

APR 29 1997

V F

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics

Newsletter

Volume 2 Number 3
October 1996

Message from the President

VETERINARIANS AND FERAL CATS: WHAT DO YOU THINK?

This past August, the American Humane Association (AHA) and the Cat Fancier's Association sponsored a scientific workshop on free-roaming, un-owned and feral cats in the US. The workshop was organized by Dr. Patricia Olson, AHA Director of Veterinary Affairs and Studies, Past-President of the American College of Theriogenologists, and SVME member. The three day workshop, held in Denver, featured presentations from a number of animal and cat advocacy groups, which offered evidence and testimony to a Scientific Panel. Proceedings of the workshop, including questions and recommendations of the Panel, will be available in December. I was honored to be a member of the Panel and also gave the workshop keynote address on the importance of ethical issues in scientifically and practically defensible approaches to feral cats.

There is undoubtedly a feral cat problem, which both affects and is affected by veterinarians. Estimates of the number of free-roaming, feral, or unowned cats in the United States range from 30 million to an astonishing 60 million. One problem these animals pose is for wildlife and the environment. Evidence regarding what kinds of and how many wild animals feral cats kill is scanty and sometimes conflicting. But even if one accepts the low estimate of 30 million cats, it is clear that many millions, perhaps many hundreds of millions of songbirds and rodents are killed (sometimes eaten,

Jerrold Tannenbaum, MA, JD, President
John Boyce, DVM, PhD, President-Elect
Albert S. Dorn, DVM, Past-President
Kathy Potter, DVM, Secretary
Robert C. Speth, PhD, Treasurer
Richard Fink, DVM, Parliamentarian
Larry Carbone, DVM, MA, Historian

sometimes not) by these cats annually. Some wildlife experts and government authorities believe that these cats are having a major and potentially irreversible effect on the environment. Most wildlife officials believe that feral and free-roaming cats should be trapped and either killed immediately or brought to shelters and euthanized if not claimed or adopted as pets.

This so-called "trap and kill" approach was voiced by a small minority of contributors to the workshop, most of whom advocated what is referred to by feral cat advocates and fanciers as TTVAR: trap, test (for FeLV and FIV), vaccinate, alter, and release. Most supporters of TTVAR support "managed" colonies of non-infected, sterilized feral cats, which are fed regularly and provided access to veterinary care by so-called feral colony "caretakers".

Many veterinarians may be surprised to learn how popular TTVAR has become among cat owners and animal advocacy and humane groups around the country. Also significant is the fact that a fair number of veterinarians seem to be participating in TTVAR by receiving trapped ferals for testing, vaccination, and sterilization. Typically, such veterinarians either do some of this work free of charge, or at reduced fees for individual caretakers or recognized feral cat protection groups. There were reports at the AHA workshop of donations of vaccines and surgical supplies from pharmaceutical and supply companies.

The AVMA was represented at the workshop by Drs. Lyle Vogel and Janet Donlin. On July, 19, 1996, the Executive Board adopted an official Position

Copyright 1996 Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics

Statement on Abandoned and Feral Cats. The Position opposes maintenance of feral cat colonies generally, but goes on at some length to set forth appropriate conditions "if local and state ordinances permit abandoned and/or feral cats to be maintained in 'managed colonies' during an interim period until the colony size can be reduced and eliminated by attrition." The conditions demanded by the AVMA include restriction of maintained colonies to well-defined and safe areas, registration of caregivers with local authorities, a written protocol and record keeping system to ensure daily care for the animals, and maintenance of "an ongoing health care program which provides universal vaccinations, medical and/or surgical care, and parasite control." The AVMA Position calls for the eventual elimination of feral cat colonies "through a combination of activities such as licensing requirements; discouraging free roaming cats; requiring rabies vaccinations for cats and issuing citations for unvaccinated animals; encouraging permanent animal identification; and encouraging sterilization."

I encourage all of you who are interested in this issue to contact me by mail or by e-mail <0006936323@mcimail.com> so that I can transmit your views to Dr. Olson as she prepares the proceedings of the workshop. I, for one, am troubled by TTVAR programs and the extent to which veterinarians appear to be participating in them. Does it make ecological or ethical sense to perpetuate feral cat colonies that might have devastating impact on the environment? Should the lives of feral cats be favored over those of songbirds, for example? What kind of life do feral cats experience, especially in areas with extreme heat and cold, and is it humane to perpetuate such an existence? Should veterinarians be subsidizing TTVAR programs when some clients who own cats (and dogs) and who care for them responsibly do not receive such benefits? Do we send the right message to cat owners who are not inclined to care for their animals responsibly by sustaining abandoned cats, and offspring of such cats, in carefully maintained colonies? To be sure, supporters of TTVAR have responses to these and other questions.

What do you think?

Jerrold Tannenbaum, President

Message from the President-Elect

I must admit that when Al Dorn and Jerry Tannenbaum approached me earlier this year about the possibility of becoming President-Elect of the Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics, I was surprised, honored and somewhat intimidated. I had been a member of the Society since its inception, but because of other duties at the AVMA Convention, I had not been able to attend the meetings. I did manage to attend the last part of the meeting last month in Louisville, and enjoyed spending some time with those in attendance.

Many of you know me, but for those who do not, I thought I could use this first column as a form of introduction. I am a native of Detroit, Michigan, and received my DVM from Michigan State University in 1974. I served two years in the US Army Veterinary Corps in a research position at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research in Washington, and then moved to Knoxville, Tennessee to enroll in a graduate program in Microbiology at the University of Tennessee. After completing my PhD in Microbiology, I accepted a position at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Indiana, where I served seven years on the faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine teaching microbiology to sophomore veterinary students.

It was during my time at Purdue that I became interested in the animal rights debate, a process heightened by my participation in a conference entitled, "Religious Perspectives on the Use of Animals in Science" in London in 1984. As a result of that conference, and through subsequent reading, I began to refine my own understanding of the relationship between people and animals. This area of interest was enhanced when I left Purdue in 1987 to become Assistant Director of Scientific Activities at the AVMA. One of my duties was serving as staff consultant to the AVMA Animal Welfare Committee. That involved handling calls to the AVMA office on animal welfare matters, organizing committee meetings, and following up on committee actions. In addition, I had the privilege of helping organize six AVMA Animal Welfare Forums and one symposium on genetically engineered animals while with the AVMA.

I also worked as staff consultant to the AVMA Council on Research. One of the Council's areas of

responsibility was the Euthanasia Panel, and I was able to serve as a member of the 1993 AVMA Panel on Euthanasia. Our report was published in the Jan. 15, 1993 JAVMA, and it serves as a standard reference on animal euthanasia for veterinary practices, animal shelters, research labs, and other settings. I also handled calls and letters to the AVMA on a variety of animal euthanasia inquiries, and these proved to quite interesting and challenging. This aspect of my job led to my one and only national television appearance. I was filmed as part of a segment on euthanasia of chinchillas that aired on ABC World News Tonight!

Another one of my duties during my nine years at the AVMA was to serve as staff consultant to the National Board Examination Committee (NBEC). The NBEC is responsible for developing our two national licensing examinations, the National Board Examination, and the Clinical Competency Test. The NBEC had operated as a committee of the AVMA since its inception in 1948. However, concerns for the appearance of a conflict of interest when the national professional association is involved with the operation of the organization that prepared the national licensing examinations led the NBEC to become an independent organization, incorporated in 1994. In 1995 the NBEC paid its own operational expenses, but used AVMA administrative support. In 1996, the NBEC separated completely from the AVMA and I chose to leave the AVMA staff to become Executive Director of the NBEC. I now work for the NBEC out of an office in my home, and am enjoying the change very much. Through working with the NBEC, I have had the privilege of working with the American Association of Veterinary State Boards, and various national organizations dealing with testing and licensure issues.

From the above description, you can see that my primary areas of interest in veterinary medical ethics include animal welfare issues, animal euthanasia, and issues arising out of testing and licensure. I hope to be able to explore each of these areas in more detail during my tenure in office.

I am looking forward to serving as your President-Elect this year, and to interacting with many of you in the months and years ahead.

John R. Boyce, President-Elect

Message from the Past President

At the recent meeting for the Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics in Louisville, Kentucky, a new president assumed office to carry on the activities of the society. I am pleased that Dr. Jerry Tannenbaum will now assume these duties and he will provide excellent leadership for our organization. I will continue to support the organization and look forward to doing so with enthusiasm during this coming year.

Our society faces many challenges for educating and informing veterinarians on ethical and value issues facing our profession. In this regard, I shall continue to try to make a contribution as chair of the AVMA Judicial Council for this coming year. The Judicial Council faces many important challenges and issues, and one which is causing considerable debate is entitled "Influences on Judgment".

Influences on Judgment generally refers to various types of financial remunerations or advantages which veterinarians receive for recommending, soliciting, promoting or using certain products and services. The changing nature of veterinary practice and the growth of multi-person practices with professional interrelationships has required that veterinarians communicate frequently with their professional colleagues on professional practice matters. In some instances, these communications may involve consultations and referrals of products and services for which the primary care practicing veterinarian may wish to secure a remuneration or financial advantage.

There are ethical issues involved with such relationships, and the extent to which they are considered ethical veterinary practice have caused considerable debate and discussion. The Judicial Council is trying to study this issue and determine what is the current practice regarding this issue.

I should like to use this newsletter to solicit the help of the membership of our society. Please let me know your thoughts on this matter. Are such influences on judgment ethical? How are the relationships between veterinarians changed when all individuals involved are employees of large corporate practices? Should there be a redistribution or change in the fee structure because of such professional relationships? Are there differences between the promotion of professional and

non-professional products within the veterinarian profession?

I look forward to hearing from each of you regarding your thoughts on this issue. If you have never thought about this issue and the potential ramifications on our profession, please pause for a minute and give this matter some consideration. The ideas you develop may influence our profession for a very long time into the future. Perhaps it would be appropriate to place this item on the agenda for the program of our next meeting in Reno, Nevada in 1997. It has been a pleasure to serve the organization this past year, and I look forward to hearing from each of you on this very important issue facing our profession.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert S. Dorn, DVM, MS , Past President

Review of Annual Meeting

The Third Annual Meeting of the Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics was held met in the Pimlico C Room of the Louisville Hyatt Regency Hotel on Tuesday, July 23, 1996.

The meeting was opened by the President of the Society, **Albert Dorn, DVM**, from the College of Veterinary Medicine, at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, who presided over the morning session "Ethics of Animal Ownership." Al welcomed the members of the Society and guests and introduced the first speaker, **John New, DVM**, from the College of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. His topic was "Concept of the Quality of Life of Companion Animals."

In his presentation, John pointed out the difficulties of determining quality of life in companion animals. While we all have an intuitive idea of a quality of life, it is hard to quantitate in animals. John described efforts to apply quality of life concepts from human studies to animals, describing a continuum of quality of life as a series of concentric circles ranging from ability to meet needs, to the outermost circle of being able to satisfy wants and live to the fullest.

John also described how quality of life issues are routinely considered with research and assistance

animals, but have not been a major consideration for companion animals in the 55 million American households with pets. He described some of the needs of animals, focusing on the need for attachment, either to other members of their species (it was noted that Michael Fox recommends 2 cat households based on the rationale that such cats live longer) or their owners. Citing the pioneering studies of Konrad Lorenz and Nikolaas Tinbergen on attachment theory, John described various aspects of attachment between animals and their owners. Two interesting asides from this topic were; that adults more often allow their animals to sleep with them than their children, and that animals are much better at reading the body language of their owners than they are at understanding their verbal language.

John concluded his presentation with a discussion of the differentiation of 'wants' and 'needs', a subject that had been raised by Jerry Tannenbaum. While they are two points on a continuum, John suggested that 'wants' should be viewed as generating a positive effect when present, but not causing a negative effect when absent. By contrast, 'needs' could be considered as things that if absent have a negative effect when not available.

In the discussion period following John's presentation, Bob Speth raised the question of whether the ability of companion animals to reproduce, (not be neutered or spayed) should be considered as a quality of life issue. Dr. Nedim Buyukmihci expressed the opinion that it was OK to sterilize companion animals because the desire to reproduce is an externally driven need and that dogs have no desire to reproduce without a female in heat. Bob suggested that the recent heroics of the cat named Scarlett who rescued her kittens from a burning building in New York takes the matter far beyond the act of procreation.

The next speaker was **Rebecca Bennett, DVM**, (and PhD. candidate) also from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Her topic was "Euthanasia: Linguistic (Mis)Applications to Humans and Animals." Starting with an early dictionary definition of euthanasia that refers solely to the Greek roots of the word eu = good and thanatos = death, that infers that death need only be painless to be euthanasia, Becky took the tack that the definition should have a moral justification or references to the reason for killing as well. An indication that such an evolution in the definition of euthanasia can be found in the 1993

Review of Annual Meeting (Continued)

Webster's dictionary definition of euthanasia that infers that there is a benefit to the recipient, i.e., a mercy killing that is in the animal's best interest. This would preclude the use of the word euthanasia where animals are killed painlessly, but not for their best interests, e.g., slaughter of animals for food, hunting, and killing of animals for research, which Becky characterized as a misuse of the word.

Becky differentiated types of euthanasia as active (causing death) versus passive (not aggressively acting to prevent death), and voluntary (patient's choice) versus non-voluntary euthanasia (patient unable to make the choice). She referred to the works of Childress and Beecham and Pellegrino on human euthanasia. She presented the problem of the slippery slope argument by which any human euthanasia could be viewed as opening the door to forced euthanasia and the consequent loss of respect for human life.

The question of whether killing animals in pounds could be considered euthanasia was discussed. There was considerable debate on this question with a consensus that if the animal was unhealthy and unadoptable, killing of the animal could be viewed as euthanasia. But if the animal was healthy and adoptable, and was killed, there was disagreement on whether it should be viewed as euthanasia.

After a short break **Richard Fink, DVM**, of Hacienda Heights, CA, spoke on the subject of "Ethical Dilemmas of the Small Animal Practitioner. From a list of 10 ethical problems, Dick focused on three hypothetical issues: 1) A veterinary practice owns a dog food company and recommends only one brand of food. 2) Responding to a client complaining about your colleague down the street. 3) The use of vaccines or medication for parasite control in locations where disease or parasites are not a threat. Pertinent to issue 1, Dick expressed concern that a company might be inclined to pay employees of a veterinary practice a nominal amount of money for wearing a pin advertising that company's products. He felt that such ethics are unfortunate both for the hypothetical company and the hypothetical veterinary employees for selling out their integrity by promoting only one product. Pertinent to issue 2, Dick also expressed his

concern that criticism of colleagues/competitors arises in part from a failure to get to know them and to communicate your concerns openly when you believe there is a problem that you can help to resolve. He issued a call for greater collegiality among practitioners. The question of the increased diversity of new veterinarians and stimulation of competitiveness for grades in veterinary school were cited as two possible causes for the perceived diminution in collegiality. Finally, Dick chastised those who would vaccinate animals for heartworm in Southern California, where the threat of disease is not present. Other examples of unneeded or possibly ineffective vaccinations include adult distemper and Lyme disease vaccine. Dick reminded the audience of the potential adverse consequences to animals from over-vaccination as the reason why Veterinarians should vaccinate animals only when needed.

Jerrold Tannenbaum, JD, from Tufts University, Boston, MA, presided over the afternoon session: "Ethics of Veterinary Specialization". In the first presentation in the session, Jerry talked about "Ethical Issues in Veterinary Specialization". Sticking with the idea of properly defining terms, Jerry defined specialists and the requirements that an individual must meet to gain that title. He notes that the definition and requirement of "specialist" and "specialty" are legal ones. Not only must a practitioner be board certified to call themselves a specialist, they must also meet higher standards than a generalist practitioner. He provided the audience with examples of Yellow Pages ads by veterinarians and veterinary practices that made improper inferences that the clinicians were certified as specialists.

Jerry noted that roughly 95% of lawsuits and claims against veterinarians allege negligence, while only 5% allege intentional torts.

Jerry next discussed the "duty to refer" obligation of the generalist as a legal requirement. He acknowledged the difficulty and ambiguity in making the decision of when and to whom should a referral be made. He noted that there are economic concerns associated with referrals. Beyond the immediate loss of income, the client may decide to do all of their business with the specialist practice.

Other issues and questions Jerry brought up were: 'Do we need more specialists?', establishing that certification should include a requirement for

Review of Annual Meeting (Continued)

residencies, and the association of new specialties with innovation.

Switching gears, Jerry briefly discussed the age-old question in Veterinary Medicine, when to euthanize. The example for discussion was: A client wants you to do everything possible to save their terminally ill dog. You know it is hopeless and that the animal will die in a few weeks. Do you insist on euthanasia, or let the client spend lots of money? He cited an example in Canada of an animal being treated using high tech equipment for radiotherapy of a cancer. Since all persons in the Canadian health care system were subject to delays and waiting periods for this kind of care, the propriety of such care being available at a veterinary school to owners who could afford it became an issue.

The next speaker was **Richard Brown, DVM**, of West Palm Beach, FL, who spoke on "The Role of the American Board of Veterinary Practitioners (ABVP) in the Veterinary Specialty Community." The ABVP was formed to raise the standards of practice in the profession internally, by self-regulation. Dr. Brown's talk centered on criteria for certification in ABVP. He discussed the issue of species specialization, of which the ABVP is an example along with laboratory animal medicine specialists, and zoological medical specialists. He discussed how the ABVP certifies specialists in Canine/Feline, Avian, Swine, Beef Cattle, Feline exclusive, and Dairy Clinical Practice. There can also be food animal and equine specialists. There are now 450 board certified ABVP specialist veterinarians. Will there be additional species practice categories? "Probably not at this time," according to Dr. Brown.

The ABVP Diplomate serves *in most cases* as the only practical source of advanced competency to the veterinarians in his/her general practice area. If there are other specialists in the area, they may not represent a discipline or an organization that is germane to the problem with which the referring veterinarian needs help. By being broad-based, the ABVP Clinical Specialist will, *in most cases*, be able to help the referred patient. If the problem is such that the ABVP Diplomate does not possess the necessary expertise to help the patient, the ABVP Diplomate is in a position to realize what discipline or organ specialist would be

able to assist the patient and would send the patient "up the line" even though the traveling distance may be substantial. The ABVP Diplomate is meant to be a practical solution to the providing of above average care.

Larry Carbone, DVM, from Cornell University in Ithaca, NY, spoke on "Laboratory Animal Practice and the AVMA Guidelines for Euthanasia." Noting that while we have a right to do research on animals, it is not *carte blanche* and we must abide by the requirements established to safeguard the welfare of the animals. He reviewed the history of the AVMA's panel on Euthanasia going back to the First Euthanasia Panel Report in 1963. This was the same year that the first NIH "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals" was published. Over the next few years the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) was passed and included a definition of euthanasia that "involves instantaneous unconsciousness and immediate death". The Second Euthanasia Panel Report by the AVMA in 1972 mentioned the use of a rodent guillotine as "rapid, inexpensive and produces euthanasia". But, in 1975 a paper published by Mikeska and Klemm "EEG Evaluation of Humaneness of Asphyxia and Decapitation Euthanasia of the Laboratory Rat" was published in Laboratory Animal Science. The claim of the paper was that the decapitated rat head shows EEG patterns consistent with intense pain for as long as 29 seconds post-decapitation. Of note however, is the fact that none of the actual EEG's were published in the manuscript. The Third Euthanasia Panel report of the AVMA in 1978 made a minor change in the language on the guillotine from "produces euthanasia" to "produces instant death", with no mention of the Mikeska and Klemm paper. After languishing for more than 10 years with little notice, the Fourth Euthanasia Panel Report of the AVMA in 1986 cited the Mikeska and Klemm paper as evidence that decapitation does not cause immediate loss of consciousness and recommended use of the guillotine only if the "animal has been sedated or lightly anesthetized," 'or if the severed head will be flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen.' In view of the recommendation in the Fifth Edition of the NIH "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals" that the AVMA Panel on Euthanasia Recommendations be followed, there was concern in the research community about the propriety of this

Review of Annual Meeting (Continued)

recommendation. Following a flurry of papers that refuted the claims of the Mikeska and Klemm paper, the Fifth Euthanasia Panel report of the AVMA in 1993 dropped the call for sedation, light anesthesia or freezing the heads in liquid nitrogen while retaining an attitude of condemnation of the practice. The Seventh Edition of the NIH "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals" in 1996 recommends chemical euthanasia methods over physical methods unless there is scientific rationale for the use of physical methods.

Questions that abounded from this presentation dealt with the need for further study of the question of whether the severed head suffers pain, how long consciousness is retained, whether evoked potentials, e.g., visual stimuli are transmitted to the cortex, whether other more modern methods of neuroscience can be applied to the evaluation of this question and the big question, How do we deal with uncertainty?

Another matter associated with the ambiguity of the effects of decapitation is a wide variation in the decisions of institutional animal care and use committees (IACUC's) on whether to permit rodent decapitation. Jerry suggested that more work is needed on this issue, for which there was universal agreement.

The final speaker of the day was **Al Dorn, DVM**, who spoke on "Ethical Issues of a Multi-Veterinarian Specialty Practice." Basing his talk on a fictional case history of a dog named Max, Al described how an initial diagnosis of a malignancy from a biopsy sample taken by a general practitioner turned into a complex set of ethical problems following Max's referral to the nearest University based teaching hospital. At each step, Al reviewed some ethical considerations for the procedures that were done and the decisions that were made. The bottom line was that shared responsibility especially that between specialists, residents and students can be dangerous unless rigorous safeguards are in place to preclude miscommunication and contradictory decisions that compromise the treatment of the animal. While the example involved a University teaching hospital, such incidents can also occur in multi-person private practices as well.

Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Third Annual Meeting of the Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by President **Albert Dorn DVM**, at 4:35 PM.
2. Minutes of Last Meeting: The minutes of the previous meeting, held in Pittsburgh, on July 11, 1995 were approved as presented in Volume 1, Number 3 of the Society's Newsletter.
3. Announcements:
 - Al briefly reviewed the accomplishments of the preceding year including the development of this year's Program, the continued development of the Newsletter, and the slow but steady growth of the Society.
 - Al announced that our founding President, **Dr. Robert Shomer**, was unable to attend this meeting because he was recovering from heart surgery and on behalf of the Society wished him a speedy recovery.
4. Officer Reports:
 - President Al Dorn thanked his fellow officers in the Society for their efforts on behalf of the Society and specifically complemented the President-elect, **Jerry Tannenbaum** and the Treasurer and Newsletter Editor **Bob Speth** for the pleasure of having been able to work with them this year.
 - President-elect **Jerry Tannenbaum** mentioned briefly his plans for: 1) promotion of a vigorous Newsletter, 2) possible cooperation with Veterinary Schools in organizing sessions on veterinary ethics for students and faculty, and 3) creation of a veterinary ethics EMAIL list open to members of the Society.
 - Treasurer **Bob Speth** gave the Treasurer's Report: As of July 17, 1996 the Society's assets were \$2460.83. Expenditures for 1996 were \$808.91. The breakdown of the expenditures was \$292.16 for photocopying and postage costs for distribution of the Newsletter, \$8.00 for postage for dues solicitation, \$358.75 for preparation of the 501(c)3 forms to obtain a tax ID number and nonprofit, tax-exempt status for the Society, and \$150.00 to the Internal Revenue Service for the 501(c)3 application. We now have our own tax

ID number and the 501(c)3 application is pending. As of 7/17/96 the Society had 83 paid members for the July 1996 - June 1997 membership period.

Bob noted that there are about 30 paid members from the July 1995 - June 1996 period who have not yet renewed their membership. It was recommended that Bob send out postcards notifying these individuals that the 1996-1997 dues were overdue and to request their dues payments to enable them to maintain their membership.

- Historian **Richard Fink** had no report
- 5. Committee Reports: None were presented
- 6. Old Business: None
- 7. New Business:
- Constitution and By-Laws: **Bob Speth** reported that the document agreed upon by the Officers of the Society at its first Annual Meeting in San Francisco in July 1994, was sent to the Internal Revenue Service essentially in its original form. It will be distributed to the new officers of the Society and at some future time, a copy will be distributed to all members of the Society.
- Newsletter: **Bob Speth** reported that 3 issues of the Newsletter had been distributed in the previous year and that the most recent issue was a record in terms of the quantity and quality of the information it contained. He noted that the distribution of the next Newsletter is planned for late August/early September 1996.
- Web Page: The idea of having a Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics Web Page as well as a List Server/Bulletin Board for discussion of Veterinary Ethical issues on the Internet was discussed. Jerry noted that veterinary ethical issues need to have their own forum on the internet. Bob noted that the posting of a notice of the existence of the Society and an application form on the Internet in the COMPMED listserver had led to a number of new members of the Society. **Ione Smith** noted that she has a home page on the Internet and offered to include this notice in her home page. Bob said he would be in contact with her to implement this offer. Bob said he would begin efforts to use the internet access resources of his University to establish a home page for the Society and to establish a Veterinary Ethics listserver/bulletin board.

- Student Membership: The question of how much dues should be charged for the "Student Membership" category was discussed. **Ione Smith** recommended that no dues be charged the first year and that \$5.00 be charged in succeeding years. Bob indicated that there are some costs associated with serving the members and that a nominal fee should be charged to students to establish their sense of commitment to the Society. He recommended that the student members be charged \$5.00 for annual dues. Al called for a vote on the two suggestions. The motion to charge \$5.00 for student membership starting from the first year as proposed by Bob was chosen.
- Program for Fourth Annual Meeting in Reno in 1997: Al noted that next year's AVMA meeting will run one day later in the week (Sunday July 20 to Thursday July 24) so if we need to schedule our meeting so as not to conflict with other AVMA meetings, the day of the week for the meeting may be changed. Suggestions presented by Al included an all day session on Monday July 21, or two half day sessions, Monday PM and Tuesday PM. Jerry said he would work on the topic of the presentations.
- Business meeting for the Fourth Annual Meeting: It was suggested that the business meeting be held at mid-day as a luncheon. This was taken under advisement.
- 8. Election of Officers:
- President: Al noted that the Constitution establishes that the President-elect automatically becomes the new President. The President automatically assumes the position of Past-President.
- President-Elect: **John Boyce** was nominated by Al Dorn. The nomination was seconded. No other nominees were presented. Upon close of nominations, John was unanimously elected to be President-Elect.
- Secretary: **Kathleen Potter** was nominated by Al for re-election to the office. The nomination was seconded. No other nominations were presented. Upon close of nominations, Kathleen was unanimously elected to be Secretary

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics

Newsletter

page 9

- Treasurer: **Bob Speth** was nominated by Al. The nomination was seconded. No other nominations were presented. Upon close of nominations, Bob was unanimously elected to be Treasurer.
- Parliamentarian: **Richard Fink** was nominated by Al. The nomination was seconded. No other nominations were presented. Upon close of nominations, Richard was unanimously elected to be Parliamentarian.
- Historian: **Larry Carbone** was nominated by Al to be the Historian. The nomination was seconded. No other nominations were presented. Upon close of nominations, Larry was unanimously elected to be the new Historian.
- 9. Adjournment: Upon the completion of the elections of the new Officers of the Society, Al adjourned the meeting and expressed his pleasure to have had the opportunity to serve the organization and oversee its growth

request another copy from me via FAX or regular or E-mail.

A late dues notice is included with this Newsletter to members paid for 1995-1996 who have not yet paid their dues for 1996-1997. We appreciate your previous support and hope you choose to continue your membership. Also, the notice to students of the \$5.00 student dues structure established at the Annual Meeting will be sent out to student members.

Please do send your checks for \$20.00 (\$5.00 for students) payable to SVME c/o Bob Speth, VCAPP, WSU, Pullman, WA 99164-6520. Thanks ☺

Bob Speth, Treasurer

Editor's Notes

I am pleased to announce that **Robert R. (Bob) Shomer** our Founding President, is recovering nicely from his surgery and has gone on-line <Bobshomer@aol.com> so drop him a note to avail yourself of his wisdom and collegiality.

Special thanks again to **Jeanne Jensen**, the VCAPP departmental editor for helping to prepare this issue.

There are 43 Veterinary Libraries in North America that are receiving the Newsletter. I underestimated the number in the previous issue of the Newsletter.

Do you have opinions you would like to express, a special perspective on an issue? We welcome members' comments on any and all issues related to Veterinary Ethics. Send your messages to the Editor via regular mail to:

Bob Speth, Editor, SVME Newsletter
VCAPP

Washington State Univ.

Pullman, WA 99164-6520

or E-MAIL: speth@vetmed.wsu.edu

or FAX (509) 332-6340 or (509) 335-4650

Treasurer's Report

As of Sept. 30, 1996 the assets of the Society were \$2666.49. Dues payments from new members have continued to flow in. We now have 99 paid members, including 1 student member. My apologies for not acknowledging receipt of payment from all new members until now. We sincerely thank all those who have sent checks to join and support the Society.

Papers have been filed with the Internal Revenue Service for 501(c)3 status for the Society and the application is still pending at this time.

Because of our sustained growth and a smattering of typographical errors, a new list of members with addresses, phone and Fax numbers and E-mail addresses has been prepared and is included with this Newsletter. If there are still errors or changes that need to be made, please inform me via the routes indicated below and an updated list will be published with the next Newsletter if needed.

We encourage you to talk with your colleagues and invite them to join our organization. A membership application is included as the last page of this Newsletter. Please make copies of the application or

Comments from a Student Member

The Veterinary Student and Ethics

When Dr. Speth requested that I write about the veterinary student perspective of veterinary ethics, I was not sure how to proceed. The prospect of summing up such a diverse range of ideas is quite daunting. After some careful thought, these are examples of areas of ethical debate which face the veterinary student today and my perspectives on some of them.

One of the first things that I realized is that veterinary students are often in the middle of the ethics debate. For example, animal rights activists believe that our surgery classes are "inhumane, immoral and unethical" when they involve live animals instead of models. However, our professors strongly believe that performing surgery on live animals (who may or may not be adopted later) in addition to models is the best way to learn. They feel that we should not be performing our first procedure on the dearly loved pet entrusted to our care in a position where we have no assistance or support. It is unethical to the client to do otherwise.

However, the veterinary student who shares any or all of the beliefs of the animal rights activist has the ethical dilemma of having to choose between doing what is best for their education and what is best for the animals involved (both practice subjects and future patients).

Another example is the debate over the "incorporation" of veterinary medicine. We sit through discussions about the ethics of corporations like PetSmart operating and "stealing" clients from traditional practices. Most of us, while sympathetic to the small private practices where we once worked, are hoping that these companies will still be around when we graduate since their pay and benefits are often so much better. Our concern is how we will feed ourselves (and our families) after graduation, especially in the face of the student loans which grow by leaps and bounds each year.

One thing that the majority of veterinary students feel is unethical is the historical refusal of the AVMA to let the students have a voting representative. We are told that we are the future of the veterinary

profession; yet, at the same time, we are told that we are not worthy of a voice in the AVMA. Although the initial votes have been made and this is changing, the issue is still not resolved.

These are just examples of some of the ethical debates which I have heard around me in the last two years. I joined this society because I feel that it provides a place where these issues and more can be discussed. There are many other students like myself who encounter these debates, and there are few places to discuss these issues. For that reason, I echo Dr. Tannenbaum's plea to recruit veterinary students as new members to provide another forum for the discussion of these ethical debates.

Debra Hickman Class of '98, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Illinois

Special Topic: The Animal Rights March on Washington

Editor's Note: The week of June 17th was designated as "World Animal Awareness Week" by a coalition of animal rights groups that sponsored a March on Washington, DC in an effort to focus national attention on the animal rights agenda. Because it was widely promoted among animal rights organizations, word of the march spread to groups opposed to the animal rights philosophy. The result was that both sides of issue were presented in a variety of forums that week. In anticipation of this event, I solicited input from members of the Society for commentary pertinent to this event and 3 responses were received.

They are presented in the order of their receipt.

Adrian Morrison responded by granting permission to reprint an article he wrote for the National Animal Interest Alliance NAIA News. **Susan Paris** responded by suggesting that the Newsletter reprint an Op-Ed piece from the Wall Street Journal written by Jeff Getty, published the week before the March.

Michael Fox responded with a narrative of the event of the week and it is printed in full below.

Your responses to these articles are welcome and will be published in the next issue of the Newsletter.

Dissecting Peter Singer: Putting the animal rights guru under a microscope

Adrian R. Morrison for March-April NAIA News
Reprinted with Permission

Foolish, outrageous claims against the necessity or even usefulness of animal-based research are common in animal-rights literature. These are as irresponsible as they are silly because they can lead the unwary with a natural, compassionate concern for animals to contribute money to a cause actually working against the contributor's best interests. Although I believe the political leaders know better and lie deliberately, they are not the most dangerous or even the most culpable in my mind.

I am bothered most by the intellectuals-scientists and non-scientists—who have stoked the fires with gross misrepresentations of the nature and necessity of biomedical research. Indeed, the acknowledged founder and chief guru of the movement, Australian philosopher Peter Singer, played a major role in unleashing the virulent attack on researchers with his descriptions of their work in the chapter, "Tools for Research," in *Animal Liberation*.

Singer's utilitarian philosophy depends upon the demonstration that insufficient good has come from animal research to justify the pain or suffering he argues it has caused. But two scientists, Sharon Russell and Charles Nicoll, recently reviewed "Tools for Research" and demonstrated in detail just how much Singer misrepresents research to support his thesis. Their results were published in a scientific journal, *Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine*,¹ with a rebuttal by Singer,² and their reply³. Even Singer's rebuttal is revealing.

Russell and Nicoll's analysis is very harsh but, in my opinion, deservedly so. As they note, Singer is held up as a model standard-bearer of the movement, one who has provided intellectual rigor to replace emotionalism and sentimentality. Yet, a close look at the chapter revealed a reliance on distortion and selectivity that was surprising in the work of a noted scholar, one who authored the section on ethics in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

Were I to make a blanket condemnation of some activity as Singer has in the case of biomedical research I believe it would only be fair (and certainly most accurate) to sample various aspects of that activity for critiquing. Did Singer choose to focus on the experiments that have led to various safer anesthetics or did he focus on surgical techniques and apparatus that make previously impossible operations possible, such as the heart-lung machine that permits prolonged open-heart surgery? Did he emphasize studies aimed at understanding what causes cells to run wild in cancer? No, he chose to put most of his emphasis on behavioral experiments for analysis. These are, without doubt, the hardest experiments for the untutored to see as justified. I am sure this is why Singer zeroed in on them to make his case.

How unbalanced was his treatment? Of those pages strictly devoted to the use of animals in research, half deal with studies on animal behavior and drug addiction. Yet in 1993 the National Institutes of Health doled out only 11% of its budget to those institutes funding research on behavior, mental health and addiction; while 37% went to those institutes concerned with research on cancer, diabetes and heart disease. Considering that these percentages would translate roughly to the number of animals used in studying the problems, one can conclude that Singer shied away from picking on targets which the public regards with greater sympathy than mental health and addiction.

Not only are there many distortions, the chapter is sloppy in handling literature citations. Russell and Nicoll checked the accuracy of 49 of the 132 references for the chapter and found that 16 (one-third!) were inaccurate or could not be found. That is an astounding record. In my most recent research paper, I found that my proof-reading had missed one reference that had the same page numbers as another in a list of 78 references. To me, that seemed sloppy.

How does Singer introduce distortion beyond focusing attention away from more "central" concerns, such as cancer and heart disease? One trick is to confuse the reader into thinking he is reading about a species that may merit (or at least attract) more human concern when the subject is quite another. "Tools for Research" begins with this ploy. At the beginning of the chapter, we are reminded of the Hollywood film "Project X" in which chimpanzees are used in experiments to test their ability to fly a plane after having

been dosed with radiation. He then segues into descriptions of actual U.S. Air Force studies to determine capabilities of previously trained monkeys to "fly" a simulator after exposure to radiation or chemical poisons. Singer leaves the reader wondering about the point of subjecting animals to such conditions; for he never provides the rationale, uncertainty about a pilot's ability to function in defense, a grave concern during the Cold War era.

In his rebuttal to Russell and Nicoll, Singer pooh-poohs their concern that he intended to mislead readers into thinking that the Air Force experiments on monkeys were performed on chimpanzees, a way of upping the ante of species concern so to speak.

Russell and Nicoll replied., "Although Singer does not state that chimpanzees were used, neither does he state they were not." They go on to say: "Even if it was not intended, we suspect that many readers of Singer's book come away with the mistaken impression that chimpanzees have been used for this type of military research ³.

Well, one cannot state with certainty what he intended, but he clearly misled two of his fellow philosophers, Lawrence and Susan Finsen, who describe the experiments in this way in their book (*The Animal Rights Movement in America*, New York, Twayne Publ., pp. 19-20) 1994, which is not a model of accuracy itself. "*The popular film Project X (1987) made many Americans aware that radiation research on animals is an ongoing military activity. The film is a dramatization of actual research on chimpanzees, who are trained to operate a flight simulator using extensive aversive conditioning (i.e., electric shock) and are then irradiated. They are observed to determine for how long and at what doses of radiation they can continue to perform their tasks. Former military researcher Donald Barnes resigned in protest of the pointlessness of this research which had been conducted for years on hundreds of chimpanzees.*"

However, Barnes had worked with rhesus monkeys, not chimpanzees.

This is but a fraction of what Russell and Nicoll have discovered. They have performed a real service.

1. Russell, S.M. and Nicoll, C.S. A dissection of the chapter "Tools for Research" in Peter

Singer's *Animal Liberation*. Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine. 211/2 (1996): 109:109-138.

2. Singer, P. Blind hostility: a response to Russell and Nicoll. Ibid., 139-146.

3. Russell, S.M. and Nicoll, C.S. Reply to Singer's "Blind hostility." Ibid. 147-154.

Reprinted with permission of The Wall Street Journal copyright 1996 Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All rights reserved.

The Tragic Hypocrisy of 'Animal Rights' by Jeff Getty

Without animal research there will be no cure for AIDS. My life and the lives of millions of people with HIV/AIDS depend on scientists working with animals to develop new therapies. Every single drug we are taking right now to stay alive until a cure is found has come about only because of animal research. Yet the advocacy group People for the Ethical Treatment for Animals (PETA) says it would oppose any cure for AIDS that involved research with animals.

Such extremists do not simply make animal research a matter of polite debate. One need not look far to find people with HIV or AIDS who have been targeted by the animal rights zealots. When I was fighting for my life in the hospital this winter, I received death wishes from so-called animal lovers. Cleve Jones, founder of the NAMES Project, received death threats after being a grand marshal for a gay rodeo. Peter Stahley of Treatment Action Group recently said that PETA is a direct threat to his life. He is right.

Using tactics of distortion, intimidation, harassment and in some cases even violence, animal rights extremists have effectively delayed significant AIDS research. Here are some examples:

* AIDS researchers at Stanford University in California were forced to build labs and complexes underground following attacks on university property carried out in the name of animal rights.

According to one researcher there, the violent tactics of the animal rights fanatics' violent tactics have added great costs to AIDS research, slowed certain projects and blocked other AIDS experiments from happening altogether due to high costs.

* Recently, a prominent immunologist in the Northeast who is researching important immune restoration therapies for people with AIDS said that the biggest obstacle to his research was over-restrictive animal rights laws. In his research, this AIDS scientist is transplanting thymus tissue from infants to adults. After transplants are performed on animals, researchers are prohibited from conducting further biopsies on any of these animals. On the other hand, human study subjects can and will receive biopsies over and over, as needed.

* An animal rights group's complaint to the National Institute of Health (NIH) about the appropriateness of the xenotransplant I received in December led to an expensive, time consuming paper chase for researchers. The NIH responded that there was no wrongdoing and that the experiment was approved to move forward. This bogus complaint cause people with AIDS needless waste of time and money.

* The Progressive Animal Welfare Society, an animal rights group, targeted a Washington State researcher and successfully shut down, for a time, research involving mother-to-child transmission of simian immunodeficiency virus among macaque monkeys. This work later turned out to be the foundation for treatment of human newborns with AZT to block HIV. How many children are now needlessly dying of AIDS because information that could have prevented their disease was obstructed by animal rights extremists?

Certain Hollywood celebrities like to wear red AIDS ribbons while also supporting groups like PETA. It is time for the hypocrisy to end. You can't for AIDS, breast cancer and diabetes research and also support militant animal rights groups.

The only productive research approach is intensive, well-funded biomedical experimentation performed by

scientists free to use animals in their work. Contrary to PETA's rhetoric, computers have not replaced animals for drug safety testing and research. It will be many years before such a computer is ever programmed, simply because we now only dimly understand how the immune system works.

Meanwhile, animal rights groups continue to take donors' money, promising to fight "for the animals." In fact, their agenda is to stop all animal research forever, no matter what the human cost. Dan Mathews, an openly gay employee of PETA, has said publicly that he agrees with the group's opposition to a cure for AIDS if it came through animal research. When asked about the fate of those currently dying of the disease, he said "Don't get the disease in the first place, schmo." Dan does not have AIDS, but he has shown that he has contempt for the men, women and children who do.

Many of the cures for diseases that are now long gone and out of the way came from animal research. If PETA had it way 50 years ago, we'd be talking today about hundreds of thousands of people dying from polio, as well as AIDS.

Mr. Getty is an AIDS activist with ACT-UP Golden Gate. He received a baboon bone marrow transplant in December.

The March on Washington a Mixed Success

The National Alliance "March on Washington wasn't much of a march, the number of participants being a fraction of the 50,000 that came in 1990. But in some ways it was even more of a success. Three days of talks at the vast U.S. Air Arena gave the 3,600 participants opportunity to network with other activists from as far away as Taiwan and India. There were some excellent presentations with more facts than rhetoric, combining the elements of sound bioethics, compassion and moral outrage. These were often enriched by video documentation of animal abuses, most notably by agribusiness, the biomedical research industry, and the fur trade. The level of

discussion was high and broad, ranging from the atrocities of puppy mills and USDA licensed dog dealers to the implications of GATT and the World Trade Organization for marine mammal protection and other national and international laws and conventions aimed at protecting animals and the environment.

Several companies, like the Body Shop, helped underwrite this conference. Especially newsworthy, which certainly helped publicize the conference and March on Washington, was a drug company funded platform of people with AIDS. They waged a media campaign to discredit the March and the animal rights movement by accusing them of putting animals before people because of its opposition to animal experiments. But other people with AIDS representing an international AIDS activist organization, spoke out at the March to get the record straight, insisting that they saw no future cures coming from animal research and that those with AIDS who opposed animal rights were being used by the biomedical research industry to discredit a much larger agenda of animal rights concerns, from whaling and factory farming to genetically engineering pigs to become human organ donors. This controversy sparked international media attention and helped publicize the animal rights movement Convention and March to an estimated 200 million people worldwide.

Dr. Michael W. Fox, Vice President, The Humane Society of the United States, August 20, 1996

New members profile

Since the last issue of the Newsletter we have added 26 new members. Our new members are:

Isabelle Allmann, DVM, who is the Institute Veterinarian and Head of the Animal Facilities at the Institute of Toxicology of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. She will be organizing a conference about ethics for the Swiss Association of Lab Animals and it is of great interest to her to find differences and similarities between ethics in different countries.

Cory Brayton, DVM, who is the Director of the Facility for Comparative Studies and Attending Veterinarian at the Hospital for Special Studies in New York City. His interests in the Society focus primarily on research related issues.

P. Rand Brown DVM, who is an Associate Professor in the Division of Comparative Medicine at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, MD. His interests in Veterinary ethics relate more toward the area of "Professional Ethics" in the old sense, more specifically the vet to vet and vet to client relationships. He is also concerned about the lack of advancement or new ideas on research animal ethics in the last few years.

Henry Childers DVM, who is a private practitioner in Cranston RI. He is the Chair of the AVMA Council on Public Relations. His interests in Veterinary Ethics are based on his opinion that ethics are an integral, in fact essential, part of Veterinary Medicine and life in general. "Without ethics, morals and principles a person has nothing."

Peter Conlon, DVM, PhD, who is the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs at the Ontario Veterinary College of the University of Guelph. He is the coordinator of the Veterinary Ethics course.

Charles Daniell, DVM, who is a private practitioner in Brunswick, GA. His interest in Veterinary ethics arises from his concerns about improper vaccination protocols and the influx of "marketing" into what has been an honest profession.

John Daugherty, DVM, who is a private practitioner in Poland, OH. He is interested in seeing a peer-review process instituted in the Veterinary profession. He is concerned about the lack of quality control in the profession and fears that if we do not establish a dialogue concerning such topics as ethical behavior, and professional standards we will live to regret it. "We enjoy a great deal of public trust and respect, and must work to keep it."

Jean Dodds, DVM, who is the President of "Hemopet" a non-profit animal blood bank in Santa Monica, CA. She has studied bleeding diseases in animals for more than 30 years and has published more than 150 papers on the subject. She is a former president of the Scientists Center for Animal Welfare and Chair of the Committee on Veterinary Medical sciences and Vice-Chairman of the Institute of

New members profile (Continued)

Laboratory Animal Resources for the National Academy of Sciences. She is the recipient of numerous awards for her service to the Veterinary profession. She is the Editor of *Advances in Veterinary Science and Comparative Medicine*. She has a long-standing interest in laboratory animal welfare.

Lisa Fazio who is a student (class of '98) at the College of Veterinary Medicine at Colorado State University. She is interested in every aspect of veterinary ethics, especially applied to exotic animal ownership and husbandry, emergency medicine, and the human-animal bond. She hopes to broaden her perspective in this "new" and exciting field.

Paul Ford, PhD, who is the Executive Director of Join Hands, "The Health and Safety Educational Alliance" located in Washington, DC. His organization addresses public concern over the use of the role of laboratory animals in health and safety research. "Our mission is to provide the public with factual information on the process of biological research, on laboratory animal care/use practices; to promote the development, validation and use of non-animal testing methods; and to promote high standards of care for all laboratory animals."

Nanette R. Kleinman, DVM, who is the Associate Director for Veterinary Services at Case Western Reserve University. Her interest in the Society relates to the use of animals in biomedical research.

Philip Kosch, DVM, PhD, who is the new Dean of the Tufts School of Veterinary Medicine. His interests in the Society revolve around his interests in the education of Veterinarians and biomedical scientists, in the signature program in Veterinary values at Tufts, The Center for Animals and Public Policy at Tufts, and academic administrative management and leadership issues.

Ed Leonard, DVM, who is a private practitioner in Gayland MA. He is a member of the New England Association of State Veterinary Boards. His interests in Veterinary ethics include: small animal practice, animal rescue league, and board of registration.

Peter Lugten, BVM&S, MRCVS, who is a private practitioner in Farmingdale, NY. His interests in Veterinary ethics focus on animal welfare versus animal rights and the rights of wildlife to welfare in the form of habitat protection.

Ken Meyers, PhD, who is the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the College of Veterinary Medicine at Washington State University. Ken's interest in the Society stem from his belief that: "Veterinary scientists and educators function in an environment where ethical decisions and dilemmas are an integral part of life. If we are to make discoveries and serve as role models and mentors for our students we need to be knowledgeable about the ethical issues of our times. I believe that the Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics provides an opportunity for colleagues to engage in dialogue that that will help clarify and focus upon these critical ethical issues. I wish to participate in that dialogue and welcome the chance to do so."

Graham Moore, BVM&S, MRCVS, who is the Head of Laboratory Animal Science at Pfizer Central Research in Sandwich, Kent, UK. Among his many affiliations, he is the honorary treasurer of the Laboratory Animal Veterinary Association, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Health. His interests in Veterinary ethics stem from his responsibility for laboratory animal science and welfare on site and for the Company's European information programme on the ethical use of animals in research. He is the Company spokesperson on the use of animals in research.

Professor David P. Morton, BVSc, PhD, established and directs the Department of Biomedical Science and Biomedical Ethics at the Medical School at the University of Birmingham in the UK. Previously he was at Leicester as a lecturer in human anatomy and also served as their laboratory animal veterinarian. The Biomedical Ethics program which he believes to be the first to formally place ethics as an integral part of an active animal research service, teaches undergraduate doctors, dentists and nurses health care ethics and law. They also run a master's programme and teach science students, and those using animals in their research,

New members profile (Continued)

bioethics and behaviour. They are also extending their interactions with postgraduate doctors and nurses, and have several postgraduate students researching into aspects of health care ethics. In addition they are carrying out research into the welfare of animals, particularly into ways in which animal suffering can be recognised, assessed, alleviated and avoided. This research is an important aspect for refining husbandry and experimental procedures to reduce any animal suffering to the minimum. Professor Morton has served as President of the British Laboratory Animal Veterinary Association, the chairperson or member of various committees of the British Veterinary Association associated with animal welfare, and was a founder member of their Ethics Committee. He represented the BVA as a government adviser during the passage of the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986. Between 1987 and 1990 he sat on the Institute of Medical Ethics Working Party on 'The use of animals in biomedical research' (Lives in the Balance book, OUP); on a similar committee at the Hastings Center New York at about the same time; and on the Nuffield Council on Bioethics Working Party on xenotransplantation in 1995/96. He has been involved in the creation of a postgraduate degree in Animal Welfare Science, Ethics and Law by the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (UK national authority responsible for the registration of all veterinarians, professional standards) and is chief examiner at present. He is a founder member of the UK's sister organisation to SVME, entitled (at the moment!) the Animal Welfare Science, Ethics and Law Veterinary Association (AWSELVA).

Guy Mulder, DVM, who is a Post-Doctoral Fellow in Comparative Medicine at the University of Washington. His interests in Veterinary Ethics include the use of animals in research, the human-animal bond, and a general interest in both medical and Veterinary Ethics.

Patricia Olson, DVM, MA, PhD, who is the Director of Veterinary Affairs for the American Humane Association in Englewood, CO. She is a

diplomate and Past-President of the American College of Theriogenologists. As noted above in the remarks of the President, Dr. Olson organized the recent Scientific Workshop on Feral Cats in the US, and is presently preparing the proceedings of that Conference.

Barbara Orlans, PhD, who is Senior Research Fellow of the Kennedy Institute of Ethics at Georgetown University. Dr. Orlans was the founding President of the Scientists Center for Animal Welfare. She organizes an annual conference or course on ethical issues of animal research.

Kent G. Osborn, DVM, PhD, who is the Associate Director of the Department of Animal Resources at The Scripps Research Institute. His interests in Veterinary ethics include animal research and the ethics of wildlife conservation. He organized and taught an ethics unit for the Zoological Society of San Diego keeper training program. He also organized a session on animal-related ethics for the annual meeting of the American Association of Zoo Keepers. In addition, he provided introductory remarks on an ethical theme for the Second International Conference on orangutans.

Donald Peddie, DVM, who is a private practitioner in Middlebury, VT. His interests in Veterinary ethics relate to his position as the Chair of the Vermont State Veterinary Board.

John Saidla, DVM, who is the Chief of Dental Services at the College of Veterinary Medicine at Cornell University, Director of Continuing Education and Course leader for "Animals, Veterinarians and Society", which is the major course in the DVM curriculum for the teaching of ethics. He is the college resource for ethical issues and conduct. His interests in Veterinary ethics range from the teaching of biomedical ethics to the Veterinary-Client-Patient relationship to jurisprudence.

Ione Smith, DVM, who is a PhD. student in Comparative Experimental Medicine (Experimental Psychology). She is interested in the entire range of the animal rights/animal welfare/anti-animal rights debate, and the attitudinal changes and practice changes resulting from either demonizing animal

New members profile (Continued)

rights or trying to work toward common goals. She maintains a web site with information on these issues.
<<http://funnelweb.utcc.utk.edu/~ilsmith/ethics.html>>

Peter Theran, VMD, who is the Vice President, Division of Health & Hospitals and Director of the Center for Laboratory Animal Welfare for the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the American Humane Education Society in Boston, MA. His interest in Veterinary ethics stem from many years of teaching values and ethics to interns. He currently interacts with members of the Veterinary profession its organizations and other professions, corporations and regulatory agencies.

John Wright, DVM, who is an adjunct faculty member in the department of Small Animal Clinical Sciences at the College of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Minnesota. His interests in Veterinary ethics relate primarily to issues related to small animal practice.

**Cornell Announces Dean's Lecture Series
on Animals and Society**

Dean Franklin M. Loew of the College of Veterinary Medicine at Cornell University is hosting a lecture series on animals and society to be held this academic year at the College. The dates and speakers in the series are the following: October 23, 1996: Jerrold Tannenbaum, J.D., Clinical Associate Professor of Environmental Studies, Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine; November 20, 1996: Stephen Zawistowski, Ph.D., Senior Vice President and Science Advisor, American Society for the Protection of Cruelty to Animals; March 19, 1997: Andrew N. Rowan, D.Phil., Professor of Environmental Studies and Director of the Tufts Center for Animals and Public Policy, Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine; April 17, 1997: Tom L. Beauchamp, Ph.D., Professor, Kennedy Institute of Ethics and Department of Philosophy, Georgetown University; and May 15, 1997: Alan M. Beck, Sc.D., Director, Center for

Applied Ethology and Human-Animal Interaction and Dorothy McCallister Professor of Animal Ecology, Purdue University School of Veterinary Medicine. For additional information, contact the Dean's Office at 607-253-3771.

**Do You Need a Speaker on
Veterinary Ethics?
Would You Like to Join the
SVME Speaker's List?
Are You Organizing a Session
on Ethical Issues?**

Increasingly, lectures and discussions of issues in veterinary ethics are being featured at meetings of state and local veterinary medical associations and practice groups. Our Society can play a useful role in encouraging and facilitating such sessions. We therefore want to create a list of potential speakers and to be able to provide this list to interested members of SVME and others who want to include sessions on veterinary ethics in their meetings.

1. If you would like to be included on our list of speakers, please contact Jerrold Tannenbaum by mail or e-mail. He will get back to you with a standard form that will request relevant biographical information and topics in which you are interested in speaking. He can be reached at <0006936323@mcimail.com> or c/o Center for Animals and Public Policy, Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine, 200 Westboro Road, North Grafton, MA 01536.
2. If you are looking for a speaker on veterinary ethics, or are just thinking about the possibility of a lecture or session on ethics please contact Jerry for a copy of the list and/or for suggestions about speakers or topics.
3. If you are sponsoring a meeting or series of lectures, such as that just announced by Dean Loew of Cornell, please let Bob Speth know so that we can include an item about it in the Newsletter.

Reminder: The last page (*over*) of this Newsletter is a copy of the membership application form. Please photocopy it and distribute it to those with an interest in veterinary ethics.

APPLICATION FORM SOCIETY FOR VETERINARY MEDICAL ETHICS

NAME:

BUSINESS
ADDRESS:

HOME
ADDRESS:
(Optional):

ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS:

PLEASE SEND MAIL TO: Office ☐ Home ☐

Phone:
Business:

Phone
Fax:

Phone:
Home:

OCCUPATIONAL AND PRESENT POSITION:

PROFESSIONAL DEGREES:

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

INTERESTS IN VETERINARY ETHICS:

MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF THE SOCIETY ARE:

- A. To encourage ethical practices and professional behavior of veterinarians in all aspects of the profession.
- B. To increase the understanding of the philosophical, social, moral and ethical and value issues encountered by the veterinary profession.
- C. To sponsor seminars and other presentations on ethics and value issues at local, state, regional and national meetings of veterinarians and other interested individuals.
- D. To promote the teaching of ethical and value issues at colleges of veterinary medicine and to identify speakers on these subjects.
- E. To encourage persons from other professions and disciplines, such as biomedical research, discussions and studies of these issues.
- F. To exchange information about veterinary ethical issues via bulletins, periodicals, and newsletters.
- G. To maintain archives of appropriate documents and materials related to these disciplines.

*I hereby make application to the Society
for Veterinary Medical Ethics*

(Signature of Applicant)

(Date)

*The dues are currently \$20.00 per year. Please mail this application to Dr. Robert Speth,
College for Veterinary Medicine, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-6520*