focus for antivivisectionists...." Once again, the AMA trivializes something that is quite significant to this discussion. When it states that the questions posed by Bentham are placed in an emotional context, it tries to make it look as if this is not a worthy issue (i.e., the suffering of animals). However, the basis of what the AMA purports to be doing *is* alleviating the suffering of humans and animals. They certainly place this goal in an emotional context, and they should. Suffering is something that should provoke an emotional response, and therefore the AMA's answer to the Bentham questions should stand at a simple "yes."

Page 8, Column 1, Paragraph 1—"*Moderates seem to play only a small role in the animal rights movement.*" Moderates in whose eyes? This is another example of the AMA looking at the world through its own glasses. As a self-proclaimed "radical" in the animal rights movement I would say that most of the people within the movement are moderates. Most in the movement would accept animal welfare regulations on the road to liberation, most would accept the continued domestication of animals, and most don't have a radical consciousness concerning human rights (and humans certainly *are* a species of animal). What the AMA has done is to define moderates as those whom I would define as conservatives—people who would like to see animals treated in a humane manner before (and during) experimentation, production, etc., and during their eventual death or slaughter. They are not moderates as a class in politics or sociology could easily affirm.

Page 8, Column 1, Paragraph 3—"*Its basic philosophy is that all mammals are created equal—a belief that has been expressed by a PETA director in the aphorism, "A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy.*" The AMA knowingly misquoted Ingrid Newkirk (PETA Director). The original quote was much longer than what the AMA included. They are aware of what the actual quote is and still excluded the ellipsis which shows that the quote does not start with "A rat...." The original quote reads, "When it comes to having a central nervous system and the ability to experience pain, hunger and thirst a rat is a pig is a dog is a boy." This is absolutely true and it would be interesting to see if the AMA could find a scientist who could prove otherwise.

Page 9, Column 1, Paragraph 1—"*...the ALF [Animal Liberation Front] vandalized a laboratory at Texas Tech School of Medicine where research directed toward understanding basic mechanisms in Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS) was being carried out.*" This is a reference to the research of John Orem. It is true that the lab was vandalized. What is untrue is that there was SIDS research going on there. Orem never mentioned SIDS at all before the break-in and has yet to substantiate the claim that any of the experimentation was related to SIDS.

Page 9, Column 1, Paragraph 3—"*The most direct threat has been attacks [by ALF] on laboratories and the harassment, including death threats, of scientists and their families.*" I would be interested in seeing one substantiated claim that would implicate the U.S. ALF in a death threat to a scientist or his/her family. In fact, if there was a connection between the U.S. ALF and death threats, I'm sure it would have been included in the *Congressional Report on Animal Extremism* but there was no mention of any connection.[3]

Page 9, Column 1, Paragraph 3—"*These activities [lab break-ins] also have had a significant impact upon recruitment of young people into careers in science.*" Lab break-ins, numbering approximately 60 since 1979, are most definitely not the cause for the problems in recruiting people into the sciences. As I see it, one of the main problems is scientists who won't progress along with the changing patterns and mores of society. Science is having the same problem as the modern church. We have a society with a different vision, one of technology and innovation, and we have a scientific community which is very stubborn and complacent, failing to pursue new methods of experimentation. I would argue that a considerably larger body of potential scientists have discontinued their education because of having to accept outmoded methodologies and the insistence on animal experimentation than those who have left their training because they felt threatened by "animal extremists."

Page 14, Column 2, Paragraph 3—"*The performance of experiments when the result is known in advance is a sound educational technique and is employed in many fields that do not involve animals, such as mathematics, physics, and chemistry.*" I agree with this statement 100%. I have included it here to show the callous attitude toward animals in research. To equate the death or suffering of an animal in dissection or vivisection with a math problem flies in the face of human decency. Mathematics does not involve the psychological or physical trauma of animals. Most educational experiments with animals are done in a setting where the practical experience of cutting open an animal will be nil. Less than one percent of those who dissect or vivisect an animal in primary, secondary, and college programs go on to become physicians who perform surgery.

Page 16, Column 1, Paragraph 1—"*Even keeping them [primates] in cages for long periods or isolating them from others of their kind is both cruel and destructive to psychological well-being, the activists argue.*" By using the phrase "the activists argue" the AMA is again discounting a charge without addressing it. The phrase makes the whole argument look foolish because the activists, who have been lambasted throughout the *White Paper*, are making the charge. The argument has also been made by Jane Goodall, Dian Fossey, Geza Teleki and countless other respected primatologists. The AMA does not include this information because it makes the case for research using primates less acceptable.

Page 16, Column 1, Paragraph 3—"*Animal rights advocates assert that most biomedical research with animals causes severe pain and that many animals used in experiments are abused either deliberately or through indifference.*" This is not true. Animal rights advocates assert that most biomedical research causes some type of distress (physical or psychological). They do not assert that most medical research causes severe pain. They do assert, and it is true, that many animals are abused either deliberately or through indifference. The researcher would counter that this is not true, that animals are treated in a humane manner. There are countless experiments where post-operative analgesics are not given because they might interfere with the results of a study. This is abuse. Because the outcome of the study will "lead to scientific discovery" or occurs in a biomedical institution does not negate abuse. While the incidents of intentional "abuse" in the generally accepted definition (i.e., deliberate infliction of pain for no "reason") are rare, they do occur.[4]

■■

Ed. Note: Copies of Dean Smith's critique of the AMA *White Paper* on animal experimentation can be ordered from The AAVS for $3.00. Send check and ask for "The *White Paper* Critique.")

References

1 **For a detailed list of all the organizations devoted to promoting animal experimentation, see the American Medical Association's resource binder titled *Medical Progress: A Miracle at Risk*. This can be obtained by writing to the AMA, Attention: Dept. of Science and Medical Education, 515 N. State St., Chicago, IL 60610.**

2 **Staff, 1993. "PAC Activity Rebounds in 1991-92 Election Cycle—Unusual Nature of Contests Seen as Reason." Federal Election Commission Press Release, April 29, pp. 11-13.**

3 ***The Congressional Report on Animal Rights Extremism* does not implicate U.S. ALF in death threats of scientists or anyone else. For more information on *The Congressional Report*, see Smith, Dean, "Animal Rights Terrorism: A Mountain out of a Molehill," *The AV Magazine*, Vol. 102, No. 5, May, 1994.**

4 **For an interesting perspective on whether or not scientists accurately assess the level of stress that a lab animal is feeling, see Phillips, M.T., "Savages, Drugs and Lab Animals: The Researchers Perception of Pain," *Society and Animals* 1993: Vol. 1., pp. 61-81.**