcare PR uses to keep the public from realizing that much of what they see, hear and read about drugs originates from sources beset with conflicts of interest.

In creating or co-opting patient groups, hiring "product champions" and cultivating doctors, PR companies make it harder for citizens to obtain accurate, genuinely independent information to

enable informed health decisions. While healthcare PR campaigns are undoubtedly effective in selling more drugs, they don't necessarily make for a healthy population.

Appreciate animal-rights restraint

http://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/opinion/orl-myword0105sep01_0.6203015.story?coll=orl-opinion-headlines

Other Views My Word

Christopher Murphy

September 1, 2005

University of Iowa researcher Mark S. Blumberg's Sunday Insight piece describing vandalism and harassment by the Animal Liberation Front, whose members he suggests should be labeled as "terrorists," was so whiny and weak I was embarrassed for him, his family and the university. Intruders rescued rats and mice on which Blumberg and others were experimenting. They spilled chemicals and damaged equipment. They videotaped their visit and sent a copy to the university. They also called Blumberg and his colleagues mean names, sent him mean e-mails and signed him up for a lot of magazine subscriptions.

There was disruption, expense and loss of data. No one died. No one was injured. No one so much as suffered a paper cut, yet Blumberg describes the incident in terms so hyperbolic, I am concerned for his sanity. My favorite example, one that should get him fired from the university and laughed into hiding, was that he found the vandalism and insulting e-mails more harrowing than having his house broken into in the early 1980s by armed robbers who tied him up and stuck snub-nosed revolvers in his face. I mean, really, I can't think of a victim of a violent home invasion who wouldn't have preferred having his office wrecked while he was on vacation.

Blumberg goes on, with weepy righteousness, about how difficult it was for him to learn that after freeing them from their cages, the animal-rights intruders mixed baby mice with adult mice that weren't their mothers, all but ensuring they would be eaten. How much nicer it would have been for them to be killed by Blumberg via poison or freezing or other methods as painful. Readers aren't sure because nowhere in the piece does its author mention what really happens to them. Further, it's convenient that only rats and mice were saved from that University of Iowa lab. That way, Blumberg also can avoid mentioning the armies of cats, dogs, monkeys and chimpanzees he and others in the research industry torture and kill annually.

How stupid he must think his readers are.

Blumberg claims the folks who trashed his laboratory have a distrust of and disdain for science. I don't think that's true. I think they like science but have a distrust of and disdain for people who torture and kill animals in its name. Science can be furthered without animal experimentation. Regrettably, those who make money breeding mice, monkeys and beagles, the dog of choice for animal experimentation, are able to spend it in amounts sufficient to convince most people it

can't.

No group in United States history has won rights without inflicting, and suffering, violence. The Revolutionary War, abolition, women's suffrage, labor rights, civil rights, rights of the unborn -- all these movements have been, and continue to be, stained with violence. Blumberg and his crybaby colleagues got off with broken computers, graffiti and subscriptions to Time and TV Guide. Instead of likening animal-rights activists to actual terrorists, they should be thanking them for their restraint.

Christopher Murphy lives in Orlando.

Copyright © 2005, Orlando Sentinel

The High Price of Animal Experimentation

August 29, 2005

by Robert Bass, Ph.D.

You do not settle if an experiment is justified or not by merely showing it is of some use. The distinction is not between useful and useless experiments, but between barbourous and civilized behavior. Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expence of human character. - George Bernard Shaw

Animal exploiters and their apologists, like Brian O'Connor, have trouble focusing on the real issues. O'Connor briefly adverts to Gayle Dean's article before launching into a long, rambling catalogue of allegations against PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals). This is puzzling. You might think that Dean's article had been written about how PETA has a squeaky-clean record. O'Connor's catalogue would then make a certain amount of sense. In fact, Dean's article had been hardly concerned with PETA at all, except to point out that the organization had compiled a strong and well-documented case that the biomedical research firm, Covance, had engaged in unconscionable cruelty to their animal test-subjects. Never mind any question of animal rights: Covance appears guilty of egregious violations of existing animal cruelty law. (See for yourself at www.covancecruelty.com.) Since Dean's article was not a defence of PETA, the enumeration of their alleged sins appears to be merely an ad hominem attack: O'Connor does not like the message, so he attacks the messenger.

Still, though the supposed misdemeanors have no logical relevance, citing them makes a certain strategic sense on O'Connor's part – at least if he seeks to distract attention from the real issues. It is tempting to try to answer each allegation, to show how quotes were ripped from their contexts, and to counter the fundamentally unfair tactic of taking different things, said by different people, on different occasions, as the expression of a single sinister view. The problem with that is that editors will not tolerate having their pages taken over by the explanations. He who makes the most accusations wins by default. Evidently, O'Connor has no intention of losing

for lack of enough accusations.

Rather than being drawn into the thankless task of point-by-point reply, however, I will mention just one case where O'Connor's eagerness to believe bad things of PETA has betrayed him. He speaks of Fran Trutt, "who tried to kill the director of a medical lab." He doesn't bother mentioning that the whole thing was a put-up job, deliberately designed to make the animal rights cause look bad. Who did the designing? The lab director himself, who also made sure police were on hand to make the arrest – all of which came out at the trial, with incriminating tape transcripts to prove it.

The more important issues here are three-fold. The first has to do with O'Connor's conception of animal rights. The second is the important scientific question of whether animal research is needed. And the third is the moral question of what to do about it.

O'Connor sums up the animal rights view in a single principle, "that the life of an animal and that of a human are of equal value," and proceeds to deduce a string of consequences, asserting that animal rights advocates (ARAs) must all be extremists who believe (and perhaps practice) monstrous things. The problem is that his evidence is sadly lacking. Many, but not all, ARAs accept some kind of equality between humans and other animals. For those who do not, his initial statement of the position already errs by exaggeration. More importantly, even those who accept some kind of animal-human equality don't understand it the way O'Connor does. He imagines ARAs ready cavalierly to trade off some number of human lives for just that many animal lives, plus one more. That's a caricature on the face of it. Someone who believes in human equality doesn't automatically have to think that, if you must choose, the thing to do is always to save ten Alzheimers' patients over nine healthy adults. If human equality doesn't imply such crude accounting, no more should it be assumed that human-animal equality requires it. Nor is such crude accounting accepted by leading animal-rights thinkers. Peter Singer defends a principle of equal consideration of interests, whether human or animal interests are at stake, but argues that normally, if we must choose, a human being is to be saved rather than some other animal. From a different theoretical framework, Tom Regan reaches a similar conclusion.

Easily correctable mistakes like these about what ARAs think call into question how carefully O'Connor has thought about or investigated the position. The larger problem, though, is not that he misrepresents people, organizations or ideas, but that in the process the public is distracted from the real issues connected to animal experimentation and its moral costs. One issue is whether research must be done on animals for the sake of saving human lives. Many people have some sympathy with the argument that if we had to test on animals to save human lives, then it would not be wrong. Knowing how animals in research facilities are made to suffer and die, however, they would add that if the animal experimentation is not necessary, it should not continue. The professional animal-exploiters will be quick to assure you that there is no "if" about it, that medicine can progress in no other way, and that human lives are at stake if we listen to the ARAs rather than vigorously pursuing animal research.

There is room for reasonable doubt, however. The animal-exploiters and their spokespeople are unlikely to mention it, but many scientists doubt the value of animal testing. In a recent article, Duncan Campbell and David Adam cite "Kathy Archibald, a geneticist and the director of Europeans for Medical Progress," commenting upon those who try "to create the impression that there is unanimous support [for animal testing] in the scientific community, and that is not the case. There is enormous doubt about the testing.... Looking at the evidence overall, animal testing is positively harmful." Further doubt comes from the fact that our evidence is

contaminated. Regulatory requirements mean that a new drug cannot go to market without being tested on animals. We do not see, and so cannot judge, what would happen instead if comparable resources, intelligence and skill were devoted to non-animal-based research.

Thus, even in the best case for animal experimentation, we are comparing a doubtful benefit, that some crucially important medical discovery can be made in no other way, to a certain cost, the suffering and death of many millions of animals a year. Rethinking our priorities may be in order.

But that is not all. There is a simple argument that animal experimentation to gain insight into human health, disease and well-being is either morally or scientifically dubious: The animals must be a great deal like us for the results to be scientifically unproblematic, but very different from us in order to be morally unproblematic.

When we want scientifically useful results, the more like us the animals are, the better. When we want clear consciences over causing disease, suffering and death to innocent creatures, the more like us the animals are, the worse. How can we have it both ways?

Perhaps we should grow up and quit trying to have things both ways. When, as Shaw suggests, doubtful benefits are purchased at the price of our character, the price is far too high.

Robert Bass, Ph.D.

Robert H. Bass, Ph.D, is Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of Philosophy at the University of North Florida. His current research centers upon the relation of virtue ethics to politics and to our treatment of animals.