

more appalling than any photographs taken by antivivisectionists, and in view of their origin, they could not be attacked as coming from a biased source.

Adding to the suitability of the Draize test as a target was the fact that the purpose of the whole thing is so trivial. We could pose the issue this way: is another shampoo worth blinding a rabbit? It was so incongruous for the cosmetics industry to be carrying out these tests. The cosmetics industry is trying to sell dreams, but the reality is that they are creating a nightmare for the rabbits. Exposing the reality of what they are doing threatens the whole image of the industry. Blinding rabbits isn't beautiful.

As in the case of our previous campaigns, we used the Freedom of Information Act to document what was happening. We got the official reports submitted by the cosmetics companies to the US Department of Agriculture. These returns showed that companies like Revlon and Avon were performing the Draize test on thousands of rabbits each year. They also showed that the rabbits received no anaesthetics.

Armed with this information, we approached the industry leader, Revlon. We said that we thought they should take the lead in overcoming this problem, and that what was needed was a contribution of a couple of hundred thousand dollars to develop non-animal alternatives to the Draize test. We pointed out that such a sum was no big deal for a company like Revlon, which spends millions on advertising. All we were asking for was one-hundredth of 1 per cent of the company's gross revenues. Leonard Rack even developed position papers showing some good strategies for research that could yield alternatives.

We got as far as the vice-president for public affairs. He had a big office; a butler came and asked us what we would like to drink; he was very polite; but nothing happened. A year passed, during which we had more meetings and there was a lot of correspondence, but still nothing happened. So we organized another coalition, building on our record of success. Now that we had shown what we could do, the normally more cautious, old-established animal organizations were eager to lend their names to our efforts. We ended up with a coalition of 407 organizations, with a combined membership in the millions.

We devised a plan for an advertising campaign which we submitted to Pegeen Fitzgerald, president of the Millennium Guild. She decided on the spot to provide financial support. So one morning in

April 1980 readers of the *New York Times* opened their newspaper to find a full-page advertisement featuring a picture of a white rabbit with sticking plaster over his eyes. Above was a single question: 'How many rabbits does Revlon blind for beauty's sake?' The text beneath gave the answer, described the Draize test and asked readers to write to the president of Revlon stating that they would not use Revlon products until Revlon funded a crash programme to develop non-animal eye irritancy tests.

The *New York Times* advertisement was followed by advertisements in other newspapers. In May 1980, 300 people, some dressed in bunny costumes, demonstrated outside Revlon's New York offices. In September the campaign went international, with demonstrations against Revlon in Britain, Canada and Australia. By December Revlon had had enough. The vice-president for public affairs was replaced along with some of his staff, and his successor began serious discussions with us. Within a few weeks Revlon came up with an offer to make a grant of \$250,000 a year, for a minimum of three years, to Rockefeller University, so that it could carry out a search for alternatives.

This was an enormous breakthrough. It transformed the search for alternatives from some kind of flaky antivivisectionist issue to something that received large-scale support from a multi-billion-dollar corporation and was linked with one of the most respected medical research institutions in the country. Once Revlon had done this, it was a simple thing to go to Avon, the second flagship of the industry, and tell them that they couldn't do any less than Revlon. Avon soon put up the money and started a centre for research in alternatives at Johns Hopkins University, again a most prestigious medical school. This set the pattern, and Estée Lauder and a number of other companies soon came into line.

THE LD50

At this point we realized that we had the formula for liberating money from just about every company that experiments on animals and wants to keep its image clean with consumers. But then we decided to re-evaluate what we were doing. This led to two changes. First, we decided to broaden our target. Just as our past successes had given us the strength to tackle larger goals, involving more animals, so now we thought the time was right for doing something