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Your article "Procter & Gamble's Testing on Animals: When Will It End?" (Newsline, March 1988) missed the point of our objection to the dumping on Procter & Gamble (P&G) by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). It's not that P&G couldn't be doing more, or that we, as animal activists, shouldn't be pressuring all companies to do more. Rather, it's that there are so many corporations doing little or nothing to phase down and phase out lab animal use, that it defies common-sense to pick on the company that's been a pioneer in the development and implementation of alternatives.

It is worth noting that the Council on Economic Priorities, which launched the recent best-selling handbook Rating America's Corporate Conscience, has just announced that P&G is the winner of its 1988 "Corporate Conscience" award for animal rights. The New York Times, on March 1, 1988, reported that P&G was chosen for this honor because it "has been a leader in seeking alternatives to using animals in tests, and for prodding Federal agencies to look at these alternatives."

PETA's policy could undermine P&G's (and other responsive companies') willingness to actively and productively promote alternatives. At the same time, it would allow nonresponsive companies to sit back and get away with doing nothing. The strategy of limiting confrontational tactics to corporations that are minimally responsive or nonresponsive would win greater support for our concerns. And it would encourage those companies that are making progress to work with increasing energy towards phasing animals out of the labs.
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