

Lush Public Awareness Prize 2013

Background Paper

1 Executive Summary

The Lush Prize seeks to reward excellence and innovation by organisations working to remind the public that animal testing is on-going, in order to rally support for lobbying activities and other interventions and to ensure that this issue remains high on the political agenda. The criteria for selecting potential winners of the Lush Prize - Public Awareness category are:

- Raising public awareness of animal testing (ideally within consumer products rather than pharmaceuticals)
- Projects which ran in 2012 or 2013
- Excellence and innovation by organisations working in this field

1.1 Key findings

Thousands of NGOs (Non-Governmental Organisations) around the world campaign for an end to some form of, or all, animal testing. Some of these organisations campaign exclusively on the issue, others as part of a wider call for animal rights.

The variety of campaigns is huge: social media or internet-based campaigns; grassroots activism to multinational million dollar organisations; from wealthier countries with a long history of social justice movements to nations where the concept of animal rights is a recent phenomenon.

Traditional forms of protest are joined with innovative ways of spreading the message such as blogs, social networking sites and cruelty-free shopping guides available on mobile phone applications.

Public awareness campaigns aim to draw attention to issues and bring about behaviour and social change, changing behaviours rather than simply changing opinions; encouraging public engagement to form a personal state of connection with the issue.

1.2 Table of groups active in this sector

The core of this report is a table of NGOs active in the area of public awareness-raising and campaigning against animal testing. It covers dozens of organisations in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia and America.

Although there are thousands of organisations working in some way to create awareness of animal testing issues, our focus has been on those working to a larger extent on a national or international level and whose campaigns specifically include

topics relevant to the Lush Prize (rather than wider issues such as pharmaceutical research).

1.3 Conclusions and recommendations

This study analysed the public awareness work of dozens of NGOs around the world to highlight, and act against, the use of animals in testing. The following organisations have been short-listed because they are recognised for their particularly effective work on these issues. This list has been drawn up from a combination of nominations received and additional NGOs identified during research for this report.

Coordinamento Fermare Green Hill (Coordination to Close Green Hill) – Italy

For engaging massive public support for the closure of a company breeding beagles for laboratories; the seizing and re-homing by authorities of 2,700 dogs; encouraging political movement leading to some cities declaring themselves ‘vivisection free’ and national legislation to ban the breeding of dogs, cats and primates for testing and on certain areas of animal experimentation.

NOAH, Menschen für Tiere – Germany

Unique use of visual advertising, photographic and video materials to reveal the reality of animal testing to consumers.

The Ghosts in Our Machine – Canada

Film based on the work of photographer Jo-Anne McArthur exploring human relationships with animals and their exploitation in laboratories, farms, etc., around the world.

SAFE – New Zealand

Partnered with HSI to launch ‘Be Cruelty Free’ in New Zealand to ban the sale of animal tested products.

Humane Society International (HSI)

For its launch of ‘Be Cruelty Free’, a global campaign in partnership with NGOs worldwide, and awareness, scientific and lobbying activity in key countries such as Brazil, India and China.

PETA India

For its major role in the successful campaign to ban the testing of cosmetics on animals in the country.

New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAVS)

Project R&R works to end the use of chimpanzees in U.S. research and release them to sanctuaries. NEAVS has provided sanctuary funding, including establishing Lifetime Care Funds.

Andre Menache

Veterinary surgeon and scientific consultant for various NGOs campaigning against animal testing, Menache is a prolific public speaker and author of many scientific papers and reports.

Beagle Freedom Project

BFP has rescued over 60 beagles as well as other animals from labs in 3 countries in the past 18 months, rehoming them and raising the issue of animal testing to the public in innovated and compassionate ways.

2 Introduction

The animal protection movement has a long history in parts of Europe and the USA, with animal testing being a key issue for campaigners: e.g. the American Anti-Vivisection Society (AAVS) was formed in 1883, and the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV) in 1898, both inspired by the passing into British law in 1876 of the first regulation of vivisection, the Cruelty to Animals Act. Today, that movement is growing rapidly around the world, across Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa and South America.

Opinion polls show that a majority of consumers in many countries would prefer not to have cosmetics and other personal products tested on animals, and in 2013 the EU finally banned the marketing of animal-tested cosmetics (a testing ban on finished cosmetic products was introduced in 2004, followed by a ban on testing ingredients in 2009). Israel introduced a testing ban in 2010 and India in 2013.

Countries such as China and Brazil, which currently require cosmetics to pass animal tests before being allowed on the market, are being robustly challenged to implement effective non-animal testing methods and end animal use entirely.

There are still many challenges ahead, not only in widening the cruelty-free cosmetics message generally, but particularly in areas of toxicological research. Effective partnership between NGOs, regulators and companies has been building bridges and challenges are being met head on.

3 Public Awareness

The guidelines for the Public Awareness prize are:

Public Awareness of ongoing testing

Despite years of campaigning, animal testing has yet to be consigned to the history books where it belongs. However, partial legislative victories have led to the common misconception that animal testing, especially for cosmetics, no longer takes place.

It is vital therefore that the public is reminded that this cruel and unscientific practice does continue in many areas of the world. Support is essential for public awareness activities to ensure that this issue remains high on the political agenda. We are therefore seeking to reward excellence and innovation by organisations working in this field.

3.1 What is public awareness?

Public awareness campaigns are designed with the main objectives of drawing the public's attention to particular issues and bringing about behavioural and social change.

Within the animal rights movement a number of key methods (usually more than one at a time) have traditionally been used, including:

1. Public protests and information dissemination: mass marches and rallies, presentation of petitions, or simply an information stall in a town centre.
2. Press releases and media stories: aiming to place information in mass-media print and broadcast outlets. Reports covered in this way will be seen by some in the 'audience' as impartial and more trustworthy.
3. Direct action: everything from scaling a building in order to hang a banner, to a sit-in at a company's headquarters to the liberation of animals.
4. Exposéés: undercover investigations or thorough research (e.g. using freedom of information legislation) to obtain new evidence or information.
5. Use of celebrities: celebrity endorsements can create more media coverage and reach the larger audiences of those celebrities' fans.
6. Internet and social media: can take even the smallest campaign global and reach millions of people quickly; e-campaigns utilise specialist software to allow supporters to send personalised e-mails to political representatives, company CEOs and other 'targets'.
7. Conferences and seminars: assist in networking a range of stakeholders, to discuss a variety of views and lead to new ideas, tactics and goals. Can sometimes provide a greater air of professionalism, thereby reaching some audiences (e.g. regulatory bodies, media) who may have previously not taken the issue/NGO as seriously.

All of these methods can raise the level of exposure to the public but this does not always mean that awareness has been raised and it certainly does not always result in changing opinions or behaviours (“attention does not necessarily result in support”, according to Ronald D. Smith, Professor of Public Communication¹). There can be a temptation to believe that a few thousand ‘hits’ on a web page, or a thousand ‘likes’ on Facebook, or even a story in a national newspaper, amounts to a success. However, unless significant inroads are made on the way to achieving the overall goal (e.g. a ban on testing cosmetics on animals), these individual factors are no more than stepping stones.

For example, campaign strategist Chris Rose questions whether online campaigns are actually increasing participation. He suggests that “high effort campaigning [e.g. mobilising on the street or direct action, rather than signing online petitions or involvement in social media campaigns] actually creates motivational capital in the form of social bonds. If mobilisation mechanisms are not just to become a form of opinion polling, they need to have a bit of them that is difficult.”² He adds: “Even the person stopping on a High Street and taking a minute to write out their name and address on a list, was probably putting in greater effort, and making a greater commitment to confirm their view, than someone ‘liking’ an action on Facebook or retweeting it on their smartphone.”³

The impact that campaign events have both on public/media opinion and long term effects on the wider movement (the ethics of campaigning) is important to take into account when devising strategies. In his book *Strategic Planning for Public Relations*, Professor Ronald D. Smith states:

“in developing public relations strategies, give thought to the ethical considerations that underlie publicity stunts

- Does the action have any intrinsic value, or is it mainly for show?
- Will it be offensive? To whom?
- If it is offensive, does this matter to your organisation?
- Does the publicity stunt trivialise an otherwise serious topic?”⁴

3.2 Effective public awareness

Rather than discuss each of the usual tactics used by animal NGOs in more detail, we have focused here on some key elements about raising public awareness in general.

¹ Ronald D. Smith. *Strategic Planning for Public Relations*. Routledge, 2012

² [Is Online Increasing Participation in Campaigns?](#) Chris Rose. Presentation at the World PR Forum.

³ [Is ‘Online’ Increasing the Number of People Engaged in Campaigns?](#) 23.10.12.

⁴ Smith defines a publicity stunt as “merely a gimmick planned mainly to gain publicity, having little value beyond that”, as opposed to a ‘special event’ which is a staged activity “to gain the attention and acceptance of key publics.”

3.2.1 Changing behaviours rather than changing opinions:

Opinion polls have been widely used by NGOs to show public support for an end to animal testing, particularly for cosmetics (and some are referenced later in this paper). However, campaign strategist Chris Rose warns that campaigners should focus on outcomes (changing behaviours), not changing opinion.

In his paper 'Beware the Siren Songs of Opinion Polling',⁵ Rose states:

"Campaigns drawn into trying to navigate by what the polls say, or seduced into trying to win by changing 'public opinion', risk running aground and becoming stuck fast.

[...] The best strategic safeguard is to have a critical path based on events and activities which evidence shows will lead to outcomes, and not to deviate from it. As a rule campaigners should research, develop, test and then implement a plan, and not wait for public opinion.

[...] So plan your campaign around changing outcomes, without needing to change opinion polls, and in the end you will probably in fact change 'opinion'.

[...] For campaigns, the importance of behaviours is that they are intrinsic to real outcomes. To get less pollution, for instance, people must change what they do, not what they say. Which is why the approach I advocate is always to try to work back from the outcome you want, in order to plan a communications campaign. If not, countless pitfalls may ensnare you, of which the circular relationship between media, polling and pollsters is but one.

[...] To chase the chimera of changing opinion rather than changing outcomes, risks leading you round in circles".

3.2.2 Public engagement:

Making people aware of an issue is only the first step to change: public awareness needs to lead to public engagement (a personal state of connection with the issue). Those people need to be encouraged into taking action of some sort, whether to change their individual habits, practices or purchases; encourage others to also take action; or to lobby for legislative change.

Lorenzonia et al (2007),⁶ in a study of public attitudes to climate change, consider one of the most easily identified barriers to engagement to be "a lack of basic knowledge about causes, impacts and solutions to climate change. While there is information available (to those who wish to seek it), it is not necessarily taken up or translated into knowledge or action, for various reasons", including a lack of knowledge about where to find information and a lack of desire to seek information.

One reason for the success of the EU ban on animal testing of cosmetics is that NGOs and some cosmetics companies have made it easier for the public to engage and implement change: making them aware of issues (through investigations, media

5 [Beware the Siren Songs of Opinion Polling](#) June 2013. See also [Campaign Strategy Newsletter 86](#) – June 2013. Rose is also author of the book *How to Win Campaigns*, published by Routledge in 2010, an essential book for campaign managers.

6 Lorenzonia, I., Nicholson-Cole, S., Whitmarsh, L. Barriers perceived to engaging with climate change among the UK public and their policy implications. *Global Environmental Change* 17 (2007) 445–459.

coverage, street stalls, protests, etc.); providing information in attractive and easily-accessible ways (e.g. cruelty-free guides in booklet form, on websites and as mobile phone apps); and making high-quality, attractive, cruelty-free products easily available (e.g. high-street stores such as Lush and encouraging mainstream brands to sign up to recognised cruelty-free protocols and label products with the BUAV's Cruelty Free International bunny logo).

3.2.3 Visual representations:

According to the website 'New Tactics in Human Rights'⁷: "No matter what audience you are trying to reach, visual representations of the problem you are addressing can be a very strong asset". It provides an example of Greenpeace Lebanon mapping "environmental violations along the country's coast in order to educate the general public about the problem of toxic industrial waste and to pressure the government to institute policies to remedy the problem". This "turned dry, technical information into a compelling picture — making facts understandable to members of the public while attracting and holding their interest in its work, and at the same time moving them to take action to remedy the problem".

GIS mapping (computerised mapping for geographical information systems), used as part of the Lebanon campaign, is also being used to illustrate and combat other human rights problems, such as sex trafficking. The website concludes: "When we can see the extent of a problem, we are better equipped to respond to it".

Greenpeace provides many examples of effective use of visuals. Its recent publication *Down to Zero* reports on the NGOs campaign in Indonesia and elsewhere to stop deforestation for pulp and paper and palm oil products. The Greenpeace campaign was to make governments enforce their own policies and to change the supply chain of major multinational corporations. Visuals such as spoof TV ads and print adverts raised public awareness and embarrassed multinationals such as Unilever.

In March 2010 Greenpeace produced a campaign film, 'Give the Orang-utan a Break'. It was part of its campaign linking Nestlé, makers of KitKat chocolate bars, to rainforest destruction by the Sinar Mas paper group. *Down to Zero* reports:

"Our campaign launches with a provocative video in which an office worker bites into a KitKat containing a dead orang-utan's finger. Nestlé had the video removed from YouTube and threatened to delete all related comments on its Facebook page. This backfired spectacularly, as Greenpeace supporters rushed to re-upload the film and overwhelmed the company with emails and Facebook comments."⁸

The film was watched over 1.5 million times and eight weeks after its launch, Nestlé announced a zero deforestation policy that eliminated deforestation from its supply chain.

⁷ [Visual mapping to create public awareness and pressure for policy change.](#)

⁸ *Down to Zero: How Greenpeace is ending deforestation in Indonesia. 2003 - 2013 and beyond.* Greenpeace South East Asia – Indonesia. 2013.

John Sauven, Executive Director of Greenpeace UK, said: “If there’s one lesson I’d draw from what we did it is to be creative and fun. All campaigns need humour. To get Mattel to stop buying their packaging from companies destroying the rainforests we produced a short film of a camp Ken splitting up from Barbie. It went viral very quickly with 1.75 million views.”⁹

Despite the success of viral videos and fun, creative visuals, the animal rights movement appears to have been slower than environmental organisations in using them. Visuals do play an important role within public awareness campaigns by anti-vivisection organisations, but they tend to be more traditional documentary-style (graphic images, sad-voiced narration) longer films. A lot can be learned from the successful public awareness campaigns of other movements. (Good examples of unique, creative video and other visuals highlighting animal protection issues can be seen on the website of the German organisation NOAH, Menschen für Tiere - www.noah.de).

4 Campaigns are not in isolation

The focus of this report is on public awareness campaigns. However, many such campaigns include political lobbying as part of their key strategies. Lobbying is the subject of a separate Lush Prize and research paper. Although there is much cross-over between public awareness and lobbying and both will often be conducted by the same NGOs as part of an overarching campaign strategy, the two tactics are separated as much as possible for the purpose of these research papers.

5 Key campaign issues

In terms of animal testing issues relevant to the Lush Prize, public awareness campaigns have, not surprisingly, overwhelmingly focused on animal testing for cosmetics. Other campaigns have targeted areas such as the testing of household products (e.g. cleaning products), and specific species, mainly dogs, cats and primates.

5.1 5.1 EU cosmetics animal testing ban

The European campaign to ban cosmetics testing on animals has been probably the best publicised campaign relating to any area of animal testing. This may be because, in the main, the products tested are not essential: there are many products and ingredients which have been on the market for decades (so the long term safety or otherwise of them is known) and there is an almost limitless choice of products that have not been animal tested. In other words, using animals to test what are often seen as non-essential products could no longer be justified.

⁹ [Campaign Case Study: How Greenpeace Changed Corporate Behaviour Over Rainforest Destruction](#). 26.7.13.

High-profile campaigning, often with celebrity backing, resulted in consistent public support for a ban on testing cosmetics on animals. Opinion polls reveal the extent of this support:

In 1983, 78% of people in the UK considered it unacceptable “to use animals for testing and improving cosmetics”.¹⁰

Opinion polls conducted in 2001 and 2004 showed that 83% of women in the UK would be in favour of a Europe-wide ban on the sale of cosmetics that are tested on animals and 79% of people said they would be likely to swap to a brand that was not animal tested.¹¹ Polls for other European countries reveal similar results.¹²

In the USA, a poll commissioned by Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) in 2011 revealed that 72% of respondents agreed that testing cosmetics on animals is unethical; 78% agreed that the development of alternatives to animal testing for cosmetics testing is important; and 61% said that cosmetics and personal care product companies should not be allowed to test products on animals.¹³ These numbers are up significantly from a 2003 Gallup Poll that found 38% of Americans would support a complete ban on product testing on animals.

Due to this sustained campaigning the testing of cosmetics and their ingredients on animals was banned in the UK in 1998. The campaign on an EU level resulted in a ban on the testing of finished cosmetic products in 2004 and a testing ban on ingredients since 2009. A marketing ban followed, prohibiting the import and sale of products and ingredients tested on animals outside Europe after March 2009, with the exception of testing for three ‘toxicological endpoints’ which were considered harder to replace. In March 2013 a full marketing ban was introduced in the EU (although some ingredients will still be animal tested to meet other legislative requirements such as REACH chemical testing).

The issue was very much one of animal welfare, exposing the cruelty individual animals were subjected to in order to test an ingredient for lipstick or shampoo, for example. Parliamentary action was based on the ethics of the issue, with science being made to follow: impending bans forced cosmetics companies to look for non-animal testing methods.

Writing in support of the 2013 marketing ban, the Animal Welfare Intergroup said: The European Commission “has thoroughly assessed the impacts of the marketing ban and considers that there are overriding reasons to implement it. This is in line with what many European citizens believe firmly: that the development of cosmetics does not warrant animal testing.”¹⁴

10 Hans Gutbrod, HRC 30.4.13. [EU Bans Animal-Tested Cosmetics - What Can We Learn from Research?](#)

11 [Media release: Argos becomes BUAV Approved](#). BUAV, 13.2.10.

12 See section 2.1.5 of [Stakeholder Consultation on the 2013 Implementation date of the Marketing Ban – Cosmetics Directive](#). Submission by the European Coalition to End Animal Experiments. 2011.

13 [More Than a Makeup Trend: New Survey Shows 72 percent of Americans Oppose Testing Cosmetics Products on Animals](#). Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine.

14 [Entry into force of a full EU ban on animal testing for cosmetics welcomed but loophole needs to be closed](#) Intergroup 12.3.13.

The campaign for an EU ban was very much based on an ethical public opposition to animal testing. As PETA said in response to the March 2013 marketing ban: “The sales ban is a spectacular achievement. It declares that testing cosmetics on animals is wrong and – further – that profiting from that testing is wrong.”¹⁵

Hans Gutbrod, a blogger with the Humane Research Council, believes that the UK “offers the most instructive case on the campaign to end animal testing” because of its long-established anti-vivisection NGOs and 1998 success with a cosmetics testing ban.¹⁶

Gutbrod states that public awareness campaigns mobilised support “on a significant scale” and “translated sentiment into action”, with a 1999 IPSOS-MORI study finding that 20% of people claimed they had signed a petition on an animal welfare issue. He also notes that the European Coalition to End Animal Experiments, an organisation founded by the BUAV, collected 4 million signatures throughout Europe against cosmetics testing on animals.

In his assessment of the EU ban, Gutbrod refers to cosmetics company The Body Shop as an example of ‘providing attractive commercial alternatives’ and being a leader in ‘ethical consumerism’ in its specific offering of cruelty-free products. (The Body Shop was also a major promoter of the campaign to end animal testing).

(With the sale of the Body Shop to L’Oreal, a company that still tests on animals, there is debate about whether this is a company that should be supported – see footnote¹⁷)

Finally, Gutbrod comments on ‘expanding from the best constituency’: The EU ban is likely to have a global impact, “since global manufacturers will adapt to the rules of the world’s single largest market. The EU thus has an impact far beyond its borders”. Yet the data suggests that levels of concern about animal experimentation vary within the EU and “engaged countries seem to have brought others along”. In this way, “Britain’s ban on testing cosmetics on animals in 1998, as well as a number of similar measures in other countries, helped to bring about a broader change across Europe and beyond. This particular trajectory of success may suggest that one lesson is to consolidate gains in constituencies amenable to change, before taking the policy gains to the next level, bringing along less active groups. Put differently, in pursuing transformative change, one powerful strategy may be going deep before you go wide.”

15 PETA UK: [Cosmetics and Animal Testing: A Historic Victory](#)

16 Hans Gutbrod, HRC 30.4.13. [EU Bans Animal-Tested Cosmetics - What Can We Learn from Research?](#)

17 Body Shop: The Body Shop is owned by L’Oreal which continues to conduct some animal testing for cosmetics ingredients and does not have a ‘fixed cut-off date’ (which prevents the use of ingredients tested on animals after that date) ([Why doesn’t the Group have a label “not tested on animals”?](#)). Although Body Shop is an approved cruelty-free retailer under the BUAV’s Humane Cosmetics Standard, [the parent company L’Oreal is not](#). Other cruelty-free accreditations, such as the Australian Choose Cruelty Free, will not accredit companies unless all parent and subsidiaries are also accredited ([Criteria for Accreditation. Choose Cruelty Free](#)).

5.2 Individual Species

Several campaigns have highlighted the use of specific species in animal testing. These have generally been species seen by many members of the public as more 'intelligent' or more capable of suffering or are seen as 'pets'. The NGOs running these campaigns oppose experiments on all species but highlight these particular animals as a way of creating awareness and action on vivisection issues generally.

Primates have received the attention of many animal NGOs; for example:

- BUAV campaign 'Stop the Baby Trade' - www.buav.org/our-campaigns/primate-campaign - to end the international trade in non-human primates for research.
- New England Anti-Vivisection Society 'Project R&R' (Release & Restitution for Chimpanzees in U.S. Laboratories) - www.neavs.org/campaigns/randr - a campaign to end the use of chimpanzees in invasive biomedical research and provide them release and restitution in a sanctuary.
- Animal Defenders International 'My Mate's a Primate' - www.ad-international.org/mmmap - aims to end four ways in which primates are threatened or exploited: as bushmeat; in entertainment; the pet trade; and in experiments.

Cats and dogs, kept in their millions as pets in Western countries, have also been the centre of attention for anti-vivisection campaigners; for example:

- BUAV's 'our best friends' campaign – www.ourbestfriends.org – reveals the types of experiments conducted on cats and dogs in UK labs and calls on the Government to end the use of the animals in research in the UK.
- Close Green Hill campaign – www.fermaregreenhill.net – a successful Italian campaign to close a major beagle breeding company, but which also highlights animal testing generally and encourages the public to change consumer behaviour

These campaigns are not solely about those specific species but are a way in which public and media attention and support can be fostered for wider debate about animal testing.

At the time of compiling this report, both Houses of the Italian Parliament voted in favour of a number of bans and restrictions on animal experiments.¹⁸ There are further stages to pass but so far the changes include:

- Green Hill will definitely have to close soon.
- A Ban on breeding dogs, cats and primates for vivisection.

¹⁸ Personal Communication with Coordinamento Fermare Green Hill, 31.7.13

- A Ban on experiments using primates, dogs and cats, except in limited circumstances.
- Bans on warfare experiments; experiments with drugs, tobacco and alcohol; animal research involving xenotransplantation (transplanting cells and tissues across species).

6 Who is active in the sector? NGOs active in raising public awareness about animal testing

The table below lists groups across the world currently active in the area of public awareness and campaigning against animal testing. The list is certainly not comprehensive. Attempts have been made to include a range of organisations from grassroots, volunteer-led groups to international, well-funded NGOs. Attention has also been paid to NGOs in ‘emerging’ countries where the demand for consumer products is increasing. This research has been largely web-based and although effort has been put into researching websites in many different languages, we are aware that not all NGOs will have websites, that information available on websites will in some cases be limited and that there will be other effective NGOs which have been missed during our research.

Organisation
 Campaign
 Phone
 Email / web

Australia

1

Animals Australia

Various animal protection: animal testing; factory farming; live export; rodeos; animal circuses; puppy mills; fur
 +61 39329 6333

enquiries@animalsaustralia.org / www.animalsaustralia.org

2

Animal Liberation Victoria

Various animal protection: animal testing; duck shooting; zoos, circuses, rodeos; puppy farms; veganism
 +61 39531 4367

enquiries@alv.org.au / www.alv.org.au

3

Choose Cruelty Free

“An independent, non-profit organisation which actively promotes a cruelty-free lifestyle.” Surveys and accredits companies not testing on animals

+61 39328 1377

admin@choosecrueltyfree.org.au / www.choosecrueltyfree.org.au

4

Animal Liberation

Various animal protection: animals for food; fashion, entertainment; science

+61 29262 3221

sydneyhq@animal-lib.org.au / www.animal-lib.org.au

5

Replace Animals in Australian Testing

Based at University of Wollongong. Aims to "create a network of researchers and other individuals or groups interested in advocating non-animal based research and in strengthening the Australian Government/NHMRC guidelines and their enforcement"

+61 24221 3387

Dr Denise Russell: deniser@uow.edu.au / www.uow.edu.au/arts/research/raat/index.html

6

Humane Research Australia

“Challenges the use of animals in research and promotes the use of more humane and scientifically-valid non animal methodologies”

+61 38823 5704

info@humanereseach.org.au / www.humanereseach.org.au

Austria

1

Verein gegen Tierfabriken (Association against Animal Factories)

Various animal protection: animal testing; animal farming; veganism; fur; hunting

+43 1929 14 98

vgt@vgt.at / www.vgt.at

2

Internationaler Bund der Tierversuchsgegner / Ein Recht für Tiere (Rights for Animals)

Animal testing. Long term lobbying on issues such as REACH

+43 1713 08230

tierversuchsgegner@chello.at / www.tierversuchsgegner.at

Belgium

1

Eurogroup for Animals

Various animal protection: animal testing; farmed animals; wildlife; companion animals; EU & animal welfare

+32 2740 08 20

info@eurogroupforanimals.org / www.eurogroupforanimals.org

2

GAIA - Voice of the Voiceless

Various animal protection: animal testing; factory farming; foie gras; fur trade

+32 2245 29 50

info@gaia.be / www.gaia.be

3

Bite Back

Various animal protection: animal testing; veganism; zoos; animal circuses

+32 486/601 666

info@biteback.org / www.biteback.org

Brazil

1

ANDA - Agência de Notícias dos Direitos dos Animais [News Agency of Animal Rights]

Articles and news on animal rights issues from around the world.

+55 11 9810119 16

faleconosco@anda.jor.br / www.anda.jor.br

2

ARCA Brasil

Various animal protection: animal testing; responsible 'pet ownership'; farmed animal welfare; wildlife trade; animal circuses; rodeos.

In 2013 partnered with HSI Be Cruelty Free campaign

adm@arcabrasil.org.br / www.arcabrasil.org.br

3

Humane Society International

Be Cruelty Free campaign

+55 (21) 8342-4163

Helder Constantino:

hconstantino@hsi.org / www.hsi.org/world/brazil

Canada

1

Animal Alliance of Canada

Various animal protection: animal testing; farmed animals; seal hunting. Working with HSI as part of 'Be Cruelty Free'

+1 416-462-9541

contact@animalalliance.ca / www.animalalliance.ca

2

Canadian Federation of Humane Societies

Various animal protection: animal testing; companion animals; farmed animals; hunting; zoos

+1 613 224-8072

info@cfhs.ca / <http://cfhs.ca>

3

The Ghosts in Our Machine

A cinematic documentary on the work of photographer Jo-Anne McArthur as she “illuminates the lives of individual animals living within and rescued from the machine of our modern world. [...] Are non-human animals property to be owned and used, or are they sentient beings deserving of rights?”

info@theghostsinourmachine.com / www.theghostsinourmachine.com

China

1

Capital Animal Welfare Association

Working with HSI to launch Be Cruelty Free campaign in China

China mobile: +86 13901132574

2

Animal Protection Network
Be Cruelty Free partner
<http://dongbaowang.org/BCFChina>

3

Humane Society International
2013 launched Be Cruelty Free campaign in China with Chinese NGOs and academic scientists. HSI launched an \$80,000 partnership with the Institute for In Vitro Sciences to provide Chinese scientists with hands-on training using advanced non-animal methods.
China mobile: + 86 13718914649
Peter Li, China Policies Specialist: pli@hsi.org

Croatia

1

Animal Friends Croatia
Various animal protection: animal testing; vegetarianism; fur; hunting; animal circuses.
ECEAE member
+385 1 4920226
prijatelj-zivotinja@inet.hr / www.prijatelj-zivotinja.hr/index.en.php

Czech Republic

1

Svoboda zvířat [Freedom for Animals]

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; animal circuses. Grants the Humane Cosmetics Standard and the Humane Household Products Standard international certificates to Czech companies fulfilling given criteria.

ECEAE member

+420 377 444 084

info@svobodazvirat.cz / www.svobodazvirat.cz

Denmark

1

Anima

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; animal circuses; farmed animals

+45 35 10 70 70

www.anima.dk

Finland

1

Animalia

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; vegetarianism. Produces a list of non-animal tested cosmetics. ECEAE member

+358 9720 6590

animalia@animalia.fi / www.animalia.fi

France

1

One Voice

Various animal protection: animal testing; animal circuses; dolphinariums; bullfighting; hunting; farmed animals.

ECEAE member

+33 3 88 35 67 30

www.one-voice.fr

2

The Anti-Vivisection Coalition France (CAV)

International Toxicology Center switch to non-animal testing; Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty; air transport of animals for labs

info@cav.asso.fr / www.cav.asso.fr/en

3

Destination Enfer - Campaign for the Abolition of Vivisection

Animal testing

+33 6-70-99-41-70

presse@destination-enfer.com / www.destination-enfer.com

4

Le Graal

Arranges to rehome animals from laboratories to private homes or sanctuaries.

www.graal-defenseanimale.org

Germany

1

Bundesverband Tierschutz (Association of Animal Protection)

Various animal protection: animal testing; animal circuses; zoos; animals for fur

+49 2841 25244

bv-tierschutz@t-online.de / www.bv-tierschutz.de

2

NOAH

Various animal protection: animal testing; factory farming; animals used for entertainment

Unique use of visual advertising (photographic and video)

+49 228 – 350 77 99

www.noah.de

3

Ärzte gegen Tierversuche e.V. (Doctors Against Animal Experiments)

“We are a charitable organisation of several hundred doctors and scientists who work in the medical field. We support the immediate abolition of all animal experiments on ethical and scientific grounds.” ECEAE member. The NGO’s toxicologist works to prevent animal testing under REACH by submitting scientific evidence.

+ 49 89 - 35 99 349

info@aerzte-gegen-tierversuche.de / www.aerzte-gegen-tierversuche.de

4

Menschen für Tierrechte (People for Animal Rights)

Various animal protection: animal testing; factory farming; animal circuses; zoos; hunting; sexual abuse of animals.

ECEAE member

+49 2 41 - 15 72 14

info@tierrechte.de / www.tierrechte.de

India

1

Humane Society International

Be Cruelty-Free campaign for marketing ban on animal-tested cosmetics in India.

+91 9849094113

Alokparna Sengupta: asengupta@hsi.org / www.hsi.org/world/india/work/end_animal_testing/be_cruelty_free/be_cruelty_free.html

2

People For Animals

Cruelty Free International partner. PFA members are board members of every Laboratory Ethics Committee.

+91 - 11 - 23357088

www.peopleforanimalsindia.org

3

PETA India

Lobbying and public awareness to help achieve ban on animal testing of cosmetics. Now working to prevent products animal tested elsewhere from being marketed in India.

+91 22-4072 7382

Info@petaindia.org / www.petaindia.com

Ireland

1

Irish Anti-Vivisection Society (IAVS)

General anti-vivisection campaigns.

Member of ECEAE.

+353 (0)1 2820154

info@irishantivivisection.org / www.irishantivivisection.org

Israel

1

Israeli Society for the Abolition of Vivisection Society (ISAV)

General anti-vivisection campaigns.

+972-76-5403257

isav@isav.org.il / www.isav.org.il

2

Behind Closed Doors

Campaigns against animal experiments and breeding animals for labs in Israel.

Undercover investigations of Israeli laboratories in cooperation with Let the Animals Live and Animal Log.

+972 54-6462170

anat@invitro.org.il / www.invitro.org.il

Italy

1

Coordinamento Fermare Green Hill (Coordination to Close Green Hill)

Campaign to close Green Hill beagle breeders. Protests with up to 10,000 people and rescue of dogs led (in 2012) to 2,700 beagles being seized by authorities and re-homed. Green Hill to be closed down. Public support for the campaign led to some cities banning construction of labs and legislation being passed to ban the breeding of, and testing on, dogs, cats and primates. The campaign, and particularly images of the rescue of dogs, provided a major boost to the global anti-vivisection campaign.

+39 339-2144345

info@fermaregreenhill.net / www.fermaregreenhill.net

2

Lega Anti Vivisezione (LAV) (Anti-Vivisection League)

Various animal protection: animal testing; vegetarianism; animal circuses; zoos; hunting; fur

Produces guide to cosmetics not animal tested

+39 6 446.13.25

info@lav.it / www.lav.it

3

Lega Internazionale Medici per l'Abolizione della Vivisezione (LIMAV) (International League of Doctors for the Abolition of Vivisection)

“The purpose of the Organisation is to improve public health through the abolition of all animal experiments”

+39 2 6427882

info@limav.org / www.limav.org

4

Stop Vivisection

A Citizens Initiative to end animal experiments. Committee includes scientists, activists and politicians. June 2013: Arranged presentations in the European Parliament as part of the campaign.

representative.stopvivisection@gmail.com / www.stopvivisection.eu

Japan

1

Japan Anti-Vivisection Association (JAVA) Lobbies for end of animal testing as Asian representative member of ICAPO (International Council on Animal Protection in OEC programmes); Publishes guide to cruelty-free cosmetics; Campaign partner of Cruelty Free International

+81 (3) 5456-9311

java@java-animal.org / www.java-animal.org/english

Korea, Republic of

1

Korea Animal Rights Advocates (KARA)

Various animal protection: animal testing; anti-dog meat; companion animals; clothing trade; hunting; factory farming.

Partnered with HSI on Be Cruelty Free campaign. Produces guide to cosmetics and household products not animal tested.

+82 2-3482-0999

admin@animalrightskorea.org / www.animalrightskorea.org (English website) / info@ekara.org / www.ekara.org (Korean website)

2

Korean Society for Animal Freedom / Korean Animal Welfare Association

Various animal protection: animal testing; pets; farmed animals; illegal animal slaughter programme; animal use in sports and entertainment.

benicetobunnies.org website educates public on animal testing and gathers signatures for their campaign 'No to cosmetics testing on animals'.

+82 2-2292-6337

admin@animals.or.kr / hjl@animals.or.kr / www.animals.or.kr / Campaign website: www.benicetobunnies.org

Netherlands

1

Bite Back

Various animal protection: animal testing; veganism; zoos; animal circuses

+31 6 34132082

nl@biteback.org / www.biteback.org

2

EDEV - Een DIER Een VRIEND (An Animal Friend)

Various animal protection: animal testing; dolphinariums; fur.

ECEAE member

EDEV runs the Humane Cosmetics Standard in the Netherlands.

+31)70 383 3699

campagnes@edev.nl / www.edev.nl

3

Proefdiervrij

Campaigned against animal testing for cosmetics; produces guide to cruelty-free cosmetics; funds non-animal medical research.

+31 70 306 2468

www.proefdiervrij.nl

4

Anti Dierproeven Coalitie (Anti Animal-Cruelty Coalition)

Grassroots anti-vivisection campaigns. Has helped rehome animals no longer used by labs (including primates). In 2013 carried out an open rescue at a centre breeding dogs for labs, rescuing 6 beagles.

+31 479/85 15 19

info@stopdierproeven.org / www.stopdierproeven.org

5

Respect Voor Dieren (Respect for Animals)

Various animal protection: animal testing; vegetarianism/veganism; fur.

info@respectvoordieren.nl / www.respectvoordieren.nl

New Zealand

1

Save Animals From Exploitation (SAFE)

Various animal protection: animal testing; factory farming; rodeos; poisoning.

Produces guide to cruelty-free cosmetics; organising Cruelty Free Cosmetics week; is part of the Be Cruelty Free campaign.

+64 3 379 9711

info@safe.org.nz / www.safe.org.nz / www.safeshopper.org.nz

Norway

1

Dyrevern Alliansen (Norwegian Animal Protection Alliance)

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; factory farming.

Produces guide to cruelty-free cosmetics; developed and marketed a free app listing cruelty-free products; ECEAE member

+47 22 20 16 50

post@dyrevern.no / www.dyrevern.no/english

2

NOAH - for dyrs rettigheter (NOAH - for animal rights)

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; veganism; animal circuses; zoos

List of cruelty-free cosmetics and info campaign at www.kosmetikk.info

+47 22114163

support@dyrsrettigheter.no / www.dyrsrettigheter.no / www.kosmetikk.info

Poland

1

VIVA! Poland

List of cruelty-free cosmetics and info on anti-vivisection campaigns

www.notest.pl

Portugal

1

ANIMAL Association

List of cruelty-free cosmetics; ECEAE member

+351 96 132 08 18

info@animal.org.pt / www.animal.org.pt

Russia

1

VITA Animal Rights Centre

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; animal circuses; vegetarianism.

List of cruelty-free cosmetics

vita@vita.org.ru / www.vita.org.ru

Serbia

1

Feniks (Phoenix, Society for the Protection of Animals and Development of Civic Consciousness)

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; companion animals.

ECEAE member

+381 64 253 71 15

drustvo.feniks@yahoo.com / www.feniks.org.rs

2

ORCA – Organization for Respect and Care for Animals

Various animal protection: animal testing; farm animal welfare; zoos; companion animals; developing regulations; education

orcabeograd@yahoo.com / www.orca.org.rs

Singapore

1

Animal Concerns Research and Education Society (ACRES)

Various animal protection: animal testing; zoos; fur; wildlife crime; wildlife rescue

+65 6892 9821

info@acres.org.sg / www.acres.org.sg

South Africa

1

Beauty without Cruelty

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur/wool/leather; veganism; hunting; ritual killings

+27 21 438 2282

chairperson@bwcsa.co.za / www.bwcsa.co.za

Spain

1

Asociación Defensa Derechos Animal (ADDA) (Association for the defence of animal rights)

Various animal protection: animal testing; zoos; animal circuses; fur; bullfighting/fiestas; factory farming; hunting.

ECEAE member

+34 93 459 1601

adda@addaong.org / www.addaong.org

2

Igualdad Animal (Animal Equality)

Various animal protection: animal testing; zoos; animal circuses; fur; bullfighting/fiestas; veganism.

Conducts undercover investigations and animal rescues.

June 2013: Animal Equality gave a presentation in the European Parliament on the campaign 'Stop Vivisection'.

+34 915 222 218

info@igualdadanimal.org / www.igualdadanimal.org

3

Animanaturalis

Various animal protection: animal testing; zoos; animal circuses; fur; bullfighting/fiestas; vegetarianism.

June 2013: Animanaturalis gave a presentation in the European Parliament on the campaign 'Stop Vivisection'.

www.animanaturalis.org/home/es

Sweden

1

Djurrättsalliansen (Animal Rights Alliance)

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; bestiality; veganism.

Ongoing campaign against primate testing.

www.djurrattsalliansen.se

2

Djurens Rätt (Animal Rights Sweden)

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; hunting; factory farming.

ECEAE member

+46 8-555914 00

info@djurensratt.se / www.djurensratt.se

Switzerland

1

Ligue suisse contre la vivisection (LSCV) (Swiss League Against Vivisection)

Supports development of non-animal testing methods and takes legal action to prevent animal tests. Publishes list of cruelty-free cosmetics.

+41 (0)22 349 73 37

admin@lscv.ch / www.lscv.ch

2

Zürcher Tierschutz Association (Zurich Animal Protection Association)

Various animal protection: animal testing; fur; farm animal welfare.

Funds non-animal testing; has a representative on the Zurich Animal Experiments Committee and the Federal Animal Experiments Committee.

+41 44 261 97 14

info@zuerchertierschutz.ch / www.zuerchertierschutz.ch

UK

1

British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV)

Key issues include: primates in research; cruelty-free cosmetics; animal testing of household products in UK; REACH; Freedom of information. Conducts undercover investigations. Co-ordinates the European Coalition to End Animal Experiments and Cruelty Free International (global campaign to end animal testing for cosmetics).

+44(0)20 7700 4888

info@buav.org / www.buav.org / www.crueltyfreeinternational.org

2

National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS)

Part of Animal Defenders International (ADI).

Animals in space research; freedom of information; World Day for Laboratory Animals; Good Charities Guide (charities funding non-animal medical research).

+44 (0)20 7630 3340

www.navs.org.uk

3

Animal Aid

Various animal protection: animal testing; veganism; horse racing; hunting; wildlife.

Vivisection campaigns focused on medical experiments (e.g. charities funding animal tests).

+44 (0)1732 364546

info@animalaid.org.uk / www.animalaid.org.uk

4

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA UK)

Various animal protection: animal testing; veganism; fur; circuses

+44 (0)20 7837 6327

Info@peta.org.uk / www.peta.org.uk

5

InterNICHE (International Network for Humane Education)

Network of students, teachers and campaigners working for fully humane education and training in medicine, veterinary medicine and biological science. Produced award-winning video on alternatives, available in nearly 20 languages; book describing over 500 products designed for progressive life science education; offers global Alternatives Loan Systems - libraries of products available for free loan, as well as literature, support and advice for teachers and students. Conferences, seminars and training.

+44 (0) 116 210 9652

coordinator@interniche.org / www.interniche.org

USA

1

Coalition for Consumer Information on Cosmetics (CCIC)

Coalition of 8 national animal protection groups. The CCIC “promotes a single comprehensive standard and an internationally recognised Leaping Bunny Logo”.

+1 888546-CCIC

info@LeapingBunny.org / www.leapingbunny.org

2

The American Anti-Vivisection Society (AAVS)

Key issues include: Ban Pound Seizure; End Animal Cloning; Compassionate Shopping. In 2006, AAVS assumed the leadership role as Chair of the Coalition for Consumer Information on Cosmetics (CCIC). Free phone app with guide to over 200 cruelty-free cosmetics companies.

+1 800-729-2287

aavs@aavs.org / www.aavs.org

3

Humane Society International (HSI)

Launched ‘Be Cruelty Free’, a global campaign in partnership with NGOs worldwide. Active in key emerging countries such as Brazil, India, China.

+1 202-452-1100

info@hsi.org / www.hsi.org

4

The New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAVS)

NEAVS is the U.S. Executive Office for Cruelty Free International. Founding member of the Coalition for Consumer Information on Cosmetics.

+1 617-523-6020

info@neavs.org / www.neavs.org

5

Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM)

PCRM is Secretariat of the International Council on Animal Protection at OECD (ICAPO), which was formed to incorporate alternative methods that can replace, reduce, and refine animal use in OECD guidelines and programmes.

+1 202-686-2210

pcrm@pcrm.org / www.pcrm.org

6

Beagle Freedom Project

Started in 2010, the Project negotiates with labs to hand over animals for re-homing to suitable private homes. 120 dogs have so far been saved in 14 rescues.

+ 1818-330-4040

shannon@beaglefreedomproject.org / www.beaglefreedomproject.org

7

National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS)

In addition to general anti-vivisection, campaigns include: fund to assist sanctuaries; cruelty-free product search; AnimalLaw.com provides access to legislation and legal matters pertaining to the rights and welfare of animals.

+1 312 427-6065

navs@navs.org / www.navs.org

7 Public Awareness Prize Winners 2012

In the inaugural Lush Prize in 2012, three winners shared £50,000 of prize money for their work raising public awareness about animal testing:

- Japan Anti-Vivisection Association – Japan: Awarded £30,000 for their successful campaign to persuade cosmetics company Shiseido to abandon animal testing. <http://www.java-animal.org>
- Decipher Films - Canada : Awarded £10,000 for their feature film 'Maximum Tolerated Dose' on animal testing. <http://maximumtolerateddose.org>
- VITA Animal Rights Centre - Russia : Awarded £10,000 for their work on awareness raising with the Russian media. <http://www.vita.org.ru>

Also short-listed:

- Pro Anima – France: For their work on raising awareness of REACH and animal testing in France. <http://www.proanima.fr>
- Humane Society International: For their Cruelty Free 2013 campaign to enforce the European 2013 cosmetics testing ban. <http://www.hsi.org>
- EQUIVITA Scientific Anti-vivisection Committee – Italy: For their work bringing the attention of animal testing to the wider global justice community. <http://www.equivita.it>
- NOAH, Menschen für Tiere e.V. – Germany: For the quality of their creative adverts and interventions on animal testing. <http://www.noah.de/wp>
- Beagle Freedom Project – USA: For the high profile rescue of 40 beagles from a laboratory in Spain. <http://www.beaglefreedomproject.org>
- Andrew Knight – UK: For producing the book 'The Costs and Benefits of Animal Experiments'. <http://www.andrewknight.info>
- Animal Friends Croatia: For their work on awareness-raising in Croatia. <http://www.animal-friends-croatia.org>

8 Shortlist of potential winners for the Public Awareness category of the 2013 Lush Prize

This section is based on nominees' submissions.

8.1 Coordinamento Fermare Green Hill (Coordination to Close Green Hill) – Italy

Telephone: +39 339-2144345

E-mail: info@fermaregreenhill.net

Web: www.fermaregreenhill.net

The campaign began in April 2010 to prevent the expansion of Green Hill beagle breeders, one of the largest suppliers of dogs to European vivisection labs (housing up to 5,000 dogs). Once that was achieved, the aim became to close them down.

Dogs are often used for testing chemicals, as the 'second species' in toxicity tests after experiments have already been carried out on mice or rats.¹⁹

One month after the campaign was launched, Brescia and Verona airports stopped shipments of all animals: both airports had been involved in transporting the beagles to labs worldwide.

Protests organised by the group saw up to 10,000 people marching to call for the closure of Green Hill. During one protest, puppies were rescued from the centre and pictures appeared in the media worldwide. The publicity generated led to opinion polls finding that 87% of Italians opposed animal experiments.

Public support for the campaign led to some cities declaring themselves 'vivisection free' and banning construction of labs in their area. Legislation was also submitted to Parliament to ban the breeding of dogs, cats and primates for animal testing (a law specifically designed to close down Green Hill) and to impose a ban on certain areas of experiments on animals.

The group's focus has been not only to fight this particular breeder, but to give visibility to the issue of vivisection and get results in the political arena, creating a strong popular support.

¹⁹ [BUAV](#)

In July 2012, judges determined that allegations of maltreatment of dogs warranted further investigation.²⁰ Rangers from Italy's forest service found dogs – adults and puppies – at Green Hill were being kept in seriously overcrowded conditions in a series of hangars. Dozens were found dead.²¹

In 2012, 2,700 beagles were seized by authorities and re-homed to private homes and sanctuaries. In recognition of Coordinamento Fermare Green Hill's leading role, the group was given the very first dog to be removed and they helped re-home 550 of the others.

The campaign, and particularly images of the rescue of dogs, provided a major boost to the global anti-vivisection campaign.

Since Green Hill was emptied by the authorities, Italian labs have had to rely on imports (no more dog breeders are present in the country as the same campaign group closed down the Morini farm a few years before). The group managed to track some of the imports and start local campaigns against the airports and labs before the dogs arrived. In March 2013 a lab in Rome handed over the 8 dogs they had imported for experiments to a local animal rights organisation. 32 more beagles arrived at a lab in Verona and the campaign led to the City Council calling for their release.

In August 2012 the group persuaded Phoenix Air to stop transporting primates for labs after it discovered 23 macaques were due to be imported from the Caribbean.

At the time of compiling this report, the Italian Parliament voted in favour of a number of bans and restrictions on animal experiments.²² There are further stages to pass but so far the changes include:

- Green Hill will definitely have to close soon.
- A Ban on breeding dogs, cats and primates for vivisection.
- A Ban on experiments using primates, dogs and cats, except in limited circumstances.
- Bans on: warfare experiments; experiments with drugs, tobacco and alcohol; animal research involving xenotransplantation (transplanting cells and tissues across species).

8.2 NOAH, Menschen für Tiere – Germany

Telephone: +49 228 350 77 99

Web: www.noah.de

20 [Court orders temporary closure of Italian dog-breeding premises](#). Alison Abbott. 2.8.12.

21 [The Great Italian Beagle Rescue](#). Michael Mountain, 2.8.12.

22 Personal Communication with Coordinamento Fermare Green Hill, 31.7.13

In 2012 NOAH replaced the QR codes (Quick Response codes that can be read using smartphones, which link directly to text and websites) on cosmetics companies' billboards with QR codes that lead to videos and information exposing animal testing. Codes can be downloaded from NOAH's website for individuals to take action.

A film of their project, 'Code', can be seen at:

<http://uk.adforum.com/creative-work/ad/player/34479958/sxi:3357516>

And an image at:

<http://uk.adforum.com/creative-work/ad/player/34477148/sxi:3357516sxi:3357516>

8.3 8.3 The Ghosts in Our Machine – Canada

E-mail: info@theghostsinourmachine.com

Website: www.theghostsinourmachine.com

The Ghosts in Our Machine is a film exploring our relationship with animals, focusing on the work of photographer Jo-Anne McArthur. According to the website:

“With the exception of our companion animals and a few wild and stray species within our urban environments, we experience animals daily only as the food, clothing, animal tested goods and entertainment we make of them. This moral dilemma is often hidden from our view ...

THE GHOSTS IN OUR MACHINE illuminates the lives of individual animals living within and rescued from the machine of our modern world. Through the heart and photographic lens of acclaimed animal photographer Jo-Anne McArthur, we become intimately familiar with a cast of non-human animals. The film follows McArthur over the course of a year as she photographs several animal stories in parts of Canada, the U.S. and in Europe. Each story and photograph is a window into global animal industries: Research; Food; Fashion and Entertainment. The question is posed: Are non-human animals property to be owned and used, or are they sentient beings deserving of rights?”

Director Liz Marshall adds:

“THE GHOSTS IN OUR MACHINE is a journey of discovery into what is a complex social dilemma. In essence, humans have cleverly categorized non-human animals into three parts: domesticated pets, wildlife, and the ones we don't like to think about: the ghosts in our machine. Why do we value wildlife and our companion animals but not the billions of animals bred and used annually by global industries? It is this core question that prompted me to delve deeply to explore this subject matter. The film follows animal photographer and activist Jo-Anne McArthur over the course of a year. I chose Jo-Anne as the protagonist because her mission is a sympathetic entry-point into the animal question, and her powerful photographs invite us to consider non-human animals as individuals.”

The film includes animal research within its exploration of animal use, including: McArthur's pitch to her New York photo agency about her photographic lead story of monkey farms in Asia; rehabilitation of two beagles used in a medical teaching facility; and a chimpanzee used for biomedical research, who lived in a small cage in a lab for many years.

The Ghosts in Our Machine was released in Canada in summer 2013 and will be released in the USA later in the year. A European launch will follow.

8.4 SAFE (Save Animals from Exploitation) – New Zealand

PO Box 13 366, Christchurch 8141, New Zealand

Telephone: +64 3 379 9711

E-mail: info@safe.org.nz

Website: www.safe.org.nz and www.safeshopper.org.nz

SAFE campaigns on a number of animal rights issues and has partnered with HSI to launch 'Be Cruelty Free' in New Zealand to ban the sale of animal tested products.

The campaign has included encouraging people to send an e-card to Prime Minister John Key calling on him to support a ban on cosmetic testing on animals and, in July 2013, Green Party MP Mojo Mathers handing in a 15,500-signature petition to parliament. The hand-in was attended by two TV stations, two major radio stations and the two main newspapers.

In July 2013 SAFE ran its first 'Cruelty Free Week' aiming to bring awareness to consumers about how many common cosmetics and household products are still routinely tested on animals. The campaign involved three make-up-free celebrities on billboards and posters throughout the country and in Lush stores, asking people to 'get the bare facts' on cosmetic testing. Stories were carried in major newspapers, a TV channel and three magazines. SAFE's social media campaign also attracted a huge amount of interest, with one post alone receiving nearly 70,000 views.

SAFE Shopper (www.safeshopper.org.nz) is SAFE's online consumer initiative that lists products not tested on animals, available in New Zealand. It has been running since 2011. The guide is available both online and in a wallet-sized, downloadable booklet.

In 2012 the NZ Government announced its intention to regulate the sale of psychoactive substances, also known as party pills. New Zealand is the first country in the world to do so. The vast majority of people were disgusted to learn through a campaign run by SAFE, NZAVS (NZ Anti-Vivisection Society) and the SPCA that the Government intended to allow animal testing as part of the regulation process. Together, the NGOs started the Leave Animals Out website www.leaveanimalsout.org.nz which called for the public to make submissions on the issue. A separate petition attracted 70,000 signatures and was handed in to

Parliament in May 2013. SAFE is still pushing for animals to be ruled out of these cruel tests.

8.5 Humane Society International (HSI)

2100 L St., NW Washington, D.C. 20037, USA

Telephone: +1 202-452-1100

E-mail: info@hsi.org

Website: www.hsi.org

Launched 'Be Cruelty Free', a global campaign in partnership with NGOs worldwide. Active in key emerging countries such as Brazil, India, China.

To coincide with the EU ban on marketing animal tested cosmetics, HSI launch a week of action, 'Get rid of Cruelty'. Promoted globally, it focused on consumer awareness and, in countries such as Brazil, also called for the industry to abandon domestic cosmetics animal testing.

HSI launched an animated video, 'Bright Eyes', the same week the European Union implemented its ban on selling animal-tested cosmetics. The video shows animal testing from the perspective of a rabbit called Warren who finds himself in a laboratory and subjected to painful eye tests.

'Bright Eyes' was first produced by Australian Be Cruelty-Free partner Choose Cruelty Free, which donated its use to the campaign, and it has been translated into multiple languages for simultaneous launches across Brazil, Canada, Europe, India, Russia and South Korea.

HSI has launched the campaign across the world with the support of NGOs in each country, backed by widespread celebrity endorsement.

8.6 PETA India

PO Box 28260 Juhu, Mumbai - 400 049

Telephone: +91 22-4072 7382

E-mail: Info@petaindia.org

Web: www.petaindia.com

PETA India played a major part in the successful campaign to ban the testing of cosmetics on animals in the country. In addition to the important lobbying work that was part of this campaign (see Lobbying Research Paper for more information), public awareness initiatives were also involved.

These included:

The British-Asian actress Sofia Hayat (whose latest film is *Diary of a Butterfly* and who is associated with Bindass TV's *Superdude*) organised her birthday party to draw attention to the testing of cosmetics on animals. She appeared in a pristine white swimsuit, with bunny ears and a fluffy tail, holding a placard that read, "Be Sweet to Bunnies: Choose Cruelty-Free Cosmetics".

In 2012, the cast and crew of Farah Khan's *Joker*, directed by Shirish Kunder and starring Akshay Kumar, Sonakshi Sinha and Chitrangda Singh, joined PETA in urging the government to ban cosmetic testing on animals. Chitrangda posed on behalf of PETA and *Joker* with the aliens from the film for the campaign. The ad was shot by photographer Atul Kasbekar.

Sitting in a bathtub filled with blood-red water next to a backdrop that reads, "Don't Buy While Animals Die. Choose Cruelty-Free Cosmetics", Gladrags model Rozlyn Khan appeared in public with body wash and shampoo bottles filled with "blood". The event was held on the eve of World Day for Animals in Laboratories.

PETA India has also held numerous protests against the testing of cosmetics on animals and has encouraged consumers to only buy cruelty-free cosmetics in Delhi and throughout India without the endorsement of celebrities but which still garnered tremendous media support.

8.7 New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAVS)

333 Washington St., Ste. 850, Boston, MA 02108-5100

Telephone: 617-523-6020

Email: info@neavs.org

Web: www.neavs.org

Founded in 1895, NEAVS works in several key areas to end the use of animals in research:

- Legislation/policy change
- Scientific research
- Public outreach
- Education and medical training
- Rescue and sanctuary

A major campaign, initiated in 2004, is Project R&R: Release and Restitution for Chimpanzees in U.S. Laboratories, which works for a nationwide focus to end the use of chimpanzees in U.S. research and release them to sanctuary.

Although opposed to all animal testing, focusing on chimpanzees 'would break the species barrier'. By making the chimpanzees' plight compelling to the public, media, scientific bodies, legislators, and other organisations, NEAVS aim was to bring the campaign to the forefront of priorities. The campaign (releasechimps.org), which has been presented in in major US cities, highlights the plight of chimpanzees in labs, their lack of scientific necessity, and their healing in sanctuaries. Lobbying was also conducted around the Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act (to end chimpanzee research).

Based on its work, NEAVS was one of two animal organisations invited to testify to the Institute of Medicine (IOM), charged with studying the status of chimpanzees in research. The IOM concluded chimpanzees were not necessary in most areas of research. NEAVS' final publication in 2012, a study in which pathologists reviewed autopsies of chimpanzees in or from labs, concluded that the vast majority suffered long-term, multi-organ diseases, leading NEAVS to call for review of the health status of all chimpanzees held. NEAVS persisted in influencing NIH (National Institutes of Health) by submitting detailed testimony to NIH's calls for public comment and other input, including bundling years of work and submitting it to an NIH appointed council charged with developing recommendations to implement the IOM report.

Throughout, NEAVS provided sanctuary funding, including establishing Lifetime Care Funds. Vigorously advocating for chimpanzees NIH decided to retire from one lab to another, NEAVS provided legal arguments for transferring them to sanctuary and was the first to grant \$100,000 once NIH reconsidered and sent them to sanctuary.

NEAVS' vision included awareness that once chimpanzee use in U.S. research ended, NEAVS' work wasn't over. Instead, the campaign would have established a cornerstone for arguments that the ethical and scientific facts that led to Project R&R's success apply to all animals in research. With strategic campaign choices and passionate ethics, NEAVS continues its mission—to end and replace the use of all animals with better science.

8.8 Andre Menache

E-mail: andre.menache@gmail.com

Andre Menache is a veterinary surgeon and scientific consultant for various NGOs campaigning against animal testing. Founder and former president of the Israel Antivivisection Society and former president of Doctors and Lawyers for Responsible Medicine (UK), he currently provides scientific help to the following organisations: Antidote Europe (France), Humane Research Australia, Anti dierproeven coalitie (Belgium), Equivita (Italy), Swedish Antivivisection Society, Save the Harlan Beagles (UK), National SPCA (South Africa), Behind Closed Doors (Israel), Fermare Greenhill (Italy), Animal Aid (UK), ARAN (Ireland), Ligue Suisse Contre la Vivisection (Switzerland), One Voice (France) and GAIA (Belgium). He has previously served on the subcommittee on Alternatives of the National Council on Animal Experiments

(Ministry of Health, Israel) and is currently a member of the Belgian national Deontological Committee on animal research ethics.

The European Citizen's initiative, 'Stop vivisection', launched in 2012 by Sonia Alfano MEP, invited Menache to be part of the Citizen's Committee. He sees the initiative as a 'golden opportunity to inform the general public as to why animal experiments are bad science'.

His YouTube video 'Good Science versus Bad Science' contains subtitles in 10 different languages, ranging from Polish to Japanese to Spanish and has been watched by tens of thousands.

Menache has co-organised several national and international meetings and conferences against animal experiments, most recently in Montreal in 2011, where he presented a poster of a scientific study showing the effect of pesticide mixtures on human cell lines as a replacement technique to the use of animals in toxicity testing. This study was subsequently published in science journal PLoS One in 2012.

He is a prolific public speaker and in August 2012 joined Nick Jukes (InterNICHE) on a university lecture tour of South Africa on the replacement of animals in education and training, research and testing.

Author of many scientific reports and papers against animal experiments for both the general public and scientific communities, recent examples include:

The PIP scandal: an analysis of the process of quality control that failed to safeguard women from the health risks. Martindale V, Menache A. J R Soc Med. 2013 May;106(5):173-7.

Systematic reviews of animal models: methodology versus epistemology. International Journal of Medical Sciences (2013).

Trends in animal use and replacement in the 'Three Is' of industry. Menache A. Altern Lab Anim. 2012 Dec;40(6):P20-1.

A preliminary investigation into the impact of a pesticide combination on human neuronal and glial cell lines in vitro. Coleman MD, O'Neil JD, Woehrling EK, Ndunge OB, Hill EJ, Menache A, Reiss CJ. PLoS One. 2012;7(8):e42768. Epub 2012 Aug 3.

REACH, animal testing and the precautionary principle. Menache A, Nastrucci C. Medicolegal and Bioethics 2012.

Animal models in an age of personalized medicine. Greek, Ray; Menache, Andre; Rice, Mark J. Source: Personalized Medicine, Volume 9, Number 1, January 2012, pp. 47-64(18)

Are Animal Models Relevant in Modern Psychiatry? Menache A. Psychiatric Times. Vol. 29 No. 3 February 28, 2012.

8.9 Beagle Freedom Project

4804 Laurel Canyon Blvd. #534, Valley Village, CA 91607

Telephone: 818-330-4040

E-mail: shannon@beaglefreedomproject.org

Web: www.beaglefreedomproject.org

Beagle Freedom Project (BFP) was formed in 2010 with the goal of rescuing dogs from research (96% of whom are beagles) as a vehicle to educate the general public about animal-testing, the importance of cruelty-free alternatives, and advance legislative policy to help end vivisection.

Over the course of 2012 and the first half of 2013, BFP has successfully liberated of “research” animals from laboratories across the world, each action bringing mainstream media attention to the plight of animals in laboratories. The entire social media apparatus of BFP is dedicated to telling the stories of the rescued dogs and giving a face to actual victims of vivisection.

With the ultimate objective of ending animal-testing, BFP is amassing a new generation of anti-animal testing activists. These new advocates have been created with a carefully crafted message for mainstream America. 60 million U.S. households share their space and hearts with dogs, and there is no more quintessentially American breed than that of the beagle. The liberated laboratory beagles serve as the perfect ambassador to the general public, as they are instantly identifiable and easy to feel empathy with. The rescue of these dogs is a soft, but poignant, approach that can shock an otherwise animal-testing-ignorant public into learning more and making pro-active lifestyle changes.

In the last 18 months, BFP has freed and homed over 60 beagles, 2 mixed breed dogs, 4 rabbits and 1 cat from 10 different laboratories in the U.S., and additionally animals from labs in Spain and Albania.

The 50 State Campaign aims to put freed beagles in each state so these dogs can act as ambassadors in educational forums or media coverage. The public sees their sweet nature, the tattooed ears and realizes animal-testing is not an abstract concept. As of July 2013 BFP has 121 freed beagles in 14 states.

BFP has written to all 383 US laboratories with dogs asking for participation in the release program under the message ‘we owe them’, a campaign that lets the public see the labs in their community, how many dogs are inside, and gives them a constructive outlet to protest.

The Identity Campaign, launched in the spring of 2013, is a ‘viral video’ concept that captures public imagination, sparks online video participation, and generates media attention to the issue. In labs, dogs are only known by a Federal ID number tattooed in their ears. To highlight this historically relevant imagery and create a voice for

these dogs, BFP has created temporary tattoos of the same design used on the beagles and with the actual number of one dog. Many supporters across the U.S. have put one on and recorded a short video clip explaining their solidarity with nameless animals suffering in labs. Already this campaign has inspired creativity and the clips (or photos) are being “shared” on a variety of social media platforms. A social media meme that these dogs “have names and are not numbers” has taken hold and BFP is finalising the construction of a website to host all of these videos at www.identitycampaign.org.