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"Cruel Cosmetic Testing Could Be Stopped Today If Consumers Demanded It!"

—Dr. John McArdle

Time is running out for the millions of creatures that will suffer agonizing deaths in product-safety tests this year.

The HSUS is launching an all-out offensive to bring an end to the terror and torture endured by millions of animals used in product-safety tests for cosmetics. In recent years, pressure from the animal-welfare community has prompted cosmetic companies to begin developing more humane methods of testing their products. Despite what appears to be progress, findings of a new HSUS study indicate that non-animal alternatives for testing cosmetics may never be implemented on an industry-wide basis unless consumers take action now!

"Not only are animal tests often unreliable and misleading," explains Dr. John McArdle, HSUS director of laboratory animal welfare, "but cosmetic companies aren’t even required by law to conduct them!" Dr. McArdle recently completed a year-long study to assess cosmetic industry trends in animal testing. "We’ve been trying for years to convince this industry to stop these senseless tests. Unfortunately, The HSUS and the animal-welfare community can no longer fight this battle alone!

"The time has come to deploy our most powerful weapon. Only by using consumer power will we be able to force cosmetic companies to start implementing humane alternatives and spare the lives of literally millions of creatures. But," continues Dr. McArd-
To initiate and finance research to traditional toxicity tests. The re-rects exploring non-animal alternatives to these ghastly tests. The Cosmetic industry, demanding that pesticides dropped into their sensitive pests, are force-fed massive quantities of私自s were established both internally and at university research facilities. However, despitethis display of commitment by the cosmetic industry, there is, to date, been no indication of a signifi-ctive decline in the number of animals employed in painful toxicity tests industry-wide! And, while cosmetic com-panies continue to blind, poison, and gas animals in the name of product safety, the Food and Drug Administra-counter-verified test substance into a concentrated dose of test substance into a rabbit’s eye and recording the amount of tissue damage that occurs over a given period of time. Test animals, fre-quently immobilized in stocks or restrained, suffer agonizing pain in the face of development of more humane alternatives—is some of which, if formallyimplemented, could dramatically reduce the number of animals used while providing more accurate information to safeguard human health! It’s now up to consumers to demand that the cosmetic industry not only step up its search for reliable non-animal testing alternatives but also abandon its current exploitative practices at once! As a result of our in-depth survey, The HSUS has compiled a list of companies that do not employ ani-mals in their product-safety tests. (This list appears on the enclosed “Humane Shopper’s Guide.”) The HSUS also urges its supporters to utilize My Brother’s Keeper, a distributor of cruel-ty-free cosmetic and personal care products.) By altering buying habits to support only that segment of the industry which has demonstrated that cruelty-free products are produced profitably, we will force other com-panies to realize that animal testing is both archaic and altogether unneces-sary.

A staggering 38,000 laboratory animals die each day in agonizing product-safety tests!

Do Rabbits Actually Scream?

Although animal tests are conducted for most of the estimated 1,000 chemicals introduced on the market annually, they by no means guarantee that these substances are safe for human use. Due to numerous biological differences between humans and other animals, it is difficult, if not impossible, to use animal data to determine the effects a given substance will have on humans. Despite the fact that many industry scientists have publicly acknowled-ged this, millions of creatures con-clude are put through days or weeks of agony under the guise of product safety.

The cosmetic industry employs a variety of procedures for estimating the safety of such products as shamp-oo, toothpaste, mouthwash, hand- lotion, face cream, lipstick, eye cos-metics, hair conditioner, perfume, and cologne. One of the most common techniques, the Draize Eye-Irritation Test, is performed by dropping a con-centrated dose of test substance into a rabbit’s eye and recording the amount of redness and swelling of the eye to complete rupture of the eyeball.

While cosmetic companies are not required by law to conduct brutal LD50 tests, they continue to do so to protect themselves in product-liability suits.

The time has come for consumers to demand that the cosmetic industry abandon this deplorable waste of animal life.

Scientists and animal-welfare advocates agree that this archaic body count provides little-to-no useful in-formation about potential health risks to human beings. Nevertheless, each year, countless anonymous creatures die slow, painful deaths—the victims of cruel LD50 tests for cosmetics.

Spurred by the actions of The HSUS and other animal-welfare or-ganizations, the cosmetic industry has, in recent years, established research pro-grams to develop non-animal alternatives to these ghastly tests. The Cosmetic, Tolellry and Fragrance Association (CTFA), the industry’s principal trade organization, representing some 350 mem­ber companies, has contributed $1.7 mil­lion to The Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing. Revlon, Colgate-Palmolive, and others have also funded studies exploring more humane methods of assessing product safety.

Due to these and other innova­tive programs, progress has been made in the search for reliable, scientific testing methods that do not harm ani­mals altogether! As of this writing, no “of­ficially” accepted replacement to the Draize Eye-Irritation Test, a number of promising alternative procedures using chicken-egg membranes, cell cultures, and invertebrates—have the potential to replace living mammals in these product-safety tests.

Research into alternatives to the brutal LD50 test has brought several, cheaper, faster, and more humane pro­cedures to light. For example, modi­fied LD50s, which employ fewer ani-mals, could reduce the number of lives being sacrificed by up to ninety per-cent, while providing more accurate information about potential risk to human health. Toxicity Effects Studies are also more humane since test-an­imals look for signs of toxicity, not death. Computer models, which can predict the toxicity of a substance on the basis of previously studied chemicals, and in vitro tissue cultures may soon be used to replace animal tests altogether!

In view of more humane alternatives, why do cosmetic companies continue to...
to promote the use of animals in product-safety tests?

The answer is simple:

"We do not know of other methods that would satisfy knowledge of product safety both out and in courtroom in case of product-liability suits," explained one cosmetic company official who responded anonymously to the recent HSUS survey. Animal-test results can be used as a legal defense in the event someone using a product is injured and decides to sue. At a time when "new" and "improved" cosmetic goods are flooding the market, can we allow legal and financial motives to justify such large-scale suffering?

By funding research projects to develop more humane testing methods, hasn't the cosmetic industry reflected genuine concern about the use of animals in testing?

By establishing university research programs to develop non-animal toxicity tests, the cosmetic industry has created the impression that it has gone to great lengths to end widespread animal suffering in product-safety laboratories. Contrary to this, however, the multi-billion-dollar cosmetic industry's total financial contribution to alternative studies amounts to only about 2/100ths of one percent of annual sales! Cosmetic companies are far more capable of bringing their exploitative practices to an end!

There can no longer be any justification for the cosmetic industry to subject millions of animals to the terror and torture of unnecessary product-safety tests. Because we have momentum from our earlier campaigns, we must now continue to wage war until these senseless tests are eliminated once and for all!
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