

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics

Newsletter

*Volume 4 Numbers 1-2
May 1998*

Annual SVME Meeting at AVMA in Baltimore

The annual plenary session and business meeting of the Society will take place in conjunction with the AVMA annual convention in Baltimore. We will meet on Saturday, July 25 in the Kent Room of the Renaissance Hotel.

On Saturday morning, we will have a session entitled: "You Gotta Serve Somebody: Ethical Issues in Veterinary Practice." The speakers will be Drs. Mary Beth Leininger, Hugh Lewis, and Don Draper. Mary Beth will focus on private practice, Hugh on corporate practice, and Don on academic practice. They will consider primarily economic issues, and the ethical concerns posed by often conflicting demands of the patient, the client, the practice, the employer, and the public. The morning session will run from 9:00 to 11:30. Each speaker will have about 30 minutes for a formal presentation, then after a break we will have a panel discussion.

The afternoon session is entitled, "Veterinary Ethics: A View From the Licensing Board." Confirmed or almost confirmed speakers are Drs. Nancy Collins (California Board), Don Watson (Michigan Board), A. Cleveland Brown (former member, Maryland Board), and Mary Ballenger (Oklahoma Board). The speakers have not been assigned specific topics; they will talk about cases they have encountered as members of licensing boards. We will have a 20 minute presentation from each speaker and, after

President: John R. Boyce, DVM, PhD
President-elect: Robert C. Speth, PhD
Secretary: Ione L. Smith, DVM
Treasurer: Robert C. Speth, PhD
Parliamentarian: Richard B. Fink, DVM
Historian: Lawrence G. Carbone, DVM, MA
Past presidents: Robert Shomer, VMD, Albert Dorn, DVM, Jerrold Tannenbaum, JD

a break, a panel discussion. The session will be from 1:30 to 3:30. The Society will have its business meeting from 3:45 to 4:30.

John R. Boyce



Contents

Annual SVME Meeting.....	1
President's Message.....	2
Dues Notice and Membership List.....	2
Slate of Officers Proposed.....	3
Biographical Sketches of the Nominees.....	3
Secretary's Message.....	4
Treasurer's Report.....	5
From the Editor.....	5
New Member Profiles.....	6
Noteworthy Member Activities.....	9
Course Announcement.....	9
Book Reviews.....	10
AAVAW Meeting.....	16
Original Discussions	
President-elect's Message, "Penicillin and the Tuskegee Syphilis Study".....	14
Adrian Morrison, "Another View of Animal Liberation".....	17
Ione Smith responds to Morrison.....	19

The views expressed in this newsletter are those of their authors and not of SVME or any of its other members. The Society is dedicated to the free and open exchange of ideas. All members are encouraged to submit articles or opinions for the newsletter. Please contact the editor.

President's Message

It is truly an honor to serve the Society of Veterinary Medical Ethics as President. Although the Society is small, we continue to grow, both in membership numbers and in influence. My main goal as President this year was to see an increase in the number of private practitioners who belong to the Society.

Toward that end, I have tried to put together a program for the July 25 meeting in Baltimore that will appeal to private practitioners, as well as to academicians and those of us who don't fall into either category. The program is included on page 1 of this newsletter. I was delighted that Drs. Mary Beth Leininger, Hugh Lewis, and Don Draper agreed to take part in the Saturday morning session. I can't think of three veterinarians more qualified to discuss ethical issues confronting practitioners. I have asked them to focus their remarks on economic issues facing veterinarians who attempt to serve, often simultaneously, the best interests of their animal patients, clients, colleagues, practice owners, and the public.

Our afternoon session will feature presentations by four veterinarians with experience serving as members of licensing boards. Dr. Nancy Collins will begin by outlining the role of regulatory boards in ensuring that licensed veterinarians adhere to ethical and legal standards of practice. Drs. Cleveland Brown, Mary Ballenger, and Don Watson will use their own experiences to illustrate various ethical issues they have dealt with as board members.

Thanks to the continuing efforts of Ione Smith, the VETETHIC mailing list continues to flourish. Topics discussed recently have included whether it is unethical for veterinarians to do ear

cropping, whether neutering is or is **not** in an animal's best interest, and whether death of an individual animal is a harm to it. If you aren't participating on the list, please consider doing so.

The Annual Meeting in July is when the Society elects officers for the coming year. Elsewhere in this issue is a slate of candidates prepared by the Nominating Committee (Drs. Dick Fink, Jerry Tannenbaum and me). Please look this list over and plan to attend the business meeting on Saturday and help select our new officers.

This is the first issue of the SVME Newsletter to be edited by Jerry Tannenbaum. Thank you, Jerry, for agreeing to take over this responsibility from Bob Speth, who performed so well as newsletter editor the past several years.

I hope to see many of you at our meeting in Baltimore on Saturday, July 25.

John R. Boyce



Dues Notice and Membership List

It's that time again. Included with this copy of the newsletter are two separate documents: a dues reminder and a list of SVME members.

We are pleased to be able to keep our dues at the very reasonable amount of \$20 for regular members and \$5 for students. These dues are used exclusively to cover the costs of printing and mailing the newsletter, maintaining the Vetethic List, and running the annual meeting. Please mail your dues in the enclosed envelope, and include the remittance notice with the copy of your name and address. Your prompt attention to this will save the

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics Newsletter

Volume 4 Numbers 1-2 May 1998

Page 3

Society time and cost of sending reminders.

Also enclosed with this issue, and being sent only to SVME members, is a complete list of members as of April 20, 1998. Please let us know if any corrections or additions need to be made for the degrees listed here. They reflect what each member submitted in his or her membership application. Any corrections should be noted on your dues remittance form.

If you do not see someone on the list you think should join, please invite him or her. You may copy and send them the printed application form on the last page of this newsletter. Or, an e-mailable application will be sent to you for forwarding if you request an application by email from <jtannenbaum@earthlink.net>.

Members on the enclosed list whose names are followed by an asterisk are also members of our SVME Vetethic list. For information about how to join the list, which is open to all SVME members, please see page 4 of this issue.



Slate of Officers Proposed

Dick Fink, Parliamentarian and Chairman of the Nominations Committee and the committee respectfully submit to the members the following nominations for 1998-1999. Voting on next year's officers will occur at the annual meeting on July 25. (See page 1.) Terms of office begin at the close of the annual meeting.

President: Bob Speth

President-Elect: Ron McLaughlin

Secretary: Ione Smith (new 2 year term)

Treasurer: Hal Jenkins

Historian: Larry Carbone (new 2 year term)

Dick Fink will begin the second year of his two year term as Parliamentarian, and John Boyce automatically becomes Immediate Past President.



Biographical Sketches of the New Nominees

**Ronald M. McLaughlin, DVM, MS,
Diplomate ACLAM
*Nominee for President-elect***

Ronald M. McLaughlin received a BS degree in Zoology (1964), and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and a Master of Science (Veterinary Physiology) in 1968 from Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. Dr. McLaughlin achieved specialty board certification in the American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine in 1975. He served in the U. S. Army Veterinary Corps from 1968 to 1976. He was stationed in Fort Worth, Texas, and the Panama Canal Zone, where he had responsibilities in animal health and food safety. He then became a laboratory animal veterinarian at the U. S. Army Biomedical Laboratories at Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland, from 1972-1976. From 1976-1979 he was the Director of Laboratory Animal Medicine and a Senior Staff Scientist in Primatology at Hazleton Research Laboratories, Vienna, Virginia.

In 1979 he moved to the University of Missouri. He is the Director of the Office of Laboratory Animal Medicine and a Professor in the Department of Veterinary Pathobiology and the Director of Graduate Studies for the MU Laboratory Animal Medicine Training Program. He teaches graduate courses in the MU Laboratory Animal Medicine Training Program and

teaches a 1.5 credit hour laboratory animal medicine class in the professional curriculum. His research activities have been primarily related to health and welfare of experimental animals.

Dr. McLaughlin is married (38 years), and he and his wife Karen live on and operate a 200-acre cattle and tree farm near Fulton, MO. They have two adult children. Ron McLaughlin, Jr., DVM, is boarded in surgery and has been in private practice in Sarasota, FL since January, 1998. Melissa Smith, is a CPA employed by Farm Bureau in Jefferson City, MO, and the mother of Ron and Karen's two adorable granddaughters.

Ron and Karen have two Vizsla dogs, two domestic shorthaired cats, about 40 head of cattle, three ponds stocked with bass, blue gills and catfish, and many wild deer, turkey, and Canada geese, among other creatures.

Hal Jenkins, DVM *Nominee for Treasurer*

Hal Jenkins received his DVM from the University of Missouri 1962. Since then, he has been in private practice in Tempe, AZ, first large animal and now exclusively small animal.

In addition to running a successful practice, Hal has played a prominent role in organized veterinary medicine both on the state and national levels. He was Alternate Delegate and then Delegate from Arizona to the AVMA House of Delegates. He served as President of the Arizona Veterinary Medical Association and was named Arizona veterinarian of the year.

Hal concluded a five year term on the Arizona State Veterinary Medical Examining Board in January, 1998. He has also been a member of the Executive

Board of the American Association of Veterinary State Boards.

Hal also been President of the Western Veterinary Conference and served a six year term on the AVMA Judicial Council.

20

Secretary's Message

The Vetethic List

As most of you already know, the SVME has maintained an electronic mailing list since last June. We've been online for almost a year now! This list, known as Vetethic, has provided many of our members with a convenient and stimulating place to discuss those nagging ethical problems that crop up in our daily lives as vets. We have already discussed topics such as the ethics of euthanasia, referral practices, organ transplantation, animal rights, client communication, the relief of pain, forcing rhinos to keep kosher, and --oh yes!-- how to explain politics with milk cows. While the list is intended mostly for the discussion of serious ethical topics, we do try to maintain a relaxed and friendly atmosphere. We hope every SVME member will want to take part.

The Vetethic list is also a great way to disseminate information about SVME activities. For example, we have recently heard of possible changes to the newsletter, as well as details of the next SVME meeting in July. Our list membership now represents about half of the members of the SVME, and this feature of the list will be even more useful as more SVME members join.

As a member of SVME you are automatically entitled to join the Vetethic list, and list membership is open only to SVME members. If you want to subscribe to the list, send a message addressed to

"listserv@utkvm1.utk.edu" . In the BODY of the message, write "subscribe vetethic <your name>." For instance, I would write "subscribe vetethic Ione Smith" (without the quotation marks). If you have any questions about the list, please drop me a line at <ilsmith@utk.edu> . We hope to see you on the list!

The SVME web site

Another growing feature of the Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics is our web site:

<<http://web.utk.edu/~ilsmith/SVME.html>>.

The site includes online copies of our newsletters and conference proceedings, information about the SVME, links to other sites of interest, and more. Please visit the site, and let me know what you'd like to see there. Contributions to the site are welcomed!

Ione Smith



Treasurer's Report

As of April 30, 1998 the Society had \$4941.07 in our bank account. For 1997 the Society had \$3165 in income from dues and \$80.93 in interest. Expenditures amounted to \$1523.81. Expenditures were mostly for Newsletter reproduction and distribution costs.

As of April 30, 1998 the Society has 186 members, of which there are 170 full members and 16 student members.

Please encourage your colleagues to join the Society it's still only \$20.00.

And those of you in academia, please encourage your students to join as well. At \$5.00 for student membership it is a great bargain.

Robert Speth

From the Editor

For the past three years, Bob Speth has edited this Newsletter. His tireless and patient work has enabled it to become an indispensable tool for informing the members of our Society about matters of common interest. From a one-page flier, the Newsletter has grown to a substantial and substantive document, containing many interesting, stimulating, and informative discussions.

At our annual meeting in July, Bob will become the fifth President of SVME and therefore will no longer be able to edit the Newsletter. He and the officers of the Society asked me to take over as editor.

As your new editor, I welcome your suggestions regarding matters you would like to see in the Newsletter. I intend to build on the structure Bob has fashioned by experimenting with a number of new features. Now for some ideas for the future. Let me know what you think of them.

1. ELECTRONIC DELIVERY. I would like to explore the possibility of sending the newsletter electronically to as many SVME members to whom this would be acceptable. The newsletter could be formatted (as it has been thus far) for Microsoft Word, or other word processors, and sent as an attachment to members with email. Or the newsletter can be done in Adobe Acrobat and sent via email as an Acrobat PDF file. Acrobat produces a beautiful document, that is compatible with both PCs and Apples, and that looks like an on-screen newsletter. And it will instantly print a gorgeous document. SVME members who would like to download the newsletter as an Adobe PDF file would need the Adobe Acrobat reader. Adobe distributes the reader free of charge from its web page, <www.adobe.com>. The

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics Newsletter

Volume 4 Numbers 1-2 May 1998

Page 6

Adobe reader is also included with many popular software programs.

There are a few reasons I want to propose electronic distribution. First, it can save us some serious money in copying and distribution costs, especially if membership in the Society continues to increase. Second, it would allow for quicker production and distribution of the newsletter. Third, it would allow mini, or "extra" editions of the newsletter when items of special interest pop up. Fourth, it would enable us to do things that would be cumbersome or expensive otherwise. For example, we could distribute such things as papers or articles of members and court decisions. Fifth, we could garner wider publicity for the newsletter and SVME by sending the newsletter electronically to professional groups, targeted potential SVME members, students, companies, etc., around the world and at no cost. Finally, receipt of such a document by Society members who have email but have not joined the Vetethic list might stimulate them to join the list.

An electronically distributed newsletter would not replace the hard-copy version, which would be mailed to any SVME member who wants it.

2. POINT COUNTERPOINT DISCUSSIONS. Although our Vetethic list is an optimal forum for the presentation of differing positions, there is something to be said for presenting debates in print. They can be more focused and polished.

3. BOOK AND PAPER REVIEWS. From time to time the newsletter has contained book reviews. I would like to make this a regular and expanded feature of the newsletter. (If any of you would like to review a book for the next issue, please let me know.)

4. PARTICIPATION BY MEMBERS. I would like to involve more members in the

writing of articles or items for the newsletter. If you are interested in making any kind of contribution, please contact me at P.O. Box 478, Arlington, MA 02174 or by email at <jtannenbaum@earthlink.net>.

Jerrold Tannenbaum



New Member Profiles

Leanne Alworth, DVM is a resident in the Office of Laboratory Animal Medicine at the University of Missouri in Columbia, MO. She has a general interest in veterinary ethics.

William Barry is a pre-veterinary student at Washington State University. He is interested in all areas of veterinary ethics, but especially those ethical dilemmas encountered by private practitioners and research scientists.

Lilan Basse is a fourth year student at Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine. She also has a B.S. in wildlife biology from Washington State University.

Corrado Columbo, DVM is an Italian practitioner interested in veterinary ethics. His interest is especially related to his charge in the Italian Association of Private practitioners (www.sivelp.it) as a member of the National Secretariat.

Edward Dimmick is a fourth year veterinary student at Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine. His interests in veterinary ethics are general, but his current focus is on the responsibilities of instructors and administration to students.

Julie Donan is an undergraduate philosophy major/pre-veterinary medicine student, at the University of Kentucky, in Lexington.

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics Newsletter

Volume 4 Numbers 1-2 May 1998

Page 7

Lili Duda, VMD is a veterinary oncologist at the University of Pennsylvania Veterinary Hospital. Her interest in biomedical ethics started as an undergraduate philosophy major applying to veterinary school. It continued as she worked with veterinary school faculty at the University of Pennsylvania to develop an alternative to the junior surgery course that was ethically acceptable to herself and a classmate (as well as the professors who needed to insure an acceptable and feasible educational experience). She has been a member of the Veterinary Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania's (VHUP's) subcommittee on ethics since its inception in 1994. In her role as a veterinary oncologist she deals with difficult ethical considerations on a daily basis, including informed consent, paternalism, issues of extraordinary care in veterinary patients (their hospital has a specific policy to deal with this issue), and problems of limited resources. She's is also currently pursuing a Masters in bioethics, and was overjoyed that among the 20 students accepted to Penn's first class in this program, there are not 1 but 2 veterinarians.

Brian Forsgren, DVM is a private practitioner in Cleveland, Ohio and the Director of the Cleveland Animal Protective League. He is particularly interested in changing cultural landscape and how "attitudes" impact delivery of veterinary care to humane society and animal control animal populations. He is also acutely sensitive to ethics education and its exposure to veterinary students.

Wendi Harshyne is a graduate student at Allegheny University. She is pursuing a Masters degree in laboratory animal science.

Karen Hirsch, DVM is a small animal/exotic animal veterinarian. Her main interests in veterinary ethics are: 1) The application of ethics in veterinary Schools and practices: Do students and practitioners realize that many of their decisions include ethical components? 2) The decision-making process involved in keeping exotic species as pets; and 3) Medical technology and how we use it; just because we can, should we?

Jeni Hood, BVMS is a veterinarian with an arts background working as an Animal Welfare Officer in Western Australia. She is currently completing a PhD on hereditary nephritis in the Bull Terrier as a model for Alport Syndrome in humans. She lectures and tutors part time in the Veterinary School at Murdoch University in animal behaviour, welfare and ethics. She views herself as a rather inexperienced Jill of all trades. She looks forward to communicating with like-minded veterinarians.

Kay Hossner, DVM is a part-time relief veterinarian and consultant to the California Veterinary Medical Board. Her interest in veterinary ethics focuses on the effects of ethical dilemmas on veterinarians personally and professionally. She would like to see the encouragement of all veterinarians to re-examine with a mind free of pre-conceived ideas, our relationships with animals and the issues that surround them.

Joanne Huyler, DVM is the Assistant Campus Veterinarian at the Laboratory Animal Resources Center at Washington State University. Her interest in the Society is to encourage ethical practices in biomedical research and to provide education for the necessity of such ethical practices.

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics Newsletter

Volume 4 Numbers 1-2 May 1998

Page 8

Amy Markiewicz is a graduate student working on a Masters degree in laboratory animal science at Allegheny University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. She writes: "Being involved with research animals, ethics questions are always being asked and dealt with. Therefore, obtaining all of the knowledge available in ethical practice is extremely valuable. Working in the biomedical research field, I will not only be working with investigators, but veterinarians and want to promote the highest ethical behavior possible."

Francois Martin, PhD is the Assistant Director of the People Pet Partnership at Washington State University in Pullman.

Matthew H. Myles, DVM is a post-doctoral fellow in the Office of Laboratory Animal Medicine at the University of Missouri in Columbia, MO. His interest in veterinary ethics is in how it relates to animal rights and use in research.

Danielle Newman is a second year veterinary student as well as the vice president of the newly formed Veterinary Ethics Club at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Veterinary Medicine.

Ernest D. Olfert, DVM is a laboratory animal veterinarian, for 25+ years at the University of Saskatchewan. He is also a member of the Canadian Association for Laboratory Animal Medicine, the Canadian Association for Laboratory Animal Science, AALAS, and ASLAP. He notes that in their courses for graduate students (one specifically on research animal use, and one general animal welfare one that focuses on agricultural animals), the ethical issues get a lot of discussion. He lectures at the Veterinary School on the general area of animal welfare/rights/veterinary responsibilities. In his other life he has been a long time

worker for the Saskatchewan SPCA, involved in managing the program of enforcing the Animal Protection Act.

Dott. Pasqualino Santori is from Rome, Italy. He is the President of the Commission of Veterinary Bioethics in Italy.

Kristen Strommer is a pre-veterinary student with a degree in anthropology, from San Francisco. She is currently a veterinary technician and pre-veterinary student. She writes: "My interests in veterinary ethics stem from two seemingly disparate aspects of my background: my academic work in the social sciences and my employment history as a veterinary technician. Through my undergraduate and post-baccalaureate studies in anthropology, I developed an interest in cultural beliefs surrounding the value of animal life, and in the efficacy of educational projects directed at changing those beliefs. Through my work as a technician, I have been able to witness how such beliefs can surface in the context of the veterinary clinic -- particularly in terms of client decisions regarding the treatments recommended for their pets, but also with respect to professional decisions. am primarily interested in the role of economics in shaping attitudes toward animal care."

Amy Ujicki is a pre-veterinary student at Barnard College, Columbia University in New York City. She was working at the Animal Medical Center when she first became aware of this Society and the Newsletter, and she is interested in receiving more information about veterinary ethics. She is presently studying in Australia where she is hoping to visit some veterinary clinics.

Rhea White, DVM teaches at the Koret School of Veterinary Medicine, the Hebrew

University, Jerusalem, Israel. Her major field is anesthesiology; however she also teaches half of the ethics course for first year veterinary students.

Plenary speakers included Tom Hamm, Franklin Loew, Susan Paris, Andrew Rowan, and Jerrold Tannenbaum.



Noteworthy Member Activities

Larry Carbone has left his position as Clinical Laboratory Animal Veterinarian with the Center for Research Animal Resources, Cornell University, to focus full-time on writing his PhD dissertation. His project has the working title "Who speaks for animals?" and is an examination of the role of expert knowledge in setting animal welfare public policy. He can be reached at <larry_carbone@monterey.edu> or by mail at 151 Surf Way #21, Monterey, CA 93940.

David Morton writes: "I am interested in the ethical issues surrounding society's treatment of animals and humans, particularly the moral relativism that exists across Europe, and also worldwide. More specifically, the use of animals in research and when it is NOT justified on a harm benefit analysis; and when surgical mutilations can be justified for economic and social human gains in farming and companion animals. Measuring animal wellbeing and encouraging 'best practice' play a large, but not exclusive part, in this arena. Finally, the reconciliation between duty and rights based theories in many areas of animal use, and how these lead varyingly into government policy."

A number of SVME members participated in the American College of Laboratory Animal Medicine (ACLAM) Bioethics Forum held at the Pheasant Run Resort in St. Charles, Illinois, on May 4-6. Lanny Kraus organized the entire event.



Course Announcement

Alan Beck, Director, Center for Applied Ethology and Human Interaction, School of Veterinary Medicine, Purdue University, will teach a five-day seminar, *The Animals in Our World: Use and Abuse*. The seminar is part of Ethics in Practice and the Professions, the annual summer workshop offered by The Association for Practical and Professional Ethics, August 2-6 in Missoula, Montana.

Description of Dr. Beck's seminar: Over millions of years, humans have learned how to use animals to enhance our lives and survival. Managing nature and even breeding new animals for human purposes has meant that we have an ever increasing dependence on the animals that share our world. In addition to learning not to abuse animals, we must learn to understand the nature of our relationship to them. This seminar will consider the assumptions and conceptualizations implicit in the use of animals for experimentation, human consumption, companionship, and therapeutic assistance as well as the use of animals by activist groups.

Registration fee is \$375. Low-cost housing is available on the University of Montana campus or at special rates at hotels adjoining campus. Please contact appe@indiana.edu or Deni Elliott at the address below for further information.

Deni Elliott

Practical Ethics Center
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812
Email: Deni@selway.umt.edu
Phone: 406/243-5744 Fax: 406/243-6633

Book Reviews

Robin Cook: *Chromosome 6*. New York, Berkley Books, 1998. ISBN 0-425-16124-2. Paperbound, \$7.50 (US), \$9.99 (Canada). Hardcover edition published in 1997 by G.P. Putnam's Sons

Do you like exciting summer reading, but feel guilty about spending time on books that are not relevant to science or ethics? If so, or even if you are an unashamed reader of lighter fare, I heartily recommend this book.

Robin Cook is the master of the medical thriller. He seems to produce novel a year, which have included *Coma*, *Fatal Cure*, and *Contagion*. Some of these books are better than others. *Chromosome 6* may be his best.

The subject of this book is xenotransplantation, and the ethical, economic, and social issues it raises. Interestingly, Cook does not even mention the concern that is most often expressed regarding xenografts, namely the potential danger of xenozoonoses to transplant recipients and others. In my view, this is not a weakness of the novel, but a strength. Cook concentrates on some of the ethical problems xenotransplantation could pose even if it turns out to be completely safe to humans from a medical standpoint. His book thus raises a sharp challenge to those who restrict the ethical discussion of xenotransplantation to issues relating to potentially transmittable diseases.

It is difficult to tell much of the story of the novel without divulging some of its surprising -- but entirely plausible -- twists and turns. I will reveal that Cook imagines a large corporate enterprise that raises animals for xenografts and performs transplantation surgery in a remote African nation, far away from potential regulation. Involved also are a geneticist

who is thrilled by the scientific challenges of xenotransplantation; a veterinarian whose allegiance wavers between his animals, the science, and monetary reward; physicians who will stop at nothing to attract wealthy patients; corporate managers whose focus is on the bottom line; and even some shady characters from the criminal underworld.

In a nutshell, people, some but not all of whom are yet ill, pay a substantial fee to have their genetic material inserted into a bonobo embryo. The result is a transgenic "double," selected organs of which are completely compatible with the body of the human counterpart. The animals are allowed to live at large on an island, far away from contact with people, until an organ is needed for transplantation to the human.

Needless to say, a few things that were unexpected happen. The disturbing events raise questions about profit-driven medical research, our obligations to animals, and what it means to be human.

A splendid read.

Jerrold Tannenbaum



Gary L. Francione: *Rain Without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement*. Philadelphia, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1996. ISBN 1-56639-461-9. Paperbound, \$22.95; ISBN 1-56639-460-0. Hardcover. (cloth), \$59.95

The author of this book, Gary Francione, is a Professor of Law at Rutgers University Law School where he co-directs the Rutgers Animal Rights Law Center. He is also co-founder of Attorneys for Animal Rights. In 1992, Mr. Francione with a co-author, Dr. Tom Regan, published an article in *The Animals Agenda* (Jan/Feb

1992) in which it was stated that "...the philosophies of animal rights and animal welfare [are] separated by irreconcilable differences ... and ... reforms grounded in animal welfare [are] morally at odds with those sanctioned by the philosophy of animal rights ... the enactment of animal welfare measures actually impedes the achievement of animal rights. ... The goal of the Animal Rights Movement is nothing less than the *total* liberation of nonhuman animals from human tyranny." *Rain Without Thunder* explains in detail what was meant by these statements.

Mr. Francione reviews various theoretical foundations for various "rights" and "welfare" philosophies and concludes that "...animal rights theory recognizes that animals have inherent value that cannot be sacrificed to achieve 'benefit' for humans. Animal welfare, unlike animal rights, rests on the notion that animals are *property* and that virtually *every* animal interest can be sacrificed in order to obtain 'benefits' for people." Throughout the book he distinguishes between three types of people who work for animals, i.e., the classical welfarists, the "new welfarists," and the animal rightists.

The author makes the case that classical animal welfarists accept that animals are property and that it is morally acceptable to use animals for human benefit but that they should be well treated while they are alive and being used. The "new welfarists" are defined as being those persons who advocate animal rights but believe that such rights can be ultimately achieved by incremental improvements in animal welfare with concomitant increases in societal concern about animals (but they imply support of the theory that animals are property by going along with improvements in animal care). The animal

rightist is defined as a person who rejects outright that animals are property and insists on complete abolition of the use of animals for any human benefit.

Mr. Francione goes on to conclude that only by incrementally destroying the legal concept of animals as property can true animal rights ever be achieved. Late in the book, he states, "In a sense, we are really only talking about *one* right -- the right not to be treated as property. ... As long as animals are regarded as property, we cannot really talk about their rights. That property cannot have rights follows from what it is to be property. ... We can be responsible *for* property, but not *to* property."

Those interested in exploring the philosophical foundation of the contemporary animal rights movement should definitely read this book.

Richard C. Simmonds

[Editor's Note: Dick Simmonds' review was originally published in the *ASLAP Newsletter*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 1997, pp. 10-11. Reprinted here with permission of ASLAP.]



James Serpell: In the Company of Animals: A Study of Human-Animal Relationships. Cambridge University Press, Canto Edition, 1996. ISBN: 0-521-57779-9, Paperbound, \$11.95

This volume, which is in effect, a second edition, is an updated version of the first edition published in 1986. Taking into account the considerable information that has been presented on the issue of human-animal interactions in recent years, this edition is well-documented. There are 650 footnotes to over 400 references in books and articles. Nearly 70 of the citations are to books and articles published since 1990. A notable advancement in this edition is

the additional information and documentation in the area of the beneficial aspects of pet ownership on human health.

While the book is subdivided into 4 parts, there are two primary thrusts of the book: Discussions of the interactions of humans with companion animals and the interactions of humans with agricultural and wild animals. The contrasting attitudes towards these two types of animals, introduced a "A Paradox" in Part I, is the glue that holds these two aspects of the book together.

Starting out with a rather disparaging description of pig husbandry, Serpell sets the stage for a blanket condemnation of the agricultural use of animals in the first chapter entitled "Of Pigs and Pets." While stopping short of the triteness of referring to the treatment of pigs as torture, a preview of his recurrent theme of opposing animal agriculture is revealed in his comment on page 13: "The fact that this principle also ensures that the livestock involved are subjected to a lifetime of continual deprivation, distress and discomfort seems to be largely irrelevant; merely an unfortunate by-product of the harsh, economic necessities of life."

Still in the same chapter, he then summarizes statistics about pet ownership and the criticisms that have been lodged against this activity. "They make little practical or economic contribution to human society." (page 19). However, rather than to continue this condemnation of pet ownership, Serpell refutes the evidence presented against this 'gratuitous perversion' (page 24) by a long line of pet haters dating back to Plutarch. In defending pet ownership, Serpell invokes a novel argument on page 20 that the disparagement of pet ownership is in part a ploy used by humans to justify their cruelty to agricultural animals.

Chapter 2, entitled "Substitutes for People," is a comprehensive analysis of the argument that pet owners are unable to sustain normal human relationships and therefore retreat to the company of animals.

Properly debunking sensationalist stories and ugly rumors, the net result of this chapter is a draw between the pro- and anti-pet lobbies. In Chapter 3, "Instruments of Follie," Serpell is a confessor for the extreme decadence that has occurred in the past to pamper pets. He makes little more than a token effort to counter the criticisms of the excesses associated with pet ownership.

However, in the next chapter, "Pets in Tribal Societies" he begins to restore the validity of pet ownership by introducing a discussion of the symbiotic nature of human-animal interactions in primitive societies. This argument is developed further in Chapter 5, "A Cuckoo in the Nest." This insightful chapter reveals the breadth of Serpell's understanding of animal behavior and interactions and is one of the most interesting chapters in the book. It starts with a description of parasitism between animals. This leads to the question of whether pets could also be viewed as parasites. Like the cuckoo which disguises the eggs it lays in the nest of host birds, Serpell poses the question: Do cats and dogs parasitize their human hosts by mimicking the characteristics of human infants? Serpell concludes this chapter by citing the South American giant cowbird, which also deposits its eggs in the nest of host birds, as an example of a potentially parasitic behavior that is symbiotic. In this case the interloping progeny of the cowbird protect the host bird's progeny from fly infestations!

Crossing this bridge from parasitism to symbiosis, Serpell begins Part III of the book which presents his "Alternative

View." This view not only vindicates, but openly endorses pet ownership. In "Pets as Panacea" he describes the therapeutic nature of animals for personal reassurance as well as for political gain (pages 103-104). Chapter 7, "Health and Friendship," is a continuation of the theme of the previous chapter, but it delves more deeply into the social aspects of the human psyche and how it is affected by the presence of other living beings. The insights into human nature offered by Serpell in this chapter are as knowledgeable as any I have encountered in the psychological literature. On a personal note, I found the comments on page 116 to be revealing to me of why "Richard Cory" chose to "... put a bullet through his head." Serpell's description of the importance of non-verbal communication between humans and animals, as well as from human to human is also informative and well delineated.

The final chapter in this section, "Four-Legged Friends," discusses the physical and behavioral characteristics of the species we choose as pets. Characteristics of the animals that suit them to providing for human needs, include brilliant coloration, small size, furriness, obedience, unconditional love and many others. Once again Serpell shows his insight into human and animal psyches by describing specific aspects of the human-animal interaction that provide rewards to both pet owner and pet alike. Somewhat tongue in cheek, Serpell even points out how the experience of verbally relaying your troubles to your pet has a potential benefit over non-interventional psychotherapy: "Furthermore, pets have an advantage over human therapists in that one can stroke and cuddle them at the same time." (page 141). He also provides an informed discourse on the value of pet interactions in human development. It is difficult if not

impossible to read this chapter without having a great appreciation for the value of pets in our lives.

Had Serpell chosen to end this book at this point, it would be a masterpiece. However, having committed to the argument that agricultural usage of animals compromises our appreciation of pets, he continues the text with a Final Part entitled: "Exploitation and Sympathy: a Conflict of Interests." This section which has 4 chapters entitled: "The Myth of Human Supremacy", "Killer with a Conscience", "Licensed to Kill", and "The Fall from Grace" reveals such a disparaging view of humanity that this reviewer's impression was that if it were in his power, humanity would be returned to the Garden of Eden and the Tree of Knowledge would be chopped down. Even Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation* is quoted in Serpell's diatribe against humankind.

In this final section Serpell appears to be on a mission to instill in his readers a sense of guilt for any actions towards animals that he views as transgressions against them. He develops a rationale for why we should feel guilty by a variety of techniques: appealing to our tendency to anthropomorphize, by citing religious ceremonies and taboos related to the killing of animals, by endorsing denigrations of the occupation of being a butcher or slaughterman, and by claiming that we deliberately deceive ourselves as to the criminality of our actions toward agricultural animals. In summarizing the penultimate chapter he makes statements such as: "...we fabricate elaborate and often mythological justification for their suffering that absolves us of blame.; and "...we have been practicing this form of self-deception for so long...The myths have become reality, the fantasies, fact.";

"Instead of questioning our supposedly objective, economic relations with other species, or the morality that governs our ruthless exploitation of animals and nature we tend to ridicule or denigrate those who take the opposite view." (page 211).

The last chapter seems the most ill-advised and Serpell fails to sustain the logical strength that characterizes the earlier parts of the book. He contradicts himself on the impact of hunting (pages 216 and 217) and makes unwarranted claims of nutritional superiority in hunter-gatherer societies (page 214). He blames the transition from hunter-gatherer societies to agriculturally sustained societies as causing warfare and imperialism suggesting: "And once again, the societies that emerged victorious from this struggle were the most ruthless, the most adept at dehumanizing their enemies and treating them as vermin or as beasts of burden." (page 226). With rhetoric approaching that of a preacher of Hell, Fire and Damnation, Serpell suggests that we may be nearing the end of the world because of the ruthlessness of modern day society, stating: "Or we can approach this crisis in our usual ruthless bull-in-a-china-shop manner, and rely on some charismatic and, probably, psychopathic politician or general to lead us into a brave new world."

Although he tries to end the book on a positive note returning to the beneficial characteristics of pet ownership, Serpell has now placed their human masters in such a negative light, that one is tempted to ask him whether companion animals would be better off being free of such evil masters.

Overall, this is a well-written book. It reads almost as easily as a novel, reflecting Serpell's talent for conveying his message

while telling a story. Despite my philosophical differences with the viewpoint of the author, I found it to be an enjoyable book to read and one that provided me with an abundance of knowledge and insight. I would encourage everyone who is interested in dealing with the issue of human and animal interactions to include this important treatise in their must-read category.

Robert Speth

Original Discussions

President-Elect's Message:

Penicillin and the Tuskegee Syphilis Study

Recently I had the honor of presenting the T.S. Williams Lecture at the 33rd Annual Meeting of the Tuskegee Veterinary Alumni Association. T.S. Williams was one of the first deans of the Tuskegee University School of Veterinary Medicine and his work to establish the School of Veterinary Medicine to its present level of excellence is legendary. Tuskegee University was recently awarded a \$4 million dollar grant to establish a Bioethics Center and they asked me to talk on the issue of Veterinary Bioethics.

I dedicated the talk to the memory of Signe Bustad, the loving wife and inspiration of our Dean Emeritus, Leo Bustad. Signe was one of the first people in the United States to use a hearing ear dog. She passed away in March at the age 79 following a long battle with cancer.

While the title of my talk was "Why the Veterinary Profession Must Reestablish Itself as the Leading Animal Welfare Advocate", in researching the talk I discovered an interesting link between the British Anti-vivisectionist Movement and the Tuskegee Syphilis study. I would like

to share this story with our members, as I believe the lesson is still applicable today and will continue to be applicable in the future.

The first indication that products formed by the *Penicillium* mold had antibiotic properties dates back to the 1870s, a time when Pasteur's germ theory of infectious disease was still a hotly debated topic. In *Murder, Magic and Medicine* John Mann credits Sir John Burdon-Sanderson as being the first to demonstrate "... that certain *Penicillium* molds would prevent the growth of bacteria in culture." Private correspondence of Joseph Tyndall and Thomas Huxley between 1874 and 1876 (cited by John Crellin, in *The History of Antibiotics* suggests that they had also observed this phenomenon. However, neither of these observations could be applied to infectious disease until Koch demonstrated that anthrax bacteria, taken from an infected animal and injected into a healthy animal, caused the healthy animal to develop anthrax. This experiment, which validated Pasteur's germ theory of disease, is an example of how important animal research was to our discovery that germs that could be transmitted from animal to animal. It is noteworthy to my arguments that Koch worked in Germany.

The story unfolds further with the subsequent studies of Pasteur, whose work was vigorously opposed by British anti-vivisectionists who wrote torrents of hate mail to him, (R. Vallery-Radot, *The Life of Pasteur*, 1927, p. 334). Pasteur showed that injection of some bacteria into animals could inhibit the growth of anthrax bacilli, leading him to suggest in 1877 that this could "justify perhaps the greatest hopes for therapeutics." Unfortunately, this prophetic statement was not to come to

fruition for more than 60 years, in part due to the fact that the anti-vivisectionist movement became very powerful in Europe. Crellin describes it as, "... anti-vivisectionist attacks upon Louis Pasteur and his rabies vaccine became almost a monomania in Britain." Crellin describes how this anti-animal research sentiment inhibited studies of antibiotics in Britain causing researchers to search for "alternative approaches" to using animals. Quoting Baron Joseph Lister, physician to Queen Victoria, in an 1898 letter describing a much earlier breakthrough he had made with regard to surgical procedures, "...I frequently had recourse to experiment on animals. One of these occurs to me which yielded particularly valuable results, but which I certainly should not have obtained if the present law [the 1876 Cruelty to Animals Act] had been in force." So as we can see, the anti-vivisectionist forerunners of today's animal rights activists had a chilling effect on animal research. This pressure undoubtedly suppressed the work that might have been done in the late 19th century leading to a much earlier recognition of the value of penicillin and other antibiotics to treat infectious diseases.

Lister himself is said to have used a *Penicillium* mold extract as a salve to heal an abscess afflicting a nurse in 1884, but in the absence of systematic study, it was viewed as a curiosity rather than a breakthrough. Since the penicillin in those early extracts was highly unstable and contained a variety of compounds, there is little doubt that the preponderance of failures of the mold to cure infections contributed to the lack of sustained interest in this material. Again, in view of the power of the anti-vivisectionists in Britain at that time, it is readily apparent

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics Newsletter

Volume 4 Numbers 1-2 May 1998

Page 16

why this material was never studied in animals.

Even in 1928 when Alexander Fleming described the value of the penicillium mold to inhibit the growth of staphylococci and many other pathogenic bacteria, his first two efforts to use it to treat human infections were failures. The third and last attempt by Fleming to use the mold extract to treat an eye infection was successful, but was not enough to convince the medical community of the value of penicillin as an antibiotic. Once again, the concept of testing the material on animals seems to have been ignored, and penicillin was put back on the shelf!

It was not until 1940, when Howard Florey and his colleagues injected 8 mice with a lethal dose of staphylococci and cured four of them with repeated penicillin treatments, that penicillin was truly discovered and recognized as the antibiotic we know it to be today.

How then does this relate to the Tuskegee Syphilis Study? In 1932 when the Tuskegee Syphilis study was begun, the only therapies for syphilis were the arsenic containing drugs Salvarsan and its close congener, Neosalvarsan. These drugs were extremely toxic, and it was necessary to use them for a long period of time, requiring an extraordinary degree of patient compliance. In addition, the cost of this therapy was extremely high. Since many people could not sustain the therapy and oftentimes the cure appeared to be worse than the disease, public health officials decided to select a population of men afflicted with chronic syphilis to determine how harmful the disease would be if left untreated. Hence, we incurred the infamous Tuskegee Syphilis Study.

So, if Florey's study had been undertaken in the 19th century instead of the 20th century, we might have had

penicillin at least 50 years earlier. And, if we had had penicillin available to cure syphilis in 1932, there would have been no need to even consider a study such as The Tuskegee Syphilis Study. Moreover, countless millions of lives might have been saved and immeasurable human suffering might have been prevented, if penicillin had been discovered in a timely fashion.

Why is this story relevant to today and the future? It is because we face the same challenges today as we did in the 19th century. We should never forget the words of George Santayana: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." There are diseases today, and future diseases lurking on the horizon, for which the discovery of cures will require animal research and experimentation. If we allow today's anti-vivisectionists to block animal research we will surely cause horrors and suffering that will dwarf any that occur in animal research.

I look forward to seeing as many of you as possible at the Annual Meeting in Baltimore this year.

Robert Speth

20

AAVAW Meeting

The American Association of Veterinarians for Animal Welfare will hold its annual meeting on Monday, July 27, at the Renaissance Hotel in conjunction with the AVMA Annual Convention. SVME member **Brian Forsgren** will be the presiding officer. The topic of the day-long session will be "Veterinary Ethics, Animal Welfare, and the New Millennium." Speakers will include SVME members **Don Draper**, **Patty Olson**, and **Andrew Rowan**. For additional information please contact bforsgren@compuserve.com.

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics Newsletter

Volume 4 Numbers 1-2 May 1998

Page 17

A Different View of Animal Liberation: Reflections on the Fourth Plenary SVME Session

Adrian R. Morrison

I enjoyed reading the interesting proceedings of the plenary session of the society held last summer and wish I could have attended. Here are the comments I would have made.

Ione Smith is correct to urge full discussion of the animal-rights movement and not pass it off with sloganeering. Attempting to understand what animal rights means to different people and what motivates their statements and actions is a must. Also required is a clear-headed analysis of what provides the momentum to the movement. It is not, of course, the well-meaning souls who love animals and contribute vast sums to animal-rights organizations in toto that are driving the movement: They merely provide the fuel. Rather, the few leaders and the relatively few fanatics they have inspired are the ones who seriously harm human society -- while contributing little of lasting value to animal welfare. The rest of us (including the many with only a vague idea of what animal rights mean) just want to do our best for animals and people. Ultimately, though, we have to make a choice. And that is the essential point to make when speaking to the public. Dr. Smith mentions two of those leaders in a rather benign way, Ingrid Newkirk and Peter Singer. In the spirit of giving their viewpoints fair coverage, I would like to provide a more extensive review of their thinking.

Ingrid Newkirk's now immortal statement, "A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy," was originally coupled with this: "They're all mammals" in an interview with Washingtonian writer Katie McCabe in 1986. And it was preceded by "Animal

liberationists do not separate out the human animal." Attempts to put a more humane spin on her colorful statement came from other directions. If one doubts Newkirk's misanthropy, read a few others that no one has tried to sweeten as far as I know. Students should hear them and then be asked whether they want to follow such a leader. Asked if animal research were to lead to a cure for AIDS, Newkirk replied: "We'd be against it." (*Vogue*, 1989) And another: "Humans have grown like a cancer. We're the biggest blight on the face of the planet." (*Reader's Digest*, 1990). Also, "I am not a morose person but I would rather not be here. I don't have any reverence for life, only for the entities themselves. I would rather see a blank space where I am." (*Washington Post*, 1983). And a most disturbing juxtaposition: "Six million Jews died in concentration camps, but six billion broiler chickens will die this year in slaughterhouses." (*The Washingtonian*, 1990).

Her apparent ignorance of science should also be a part of any discussion. On NBC's "Today" on Sunday about five years ago, I heard this remarkable claim by her (stated here as accurately as I can remember): "It's only the Joe Six-pack scientists who use animals these days. The Einsteins use tissue cultures and computers." Nobel Laureate Joseph Murray, whose work with dogs provided us with the marvel of kidney transplantation, laughed heartily when I suggested the category of scientists in which he seemed to fit.

Let's now take a look at just what "equal consideration for different beings" means to Singer (*Animal Liberation*, 1975) in practical terms. Should we deny ourselves the ability to survive through using

animals to solve medical problems? Singer says we can: "if a single experiment could cure a major disease, that experiment would be justifiable." However, he adds: "Since a speciesist bias, like a racist bias, is unjustifiable, an experiment cannot be justifiable unless the experiment is so important that the use of a retarded human being would also be justifiable." He adds: "I do not believe it could never be justifiable to experiment on a retarded human. If it were really possible to save many lives by an experiment that would take just one life, and there were no other way those lives could be saved; it might be right to do the experiment."

A number of readers will take umbrage at these sentiments (to put it mildly), but Singer is really not supporting -- at least I do not think he is -- the idea of experimenting on retarded humans. He is setting the reader up to accept the statement that "not one tenth of one per cent of the experiments now being performed on animals would fall into this category." Of course not, one would have to be mightily ignorant of the process of science to think so -- or to use this tactic to condemn the use of animals in research. For example, "commonplace" achievements such as open-heart surgery have depended on a host of unrelated "little" experiments, none of which would have cured a single illness. It would be next to impossible -- I will even say impossible -- for scientists ".... to save many lives by an experiment that would take just one [animal] life..."

To support his philosophy (and his cause) Singer trivializes a number of research projects in one chapter, "Tools for Research," that is full of errors and half-truths (Russell and Nicoll, *Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. & Med.*, 1996, 211: 109-154). By so doing, he makes certain that maximizing

good comes out in favor of animals: Enough good cannot come from trivial experiments to outweigh the suffering of animals.

One might argue that Singer lacks training in science and thus misrepresents science out of ignorance. There may be some -- but only some -- truth to this, for he clearly has no understanding of what makes a grant application stand out sufficiently to attract monetary support. He assumes: "A proposal for a new experiment with animals is something that the administrators of research funds will be ready to support, if they have in the past supported other experiments on animals. New non-animal-using methods will seem less familiar and will be less likely to receive support."

In fact, it is the quality of the applicant's ideas and how well they are presented, how the data will be analyzed and interpreted and that the most appropriate approach (animal or non-animal) has been chosen that win the day. And it is scientists, not administrators, who rank proposals for funding or not. That scientists serving on review boards, who are trained to look for the clearest findings using the most refined methods available, would reject new approaches out of hand is just a silly idea.

I think it is telling that after questioning the judgment and good sense of the research establishment Singer does not hesitate to fall back on its authority to support one of his arguments. Listen as he responds to the hypothetical suggestion that we would have to extend our consideration to plants to avoid being speciesists because they might suffer pain as well, thereby condemning ourselves to starvation. "Although a recent popular book, *The Secret Life of Plants*, claimed

Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics Newsletter

Volume 4 Numbers 1-2 May 1998

Page 19

that plants have all sorts of remarkable abilities, including the ability to read people's minds, the most striking experiments cited in the book were not carried out at serious research institutions, and more recent attempts by researchers in major universities to repeat the experiments have failed to obtain any positive results." I happen to agree with Singer here, merely noting a convenient inconsistency in his views on the good judgment of scientists.

Although many (both adherents and opponents of the animal-rights movement) have assumed that Singer views humans and animals as moral equals, this is not so (although the practical effect of adhering to his philosophy would create that effect). Singer states: "The preference in normal cases, for a human life over the life of an animal when a choice has to be made is a preference based on the characteristics that normal humans have, and not on the mere fact that they are members of our own species who lack the characteristics of normal humans. We can no longer say that their lives are always to be preferred to those of other animals." He is comparing normal, adult animals here to human infants and sub-normal people, neglecting the damage of such an attitude to the workings of human society.

After asking students to consider the thinking behind a movement that continues to work against medical progress -- an excellent research program at Boys Town on the problem of deafness was shut down a couple of months after the plenary session thanks to the movement -- I find them taken aback by its philosophical underpinnings. Full disclosure, not sloganeering, is, indeed, the right tactic. And, I might add, one can reveal such thinking quietly and respectfully.

The effect is no less devastating.

Ione Smith responds:

I would like to make just a few short observations in response to Dr. Morrison's comments on my talk from the SVME meeting last July. In his essay, Dr. Morrison offers us some excellent examples of "fanatic" or "extreme"-sounding quotes from two leaders of the animal rights movement, Ingrid Newkirk and Peter Singer. Unfortunately, it seems that he has missed the point of my talk entirely.

Dr. Morrison appears to believe that a "full discussion" is one in which the views of one's opponent are soundly thrashed and/or ridiculed. In truth, however, a truly full and fair discussion is one in which views from both sides are given both thorough and sympathetic consideration. The "spirit of fair coverage" and "full disclosure" are not satisfied by focusing solely on the negative and extreme, but instead require that both negative and positive aspects of the views from both sides be given fair representation.

On the other hand, condemning animal rights philosophies or the animal rights movement as a whole on the basis of a few objectionable quotes, as Dr. Morrison seems to have done, would be just as fair as condemning all animal research simply because there are still scientists and philosophers who still believe that animals do not feel pain.

And by the way -- anyone who does NOT believe that humans are the "biggest blight on the face of the planet" has not looked around lately at the miles of asphalt and smog with which we have surrounded ourselves. Let's take off those blinders giving us such a conveniently narrow view of the world, and let's get a real unrestricted look at the philosophies surrounding us.

APPLICATION FORM

SOCIETY FOR VETERINARY MEDICAL ETHICS

NAME:

BUSINESS
ADDRESS:

HOME
ADDRESS:
(Optional)

ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS:

PLEASE SEND MAIL TO

Office: ☐

Home: ☐

OCCUPATION AND PRESENT POSITION:

ACADEMIC/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 values 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 ethics 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, medicine, law, political science, philosophy, and theology, to engage in cross-disciplinary 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)

Please mail this application to Dr. Robert Speth, VCAPP, College of Veterinary Medicine, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-6520. Dues are currently \$20 per year for full members and \$5 per year for students. Membership in SVME entitles all members to participate in the VETETHIC email list, which is open only to SVME members.

© Copyright 1998 Society for Veterinary Medical Ethics. All rights reserved.