

ANIMAL ACTION REPORT

A publication of the
National Anti-Vivisection Society

Advancing science without harming animals

Summer 2006



In this issue ...

The Ethics and Treatment of Animals in Research

*Are we making moral progress?
An essay by Bernard Rollin, Ph.D*

2

NAVS celebrates fifth year of presenting Intel ISEF Humane Science Awards

5

Compassion and the Law

Turning intent into action

7

Become a more informed animal advocate

Join us for a program on prosecuting and sentencing animal abusers

8

Making the Grade—or Not—at Intel ISEF

NAVS judges continue to monitor the use of animals in student projects

9

You...to the Rescue

Our generous supporters give animals a second chance at life through the NAVS Sanctuary Fund

10

A Matter of Morals

The Ethical Perspective on Animal Experimentation

As our supporters know, NAVS opposes animal experimentation for both *scientific* and *ethical* reasons. Not only do we believe that animal-modeled research is flawed science that harms both people and animals, we also contend that no species should be exploited for the supposed benefit of another.

Regular readers of the *Animal Action Report* will recall that, in recent issues, we have focused on why NAVS opposes animal experimentation from a *scientific* perspective. Our discussions have included a look at the development and implementation of alternatives to animal testing in toxicology, as well as the inadequacies of the animal model in biomedical research.

For this edition, we'll be exploring animal experimentation from an *ethical* perspective. In the following pages, you'll learn about the evolution of how animals are regarded in the laboratory, the landmark law that has affected how experimental animals are treated, and what can be done to further address the welfare of animals in the laboratory until such time that non-animal methodologies have replaced the animal model permanently.

We are pleased to begin our discussion with an essay by Bernard E. Rollin, Ph.D. Dr. Rollin is a Professor of Philosophy,



We contend that no species should be exploited for the supposed benefit of another.

Professor of Animal Sciences, Professor of Biomedical Sciences, University Bioethicist and University Distinguished Professor at Colorado State University. He is a widely published author and has lectured extensively on animal ethics, genetic engineering, animal pain, animal research, animal agriculture and veterinary ethics.

Among his many other activities, Dr. Rollin serves on the Scientific Advisory Board of the International Foundation for Ethical Research (IFER). His most recent book, *Science and Ethics* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), addresses issues concerning animal research, xenotransplantation and biotechnology, and how ethical considerations have finally found their way into empirical science.

Dr. Rollin's unique perspective—on the ethical concerns regarding individual animals as well as on the global issue of animal use—focuses on animal welfare rather than the abolition of animal research. While NAVS tends to focus on the latter, the nature of bringing about incremental changes demands that consideration is also given to the well being of animals in laboratory use now and in the foreseeable future. Dr. Rollin, as an author of the federal Animal Welfare Act Amendments of 1985, discusses the changes that have occurred as a result of that important development of law. 🐾



Visit our web site:
www.navs.org

Ethics and the Treatment of Animals in Research

Are we making moral progress?

By Bernard E. Rollin, Ph.D.

To understand where we are today regarding the use of animals, we must know where we've been.



RECOMMENDED READING

The paperback version of Dr. Rollin's newest book, Science and Ethics, is available to NAVS' supporters at the discounted price of \$22.00, including postage and handling—a significant discount off the retail price. If you would like to order it through NAVS, please use the donor form on page 11, or call us at 800-888-NAVS (800-888-6287) with your credit card information.

An activist friend of mine recently shared her disappointment over the lack of progress in the area of animal research, education and testing. “I have been at this for 25 years, and what has changed?” she asked me. “We are still using animals!”

Her remarks led me to reflect on my own involvement with this issue, which spans over 30 years, and to wonder if my friend was entitled to her disillusionment. After some thought, I must say my answer is an emphatic “No!” And I say that despite the fact that rational animal ethics is only about 30 years old...and despite the awesome power of the research community, which has enjoyed total laissez-faire for most of its history. I hope that after reading the following essay, you will find my reasons to be justified and share my optimism.

To understand where we are today regarding the use of animals, we must know where we've been. So allow me to take you back to 1976, when I agreed to teach the world's first ethics course ever taught in a veterinary school. That was the year in which, along with three of my colleagues—two veterinarians and an attorney—I began to draft meaningful legislation to protect animals used in research, teaching and testing.

Given the issues I found myself confronting, it would have been easy to



despair. At our veterinary school, surgery was taught using the same animal repeatedly over two weeks, for a total of eight unrelated surgeries. At other schools, the number of surgeries performed was more than double ours. If a student wished to provide aftercare for animals, he or she had to cut class to do so.

The dogs used in these multiple surgeries were called “sub-dogs”—the “sub” being short for “substitute”—yet universally heard by students as “less than dogs.” At another school they were called “x” dogs, ostensibly because of an “x” chalked on their cage on the day of surgery. But students universally referred to them as “ex-dogs.”

In addition to the multiple surgeries, all veterinary and human medical schools required atrocious and brutalizing laboratory exercises, such as the infamous hemorrhagic shock lab, wherein students bled an animal to death.

Other labs involved poisoning guinea pigs and, most atrociously, feeding a cat cream and doing exploratory visceral surgery with the animal under ketamine, which is not a visceral analgesic (painkiller). Officially, this exercise, which occurred in the third week of the student's first year of veterinary school, was designed so that the student could watch the transport of cream through the villi (the mucous membrane of the small intestine). However, the real purpose

of the lab was, as one professor told me proudly, “to teach these students that they are in vet school now, and if they are soft, to get out early!”

In the research arena, things were equally shocking. At that time, there was no use and no knowledge of analgesia in animals. In 1982, when I testified before Congress, I was asked to prove that animal pain control was lacking in research. I did a literature search and found only two papers dealing with animal analgesia, one of which said that there ought to be papers! This state of affairs reflected a universally accepted ideology, or mindset, which denied that animals could feel pain and that ethics was relevant to science. So pervasive was this ideology that I dubbed it “the Common Sense of Science.” The denial of the relevance of ethics to science led inevitably not only to cavalier treatment of animals, but of human subjects as well—witness Tuskegee, Willowbrook and a myriad of other abuses.

The same behaviorist researchers who denied animal consciousness insisted on doing experimental surgery on primate brains using only curariform drugs—drugs that paralyzed but did nothing to mitigate pain—on the grounds that the animals needed to be “conscious”. We knew from experiments on humans that curariform drugs paralyze the respiratory muscles and caused sheer terror even in sophisticated researchers who understood what was happening and were being attended to by an army of MD-PhD’s.

Animal housing was designed strictly in accordance with human convenience, with the animals’ biological and psychological needs and natures cavalierly ignored. (Indeed, as just mentioned, scientific ideology denied consciousness in animals!) Nocturnal animals were kept in 24-hour

lighting, social animals were isolated, and, most egregiously, primates were kept single-caged in totally austere circumstances, left to go mad with no intellectual stimulation or opportunity for exercise.

At one primate center I visited, the baboons were in tiny cages where they had to remain hunched, unable to stand. When I asked why, I was told that they were “vicious.” I pointed out that, in my experience, the reverse was true—they were “vicious” because of how they were being kept! This appalling practice stood in stark contrast to a laboratory in Australia, where the baboons ran free and were trained by positive reinforcement to present an arm for blood sampling! In fact, one could argue, as Dr. Thomas Wolfe of NIH and I both have, that animals suffer more from how they are housed than from what is done to them.

To this horror-show list I will add one more consideration. Thirty years ago, little attention was paid to terminating the research animals’ suffering. For example, in too many disease studies, the illness was left to progress until it killed the animal. By the same token, tumor size was unrestricted. I personally saw animals with tumors literally as large as the whole animal. Tumors were commonly ulcerated and necrotic, thereby causing significant suffering.

Such was the dire situation of research animals that I encountered in the mid-1970s, and which persisted into the mid-1980s, until the passage by Congress of the laboratory animal laws in 1985. Everything I have recounted thus far is something I had personally witnessed and researched in the literature. Now, I will support my contention that considerable progress has been made

Continued on page 4



Today, it is universally accepted (as it was not 30 years ago) that animals that are stressed do not provide good research results.

Ethics and the Treatment of Animals in Research *Continued from page 3*

on all of these fronts, though a great deal more needs to be accomplished.

Let us begin with the multiple surgeries, and the other atrocious laboratory exercises described earlier. As developer of the world's first course in veterinary ethics, I became something of an "ombudsman for animals" at Colorado State University. I engaged some surgeons in dialogue about the multiple use of dogs with no aftercare. I was startled at their response. "Do you think we like doing that?" they said. "We did not go deeply into debt to cut into animals over and over just because they do not happen to have an owner." Then they issued their own challenge: "You are the ethics person—fix it!" I pointed out that we could fix it together, and we did so—within six months. This was my first clear evidence that Plato's notion of "recollection"—that when dealing with adults and ethics, one could not teach, only "remind"—really worked.

Since Colorado State University was the country's best veterinary surgery program at the time, other institutions followed suit, and the practice of multiple surgeries as a

cheap method of instruction was abolished in short order, until it was finally rendered illegal in the 1985 laws.

The same sort of thing occurred with the hideous cat lab described earlier, although in this case it took two years to abolish it, and eventually all invasive labs disappeared. And, to my knowledge, few if any human or veterinary medical schools still retain the hemorrhagic shock lab described earlier.

Even before the laws passed in 1985, the majority of schools had begun to offer alternatives to invasive exercises, based in large part on public concern about such atrocities. All teaching uses of animals after the 1985 laws passed needed to be approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), many of whom have mandated alternatives for students who object to labs on moral grounds.

The 1985 laws marked a major watershed for research animals. (Recall that one law amended the Animal Welfare Act significantly, while the other made it mandatory for NIH to enforce its guidelines and principles.) Consider the lack of knowledge or use of analgesics in 1982, as we discussed earlier. In 1985, the laws mandated control of "pain and distress" unless such control would contaminate the data—a very rare occurrence that I have seen arise only twice in the 26 years I served on CSU's IACUC.

Analgesic use is required by law in all other cases, and is strongly enforced. I recall one senior tenured researcher at CSU who agreed to use analgesics and then failed to do so—and is no longer on the faculty. The same law, incidentally, bans the use of paralytics (discussed earlier) in conscious animals. Most impressively, perhaps, the literature on pain control has grown to somewhere between 5 and 10 thousand papers. Pain control is now taught in every

veterinary school as a pivotal part of the curriculum.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) was lax in dealing with distress until the ideology denying pain in animals was thoroughly routed by the laws. Now, since the idea of pain control has become universally accepted, the USDA has turned its attention to "distress," a catchall term covering the many ways animals can experience misery beyond physical pain—fear, loneliness, social isolation, boredom, anxiety, etc.

The USDA was wise to wait. Any efforts to press such issues as boredom with the research community when there was still wide skepticism about animal consciousness of any form would surely have been ignored.

The issue of accommodations for animals used in research is more complicated, but also, in the end, positive. In our initial legislative draft of the 1985 laws, my colleagues and I stipulated that all laboratory animals be housed under conditions that fit their biological and psychological needs and natures, which Congress refused to accept. However, they did stipulate in the amendment to the Animal Welfare Act that dogs must be provided with exercise, and primates be kept under conditions that "enhance their psychological well-being," a powerful ideology breaker if there ever was one affirming that animals have psychological well-being.

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Reauthorization Bill gave the concept of enriched environments a powerful tonic. In the most recent edition of the *NIH Guide to the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals* (1996), there is considerable emphasis placed on laboratories becoming actively involved in enrichment programs.

Continued on page 6



One example of a positive step forward has been the development of systems for group housing of rabbits, social animals historically kept in small cages.

NAVS celebrates fifth year of presenting Intel ISEF Humane Science Awards

Three outstanding students recognized for their scholarship and compassion



The NAVS judges congratulate the NAVS Humane Science Awards winners at the presentation ceremony. From left to right, **Dr. June Bradlaw**, a NAVS science advisor; **Peggy Cunniff**, NAVS' executive director; **Anneke Schwob**, 2nd place winner; **Charles Dyer**, 1st place winner; **Anelise do Santos Klein**, 3rd place winner; and **Marcia Kramer**, NAVS' director of legal and legislative programs.

This spring NAVS was pleased to present, for the fifth straight year, our Humane Science Awards for projects at the Intel International Science and Engineering Fair (ISEF). The Humane Science Award is one way that NAVS, in keeping with our goal of eliminating the use of animals in research, encourages the next generation of scientists to conduct their investigative endeavors with a sense of compassion as well as intellectual zeal.

Students are awarded Humane Science Awards for projects that best advance humane science through the use of non-animal methodologies in research or

through projects that promote animal welfare. The final competition took place in Indianapolis, where more than 1,200 students competed for hundreds of prizes.

This year's judges included Dr. June Bradlaw, a NAVS science advisor and chairperson of the International Foundation for Ethical Research; Peggy Cunniff, NAVS executive director; and Marcia Kramer, director of legal and legislative programs and veteran NAVS science fair judge. Choosing the recipients of the NAVS Humane Science Award has always been a challenge, with dozens of excellent projects qualifying for a prize under the award's rigorous criteria. And this year was no exception.

The NAVS judges found a number of projects—and students—whose vision and keen investigative abilities qualified for a Humane Science Award. The energy and initiative that went into the projects was amazing. With projects ranging from nanotechnology to weather patterns on the planet Jupiter, there was a panoply of ideas and innovations to review.

To reach a decision, the judges carefully evaluated the scientific merit of each project, along with the potential contribution to the area of research being conducted. The first day of judging permitted the judges to review project boards without the students being present, which yielded a number of promising projects. During the second day the level of excitement rose as students provided a zealous defense—and an in-depth analysis—of their scientific process. In the end, three students were chosen for special award prizes, as follows:

1st Place

Charles Dyer, from Shreveport, LA, for his project, *The Function of a Novel Apoptosis Regulating Protein, XAF-1C, in Breast Cancer Research*.

2nd Place

Anneke Schwob, from Boston, MA, for her project, *A Novel Role for Telomerase in Stem Cell Differentiation*.

3rd Place

Anelise do Santos Klein, from Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, for her project, *Animal Caring—An Educational Proposal*.

Continued on page 8

Ethics and the Treatment of Animals in Research Continued from page 4

Most major research institutions—that is, those that can afford the escalating expenditures entailed in competing for federal research dollars—are taking enrichment seriously. Some campuses (including my own) even employ a full-time person to provide enrichment and stay current on the literature, an ever-increasing scholarly endeavor.

Today, it is universally accepted (as it was *not* 30 years ago) that animals that are stressed do not provide good research results, so that even if one is not committed to animal welfare *per se*, addressing issues such as distress, accommodations and enrichment is perceived as proper science.

One example of a positive step forward has been the development of systems for group housing of rabbits, social animals historically kept in small cages. Another very positive indicator is the proliferation of articles on enrichment not only in academic journals, but in trade journals as well, such as *Lab Animal*, which publishes articles on advances in enrichment with considerable frequency.

In the end, what we hoped would occur by mandating IACUCs has indeed occurred. Our major concern was to explode the scientific ideology that denied the existence of animal consciousness and animal pain, as well as the relevance of ethics to science. When the laws mandated the discussion and review of protocols by IACUCs, it essentially mandated ethical discussion, particularly concerning issues of pain and suffering. One cannot do this job while denying the relevance of ethics to science, and acknowledging the reality of animal consciousness and pain. This alone represents major progress.

IACUCs have also spurred the use of alternatives to animals in research, though certainly more in the areas of reduction



... one could argue, as Dr. Thomas Wolfle of NIH and I both have, that animals suffer more from how they are housed than from what is done to them.

and refinement than replacement. The one glowing exception is in the area of animal use in teaching, where an impressive array of non-animal alternatives has been developed. Computer simulations, for example, have replaced invasive exercises, and plastination has eliminated much of the need for repeated dissections. And, as Allen Goldberg and Thomas Hartung have shown in their important January 2006 *Scientific American* article, ethical concerns about animal use in toxicology testing have driven the proliferation of alternatives, particularly in Europe, where these concerns have ramified in the regulatory arena. Goldberg and Hartung correctly point out that this is not only ethically better, but makes for better science.

All of this gives evidence that there is no reason for despair, but that neither should animal advocates grow complacent. There

is, for example, a great need for scientifically literate and ethically conscious animal advocates to serve as community representatives on IACUCs. Thus far, community representatives have been somewhat overawed when serving on committees, despite the scientists welcoming their contributions.

As noted animal activist Henry Spira and I agreed, all social-ethical revolutions in American history have been incremental—that is, a series of small changes—and animal use is no exception. With societal ethics solidly behind concerns about animal welfare, animal advocates are in a privileged position to galvanize that concern into meaningful reforms as long as they dedicate themselves to achieving ethical and scientific sophistication in the area of animal research, and press those concerns in all relevant forums.

Although the Animal Welfare Act laid the groundwork for granting protections for animals in the laboratory, there is still a long way to go to improve the conditions for animals used in research until such time that they are no longer used for this purpose. The solution embodies greater attention to the welfare of animals currently in research as well as the eventual replacement of all animals in research.

At this juncture, there are several realistic objectives that the animal protection community should target in cooperation with the scientific community. These include:

1. Bringing mice, rats and birds under the protection of the Animal Welfare Act so that the vast majority of animals used in research can be better protected under the provisions of this law.
2. Allocating more resources to the USDA's Animal Health and Plant Inspection Service (APHIS) to ensure effective enforcement of the law and compliance with the standards of care.
3. Increasing funding to the federal Interagency Coordinating Committee for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM) for the development and validation of new non-animal based technologies.
4. Increasing support for nonprofit organizations such as the International Foundation for Ethical Research (IFER) that provide critical funding to graduate students and principal researchers for projects that replace, reduce the number, or mitigate harm to animals used for traditional animal-based research.

Ultimately, the true key to providing the best protection for animals is to replace them in the laboratory. Greater resources

directed at research into alternatives will escalate the pace at which incremental changes will occur, improve the quality of scientific research, and eliminate the perceived necessity of animals to advance human health. This is a solution that will, in the long run, benefit humans and animals alike. 🐾



COMPASSION AND THE LAW

Turning intent into action

Effective laws—and enforcement of those laws—are an essential element in giving animals protection from abuse, both in the laboratory and in our daily dealings with them in our homes. The federal government is responsible for regulating the use of animals in the laboratory, while the states have jurisdiction to enact anti-cruelty laws concerning the treatment of companion animals and animals in the wild.

Many animal advocates consider the federal Animal Welfare Act, the definitive law for the treatment of animals in the laboratory, to be significantly flawed. The Act, passed in 1966, was meant to cover those animals that the Secretary of Agriculture “shall determine” are used in research. The USDA, however, erroneously took that to mean that it was within its power to decide which animals are covered—and proceeded to exclude mice and rats. While a legal challenge finally succeeded in reversing this position, a subsequent amendment to the Animal Welfare Act in 2002 succeeded in excluding mice, rats and birds by law.

While the states have passed a record number of animal protection laws, few animal protective measures are ever enacted at the federal level. In the past few years, the most significant federal laws that have been passed ban the sale of items (over \$150) using fur from a cat or dog and prohibit the interstate transport of dog fighting paraphernalia.

There have been other efforts to protect the welfare of animals over the years, both through amendments to the Animal

Welfare Act, and through changes or additions to other laws.

Clearly, though, the legislative intent of ensuring animals the compassion, respect and justice they deserve vastly outweighs the actions taken thus far, even though dozens of measures are introduced each year in Washington to better protect animals. In the current session, such legislative efforts include:

- The American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act (H.R. 503 and S. 1915)
- Captive Primate Safety Act of 2005 (H.R. 1329 and S. 1509)
- Farm Animal Stewardship Purchasing Act (H.R. 5557)
- Pet Animal Welfare Statute of 2005 (S. 1139 and H.R. 2669)
- Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2005 (H.R. 5229 and S. 451)
- The Pets Evacuation and Transportation Standards Act (H.R. 3858 and S. 2548)
- Truth in Fur Labeling Act of 2006 (H.R. 4904)

There is still much work to be done to protect animals both at the state and federal level. To find out how you can help pass animal protective legislation, in Washington and in your own state, visit the NAVS Advocacy Center at www.navs.org.

For a more complete list of legislation concerning animal issues from both the federal government and all 50 states, visit www.animallaw.com.

Become a more informed animal advocate



Join us for a program on prosecuting and sentencing animal abusers.

The International Institute for Animal Law, in partnership with DePaul University Law School's Animal Law Program, will be sponsoring a symposium on October 19, 2006 entitled "Punishment and Sentencing of Animal Abusers." The program will be held at the DePaul University Center in downtown Chicago from 3:00-6:00 pm. This program will be open to students, attorneys and members of the public. CLE credits will be available for attorneys.

You are welcome to join us for this exciting program. For more information, contact Marcia Kramer, NAVS' director of legal and legislative programs, at 312-427-6065, ext. 226. 🐾



Intel ISEF Humane Science Awards *Continued from page 5*

Our third place winner's project deserves special note, as it epitomized the educational aspect of humane science.

Anelise's project fell into the category of behavioral science. She identified a problem in her community: a lack of regard for animals, in particular dogs, who were adopted as family pets as puppies and then disposed of as they matured without regard to their welfare.

Her project entailed 1) testing a hypothesis that educating young children about compassion would change their attitude towards animals, and 2) developing an education program that could be used in primary schools.

We congratulate these bright and dedicated students for a job very well done and hope that the encouragement they have received from NAVS will motivate them to incorporate 21st century technology as well as humane methodologies throughout their careers in science and medicine.

While all the projects the judges reviewed were indeed fascinating, meeting with the students is really the highlight of each science fair. It is an opportunity for the NAVS judges to discuss methodologies and get a sense of the progress that is being made in undertaking new research by the future scientists of the world. It also provides a chance for the judges to speak

with students who are pursuing animal-based research about alternatives to the use of animals, determine their understanding of the inadequacies of animal models, and find out whether they would consider using alternatives in the future.

We also wish to convey our gratitude to NAVS' supporters, who recognize the importance of investing in programs that provide positive incentives for young scientists. We expect that this investment will pay off as students begin their professional careers, pursuing alternatives to the use of animals and providing leadership in advancing humane science. 🐾

Making the Grade— or Not—at Intel ISEF

NAVS judges continue to monitor the use of animals in student projects.

Reviewing individual student projects in consideration for a NAVS Humane Science Award is one important reason our judges attend the Intel International Science and Engineering Fair (ISEF). The other is to evaluate the state of science education, application of rules, and the general attitude of students towards humane science. As always, there were both encouraging and discouraging factors at work during the 2006 final competition in Indianapolis.

One of the most encouraging developments is the growing number of projects in the categories of health and medicine, biochemistry and microbiology that have nothing to do with the animal model. There were several projects testing new composite materials to promote bone healing, looking at human breast cancer cells for novel expressions that may be the key to diagnosis or treatment, and even projects looking at the viability—and toxicity—of nanoparticles, which are the basis of many promising new developments in medicine and other technologies. These projects, as well as the students working on them, represent the new wave of research that does not rely on the animal model for its inquiry.

Unfortunately, the opposite side of the equation—the use of animals in science fair projects—was also well represented at this year's Intel ISEF. While Intel ISEF rules prohibit invasive animal experiments except in a laboratory under the guidance of a principal researcher, many students chose their projects based on the availability of animals or animal tissue, or because they were able to work on a summer internship at a professional laboratory based on their interest in science.

For these projects, mice and rats are still the animals of choice. Though projects conducted at a laboratory are supposed to be evaluated by an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), the federal Animal Welfare Act does not include these animals in its definition of “animals,” so the standards of care for their use and treatment are not as stringent as for other animals.

The critical question that arises is whether an individual animal was killed solely in order for a high school student to enter a science fair. Moreover, the forms provided to students using animals, along with the information provided in their abstracts, muddy these waters, making it unclear whether animals are being sacrificed for student projects, or if tissue or cells are a by-product of other laboratory research. As part of our ongoing mission to eliminate the use of animals in all Intel ISEF projects, we will be bringing this issue to the attention of Science Service in the hope that this matter will be rectified before the 2007 competition.

The large number of invertebrate animals used for experiments is also a matter for concern, as the rules and protections governing the use of animals are applicable only to vertebrates, not to all living creatures.

While the negatives may appear to overshadow the positives, in fact that is not the case. The situation is far more positive than that. Out of 1,200 projects presented at Intel ISEF, only about two percent raise any ethical questions at all. Nevertheless, NAVS promises to be there to monitor and speak out for any animal that suffers at a science fair—because any number is too high. 🐾



The National Anti-Vivisection Society
Advancing science without harming animals

National Headquarters
53 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 1552
Chicago, IL 60604

Tel: 312-427-6065

800-888-NAVS
(800-888-6287)

Fax: 312-427-6524

E-mail: navs@navs.org

Visit us on the web: www.navs.org

The National Anti-Vivisection Society is a national, not-for-profit organization incorporated in the State of Illinois. Annual membership includes a year's subscription to the Animal Action Report and a copy of *Personal Care for People Who Care*. Life Partner: \$1,000; Life Benefactor: \$500; Life Sponsor: \$100; Individual Membership: \$40; Senior Membership: \$15; Student Membership: \$15. All donations are tax-deductible to the fullest extent allowed by law. A copy of NAVS' annual financial report is available upon request.

Executive Director
Peggy Cunniff

Director of Programs and Communications
Clare Haggarty

Director of Legal/Legislative Programs
Marcia Kramer

Manager of Financial Operations
Karen Ruane

Senior Program Associate
Laura Ell

Program Associate
Jamie Aitchison

Administrative Assistant
Michael Foley

Science Advisors
Dr. June Bradlaw
Dr. Eugene Elmore
Dr. Ray Greek
Dr. Sherry Ward

THE NAVS MISSION

The National Anti-Vivisection Society promotes greater compassion, respect and justice for animals through educational programs based on respected ethical and scientific theory and supported by extensive documentation of the cruelty and waste of vivisection. NAVS' educational programs are directed at increasing public awareness about vivisection, identifying humane solutions to human problems, developing alternatives to the use of animals, and working with like-minded individuals to effect changes which help to end the suffering of innocent animals.

© 2006 The National Anti-Vivisection Society. All rights reserved.
This publication may not be reproduced in whole or in part in any form without prior written permission from the publisher.



Our generous supporters give animals a second chance at life through the NAVS Sanctuary Fund



YOU... *TO THE RESCUE*

We'd like to send a great big THANK YOU to our generous members and supporters, who provide the funds which make the NAVS Sanctuary Fund one of the best ways ever to get immediate help to animals in distress. Whether it's a natural or human-made disaster, the NAVS Sanctuary Fund is there—because of you—to deliver immediate financial assistance to those who need it the most. Here are some of the stories that, because of you, have a happy ending.



Saved from the slaughterhouse

“Bobby,” a 26-year-old draft horse, had been used and abused as a horse-for-hire at a riding camp. When Bobby became too old and unsound to work, he was headed for the slaughterhouse—until Equine Advocates stepped in. Unfortunately, though Equine Advocates has plenty of land, they had no empty paddocks for Bobby. That's where the NAVS Sanctuary Fund came in—with the funds to purchase a two-horse mobile barn structure to house Bobby.

See back cover for more stories

STATE CHARITABLE REGISTRATIONS

The address and telephone number of the National Anti-Vivisection Society may be found on page 9. You may obtain a copy of NAVS' annual financial report by writing to us. In addition, residents of the following states can receive copies as follows. In Arizona: A copy of the official registration may be obtained from the Secretary of State, State of Arizona, State Capitol, 1700 West Washington 7th Floor, Phoenix, AZ 85007-2808 or by calling toll-free 800-458-5842. In California: A copy of the official financial statement may be obtained from the Attorney General's Registry of Charitable Trusts, Department of Justice, P.O. Box 903447, Sacramento, CA 94203-4470 or by calling 916-445-2021. In Los Angeles: Information card on file with Los Angeles Police Commission. In Florida: A COPY OF THE OFFICIAL REGISTRATION (#SC-03423) AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE DIVISION OF CONSUMER SERVICES BY CALLING TOLL-FREE 1-800-435-7352, WITHIN THE STATE. In Kansas: Kansas registration number is available upon request. A copy of the financial report is on file with the Kansas Secretary of State's Office, Capitol - 2nd Floor, Topeka, KS 66612. In Maryland: Upon request, Maryland residents may obtain a copy of the current financial statement of the charity from the Secretary of State's Office, State House, Annapolis, MD 21401 or from the charity directly. In Michigan: The charity's Michigan registration number is available upon request. In New Jersey: INFORMATION FILED WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL CONCERNING THIS CHARITABLE SOLICITATION MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY BY CALLING 201-504-6215. **In New York: Upon request the latest annual report may be obtained from the charity directly by sending a self-addressed stamped envelope to the charity's address or by writing to the Office of Charities Registration, Department of State, 162 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12231.** In North Carolina: A COPY OF THE LICENSE TO SOLICIT CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS AS A CHARITABLE ORGANIZATION OR SPONSOR AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION OR A COPY OF THE LICENSE AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION OF THE SOLICITOR MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, SOLICITATION LICENSING BRANCH, BY CALLING (919) 733-4510. In Pennsylvania: A copy of the official registration and financial information may be obtained from the Pennsylvania Department of State by calling toll-free within Pennsylvania, 800-732-0999. In Virginia: A financial statement is available from the Commonwealth of Virginia, Division of Consumer Affairs, P.O. Box 1163, Richmond, VA 23209 or by calling 804-786-1343. In Washington: Financial information is available from the Secretary of State, State of Washington, Olympia, WA 98504-9000. In West Virginia: Residents may obtain a summary of the registration and financial documents from the Secretary of State, State Capitol, Charleston, WV 25305. In Wisconsin: A copy of the charity's financial statement disclosing assets, liabilities, fund balances, revenue, and expenses for the preceding fiscal year will be provided upon request by writing to the charity's name and address. **REGISTRATION DOES NOT IMPLY ENDORSEMENT, APPROVAL, OR RECOMMENDATION BY THE STATE.**

PLEASE SUPPORT OUR WORK TO SAVE MORE ANIMALS

Use this form for your donation or visit www.navs.org

- Here is my gift to sponsor NAVS' educational and advocacy programs.* **JRD10** Enclosed is \$ _____
- Here is my gift in support of the NAVS Sanctuary Fund. **JRS10** Enclosed is \$ _____
- Send me information on how I can enjoy the convenience of having a monthly donation to NAVS debited from my credit card, checking or savings account. **JRZ00**
- Please send me _____ copies of *Science and Ethics* by Bernard E. Rollin, Ph.D. for \$22.00 each. Price includes postage and handling. **JRM13**

Bill my VISA MasterCard Discover AmEx Acct. No. _____

Exp. Date _____ Signature _____

PRINT Name Here _____ Daytime Phone _____
(In case of a question about your credit card.)

I want to receive your e-blasts. Here is my e-mail address. _____

I no longer wish to receive the Animal Action Report by mail; I will read it on-line.

My e-mail address is _____

Check here if you do not wish to have your name appear on any mailing lists NAVS may rent to or exchange with other organizations.

PLEASE MAKE NAME AND/OR ADDRESS CORRECTIONS ON THE REVERSE SIDE.

Make your check payable to NAVS and return it in the envelope provided.

Or mail to: NAVS, 3071 Paysphere Circle, Chicago, IL 60674-0030.



Use this form to
*send us
your e-mail
address*

Or visit
www.navs.org
to register on
our website



* If you haven't already joined NAVS, a donation of \$40 (or more) entitles you to full membership benefits. For more information on NAVS membership, call us at 800-888-NAVS (800-888-6287) or visit us at www.navs.org.

GET ON-LINE...AND IN TOUCH!

Join our internet community of animal advocates with just the click of a mouse.

All you have to do is provide us with your e-mail address. This allows NAVS to communicate with you faster and more cost-effectively.

SIGN UP FOR E-BLASTS

Often there is very little time to react to an issue that comes up involving animal experimentation. So it's critically important that we can get information to you instantly, so you can act in a timely manner.

You may give us your e-mail address whichever way you prefer:

1. Register on-line at www.navs.org
2. Provide it on the donor form above
3. Call us at 800-888-NAVS (800-888-6287)

Please don't worry that your e-mail address will fall into the wrong hands. NAVS does not sell or exchange e-mail addresses, so your e-mail address is safe and confidential with us.

READ THE ANIMAL ACTION REPORT ON-LINE

If you're one of our valued supporters, you can read past and current issues of the Animal Action Report by clicking on the new "Supporters Only" section at www.navs.org. By reading the Animal Action Report on-line, you'll be saving us the cost of printing and mailing each issue to you, which allows us to use valuable funds to help animals directly.

If you would like to read future issues of the Animal Action Report on line rather than receiving it in the mail, please check the appropriate box on the donor form above and return it to us. We'll let you know when a new issue is available for viewing.

Otherwise, you will continue receiving your issues in the mail.



Return Services Requested

Here is your latest issue of NAVS ANIMAL ACTION REPORT



*Happy endings
are possible
through the
NAVS Sanctuary
Fund*

*If you would like to
make a donation to the
NAVS Sanctuary Fund
and save more animals
like these, simply mail
in the form on page 11
with your gift, or go to
www.navs.org. Thank
you in advance for your
valuable contribution!*

You...to the Rescue Continued from page 10



Retired from research

Thanks to a grant from the NAVS Sanctuary Fund, Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary was able to accept 26 squirrel monkeys from a Stanford University research laboratory. This particular group of monkeys is very special, not only because the laboratory will not be replacing them, but because they were being bred to supply the lab with more monkeys for research. So not only are these animals being given a second chance at life, they are no longer sustaining the pain and suffering of future generations.



It's over...for cat overpopulation

The Black and Orange Cat Foundation provides trap/neuter/return (TNR) services for feral and stray cats in the rural farming community of Plain City, Ohio. B&O set a goal to spay and neuter 206 cats in 2006, and the NAVS Sanctuary Fund is helping them realize that goal with a grant to be used for TNR and veterinary care for "barn cats" throughout the community.



No more neglect

Four 2-1/2-year-old tigers had been living on personal property in Kalamazoo, Michigan, languishing in 10' x 10' cages their whole lives. As a result of a NAVS Sanctuary Fund grant, Cedarhill Animal Sanctuary was able to transport the tigers to their facility in Mississippi. Now, the caregivers at Cedarhill can provide for the tigers' lifetime recovery and enrichment by giving them the freedom to run and play...and splash in their 24' pools! 🐾