



# 1000 DOCTORS (AND MANY MORE) AGAINST VIVISECTION

Edited by Hans Ruesch

First published 1989, Hans Ruesch Foundation

(PART 1 OF 4)

## **Acknowledgements**

A large number of people helped create this testimonial; first of all, a Swiss dentist, the late Ludwig Fliegel from Zurich, who in the 1930s published in German many of the quotations that appear in this book and that he had gathered to a good extent from the journals of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, a society which has long since abandoned its erstwhile abolitionist stance no less than the prestigious RSCPA. The lists of German, Austrian and Hungarian doctors who signed their opposition to vivisection in the years between 1904 and 1908 are a facsimile reprint from Fliegel's book. It was published in Switzerland, but soon disappeared from view. Fliegel died mysteriously soon afterward, and his book remained unobtainable until our publishing house resurrected it in 1986. Most of its German quotations, which we now publish in the present collection, were translated into English by Dennis Stuart, whom we wish to thank for his excellent and selfless efforts.

The fact that not a single British publisher or A V society, many of whom dispose of conspicuous financial assets, ever undertook to publish such a book as this, and steadfastly ignored all the other works that evidence the scientific invalidity of vivisection, at the time when Britain's new Animals Act of 1986 - also known as "The Vivisectors' Charter" - was being pushed through Parliament, is indicative of how thoroughly the British protectionist societies have been taken over by the opposing interests after the death in 1932 of Walter Hadwen, M.D., BUAV's last eminently competent and anti-vivisectionist President. (See biography.)

The word vivisection is being used throughout this work as a synonym of "animal experimentation".

Encyclopedia Americana (1974): "Vivisection - the term is now being used to apply to all experiments on living animals, whether or not cutting is done."

The large Merriam-Webster (1963): "Vivisection - Broadly, any form of animal experimentation, especially if considered to cause distress to the subject."

Contents

PREFACE

The Historical Aspect

The Medical Aspect

The Intimidatory Aspect

The Sociological Aspect

The Religious Aspect

The Psychopathic Aspect

The Mercenary Aspect

A CHRONOLOGY OF PROFESSIONAL VERDICTS

RANDOM ADDITIONS

CONCLUSION

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN BRITAIN

"We need another and a wiser and perhaps a more mystical concept of animals. Remote from universal nature, and living by complicated artifice, man in civilization surveys the creatures through the glass of his knowledge and sees thereby a feather magnified and the whole image in distortion. We patronize them for their incompleteness, for their tragic fate of having taken form so far below ourselves. And therein we err, and greatly err. For the animal shall not be measured by man. In a world older and more complete than ours they move finished and complete, gifted with extensions of the senses we have lost or never attained, living by voices we shall never hear. They are not brethren; they are not underlings; they are other nations, caught with ourselves in the net of life and time, fellow prisoners of the splendor and travail of the earth." - HENRY BESTON - The Outermost House

It often happens that the universal belief of one age, a belief from which no one was free or could be free without an extraordinary effort of genius or courage, becomes to a subsequent age, so palpable an absurdity that the only difficulty is to imagine how such an idea could ever have appeared credible. - John Stuart Mill

PREFACE

By Hans Ruesch

About the compulsion of scientists to perpetuate errors.

How can one explain that for well over a century and a half a great many respected citizens, including reputable scientists and physicians, physiologists and medical researchers have irrefutably demonstrated the uselessness of animal experimentation as a means of acquiring medical knowledge, and the damage ensuing to human health from this misconception, and yet the majority of "people who count" in politics, public health, education, media, even in animal welfare, and consequently also public opinion, which is influenced by all these institutions, continue to cling to the belief that animal experiments can't be renounced? There is a variety of reasons for this phenomenon, which shall be examined from various viewpoints.

### The Historical Aspect

History knows many cases where there was a difference between veritable or normal science, (systematic knowledge, logically interconnected facts, establishment of verifiable general laws), and spurious science believed to be true simply because it was endorsed by the powers-that-be, including the Church and the scientists of the time, and that we shall define as "official" science. Official science usually precedes normal science, sometimes by centuries. For example:

In the Second Century A.D., the Greco-Egyptian astronomer, geographer and mathematician, Claudius Ptolemaeus, had developed a theory about the universe that according to the knowledge of his epoch was considered masterly and irrefutable, conditioning the way of thinking of all mankind up to the Middle Ages, although it was wrong. It was wrong because it was built on Aristotle's misconception that the Earth is immobile, and the center of the universe.

Starting out from this false premise, Ptolemaeus had managed to present a brilliant explanation for the astral movements in the sky that even enabled the sailors to navigate.

His theory had the blessing of the Church because thanks to it she could present herself as the spiritual head and religious center of the universe, and not just of an infinitesimal fraction of it, such as the Earth; so when in the 16th Century another astronomer and physicist, Galileo Galilei, came to upset the accepted theory, true science collided with official science in a resounding clash, which Galilei could only lose, at first. He was arrested, his life was threatened, some have it that he was even tortured, at any rate he was forced to recant.

People who believe that today such a thing could happen only in Soviet Russia are grievously mistaken; it happens in our so-called free democracies all the time, in various fields, even if the punishment for dissidence is not the death penalty, but economic or other sanctions, which may equally threaten a dissident's existence.

Galilei's theory was not only opposed by the Church, but also by his peers, the "natural

philosophers", as the scientists were called at the time. Like many of today's scientists, being revered and admired as sort of demigods by the low as well as the mighty, they would rather have died than admit they had been wrong all along and propagated a mistake. Exactly this happens with many of them today in the realm of animal experimentation. Human nature doesn't change. That is why new notions are only accepted with extreme slowness and reluctance, as one must usually wait not only for all the teachers to die, but also for their pupils to die.

Another case in point was Andreas Vesalius, a Belgian who taught anatomy in Padua, Italy. It was around the same time as Galilei that Vesalius, by dissecting cadavers of the hanged (a practice that had been strictly forbidden until then, ever since antiquity), revealed that many of Galen's descriptions of the human anatomy were wrong, because Galen had based them on the dissections of animals. Again science clashed with official science when Vesalius revealed the truth - he was accused of "heresy and folly," and had to flee, fearing for his life. For example, Galen had described the human hipbone as being flared, like that of the ox, and when Vesalius corrected him, his peers, the university teachers, unwilling to admit that they had perpetuated a millenarian error, explained that since Galen's day the human hipbone must have changed shape because of the habit of wearing pants instead of the toga! Although the truth was evident for all to see, the Galenic errors survived for another 200 years in the seats of learning, proving once more that no ignorance is so stubborn as the ignorance of the learned.

This is just one reason why it is so difficult to get the men in charge of education and the health system to admit that using animals as a parameter for learning something about human biology may well be another of the great blunders of official science. (It is in regards to the most intriguing knowledge of all, the origin of life and the universe, that humans are dominated by one or the other of two misconceptions, which dwarf, in size and substance, any Ptolomean error of the past.

Both schools of thought rest plainly on fiction, but the adherents of each belief cling with unshakable faith to one or the other as if it were Gospel truth or "solid gold". One is the Big Bang explanation of our planet earth, with its corollary of the theory of evolution. It is the result of a scientific mentality that in its ignorance and shortsightedness refuses to admit that there are domains far too vast for the human intellect to encompass and comprehend; so in their arrogance they invent hair-brained theories that they present as irrefutable facts, although they have been disproven by their own standards.

The other explanation for our existence is, of course, the religious one - divine creation. Although just as fictitious as any of the newfangled scientific theories, it probably comes closer to the truth, reminding us of Joubert saying that the poets, in their search for beauty, have discovered more truths than the scientists in their quest for knowledge. The theory of creation is fiction, but highly inspired fiction, filled with human and moral values totally lacking in scientific theories, with the added advantage over its rival theory that it has never been scientifically disproven.)

## The Medical Aspect

Few words need be wasted on this. An anthology of names and opinions of physicians and researchers who, explicitly or indirectly, have denied any scientific or medical validity to vivisection make up the largest part of this book; so the question can be defined, at least, controversial. But if one considers that all those who assign validity to the animal model system are people who derive a morbid satisfaction or a monetary gain from it, the question appears no longer controversial but understandable. Just a handful of examples:

Lawson Tait, the giant of modern surgery (see biography) said:

"The position of vivisection as a method of scientific research stands alone amongst the infinite variety of roads for the discovery of Nature's secrets as being open to strong *prima facie* objection. No one can urge the slightest ground of objection against the astronomer, the chemist, the electrician, or the geologist in their ways of working; and the great commendation of all other workers is the comparative certainty of their results. But, for the physiologist, working upon a living animal, there are two strong objections: that he is violating a strong and widespread public sentiment, and that he tabulates results of the most uncertain and often quite contradictory kind."

And in 1988, Prof. Robert S. Mendelsohn of Chicago University, in his last, syndicated Medical Newsletter, *The People's Doctor*, No. 4, Vol. 12:

"Despite the tendency of doctors to call modern medicine an 'inexact science', it is more accurate to say there is practically no science in modern medicine at all. Almost everything doctors do is based on a conjecture, a guess, a clinical impression, a whim, a hope, a wish, an opinion or a belief. In short, everything they do is based on anything but solid scientific evidence. Thus, medicine is not a science at all, but a belief system. Beliefs are held by every religion, including the Religion of Modern Medicine."

And the noxious effects of modern medicine, which Prof. Mendelsohn kept denouncing to mass audiences in books, articles, newsletters, conferences and on TV, were mostly attributable to what Prof. Croce defines "the false methodology" of animal research.

## The Intimidatory Aspect

The uninformed critic might well ask how the deception of the usefulness of vivisection could be kept alive within the medical community itself, considering that there has always been a number of prominent dissenters among them.

Walter Hadwen, one of the most eminent British MDs in the first half of the century (see biography), explains this phenomenon in the preface of a book he wrote about one of those dissenting MDs, titled "The Difficulties of Dr. Deguerre". We quote parts of it, pointing out that the conditions Dr Hadwen describes are no less true today.

"No medical man during his student days is taught to think. He is expected to assimilate the

thoughts of others and to bow to authority. Throughout the whole of his medical career he must accept the current medical fashions of the day or suffer the loss of prestige and place. No public appointments, no coveted preferments are open to the medical man who declines to parrot the popular shibboleths of his profession. His qualifications may be beyond reproach, he may in himself possess qualities that command respect, but unless prepared to think and act within the narrow circle of accepted dogmas, he must be prepared for a more or less isolated path.

"The public press of today is largely governed by the orthodox rulers in the medical profession. The ubiquitous 'Medical Correspondent', who draws his inspiration from the pages of current fashionable medical literature, is expected to supply only such copy as will gratify the tastes of the mysterious power that stands supreme behind the editorial chair. The views of the unorthodox are with rare exceptions refused. So rigid is the control which medical orthodoxy seeks to exercise over the public mind, that not a word upon health matters, however important and interesting, is ever allowed to be broadcast by wireless unless it is approved and sanctioned by the bureaucrats of the Health Ministry.

"Every now and then some new medical 'discovery' is proclaimed with clamorous voice. The public eye is arrested by commanding headlines in the leading organs of the public press. The simultaneousness of their appearance and the similarity of the announcements leave no doubt as to how the whole scheme has been engineered. It may be a new cancer germ discovery; a new serum, vaccine, or chemical inoculation; a new theory concerning some old-fashioned disease dressed up in a new garb; a new outcry against flies, fleas, lice, cockroaches, dogs, cats, parrots, rats or goats; but, upon reflection, it will always be found that these 'discoveries' are entirely devoid of originality.

"It is safe to say that among all these flaming pronouncements no real discovery has been made, no original medical idea has been promulgated, no permanent contribution to medical science has been furnished, no advancement in medicine achieved. The public press has been utilized for the propagation of little else than medical sensationalism, proved to be such in time, by clinical and statistical experience.

"Practically all the modern claims of medicine are based upon the theories of Jenner and Pasteur, who have been exalted almost to the position of deities, whose dicta it is held to be impious to question. Those theories, in spite of a strenuous and increasing struggle to fix them upon a scientific basis, remain without foundation."

Modern medicine's scientific basis may be missing, but its financial profits are healthy, and anybody who dares jeopardize them is in for trouble, or worse. Who is "the mysterious power that stands supreme behind the editorial desk" which Dr Hadwen hints at? The answers stand recorded in at least two books, Morris Bealle's *THE DRUG STORY*, first published in the '40s and reprinted thirty-six times and maybe more since then, although no American bookstore ever dared handled it, and the writer's *NAKED EMPRESS*, published and republished in the '80s.

## The Sociological Aspect

From the sociological point of view, man is a herd-animal, highly imitative to boot, as his fads and fashions show. His gregarious and conventional nature influences accordingly his psychic attitude or character.

Contrary to their general conviction, human beings, with rare exceptions are not mentally free, they shy away from venturing into independent thought, from treading unexplored territory; most of all, they are afraid of spurning the dogmas that have molded them, and of distancing themselves, also intellectually, from the herd. They feel safer following a leader, some kind of father image, even without knowing his intimate nature, and not seriously worrying about where this leader might lead them. The moment individuals join a marching herd, every thought process ceases. In fact, they feel freer in following some unknown leader than in having no leader to follow and being obliged to do their own thinking.

The written laws that rule our society in a constitutional state are an integral part of the system that the people want. They are quite happy with those laws, and they are right. But not always. As happens in the field of science, also in jurisdiction some laws become obsolete, retrograde, they lag by decades, sometimes centuries, behind reality, behind the wishes of the majority or the social and scientific changes and needs. In fact laws are changed constantly, old ones are superseded by new ones, but this often only happens under great pressure, which can take on the form of violence and lead even to bloodshed. Think of all the social unrest of our and past times, some leading to revolutions and civil wars.

Obviously, reforms are started by fierce individualists, by heretics, deserters from the herd, by fearless and therefore always small minorities. The advocates of an abolition of vivisection on medical grounds, of which a goodly number are listed in this work, today still represent a minority. But what does it signify? Wisdom is not found by counting noses. Most of what the whole world now admits to be true or takes for granted, and most great social reforms which have proved immensely beneficial were originally advocated by a small, derided minority - sometimes a minority of one.

The laws that exist in most so-called civilized countries still permit, at best by omission, any and every kind of cruelty to animals, if done under the pretext of medical research, or "science". But since medicine is, by its own admission, not an exact science, and a science that is not exact is no science at all, but an oxymoron (a combination of contradictions), the cruelty carried out on animals is not only unscientific but illegal. And yet, in many countries, regulations established by the so-called health authorities actually impose those unscientific, illegal tests. How is it possible? It is rendered possible by a fact that the public blissfully ignores, namely that the same health authorities who imposes those regulations are in the employ of the drug industry\* which prescribes those notoriously unreliable tests on animals for the very reason that they are unreliable: they provide the necessary alibi every time a new pharmacological disaster occurs. Very few people are aware of that. They reason: if there are regulations, they must be good, in the public interest, like the laws against theft and armed

robbery.

\* How Rockefeller's Drug Trust financed the Board of Education in the beginning of this century in order to promote the consumption of products from its huge drug empire, is related in NAKED EMPRESS.

As at this point in our history vivisection is still being regarded as an integral part of the order of things by the great majority of the population, it is once more the dominating herd instinct of the human species that stands in the way, along with many other important obstacles, to any speedy reform.

### The Religious Aspect

The conviction that man is a supremely rational being is one more delusion in which the majority please to bask, even though it is a human idiosyncrasy to be more susceptible to demagoguery than logic, more fascinated by fiction than facts, trusting more the occult than the visible.

The soap operas on TV command more devoted mass audiences than the goings-on on the Senate floor, even though the lawmakers' antics will affect the citizens' lives more substantially than the capers of the screen characters ever will. More people carry lifelong memories of the fairytales heard in childhood than of the works of Marx and Einstein, which most of them haven't even read, no matter how deeply they have transformed the world's social and political structure. And in 1988 the press announced, pretending surprise, that the world's most powerful individual had been looking to the stars for guidance, to the point that the intrusions of the astronomer "began to interfere with the normal conduct of the presidency", as one of Ronald Reagan's former aides (Don Regan) revealed. However, there was nothing surprising in this. Rulers and conquerors through the ages have been afflicted by the very same magical dependency from Adolf Hitler all the way back to the Babylonians and Assyrians.

Some great men have used this human peculiarity for noble purposes, as have the prophets and founders of the great religions - Buddha, Moses, Jesus Mohammed. Many have exploited it to their own personal advantage.

Banking on magic rather than logic, Modern Medicine, organized by industry-beholden health authorities along strictly commercial lines, in collusion with the tax -squeezing governments, has managed to take over the role that formerly belonged to the Church. The licensed doctors are this new religion's ordained priests, in whose hands the diffident patients are requested to place their full purse and blind trust, asking no questions. This has been obtained by blending facts with fiction so skillfully that not only the lay public but also many of the participants themselves are often unable to discern between the two.

Most people today deliberately ignore, or tolerate with an intimate feeling of reassurance, the incredible tortures to which animals are subjected in the laboratories of official science. But in



the past, the great majority also regarded witch burning as a humanitarian activity that only the ignorant would oppose, because it was not only assured to protect mankind from the devil, but also to benefit the victim, whose soul was purged and thus saved by the fire.

In the same vein, the most cruel experiments on animals are foisted today on the credulous public as a blessing not only for humanity but for the animals themselves. And this because the belief in the benefit of vivisection as a corollary to the excellence of modern medicine has been inculcated into the dense population like a religious dogma, and with the same methods religions use to proselytize: continuous, systematic repetition of dogmatic claims unburdened by proofs, beginning in infancy, to the accompaniment of dark threats to any unbeliever, until the belief becomes a deeply radicated conviction - a blind faith, unfettered by thought. Freedom from thought is indeed the inderogable requisite of any faith. Once a faith has been implanted without the aid of reason, it is very difficult to eradicate it by reasoning: it has become a superstition.

The *Britannica* gives the following definition of *Superstition*:- "A belief founded on irrational feelings, especially of fear, and marked by credulity; also, any rite or practice inspired by that belief. Specifically, a belief in a religious system regarded (by others than the believer) as without reasonable support. Credulity regarding, or reverence for, the occult or supernatural."

It will be noted that this definition of *Superstition* applies equally to Religion, as well as to the belief in the excellence of Modern Medicine.

Thus, when we speak of the religion of Modern Medicine, we also mean to say the superstition of Modern Medicine, and the various rites this medicine performs are closely connected to the financial gain - and power - of its white robed priests, and more so of the heads of the syndicates, who make up the real power and take the lion's share of the gains. (See *Naked Empress* p. 35/36)

The vaccination myth is the most widespread superstition modern medicine has managed to impose, but, being by the same token the most profitable, it will prove to be also one of the most enduring, though there was never the slightest shred of scientific evidence upholding it.

Suffice it to say now that the various epidemics have experienced in all countries the same natural evolution of growth, decline, and eventual disappearance, whether vaccination or other therapies had been introduced or not. The only demonstrable effects were the widespread damages caused by the various vaccinations, none excluded.

Most pediatricians we know in Italy and France do not vaccinate their own children, although they cannot refuse to vaccinate their clients' children, if they want to retain their union license to practice. In West Germany, Medizinaldirektor Dr. med. Gerhard Buchwald had first to be shocked into awareness by seeing his own son turn into a vegetable as a consequence of smallpox vaccination, before embarking into a worldwide study that eventually led to the abolition of compulsory vaccination in his country, after he had demonstrated that there hadn't been a death from smallpox for years, but hundreds of people had died from the inoculation.

In the USA, several lawyers have published guidelines for parents on "How To Legally Avoid Vaccination", and several others have been seeking out vaccination-damaged patients, and suing the manufacturers of the killer medicament, with such success that many manufacturers nowadays refuse to produce vaccines unless the government who imposes them, also insures them against any damage suits; which many governments refuse to do.

These examples, added to many similar experiences by other doctors, in other lands, are rational arguments, but they only very slowly succeed in changing minds that have blindly adopted irrational dogmas, unburdened by scientific proofs, as is the case with all religious dogmas.

So it can safely be predicted that the advertised belief in the alleged blessings of vaccination will be among the last deadly rites of Modern Medicine to go, because it is far too profitable to the medical combine to be allowed to go without a bitter struggle, of which the beginnings can increasingly be seen today, but which will certainly drag on into the coming century. It is indeed so profitable - to Industry and State - that it is incentivated by being offered, or imposed, in many cases free of charge.

But in truth, who gets the bill? The taxpayer, of course.

That Modern Medicine can more rightly be defined as a religion than a science is demonstrated by the following:

An enlightened young patient at Zurich Cantonal Hospital had his torn Achilles tendon sewn together again and was then ordered to take some pills for several days. "Why take pills for a sewn- up tendon? Won't they affect my whole body?" - " Oh, no!" was the white-coated priest's cheerful reply. "Those pills have a *selective* effect - only on your tendon!"

That a doctor in a leading Swiss hospital can make such a statement without fearing to be laughed at demonstrates to what extent Modern Medicine has succeeded in passing itself off as a religion, in which the faithful are expected to have blind faith, rather than a science, which solicits discussions, debates, and evidence.

### The Psychopathic Aspect

Sadism is a very ugly word, which serves to define a very ugly psychopathy - a mental disease. Vivisectors have been known to accept with equanimity the allegation of being money grubbers - of doing cruel experiments only to gain money or a professorship\*. But we have never known a vivisector who bore with equanimity the allegation of being a sadist. They always reacted to all such allegations with frothing, like other psychopaths when they are confronted with the nature of their disorder.

If it is a mistake to believe that all vivisectors are sadists, it would be another mistake to believe that sadism is not rampant in the animal laboratories. It is. In fact, for men and women (more men, as a rule) who are affected by this grave psychopathy (mental malady), and on top of it are animal haters, what kind of remunerated occupation could be more gratifying than

a job in a vivisection laboratory?

\*Prof. Julius Hackethal, for example, West Germany's most celebrated surgeon, confessed in one of his books: "Today I abhor animal experiments. But there was a time when I performed them, simply because I wanted to become a professor."

Prof. Ferdinando de Leo, who has been teaching surgery at the University of Naples, Italy, for more than half a century, told us that often, at the end of the first lesson, some student will tug at his sleeve, asking eagerly: "When do we start working on animals?" However, most of the young students nowadays don't like, or refuse outright, to work on animals.

The psychological problem of sadism has been examined in *Slaughter of the Innocent*, and here we want to give some examples of experiments that were done at the beginning of the century and are still being repeated today, with a persistence unburdened by reason, which can only be explained as a serious mental defect. Today, the experiments mentioned by Dr. Hadwen more than half a century ago are still being performed, again and again, in greatly increased number and with ever-new "refinements" added, like the previous removal of particular portions of the brain, or the severing of the spine or extirpation of various organs; only their senselessness has remained unchanged. In the 1920's Dr. Hadwen estimated their number at 100,000 - 180,000 per year. But sixty years later, while a supposedly very restrictive Act was in force, they had soared to some 5.5 million in Great Britain alone, according to Home Office figures.

To this, all the unauthorized experiments should be added which physiologists conduct privately, and the experiments at the physiology teaching institutes for which no license is required and therefore go unreported, and then the mass of military experiments (in Britain at Porton Down, in the USA in many locations from coast to coast), for which no license is required either, of which no figures are given, and whose necessity politicians like Margaret Thatcher passionately invoke.

Below, two brief reports picked at random from the millions of published yearly experiments, the majority never even getting published:

"In the University of Colorado primate laboratory, baby monkeys are stimulated with 'grief' by removing them from mothers, familiar surroundings, etc., and their subsequent poor health is monitored by brain implants, etc. This brutality is funded by \$100,000 grant from the National Institute of Mental Health.

"F.L. Eldridge, D.E. Millborn and T.G. Waldrop of the Departments of Medicine and Physiology, the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill, NC 27514) subjected an unspecified number of cats to surgery, removing part of their brains, then fastening them in treadmills forcing them to walk with electrodes implanted in what remained of their brains. The animals received no anaesthesia, but some were dosed with a paralyzing agent like curare. Result: intact animals respond differently to treadmills."

One of the propaganda lines of the vivisection community is that experiments on animals obviate the necessity of experimenting on people. Just the opposite is true, and that was predicted as far back as 1912, when the German physician Dr. Wolfgang Bohn wrote in the medical journal, *Aerztliche Mitteilungen*, (Nr. 7/8): "The constant spread of the vivisectionist method has achieved but one thing: to increase the scientific torture and murder of human beings. We can expect this increase to continue, for it would just be the logical consequence of animal vivisection."

Those prophetic words were called back to many minds when in 1984 an unqualified surgeon, Dr. Leonard L. Bailey, with a record in animal experimentation of more than 300 transplant failures and not a single survival, substituted in the Loma Linda Medical Center (California) a newborn baby's allegedly defective heart with the heart of a baboon, excised without a shade of anesthetic, as surgeons nowadays increasingly do even with human newborns.

All the leading American press hailed this vivisectionist idiocy as a "historic breakthrough" and "brilliant feat". Details of this incredible, but far from isolated aberration, in which human folly vied with human cruelty, are comprehensively reported in *Naked Empress* (p. 167-172).

Raved Dr. Lawrence K. Altman, M.D., in the *New York Times*, November 6, 1984: "With every beat the thriving infant makes history...Here is one of the most exciting and potentially important medical stories in recent times." Another enthusiast of vivisectionist stolidity, and contributor to several important American papers, Charles Krauthammer, hyperbolized in *Time* magazine: "Baby Fae was a means, a conscripted means, to a noble end."

Folly? Obtuseness? The two are oftentimes hard to keep apart. At any rate, it all goes to show what kind of doctors and news people several generations of vivisectionist indulgence have produced. The day-to-day reports from Loma Lynda revealed, to anybody able to "read", that before being released by merciful death, poor little Baby Fae had to endure for three weeks the very same insane tortures to which millions of laboratory animals are being subjected for months and years on end by the laboratory psychopaths. It is understandable that the mother, who had allegedly given her consent to the sadistic operation, didn't want her name to be known.

Not only the intelligence of the experimenters, but also the sensibilities of the public are being blunted in the course of time through the good offices of such press agents as Krauthammer and Altman, who keep commending cruel follies, slated for inevitable failure, as humanitarian achievements and medical "breakthroughs".

So the *Lancet*, Britain's most authoritative medical journal, could report with its usual professional aloofness in its January 31, 1987 issue that at Oxford's John Radcliffe Teaching Hospital eight premature babies had been subjected to open-heart surgery without any anesthesia. The controversy that flared briefly in a few press organs concerned mainly the question as to whether the babies had or had not received painkillers during the operation. (Painkillers have no anesthetizing effect: Aspirin is a "painkiller").

The press reports also revealed that the controversy about no anesthetics to newborns was old hat - some surgeons denying anesthesia, under the pretext that the shock from anesthetics was worse than the shock from pain, other doctors disagreeing, as usual.

Reported *Parade* magazine, USA, April 12, 1987:

"Doctors have struggled with the problem for years. At a conference of anesthesiologists held in Palm Springs, California, in 1970, a doctor stated that premature infants did not need anesthesia, just some adhesive tape to hold them down." Was that the upshot of 150 years of vivisectionist education and influence?

And now we come to a recent case in which religion, ignorance, sadism, and psychopathy intermingle to produce a script which would discredit any fiction writer as having suddenly turned mad and addle-brained.

On May 9, 1988, Turin's *Stampa Sera* scooped the entire Italian press with a front-page story titled: "They are experimenting on dogs the passion of Christ Doctors and experts want to demonstrate that the Holy Shroud was stained during Resurrection."

(The opening sentence on the first page of *Slaughter of the Innocent*, first published in Italy in January 1976, ran: "A dog is crucified in order to study the duration of the agony of Christ.")

An abstract of the aforementioned *Stampa Sera* article of 1988 reads: "The President of the National Animal Protection Society (ENPA), Prof. Antonio Iacoe, has requested the District Attorney of Rome, Dr. Rosario Di Mauro, to stop an experiment on five dogs in whom the researchers want 'to reproduce the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.' According to Prof. Iacoe, the experiment has already begun, and today it should enter its most significant phase, in 'a location that is being kept secret, but which should be either in Rome's Gemelli Polyclinic or the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart The scientific aspect of this experiment is in the hands of two clinicians of the Catholic University: Prof. Paolo Pola, titular of the Chair of Angiology [blood vessels], and Dr. Augusto Borzone, of the Institute of Clinical Surgery.

The Mercenary Aspect

Maybe this single aspect is so strong that it might well sweep away the necessity of examining all the previous ones.

Human nature is contradictory, so that we are not only endowed with irrational feelings or instincts that might land us in some metaphysical impasse, as happens to the deeply religious, but we can also be rational to the extreme, especially when it comes to satisfying another characteristic of our nature: the miser's rapacious inclination, a thirst for riches, which can become addictive and, once born, seldom stops growing.

Of this, almost everybody is well aware. But very few realize to what extent their own minds are constantly being manipulated by the gigantic, venal interests that mold public opinion and

influence the decisions of science at top levels.

As related in *Naked Empress*, some 90 percent of commercial advertising, the wherewithal of the mass media, derive from the petrochemical combine and its business partners. And the media manipulate public opinion according to the interests of their main clients. Not so much through the seductive display ads, which only serve to sell products, but much more determinately through editorials, articles, reports, even letters-to-the-editor, which serve to sell ideas and to justify government policies.

Most of the big petrochemical combines use animals as testing material. Are those animal tests necessary? Indeed they are, but not for the reasons generally stated. They don't serve to reveal the dangerousness of the tested products but, on the contrary, to conceal it.

What if there were no animals? Then the industry would have to test its products in some other way, with some scientific method, using human cell cultures, for example, or any of the other scientific methods available, which would quickly reveal the products' noxiousness. If such methods had been used, all-encroaching world pollution would not be what it is today.

The trend of using animals on a massive scale in medical research was started in America, by John D. Rockefeller, who had learned from his pappy, a traveling salesman of snake oil as a sure-fire cancer remedy, the limitless gullibility of the general public, and how to exploit it. JDR's genius gave him the idea to involve the government in the profits from the sale of lucrative but deadly "miracle" drugs, which had constantly to be replaced by new ones, after the advertised "miracles" had not only failed to materialize but had furthermore opened big scars, mental and physical ones, in the nation's health. Exactly how the Rockefeller principle was organized and sold to all other industrialized countries has been exhaustively described by Morris Bealle in his *Drug Story* (1949) and by the writer in *Naked Empress* (1982).

To what extent commercial interests determine the consumption of test animals is shown by the following: a small country like Switzerland, with only 6.5 million inhabitants but with a huge pharmaceutical industry, uses more laboratory animals than all of Soviet Russia with its 270 million inhabitants, but where nobody can get rich from the sale of drugs.

As a corollary to this situation, Switzerland has not only the highest consumption of laboratory animals in the world compared to the population, but is also, along with the USA, one of the sickest nations. So it was to nobody's surprise when a 1987 survey showed that Switzerland was world champion also in AIDS cases, proving once more what only the health authorities profess to ignore: that modern medicine, thanks to its therapies and medications, has become the main cause of disease.

Of course, it would be the animal welfare organisations' task to draw the public's attention not only to the cruelty of animal testing, but principally to the damages deriving from a fallacious system of research. But this, most of the organizations fail to do, being no less infiltrated by commercial interests than the media and the governments.

There is indeed nothing easier than to infiltrate an animal protection society. The wolf always arrives in sheep's clothing, the devil always knocks at the door flashing smiles and a golden halo of sainthood: so that the overworked, sometimes underpaid and more often unpaid animal workers in the big societies will sooner or later be glad to relinquish their post to the genial newcomer, who seems to have even more enthusiasm and energy and no pecuniary problems.

This explains such a phenomenon as that of the largest, richest animal welfare society in the world, the RSPCA, whose patron is Her Gracious Majesty the Queen; RSPCA propagandizes the necessity of vivisection, never advertises the damage deriving to the people from this fallacious method of research, and has invested most of its huge assets in bonds and stocks of industries that practice vivisection.

Dr. Irwin D. Bross (see biography), with long experience in America's cancer research programs, sheds light on the monetary interests that keep vivisection going, in the foreword to Brendon Reines' *Cancer Research On Animals* (1986). Dr. Bross' considerations apply primarily to the USA, where most vivisection funding comes from Government sources (taxpayer); in Europe it comes mainly from industry, which also finances the universities, to insure the support and loyalty of the faculties. Writes Dr. Bross:

"It has been historically true in general that 'he who pays the piper calls the tune'. So what is deemed 'officially true' is what is in line with the sponsor's policies, not necessarily what is in line with the facts. Moreover, 'authoritative opinion' nearly always supports the policies of its sponsors. Hence, the decisions in official science are Political decisions that only masquerade as scientific ones. Those in official science have the illusion that they are not politically controlled, and at times the public may share this illusion. Whatever may be said, when the time comes to act, the actions are in line with the official policies.

"Consider, for instance, the fact that the National Cancer Institute has spent billions of dollars on animal experimentation. The myth that such research produced the main chemotherapeutic drugs supports continuation of this funding. The medical schools and research facilities of the biomedical establishment that share in this bonanza are certainly not going to let mere facts interfere with this lucrative business. So even though the historical facts here show that animal experiments were worse than useless in selecting clinically effective cancer chemotherapies - they were consistently misleading - the 'consensus of authorities' will continue to say just the opposite. They may claim to love the truth, but when it is a matter of truth versus dollars, they love the dollars more.

"The way to stop useless and unnecessary animal experimentation is simply to make it unprofitable: Eliminate the funding by the government agencies or eliminate the agencies. Reasonable approaches will not work with official -science. Guidelines or legal limitations by government agencies are made to be evaded. It is pointless to present factual evidence because it will only be ignored. Protests by animal welfare and other well-meaning groups are easily put off by official evasions. Even for official science, however, there is one persuasive

voice: Money talks.

"If the flow of taxpayer dollars that supports the foolish or cruel or dangerous practices of official science is cut off, these practices will stop."

Many of the doctors cited in the following pages have never investigated the subject of vivisection, and not all demand the immediate abolition of all animal experimentation in the realm of medical enquiry; many of them do; but all contribute to the disqualification of the vivisectionist method, nowadays often called "the animal model system," as being cruel, misleading, unscientific, and counterproductive.

## A CHRONOLOGY OF PROFESSIONAL VERDICTS

In April 1987 the first ever International Conference of Doctors Against Vivisection was held at the Kongresshaus of Zurich, organised by the Community of Swiss Anti-vivisectionists. MDs from various European nations convened to denounce vivisection not only as the moral but also as the scientific and medical aberration that it represents. Swiss doctors were conspicuous by their absence.

But the success of the meeting was such that the Swiss Community proposed forthwith the foundation of an International League of Doctors for the Abolition of Vivisection (ILDAV). The proposal was received with enthusiastic approval by all the participants at that first meeting, and within a short time the new league came into being. It was the very first such organisation to be founded since the birth of government-endorsed, pseudo-scientific vivisection and its natural consequence – anti-vivisectionism.

ILDAV is unique in that its members are composed only of doctors, surgeons, pharmacists, biologists, veterinarians, and other scientists in medical fields. And that such an international league should spring into being inside a very Citadel of commercially fostered vivisection such as Switzerland, was probably no coincidence.

In a ceremony organised by the Community of Swiss Anti-vivisectionists, ILDAV was officially inaugurated in Zurich on the 24th of November of the same year, with Dr. med. Werner Hartinger, German surgeon, acting as President Swiss medical historian Hans Ruesch, whose works had inspired this unique medical league, was named as its Honorary President Dr. Werner Hartinger is also President of the German League of Doctors for the Abolition of Vivisection (founded by the late Dr. med. Herbert Stiller). Specialist in General and Accident Surgery, practitioner for the Industrial Injuries Insurance Institutes, with 28 years experience at the hospitals and in private practice in Waldshut-Tiengen, West Germany, Dr. Hartinger had been debunking many times in conferences, interviews, articles and pamphlets the vivisectionists' self-serving myth that practice on animals is a prerequisite for surgical ability and competence.

Actually, Dr. Hartinger explains, the very opposite holds true: practice on animals can only mislead the surgeon, a view shared by the majority of his colleagues, of whom some of the



most noted are cited in this collection - from France's Desjardins to Italy's De Leo to Austria's Hyrtl to Mexico's Herrejon to Britain's Tait to America's Bigelow.

Dr. Werner Hartinger, M.D., surgeon in West Germany:

"The claim, frequently heard, that animal experimentation is vital for the training of surgeons and that practice on living animals is necessary to gain manual and operating skills cannot be left unchallenged. A surgeon acquires his basic knowledge by observing and then assisting his teacher. In time, according to his experience, ability and manual dexterity he participates in supervised operating duties, until the surgeon responsible for his training decides as to when he can start operating on his own. Specialised knowledge of microsurgery is gained in the same way, just as working at the surgical microscope does not call for operating on animals.

"The same goes for transplant surgery. The operation itself presents no technical difficulties. The outcome of the operation only becomes problematical through the more or less pronounced intolerance of the transplant, which often leads to rejection. The risk, however, can in no way be evaluated on a comparative basis via animals.

As to the effects and tolerability of foreign substances (drugs, toxins etc.) in the human organism, numerous researchers of all disciplines have repeatedly pointed out that in this field also no adequate information can be obtained from experimenting on animals. There are, in fact, only two categories of doctors and scientists who are not opposed to vivisection: those who don't know enough about it, and those who make money from it."

Dr Vernon Coleman, M.D., one of Britain's most popular medical journalists and TV personality (see biography):

"Ever since the days of Galen, who put back the study of anatomy several hundred years by basing his conclusions on his experience dissecting pigs, practising doctors have been aware that animals are so different from humans - anatomically and physiologically - that the results obtained from experiments on animals are pointless. Only really second-rate scientists still believe that such experiments are worthwhile. But, sadly, the scientists who use animals are just that - universally second rate. We suffer from different diseases and we respond in different ways to drugs. Using animals to 'try out' products intended for humans is at best useless and at worst - as with Thalidomide - dangerously misleading," (From the 24-page long speech that Dr Coleman submitted to ILDAV to be delivered at the International Scientific Conference held at the Mutualite in Paris on June 19, 1989

Prof. Andre Passebecq, M.D., N.D., D.Psy., of the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, 13th District, at the ILDAV conference of June 19, 1989 in Paris, after he had been elected as the new President of ILDAV:

"Man has developed awesome weapons of destruction, capable of annihilating our entire planet at the push of a button. But there are also other kinds of destruction. Vivisection is one

of them. It causes not only severe damages in the biological area, but also untold spiritual damages.

“Experiments on animals lead inevitably to experiments on people. They are senseless, one and all. As if an animal test could ever predict the same result on a person. And as if an experiment on one human being could enable us to foresee the reactions of another human being, whose biology and metabolism are different, whose blood pressure is different, whose lifestyle and age and nourishment and sensitivity and genes and everything else are different.

“If we adopt a correct medical concept, based on an understanding of the vital requirements of the cells; if we understand the sense and purpose of the organism's natural reactions, then we renounce all animal experimentation. Then we recognize that each single organism, whether human or animal, has its very own reactions; that it responds in its own particular, individual way to the stimuli and attacks from the environment, that it disposes of peculiar faculties of defense and regeneration and self-healing powers.

“I understand that some animal protectors advocate the adoption of computers, data banks, tests with cells and tissue cultures as substitute methods of research in order to reduce the number of experimental animals. But this is no solution. It would only reduce the amount of human and animal suffering unsubstantially, and would not put a legal halt to the experimenters' sadism, whose persistence no amount of official concealment and media complicity can eliminate.

“Today's orthodox medicine and suppressive surgery don't understand the purpose of disease and therefore don't know how to treat it. A real doctor's experience derives from his natural intuition coupled with his observation at the sickbed, but never from invasive, violent experiments on people, and much less on animals. But instead of vital hygiene, which aims at preservation or reconstruction of health by natural means and shuns all use of degrading, destructive chemicals, today's medical students are only taught to manipulate poisons and mutilate bodies. We demand that this be changed.”

.....  
The January-February 1989 Newsletter of the Washington, D.C., based Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine cited several doctors who denounced the dangerous fallaciousness of vivisection, when a University of Cincinnati head trauma "study" involving cats became known. The objections included the following three:

"[Some of] the reported changes in cats have been known to occur in humans for about 20 years. The papers [describing the cat experiments] I reviewed seem to contain little, if any, new information." - Roy Selby, M.D.

"The cat is a poor experimental model for head injury because of its distinctness from the human." - Michael Sukoff, M.D., F.A.C.S.

"It is only from human studies, both pathological (using autopsy material) and carefully controlled, prospective, randomized, double-blind clinical trials, that we will ultimately progress in our ability to treat victims of head trauma." - Josh Novic, MD.

From a 1989 article by Neal Barnard, M.D., chairman of Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, Washington, D.C.:

"Take the artificial heart. There are many researchers who now wish it had never been invented. After tremendous expenditures of tax dollars (and reasonable success in animal tests), the plastic heart led to infections, bleeding, and other serious complications when it was used in human patients. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) wisely chose to cut off funds for this seemingly dead-end research last summer, but politicians - Senators from financially-interested states - forced them to restore funds by threatening to hold up approval of all NIH appropriations.

"A key part of research in this area involves the clotting mechanism. The artificial heart acts as a foreign body that can set off the clotting process. And blood clots can be fatal; they can plug an artery and lead to sudden death. But when medicines are given to prevent clotting, there is always the risk of uncontrollable bleeding."

References: Scott, C.F. Appropriate animal models for research on blood in contact with artificial surfaces. *Annals NY Academy of Science*. 1987, 516:636-37; Scott, CF. To the editor, *The Physiologist*, 1988, 31(3): 53.

The number of American doctors who have decided at long last to endorse the CIVIS policy of denouncing vivisection not only, as hitherto, on ethical grounds exclusively, but also and pre-eminently on medical grounds has been gaining momentum. A Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM), founded in 1984 in Washington, D.C., issued in 1988 a *Declaration of Concern and Support*, which demanded the replacement of two among the most widely used animal tests - the eye-irritancy Draize test and the LD50 test for toxicity - with scientifically sounder and more humane methods. The Declaration was subscribed not only by countless lay personalities but also by many prominent members of the medical profession, including the following:

Neal D. Barnard, M.D., Psychiatrist; Carlo Buonomo, M.D., Anesthesiologist; Michael Klaper, M.D., General Practitioner; Richard M. Carlton, M.D., Psychiatrist; Murry J. Cohen, M.D., Psychiatrist; Donald E. Doyle, M.D., Surgeon; Stephen R. Kaufman, M.D., Ophthalmologist; James F. Grillo, M.D., Surgeon; Dallas Pratt, M.D., Psychiatrist; Kenneth P. Stoller, M.D., Pediatrician; Ulrich Fritzsche, M.D., Obstetrician/gynecologist; Daniel H. Siver, M.D., Internal Medicine; Herbert N. Gundersheimer, M.D., Internal Medicine; J. Herbert Fill, M.D., General Practitioner; Larry F. Kron, M.D., Psychiatrist; Richard S. Blinstrub, M.D., Dermatologist; Russel J. Bunai, M.D., Pediatrician; Donald C. Doll, M.D., Oncologist; Waiter Nowak, M.D., Hematologist; Herbert M. Simonson, M.D., Orthopedic Surgeon; Steven Tiger, Physician's Assistant Certified; Nedim Buyukmihci, V.M.D.

The following declarations were singled out:

Stephen Kaufman, M.D., New York: "As an ophthalmologist in the New York University I am surprised that the Draize eye irritation test is done at all...I know of no case in which an ophthalmologist found Draize data useful."

Christopher D. Smith, Long Beach, California: "The results of these [animal] tests cannot be used to predict toxicity or to guide therapy in human exposure."

Sandra Davis, M.D., Columbia, Maryland: "The result of these tests are of no use to physicians."

Herbert Gundersheimer, M.D., Baltimore, Maryland: "Results from animal tests are not transferable between species, and therefore cannot guarantee product safety for humans...In reality these tests do not provide protection for consumers from unsafe products, but rather are used to protect corporations from legal liability. "

Ellen Michael, M.D., Beverly Shores, Indiana: "The data produced by these tests don't keep harmful products from being sold."

Paula Kislak, D.V.M., Sherman Oaks, California: "After intensive study of the issue, I am convinced that the Draize eye irritancy and the Lethal Dose 50 tests are inaccurate, unreliable, costly and cruel to the animals. Moreover, the tests deceive the very consumers whom they are supposed to protect, by certifying as safe household products and cosmetics that cause nearly 200,000 hospital-recorded poisonous exposures annually."

Joel D. Mack, M.D., F.A.C.S., Bakersfield, California: "It has been shown on many occasions that the LD 50 test is misleading."

Neill. S. Barber, M.D., Marshfield Hills, Massachusetts: "As a board-certified emergency medicine physician who has been practicing for ten years, I have never found data from acute toxicity or eye irritancy tests on animals to be useful in treating patients. I would not rely on these data to treat patients, and I know of no physician who does."

Waiter Nowak, M.D., Worcester, Massachusetts: "I have never used the results of these tests to diagnose or treat patients. I find no justification for the continued use of these cruel tests."

Beverly Greenwold, M.D., Newtonville, Massachusetts: "The Draize test and the LD 50 acute toxicity test are as useless to the protection and treatment of humans as they are barbaric."

Carlo Buonomo, M.D., Baltimore, Maryland: "There is to my knowledge no area of science outside of commercial toxicology in which so many important decisions are based on data derived from tests which are so crude and imprecise."

Donald C. Doll, M.D., Columbia, Missouri: "As a practicing physician who is board certified in internal medicine and oncology, I can find no evidence that the Draize test, LD 50 test, or any other tests using animals to support the 'safety' of chemicals and cosmetics have any

relevance to the human species...I strongly support legislation that prohibits the use of such animal tests by industry..."

Marc Applestein, M.D., Baltimore, Maryland: "Review of the current scientific literature has shown that extrapolation of animal data in terms of human responses is not reliable. "

G. Karlin Michelson, M.D., Los Angeles, CA: "The continued use of these archaic tests is simply not justified. Exploitation and the infliction of suffering is morally objectionable, particularly when the actions serve no purpose, as in the case of current product testing methods. "

Mark Silidker, M.D., and Helen Silidker, R.N., W.Orange, New Jersey: "As members of the medical community, we are well aware of the advanced technology available in numerous in-vitro testing techniques. When alternatives are already well developed and widely available, how can we justify brutally cruel tests such as the Draize and the anachronistic LD 50?"

Leslie Iffy, M.D., Summit, New Jersey: "Legislation to modernize consumer product testing methods is long overdue. Current safety testing procedures on animals are not only out-of-date and extremely cruel, but they are also inadequate to protect consumers from unsafe products. "

Robert W. Bensel, M.D., M.P.H., St. Paul, Minnesota: "The use of non-animal models is long overdue."

The PCRM Chairman, Neal D. Barnard, M.D., added a personal note to his colleagues' quotations: "Please let me tell you about my own personal experiences as a physician. I have witnessed first-hand how medical research and training subject a wide variety of animals to cruel, even sadistic treatment. And I regret to say that what I have seen occurs in medical schools and research laboratories all across the country. "

Dr. Roy Kupsinel, M.D., graduated from Tufts University, Medford, Mass. in 1949, and University of Miami School of Medicine in 1959. After 14 years in medical practice, he went into writing and publishing an holistic magazine in Orlando, Florida, and his many articles and publications include *Vivisection - Science or Sham* (1988), in which he says:

"Why am I against vivisection? The most important reason is because it's bad science, producing a lot of misleading and confusing data which pose hazards to human health. It's also a waste of the taxpayer's dollars to take healthy animals and artificially and violently induce diseases in them that they normally wouldn't get, or which occur in different form, when we already have the sick people who can be studied while they're being treated."

One more opinion by a medical expert that AIDS was created in animal laboratories (Excerpts from an article in the *Mid-Devon Advertiser* incorporating *Mid-Devon Times*, Dec. 2, 1988):

" A preventative vaccine for AIDS is unlikely to be found, a leading world expert on the disease told this newspaper in an exclusive interview this week...In the paper, *Crossing the*

*Species Barrier*, which he was presenting yesterday in London, Dr Seale stressed that most viruses that affected one species did not affect another species. Dogs did not have cat diseases, and vice versa. The fact that the AIDS virus has such a structure is indicative to Dr Seale that it is not a natural virus, but one induced artificially in the laboratory, perhaps accidentally, by biologists using new techniques in virology, in which monkeys are used...'It could not have happened naturally', Dr Seale said. 'It has been artificially altered'."

Dr Christian Cabrol, the leading heart transplant surgeon of France, author of *My First 400 Transplants*, declared in a popular TV program, "Le Duel", Channel 5, "La Cinq", on October 20, 1988: "I agree with you, Mr Ruesch, I am against vivisection."

On March 7, 1988 Italy's leading daily, *Corriere della Sera*, published an article about a conference held in the center of Milan, titled "Still another condemnation of Vivisection" and including the following: "Prof. Pietro Croce, pathologist, asserted that it is absolutely necessary not to be content with demanding merely a regulation of animal experiments but their total abolition, and Prof. Fedi said that he agrees with this view and that such an abolition would bring great benefits to human health." (See biography)

"Truth is usually simple. Yet the AIDS virus theory has entered a realm of scientific obfuscation. Our addiction to animal research provides us with faulty information about AIDS and drugs intended for humans, who differ physiologically from other species. (Emphasis supplied.)" - Laurence E. Badgley, M.D., July 1988, in his Foreword to *AIDS, Inc.*, by John Rappoport, Human Energy Press. San Bruno, CA.

"As a chiropractor and a strong believer of the human body's innate healing ability, I want to see the abolition of vivisection in the interest of human health so that we may put emphasis on Prevention, where it belongs." - Dr Ernest P. Miron, in *CIVITAS Newsletter*, Summer 1988.

Swiss State News on TV on May 30, 1988: "The use of Accutane, a Hoffmann-La Roche product, has caused hundreds of defective births. The packages containing this drug will henceforth have to display the picture of a malformed newborn." CIVIS: Accutane had of course also been considered safe following extensive animal testing.

"It is difficult to understand what perpetuates attempts at carcinogen identification using species to species...Not only do variations in metabolism of a drug make it difficult to extrapolate results of animal experiments to man, but they create a serious obstacle to the development of new therapeutic agents..." From an article in the *Journal of the American Association For Science and Public Policy* of March, 1988, by Melinda Calleia, Chairman of the Board.

For more than 200 years orthodox medicine has been unable to free itself from its obsession with the animal models system in cancer research, with the result that cancer has been increasing steadily from year to year, that billions of animals have been tortured to death in vain, and that no other "cure" for cancer has been officially devised than the cut-burn-poison method currently in use, which usually kills the patient sooner than the cancer would.

Ernst T. Krebs, Jr., a prominent biochemist from San Francisco, co-discoverer of vitamin B-17 (commonly called 'Laetril'), and discoverer of vitamin B-15 (pangamic acid), speaking before a seminar in Newark, New Jersey, in 1988, said:

"Chemotherapy and radiotherapy will make the ancient method of drilling holes in a patient's head to permit the escape of demons, look relatively advanced....Toxic chemotherapy is a hoax. The doctors who use it are guilty of premeditated murder; and the use of cobalt and other methods of cancer treatment popular today effectively closes the door on cure."

In written testimony before the state Department of Health Services, which was reviewing U.S. Surgical's practices, Dr. Roger Thrall, director of pulmonary research at the University of Connecticut's Health Center, encouraged the "immediate cessation" of U.S. Surgical's sales training on dogs. Dr. Alfred Cohen, chief of colorectal services in the Dept. of Surgery at Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center and associate professor at Cornell Medical School, claims the U.S. Surgical dog labs are "unnecessary, cruel, and ultimately not in the best interests of human health care." Dr. Cohen, who uses the company's products "in quantity", has never attended a dog lab, nor operated on a dog in his career. "Dogs are not the flight simulators of the surgical world and the argument that surgeons must first practice on dogs is fallacious," he says. "Surgeons learn by observing other surgeons and by being supervised doing the actual procedure on humans." *U.S. Surgical Corporation, 1988.*

Donald J. Barnes, a graduate of Ohio State University, after working for over 15 years on classified chemical and laser warfare research at the Brooks Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas, quit his job in disgust in 1980. At this point, he decided that the only thing he could decently do to atone for the cruel nonsense he had been misled to participate in was to join the abolitionists' ranks. In *USA Today* of April 25, 1988 he wrote under the heading "Animal Research is Wrong":

"After reading your editorial, 'Animal research is needed; don't ban it,' for the fourth time, I cannot force myself to believe it was written by one of your regular editors. You adamantly state that animal research is "necessary" for human health, justifying this position with reams of drivel churned out by those who profit from the perpetuation of such research.

To be perfectly fair, I admit to sharing many of your views only a few years ago when I was involved in laboratory research with non-human primates, a profession which I had dutifully followed for almost 16 years. I was wrong, as you are wrong. The real "facts" demonstrate clearly that the use of non-human animals in medical and biomedical research retards rather than advances the progress of medical science."

On April 15/16/17, 1988, organized by the Netherlands' Anti-Vivisectie Stichting, the third Symposium of the ILDAV (International League of Doctors Against Vivisection), presided over by its Honorary President, Medical Historian Hans Ruesch of Switzerland, took place at Woudschoten, Holland, near the University of Utrecht. We cite briefly from four of the many speeches:

Dr. med. Werner Hartinger, surgeon, West Germany, President of ILDAV: "Vivisection is barbaric, useless, and a hindrance to scientific progress. "

Prof. Dr. Pietro Croce, M.D., pathologist, Italy, Vice-President of ILDAV (see biography): "Atrocious medical experiments are being made on children, mostly physically and mentally handicapped ones, and on aborted fetuses, given or sold to the laboratories for experimental purposes. This is a logical development of the practice of vivisection. It is our urgent task to accelerate its inevitable downfall."

Dr. med. Gerhard Buchwald, West Germany, specialist of internal diseases and participant in about 150 trials of vaccination victims: "Vaccination is not necessary, not useful, does not protect There are twice as many casualties from vaccination as from AIDS."

John Seale, M.D., world renowned specialist in venereal diseases and AIDS in Great Britain, explained in a long conference (parts of which he had previously published in London's *Sunday Express* in 1986), how AIDS was inadvertently created in the vivisection laboratories. He thus confirmed what French Dr. Gustave Mathieu had already announced in the summer of 1985, and what West Germany's Dr. med. Holger Strohm had reconfirmed in books, articles and conferences up to 1988. AIDS is a product of the animal laboratories.

The January 1988 issue of the American *A V* journal published the following opinions of mental health professionals and scientists on learning that the University of California Berkeley was planning a new Northwest Animal Facility Center for cruel psychological experiments, which would cost the taxpayers another \$14 million:

"Unfortunately these experiments will continue in a self-proliferating manner until they are curtailed by brave and innovative decisions on the part of people in positions of authority who have the courage to declare openly that the emperor has no clothes and that it is time to stop wasting money and animal lives on the pretense that manipulating several variables in rats, dogs, cats or monkeys has anything to do with human psychology." - Murry Cohen, M.D.

"I cannot recall a single instance where my clinical judgment was even remotely influenced by the results of a psychological study using animals as subjects or "models". In view of what I perceive to be the complete irrelevance of the often cruel experiments inflicted upon innocent animals, I wish to go on record in calling for the termination of the use of non-human animals in psychological experimentation." - Michael Klaper, M.D.

"An increasing number of clinicians realize that psychological animal experimentation is both unscientific and ethically bankrupt. I am among them. What do we really learn by separating infant macaques from their mothers? Does blinding a kitten teach us anything about human behavior? There is no human payoff from ablating the brains of cats, monkeys, squirrels or mice. " - Wayne Johnson, Ph. D.

"I am appalled and deeply embarrassed by the research performed by my colleagues, and by the substantiation they present for it. Neither the research that they do, nor the case they



make for it reflects wisdom. Instead, they become typified as opportunists." - Jeri Ryan, Ph. D.

"Not only are the studies themselves often lacking even face value, but they also drain badly needed funds away from patient care needs." - Neal D. Barnard, M.D.

"No animal has yet contracted AIDS after being given HIV in a laboratory." - Prof. Peter Duesberg, Biologist, Ca., from Royal Society of Medicine Newsletter, Spring 1988.

Researcher Donald J. Barnes, after experimenting on rhesus monkeys for 16 years at Brooks Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas, revealed to the *Globe*, a tabloid from Rouses Point, N.Y., May 27, 1980, how he had to blind and mercilessly torture by laser death rays and shock generators the animals in his charge. What for? In a letter to Hans Ruesch of December 31, 1987, Barnes wrote:

"Most important, I agree with your position re the utter uselessness of vivisection. When I first left the laboratory, I remained skeptical, stating, "there are some good experiments to be sure, but the majority are worthless", or words to that effect. Now after years of looking for those "good" experiments, I have long since concluded that they do not exist. But I had to do the looking myself. I was simply too conditioned to the "Party Line" to accept anyone's word for this."

From the article "The Basic Anatomical Element: Bechamp's Microzyma" by Dr. Glen Dettman, AMM, BA, PhD and Archie Kalokerinos, MD, in *Health Consciousness*, Oviedo, Fl., Oct 1986: "It is pathetic and ludicrous to say we vanquished smallpox with vaccines when only 10% of the population were ever vaccinated."

Moneim A. Fadali M. D., Cardiac/Thoracic Surgeon, UCLA Faculty, Board of Directors, Royal College of Surgeons of Cardiology, Canada, UCLA Clinical Staff, as reported by Fur 'n' feathers, October 1987: "Animal models differ from their human counterparts. Conclusions drawn from animal research, when applied to human disease, are likely to a delay progress, mislead and do harm to the patient."

Prof. Gianni Tamino, biologist, Padua University, a Congressman in the Italian Parliament, in *Gazzettino*, Venice, Oct 8, 1987:

"The growing opposition to vivisection is understandable both on ethical and biological counts. However, a certain scientific culture says they serve to save human lives. But reality is quite the opposite. Let's take the case of the pesticides. These dangerous products, used in agriculture, are classified according to their acute toxicity, graduated with the LD tests. This represents not only a useless sacrifice of animals, but it's an alibi that enables the chemical industry to sell products which are classified as harmless or almost, but are in reality very harmful in the long run, even if taken in very small doses. Many pesticides classified as belonging to the fourth category, (meaning they can be sold and used freely) have turned out to be carcinogenic or mutagenic or capable of harming the fetus. Also in this case, animal tests are not only ambiguous, but they serve to put on the market some products of which any

carcinogenic effect will be ascertained only when used by human beings - the real guinea-pigs of the multinationals. And yet there are laboratory tests that can be used, and are cheaper and quicker, than animal tests, 'in vitro' tests on cell cultures or bacteria, which have been proving their worth for years already. But the interests of the chemical industries which foist on us new products in all fields may not be questioned."

*USA progressive animal welfare society Newsletter*, issue 7, Oct. 1987: "Primate alcohol studies: one physician's view.

(1) Dr. Ulrich Fritzsche, M.D., board certified, has been practicing Obstetrics and Gynecology in Seattle for nearly 20 years. In the course of his profession, Dr. Fritzsche is called upon to advise pregnant women on alcohol consumption.

"Since 1973, more than 3,000 scientific papers have been published on the topic of alcohol's effect on pregnancy. When formulating my advice to patients who drink alcohol, I rely upon those studies which have examined the best 'model' we have: humans.

"Alcohol is a psychosocial problem. If given a choice, non-human animals will not consume alcohol regardless of how much they have been forced to consume previously. Unfortunately, humans are quite different in this respect. This very basic discrepancy is just one of the factors that make me distrustful of animal alcohol studies. I personally think the sacrifice of pets to demonstrate the effect of drugs is barbaric, but then I would be accused of being emotional, which is not the case at all.

"Only anatomy is learned from working with healthy tissues; and for that reason, a lab can use dogs which have been put to sleep by the kennels. They do not need to anesthetize live dogs and dissect them. I do not see the necessity, nor advantage, to using dog labs."

(2) Robert Ruby, MD, Moses Lake:

(3) Gary B. Spector, MD, Seattle:

"As a medical student at the University of Michigan Medical School, I was instructed in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation and tracheotomy insertion using live and, until we got hold of them, healthy dogs. At the time, I was empathetic to the animals, but I thought that this must be necessary for a medical education. I can still remember the dogs whimpering because, as students, we didn't know how much anesthetic was appropriate. Since that time I have, with experience, realized that there was no need whatsoever for this type of instruction. Today even more than when I went to school, it is not necessary or even advantageous.

"I recently completed an intense two day cardiac resuscitation course provided by Children's Hospital which used mannequins and sophisticated computer instruction. These were more realistic and more educational than the dog models. Surgical incision of the trachea can best be taught to the student by one skilled in the procedure at the time when it is either emergently or electively indicated. There are ample opportunities to learn this prior to leaving one's training."

(4) Tom Giduz, MD, Carrboro, North Carolina:

"When you talk to med students about dog labs, some of them will say 'This is disgusting'. And those are, really, the more enlightened students. But a lot of them will like the dog labs, and there's a reason for it.

"As a first or second year student, you're not qualified to do anything on people, so they let you do anything on 'animals'. And, "Gee Whiz, I get to cut open this dog's chest and watch its heart beat right there beneath my hand.

"But that's not the way you learn surgery. You learn surgery operating on people, and it's a pain in the ass way to do it. You have to stand there a whole lot; it's no fun. Surgery residencies are five or six years, because you have to do the same thing over and over again before you learn what you're doing." (From *Paws News*)

In its July/August 1987 issue, *Animals' Agenda* reported an extensive interview conducted by Allan Bullington with Dr. Michael Grant, former vivisector and Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Bridgeport. The interview had recently been aired on "Animal Rights Forum", airing weekly on cable in New York City and many other venues, including Detroit, Michigan and Seattle, Washington. Host Bullington asked: "What do you feel you achieved on your research endeavors?"

Dr. Grant answered: "As a result of eight to ten years of laboratory research I can honestly say that there was no proof of anything of more than trivial significance. I know that my colleagues will not be very happy to hear that"

The *British Encyclopedia* defines "trivial" as meaning:

1. Of little value or importance; trifling; insignificant.
2. Such as found everywhere or every day; ordinary; commonplace.
3. Occupied with trifles; of low ability or wit; unscholarly.

See synonyms under CHILDISH, INSIGNIFICANT, LITTLE, RIDICULOUS, VAIN, VENIAL.

It is worth noting that were Aspirin to be invented now "it would most probably not be licensed for use in humans because it causes birth defects in rats, mice, monkeys, guinea-pigs, cats and dogs. But not in humans."

Mr Bingham reported that the Public Health Laboratory Service recently admitted that almost half the cases of polio in Britain are caused by the vaccine itself! He pointed out that 39 chemicals are known to cause cancer in humans, but only 13 trigger cancer in laboratory animals, thus proving that vivisection is a poor test for such experiments. (From an article by Tony Orzen, "From Here to Beyond", in *Psychic News*, London, July 11, 1987.)

Dr. J. E. R. McDonagh, FRCS, bacteriologist, in *Outrage*. June/July 1987: "Immunization with

an attenuated virus cannot prevent distemper. The author has treated many dogs which have developed distemper despite two or three injections of the preventative agent... He is of the opinion that fits, chorea, hysteria, etc., in dogs have become more frequent since the use of distemper vaccine. Successful prevention will never be achieved by inoculation."

"Vaccines are made from: mucus of infected children (whooping cough), excrement from typhoid victims (typhoid), fermented chick embryos, and until recently, vaccines for polio were got from the diseased kidneys of monkeys, and cause: leukemia, encephalitis, MS - Multiple Sclerosis - and: "Now I believe the smallpox vaccine theory is the explanation to the explosion of AIDS". World Health Organization, advisor, *Times* 11.5.87.

As with all other medical drugs, vaccines are falsely 'tested' on animals in the vivisection laboratories. It is impossible to predict what a drug will do to humans from animal experiments.

"There is no doubt in my mind that in the UK alone some hundreds, if not thousands, of well infants have suffered irreparable brain damage needlessly, and that their lives and those of their parents have been wrecked in consequence. " - Gordon Stewart, Professor of Public Health at the University of Glasgow, 1980, commenting on the deadly effects of whooping cough vaccine.

Dr. med. Bernhard Rambeck, since 1975 director of the Biochemistry Department of the Society for Epilepsy Research in Bielefeld-Bethel, West Germany: From his speech at International Symposium of April 25, 1987, Zurich:

"Animal-based research has shown us how we can induce fits of an epileptic semblance in rats, cats and monkeys through the administration of poisons or electric shocks, but the epileptic patient has his convulsions spontaneously, and not as a result of poisons or electric shocks...Every new medicament is a risk, and this risk cannot be reduced by no matter how many animal tests...As a scientist, I am of the opinion that animal experiments bring no progress in the diagnosis and therapy of epilepsies. I have a well-founded suspicion that similar facts apply in other areas of medicine."

Dr. Robert S. Mendelsohn, on Toronto, Canada's CFRB station, April 10, 1987: "When I was a medical student we went into the physiology and the pharmacology laboratories and did animal experiments which we knew were worthless and the teachers knew were worthless, but we had to go through that ritual."

The April, 1987 issue of *Fur 'n' Feathers*, a monthly based in Burbank, California, evoked a number of doctors, past and present, who were opposed to vivisection. Here below, we quote a few:

Dr. Pierre Jeandidier, Ex Chief of Dermatological Clinic of the Faculty, 127 Saint Didier Street, Nancy, France - April 1964: "There are no arguments or considerations that could justify all the pain inflicted on all those unfortunate defenseless animals, and it is not much to say that

such practices are entirely inhuman, if reference to man has as yet weight on the moral plane. The state owes it to itself to condemn them unequivocally and without restrictions."

Dr. A. Maignien-Courard, Ophthalmologist, 16 Jean-Jacques Rousseau Street, Nantes, France - Clinique de L'Esprance - Feb. 6, 1964: "I am totally opposed to vivisection and experiments on animals, and have always recognized their cruelty and uselessness."

Dr. Raymond Lefevre, Professor of the School of Medicine, Director of the Regional Anti-Cancer Center, 50 Boulevard Lundy, Reims, France - March 27, 1964: "The utility of vivisection does not seem to me to be fully determined. Such products tried out on animals produce results ineffective in man."

Dr. Frederic Benoit, Surgeon of the Maternity Hospital, Wassy, France April 1, 1964: "It is nonsense to believe that vivisectional experiments are necessary or useful for scientific progress: circumstances of vivisection are too arbitrary to have real interest, and the animals cannot be identical."

Dr. Albert Poret, 6 Dufrenoy Street, Trocadero, Paris 10, France: "We demand, not regulation, but abolition of these cruelties (vivisection) which are being practiced in the name of science."

Dr. B. Ossipovski, Formerly Interne of the Hospital of Paris, Chief of Clinical Medicine of the Faculty, Chief of the Saint Louis Hospital, 74 Villiers Avenue, Mac-Mahon, France: "My accord, my assistance are yours concerning the terrible practice of maniacs and neo-scientists. Men believe they are able to acquire physiological results by torturing animals and formulating theoretical deductions which, in most cases, have revealed themselves absolutely erroneous."

Dr. Eugene Lob, Faculty of Paris, General Medicine & Diseases of the Eyes, Wasigny, France (Ardennes): "I have the honor to enclose herewith a certificate against vivisection...cruel and useless."

Dr. Marie-Louise Griboval, Paris, France: "I am against vivisection because it is immoral and completely useless for the progress of human medicine. Animals have a physiology and reactions quite different from ours. I am of the opinion that all experiments on live animals should be abolished because they only lead us into error."

"The data in a recent article by John Bailar in *The New England Journal of Medicine* shows that the total failure of the National Cancer Institute 'Conquest of Cancer' program resulted in more than 30,000 additional deaths from cancer last year!" (From an article by Dr. Irwin Bross in the *Animals' Agenda*, March 1987). CIVIS comment: Practically the entire cancer program was based on animal experimentation - by which only the experimenters, and not the patients, profited.

An article by reporter Barbara Bouyet in *Fur 'n' Feathers* cites in its March 1987 issue Dr. Robert Simpson of Rutgers University as saying: "Immunization programs against flu, measles, mumps, polio, etc., actually may be seeding humans with RNA to form pro-

viruses...which under proper conditions become activated and cause a variety of diseases including rheumatoid arthritis, multiple sclerosis, lupus erythematosus, Parkinson's disease and cancer. Spare me this 'medical miracle'."

From *The Alliance News*, Journal of Alliance for Animals, January 1987, Vol. 4, Nr. 1:

"According to Dr. A.R. Mead, an official in the Cancer Institute's Drug Development Division: 'The live mouse screen is just not producing action against the major tumors.'"

"The new system, devised to replace the live mouse screening technique, consists of the testing of compounds against more than a hundred different strains of human cancer cells growing in test tubes. Officials expect that this new non-animal testing system will determine more quickly and more accurately which chemicals might make useful anticancer drugs. The new screening system is speculated to be "more sensitive" and capable of pinpointing drugs that act against specific types of cancer...Drugs "that would have been dismissed as useless" by the traditional animal screening process.

"While it would seem obvious to the lay observer that a test performed directly on *hundreds* of different strains of *human* cancer cells is superior to testing on *mice* with *one* specific form of animal leukemia, the research community, along with the funding institutions who support them, are often so firmly entrenched in the traditional animal research system that such logic is not recognized, and researchers are often reluctant to pursue non-animal alternatives."

'The arthritis drug Opren was withdrawn in 1982 after 3,500 reports of side effects including 61 deaths, mainly through liver damage in the elderly. According to an investigation by Granada TV's 'World in Action' programme, Eli Lilly insisted that they had no reason to think Opren would cause any particular problem for the elderly before they launched the drug. Prolonged tests in rhesus monkeys (the species usually considered closest to us), in which the animals received up to seven times the maximum tolerated human dose for a year, revealed no evidence of toxicity. Nor apparently had animal tests given any warning of the photosensitive skin reactions that were to bedevil patients during the drug's brief 22-month history.' (From 'World in Action', Granada Television (GB), 9 November 1987.)

A recent book out in Great Britain, *Vaccination and Immunization: Dangers, Delusions and Alternatives* (C.W. Daniel, 1987) by Leon Chaitow, one of the world's best informed practitioners of natural medicines, includes up-to-date evidence against vaccination from vaccine researchers themselves, like the fact that even Dr. Jonas Salk, who developed the "killed" polio vaccine that bears his name, cannot agree with his rival Dr. Alfred Sabin on the merits of "live" and "killed" vaccine, and each one accuses the other of being responsible for uncounted deaths among the gullible patients.

How can there be such varying views? First, vaccination programs and antibiotics have mistakenly been given all the credit for naturally occurring declines in killer diseases such as smallpox, cholera, typhoid, tuberculosis, dysentery, etc., whereas most or all the credit belongs to better hygiene, sanitation, housing, and greater resistance to disease thanks to improved economic conditions, better nutrition being particularly important in the case of

tuberculosis.

London's typhoid epidemics were being halted by changes in the water supply *before* the "bug" was discovered, let alone a vaccine was developed- according to a 1923 report in the *British Medical Journal*. But tendentious legend has it that the vaccine saved the lives of thousands of troops in the Boer War and the 1914-1918 war. The documented truth is that typhus hit vaccinated soldiers and citizens with about the same frequency as unvaccinated ones, with the only difference that an unspecified number of vaccinated people developed the well-known post-vaccinal effects - immediate resurgence of the disease against which they had been vaccinated, meningitis, and death.

The issue is also confused by health professionals' consistent inability or unwillingness to identify vaccine-related deaths. A University of California study has shown that at least 1,000 deaths a year, described as the mysterious SIDS (Sudden Infant Death Syndrome), are in fact caused by vaccines.

In Australia, Dr. Archie Kalokerinos, M.D., and Dr. Glen Dettman, Ph.D., discovered that some 500 out of every 1,000 Aboriginal children were dying in the Northern territories. The cause was a type of toxic shock reaction, complicated by vitamin C deficiency, brought on by immunization. In a two year period without vaccination and with improved nutrition not one child died.

Even the Swiss researchers and the huge pharmaceutical industry, whose profits rest squarely on the alibis of animal experiments, concede the unreliability of the animal tests. To wit:

Hans Aebe, a Ciba-Geigy employee, told the daily *Basler Zeitung* (April 12, 1986): "That Tifanol causes cancer in laboratory animals doesn't mean that it will cause cancer in human beings as well."

*The Roche-Magazine*, the organ of Hoffmann-La Roche pharmaceuticals, always spends a considerable amount of its time invoking the unreliability of animal tests to justify the damages its drugs keep causing. In that magazine's May 27 1986 issue we read: "The fact that this preparation causes cancer in animal experimentation does not necessarily mean that it will also cause cancer in people."

In the same issue: "Whether a new preparation will cause cancer in people or not can never be predicted with certainty, in spite of all preliminary experiments and tests."

Still in the same issue: "Tests for carcinogenesis are no egg of Columbus, because they are made on animals and not on people. A human being is neither a large rat nor a large mouse, and can always react in a different way."

Once more, in the same issue: "Why was it so difficult in the case of the Seveso exposure to assay the risks to health? Because we had no parameters but animal tests, and whether Dioxin would have the same effects on people could not be read from the tests on animals."

The findings on laboratory animals were contradictory. Hamsters died from a ten-thousand higher dosage than did guinea-pigs."

Prof. Bruno Fedi, M.D., Director of the City Hospital of Terni, Italy, anatomist, pathologist, specialist in urology, gynecology and cancerology:

"All our current knowledge of medicine and surgery derives from observations of man following especially the anatomical-clinical method introduced by Virchow: symptoms of the patient while alive and the alterations found in the dead body.

"These observations have led us to discover the connection between smoking and cancer, between diet and arteriosclerosis, between alcohol and cirrhosis, and so on.

"Even the RH factor has not been discovered on the macacus rhesus. The observations of Banting and Best on diabetes, attributed to experiments on dogs, were already well-known.

"Every discovery derives from observations on humans, which are subsequently duplicated in animals, and whenever the findings happen to concur, their discovery is attributed to animal experimentation...

"Everything we know today in medicine derives from observations made on human beings. The ancient Romans and Greeks gained most of their knowledge from epidemiological studies of people. The same goes for surgery. Surgery can't be learned on animals.

"Animals are anatomically completely different from man, their reactivity is completely different, their structure and resistance are completely different. In fact, exercises on animals are misleading. The surgeon who works a lot on animals loses the sensibility necessary for operating on humans. " (Abstract from various TV interviews and articles by Prof. Fedi in the course of 1986).

"Most adverse reactions which occur in man cannot be demonstrated, anticipated or avoided by the routine subacute and chronic toxicity experiment." (Prof. G. Zbinden, Institute of Toxicology, Zurich, 1986)

From the report of the CIOMS (Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences) established under the auspices of WHO and UNESCO, XVII Round Table Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-9 December 1983, Session 11, about "Understanding the Physiological Basis of Toxicological Phenomena", by Professor M.H. Driggs:

"Many experimental toxicity studies have been conducted on contraceptive estrogens, alone or in combination with progestogens (Heywood and Wadsworth, 1981). At multiples of the human dose, no adverse effect on blood clotting was found in mice, rats, dogs, or non-human primates. Indeed, far from accelerating blood coagulation, high doses of estrogens in rats and dogs prolonged clotting times. There is therefore no appropriate animal model for the coagulation changes occurring in women using oral contraceptives. Interestingly, deaths due to intravascular coagulation were noted in dogs receiving high doses of a long-acting depot



progesterone (medroxyprogesterone acetate without estrogen), but thrombosis is not thought to be a risk in women using this product." (French Conseil des Organisations Internationales des Sciences Medicales, fonde sous les auspices de l'OMS et de l'UNESCO)

Irwin D. Bross, Ph.D., writes as a scientist with 30 years experience in public health; Head of research design and analysis at Sloan-Kettering Cancer Institute (1954), the most famous cancer research institute in the world; Then head of department of biostatistics at Roswell Park Memorial Institute for Cancer Research in Buffalo, New York; Then President of Biomedical Metatechnology; Author or co-author of over 300 published articles and reports and 3 books:

"Consider the fact that the National Cancer Institute has spent billions of dollars on animal experimentation. The myth that such research produced the main chemotherapeutic drugs supports continuation of the funding. The medical schools and research facilities of the biomedical establishment that share in this bonanza are certainly not going to let mere facts interfere with this lucrative business. So even though the historical facts here show that animal experiments were worse than useless in selecting clinically effective cancer chemotherapies - they were consistently misleading - the 'consensus of authorities' will continue to say just the opposite. They may claim to love the truth, but when it is a matter of truth versus dollars, they love the dollars more.

"Showing the uselessness of animal model systems in cancer research can do more than prevent the pointless suffering of laboratory animals. It can demonstrate why the public cannot afford to put its trust in official science...The way to stop useless and unnecessary animal experimentation is simply to make it unprofitable. Eliminate the funding by the government agencies or eliminate the agencies. Reasonable approaches will not work with official science. Guidelines or legal limitations by government agencies are made to be evaded. It is pointless to present factual evidence because it will only be ignored. Even for official science, however, there is one persuasive voice: Money talks. If the flow of taxpayer dollars that supports the foolish or cruel or dangerous practices of official science is cut off, these practices will stop." (From his Foreword to Brandon Reines' *Cancer Research on Animals: Impact and Alternatives*, 1986)

From the ATRA publication, *Physicians Have the Word*, ATRA, Camorino, Switzerland, December 1986, Dr. med. Jurg Kym, General practitioner in Zurich: "As a physician, I am definitely opposed to animal experiments. They are totally useless, they don't contribute in any way to the progress of medicine...Animal experiments are just business, and are usually associated with animal torture. Because of animal experimentation, modern medicine moves always farther away from humankind. This is obvious to every enlightened individual."

Richard Moskowitz, M.D. wrote to CIVIS on New Year's Eve, 1986: "My first disillusionment with modern medicine came in the summer of my junior year at Harvard while I was working at a large medical research laboratory...It turned my stomach to think that the whole edifice of medical research rested upon a calculated slaughter of this magnitude."

In the March 1983 issue of the *Journal of the American Institute of Homoeopathy* (76:7) he wrote among other things: "The public is surely entitled to convincing proof, beyond any reasonable doubt, that artificial immunization is in fact a safe and effective procedure, in no way injurious to health, and that the threat of the corresponding natural diseases remain sufficiently clear and urgent to warrant mass inoculation of everyone, even against their will if necessary. Unfortunately, such proof has never been given."

On December 22, 1986, the *Jerusalem Post* published the following opinion of well-known Israeli veterinarian Dr. Andre Menache of Givatayim:

"Sir, - You often publish articles where animal experiments are credited for the latest in (human) medical advances. As many research workers recognize (and now increasingly the lay public as well), animal experiments can be used to "prove" or "disprove" almost anything. Given the large variety of laboratory animals available today, and the multiplicity of laboratory conditions under which these experiments are carried out, it should not come as a surprise.

"Animal experimentation continues to provide misleading and inconclusive results for man, of which we are occasionally reminded by drug disasters. Put bluntly, animal experimentation is not science: it has no place in the so-called civilized and technologically advanced era of today."

In announcing a new weapon in cancer treatment - it combines natural cancer-killing cells with two drugs - Dr. Steven A. Rosenberger of the National Cancer Institute went out of his way to avoid raising any false hopes of a quick cancer cure for humans. "This has all been done with mice. There are things that work in mice that do not work in people." (*The AV Magazine*. December 1986)

One of Britain's leading cancer research institutes, the Marie Curie Foundation, announced at the end of 1986 that it would henceforth renounce all animal experimentation. A spokesman for the foundation, which had been active in cancer research for many years, explained the decision with the realization that experiments on animals provide no meaningful results for human beings.

"In my opinion there exists a conspiracy of the medical-pharmaceutical interests on an international basis to eradicate alternative health (not disease) care from the people of the world with a total disregard for the health and life of the people. I feel that the major motivation of this potentially destructive scheme is the desire to make money and I call the condition of this utter sickness of man, "The Greed Disease". Here in the United States I observe the conspiracy is interwoven with the American Medical Association, the federal government, especially the Federal Drug Administration, the federal Trade Commission, the Pharmaceutical Advertising Council, and the entire media including television networks, radio networks, newspapers, magazines and book publishers. The media domination prevents the majority of people from being conscious of these negative forces and focuses their minds on the propaganda that alternative health care is "quackery". However, the Office of Technological Assessment reported to the Congress in the late 1970's that only 10-20% of the methods

utilized in allopathic (official, orthodox) medicine are proven safe and efficacious. Quackery is defined as using non-proven methods for a profit. So who are the real quacks, anyway?

"Much of the enlightenment of the extremely cruel vivisection portion of this cartel is revealed in the writings of Hans Ruesch in both *Slaughter of the Innocent* and *Naked Empress*, which have both suffered international suppression. Vivisection is a paramount symptom of the "Greed Disease" and of the inhumane, unscientific, ignorant individuals who perpetuate it throughout the world. Animals are not human beings and do not react in a similar fashion to a drug. What might be beneficial in an animal might be lethal to the human, and conversely. Where is the logic to transfer information from animal experimentation to human usage of toxic chemicals? It is in the pocketbooks of the members of the conspiracy - the Greed Disease!" (Ray Kupsinel, M.D., medical magazine editor in *Oviedo*. FL 32765, November 22, 1986)

Extract from a lecture by Dr. Arie Brecher, M.D., to the Medical and Juridical Society at the Hotel Dan-Panorama of Haifa in Israel on November 1, 1986:

"The genetic code is transmitted by the chromosomes. Each species has a certain number of chromosomes, which characterizes that particular species... The genes and the chromosomes are the basis from which all other differences derive: the cythological, the historical, the biochemical, the physiological, the immunological and the anatomical differences...Because of the differences in the genetic code and the biological arrangements between one living being and another, the reactions to drugs and other stimuli between one species and another will also be different. So all this is not science, but a lottery.

"The well-being of man takes first place in the ladder of human values. Today, in 1986, after years of practice as a physician, I am convinced that any result I might obtain from experimentations on a dog, a cat, or any other animal, will be misleading, damaging and even disastrous for human beings. There is no question of any advantage to be gained at all.

"Animal experiments confuse the issues and their results will never have scientific precision. There is absolutely no connection between vivisection and human health. The general belief in the value of animal experimentation is the result of brainwashing that the public has been submitted to for a long time. Behind it are the pharmaceutical industries, which spend fortunes on publicity and finance the research institutes and the universities.

"What must be done? The laws must be changed and vivisection must be prohibited. There are today 400 experimental methods that don't require the use of animals. But even more important are prevention and the safeguard of human health. Science doesn't need vivisection, but the law does. I call upon everybody to sustain our movement bent on changing the law and bring about a total abolition of vivisection, for a better medicine and a healthier humanity."

The October-November 1986 issue of *Outrage*, the journal of Britain's Animal Aid Society, bore the following quotes:

## A Few Views On Cancer Research

"Reports in the scientific literature make it clear that as much as 75% to 85% of cancer is preventable. Cancer is no longer simply a medical problem, it is a social-economic problem, as many of the cancer-causing agents are a direct result of our technological age. Cancer agents are in the food we eat, the drugs we take, and the cigarettes we smoke. It is clear that the incidence of cancer will never decline until we look at prevention rather than cure."

"Economics and politics simply intertwine in shaping conventional medicines approach to cancer. Very simply put, treating disease is enormously profitable, preventing disease is not."  
(The British Cancer Control Society)

"Everyone should know that most cancer research is largely a fraud, and that the major cancer research organizations are derelict in their duties to the people who support them."  
(Linus Pauling, PHD, two time Nobel Prize Winner)

"Large scale nationwide advertising is bringing in the four main established cancer charities in Britain something like 46 million a year. Together they hold assets of more than 76 million, including widespread international investments and buildings such as their various prestigious Central London Headquarters." (Cancer Control Society)

"It could be argued that this (cancer research) is a field of research which has consumed an enormous number of animals without any tangible result." (Professor D.H. Smyth, *Alternatives to Animal Experiments*)

"The cancer research bodies cause pain and suffering to hundreds of thousands of animals every year by inducing in the animals, by chemicals or irradiation, large cancerous growths in their bodies and limbs...Giving cancer to laboratory animals has not and will not help us to understand the disease or to treat those persons suffering from it." (Dr. A. Sabin, developer of the polio vaccine)

"...the simple unadulterated truth is that they are neither winning the fight against cancer nor are they about to find a cure. They have been claiming that a cure is just around the corner for a good 50 years or more, but the sad fact remains that in spite of the countless millions being collected, cancer in its most serious forms - in the lung, breast and bowel - is no nearer to being beaten today than it was at the turn of the century.

"Indeed, in some cases - breast cancer for example - the exact opposite is true; the scientists are actually losing the fight." (Cancer Control Society)

From an article by William Campbell Douglass, M.D., in the *Health Freedom News*, the journal of the National Health Federation, U.S.A., October 1986, p.31: "Medical students are often used as experimental animals. They come cheap because they need the money and they are a lot like humans. The results with animals don't correlate with humans physiologically or pharmacologically, and besides, monkeys are *expensive*."

Prof. Robert S. Mendelsohn, M. D., in the film *Hidden Crimes*: "There has never been a single vaccine in this country that has ever been submitted to a controlled scientific study. They never took a group of 100 people who were candidates for a vaccine, gave 50 of them a vaccine and left the other 50 alone, and measured the outcome. And since that has never been done, that means that if you want to be kind, you will call vaccines an unproven remedy. If you want to be accurate, you'll call the people who give vaccines quacks."

"I did many experiments on live animals during medical school", said Dr. Abram Her, a Phoenix, AZ physician who formerly practiced anaesthesiology and now has switched to holistic medicine. "I would say they had nothing to do with what I later had to know about or do to humans."

## **1000 DOCTORS (AND MANY MORE) AGAINST VIVISECTION**

Edited by Hans Ruesch

First published 1989 Ó Hans Ruesch Foundation

(PART 2 OF 4)

Extracts from a lecture by Dr. Arie Brecher, M.D., the Israeli physician, held on August 12, 1986 at Tel Aviv:

"From an animal one can get only a very approximate indication of how a human will react under similar circumstances. But this is not science - it's a lottery. However, we are not playing games. At stake are health and life. There is absolutely no connection between vivisection and human health. The day it was decided to develop medicaments using animal models, it was a sad day for mankind. People began to get sick and to die due to medications. A new epoch in medicine started: the epoch of iatrogenic diseases, caused by doctors, by medical therapies. In the D.S.A., at least one and a half million people are hospitalized every year due to the intake of drugs, and many die. For the first time in history, medicine causes disasters instead of curing illness."

The cancer situation is actually even worse than generally acknowledged, which is bad enough. As John A. McDougall, M.D., explains in an article "The Misguided War on Cancer" in the *Vegetarian Times*. September 1986:

"The American Cancer Society also fails to tell us that the 'improved' survival rate seen over the past 80 years for most cancers is largely the result of earlier detection - not more effective treatment. Finding the cancer earlier does allow more people to live five years after the time of diagnosis. Thus more people will fit the definition of 'cured'. However, in most cases, early

detection does not increase a person's life span but only the length of time a person is aware that he or she has cancer."

"Researchers at the National Cancer Institute said today that the new treatment, which combines the cells with two drugs, resulted in dramatic cures in a majority of mice with colon, lung and liver cancers. Dr. Steven A. Rosenberg, the chief researcher, cautioned that the treatment had only been tested in mice. 'Lots of things work in mice that don't work in humans', he said." (From an article, "Tumor-Fighting Cells Found", in the *New York Times*. September 12, 1986)

"I have been in medical practice for 38 years. I have never done any animal experiments, neither during my studies nor subsequently, and have also never been inside an animal laboratory . Animal experimentation represents a fallacious practice. I cannot name one single case in which experiments on animals may have led to a useful result. I think vivisection is a crude, archaic method which must be completely reconsidered. I am convinced that we are approaching a quite differently conceived form of research method, based on cell cultures. " (Dr. med. Philippe Grin, general practitioner, Lausanne. Summary of a video interview with CIVIS, July 1, 1986. Translated from the French)

"I have been a surgeon for 51 years. I am still performing operations daily, and can state that in no way whatever do I owe my dexterity to animal experimentation. Like every good surgeon, I first learned my trade as an assistant to other surgeons. If I had had to learn surgery through animal experiments I would have been an incompetent in this field, just as I consider those of my colleagues to be incompetent who say that they have learned surgery through animal experimentation. It's true that there are always advocates of vivisection who say that one must first practise on animals in order to become a surgeon. That is a dishonest statement, made by people who reap financial benefit from it." (Prof. Dr. Ferdinando de Leo, professor of Pathological and Clinical Surgery at the University of Naples, in an interview with Hans Ruesch for the television station "Teleroma 56" in Rome, May 6, 1986. Translated from Italian)

Excerpt from a 3-page article by Daniel Jack Chasnan in *Science*. April 1986, titled "The Polio Paradox", and subtitled, "One of the two polio vaccines has been largely abandoned in the U.S., the other is the leading cause of the disease":

"...Presumably, when Kay McNeary changed her daughter's diapers, a reactivated virus was transmitted to her. She sued the manufacturer of the vaccine and the public agencies that administered it. In 1982, a Seattle jury awarded her \$1.1 million. Neither McNeary nor her lawyer, Daniel Sullivan, claimed that the vaccine had been manufactured improperly. The live vaccine is currently the 'vaccine of choice' in the United States. It is also the nation's leading cause of polio. In 1982 and 1983, according to the federal Centers for Disease Control's *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, it was the *only* cause."

CIVIS notes:

1) So to manufacture a highly lucrative pseudo-vaccine like Sabin's, which has been recognized as being the 'sole' cause of polio in the U.S.A. today, an entire species of animals, the highly sensitive and intelligent rhesus, have been nearly wiped out. The same pseudo-researchers who were responsible for that erstwhile fiasco are now trying to get hold of the last individuals of chimps left to manufacture an AIDS vaccine which is likely to be equally ineffective and dangerous, but even more lucrative for the profession and the industry than the Salk and Sabin products.

2) Polio has practically disappeared also in those countries where no vaccination had taken place; and countries, which of course, were spared the huge damages that the vaccinations had caused wherever they were employed.

"At no time during my training was I compelled, or shall we say persuaded, to practice any operating technique on an animal. I acquired my experience and dexterity through many years of assisting various qualified surgeons on countless occasions, as is customary and essential for the classical training of a surgeon. I identify myself unreservedly with those surgeons who, like me, advocate the abolition of vivisection. The statement that the prohibition of animal experiments would result in a deterioration of medical care and knowledge is not tenable, and quite clearly a view with overtones of self-interest." (Dr. med. Werner Hartinger, Specialist in General and Accident Surgery, practitioner for the Industrial Injuries Insurance Institutes, with 25 years' experience at the hospital and in private practice at Waldshut-Tiengen, West Germany, in a video interview with CIVIS, April 29, 1986.)

"The pressure on young doctors to publish, and the availability of laboratory animals have made professional advancement the main reason for doing animal experiments." (E.J.H. Moore, the *Lancet*, April 26, 1986)

"After 41 year's experience as a surgeon I can say with certainty that in my case animal experiments have contributed nothing to extending my surgical knowledge or improving my practical skill. That is definite. What is more, I consider cruel animal experiments as not permissible. The cruelty aspect also relates to mental agony. Animals, too, have a soul, as we know." (Prof. Dr. Julius Hackethal, Germany's most famous surgeon, at his Eubios Cancer Clinic near Munich, in a video interview with CIVIS, April 16, 1986.)

"The facts continue multiplying that refute the barbaric practice of animal experimentation in the name of human health and longevity. Yet the efforts by the medical establishment to justify this practice continues unabated...The medical establishment threatens us with dire consequences if animal experimentation is stopped. This is a shame, a weapon being used to ensure continued funding to the tune of \$6 billion a year by the National Institute of Health and Mental Health to the nation's universities." (From an article by Murray J. Cohen, M.D., in the *Chicago Tribune*. April 8, 1986.)

Moneim A. Fadali, M.D., F.A.C.S., Cardiovascular and Thoracic Surgeon, UCLA, Los Angeles, California, in a video interview with CIVIS representative Kathy Ungar in March 1986 (abstract): "I agree that for the benefit of medical science, vivisection or animal ex-

perimentation has to be stopped. There are lots of reasons for that. The most important is that it's simply misleading, and both the past and the present testify to that."

"I have seen surgeons who carried out experiments on some organs from dogs in the belief that these were identical with those of humans, and they did not know that they were cutting into a quite different organ, even into a lymphatic gland instead of the thyroid gland. Nobody has become a surgeon because of having operated on animals. He has only learnt *wrongly* through animals. I have been able to see this over my many decades as a surgeon, also as a Director of hospitals. I have carried out tens of thousands of operations on people without ever performing them first on an animal. " (Prof. Dr. Salvatore Rocca Rossetti, surgeon and Professor of Urology at the University of Turin, Italy, in the science program "Delta" on Italian television, March 12, 1986.)

*The Sunday Independent* (February 2, 1986) carried an article by Dr. Vernon Coleman, a television medical expert, author of over thirty books on health and medical practice. Dr. Coleman writes: "The researchers who conduct these experiments usually argue that their work will benefit mankind. They dismiss protestors as ignorant and unreasonable. They claim that it is necessary to maim, torture and kill animals in order to push back the frontiers of medical science. It's all absolute hogwash...I cannot think of a single major breakthrough that was produced as a result of an animal experiment."

In the newsletter *In Defense of Animals*, Winter 1986, Corte Madera, Ca., Elliot Katz, D.V.M., wrote: "You and I are lied to by the animal 'research' establishment when they tell us all this cruelty is 'necessary' for scientific research. We are being fed this lie by people who make a living of their practices behind closed doors at universities and scientific institutes...by people who are deeply interested in keeping things in this \$8-billion-a-year-business just the way they are..."

Prof. Dr. Pietro Croce, M.D. (see biography), in an interview with CIVIS, January 11, 1986: "The question was, can we give up animal experiments without halting medical progress? My answer is that not only one *can*, but that one *must* give up animal experiments not to halt medical progress. Today's rebellion against vivisection is no longer based on animal welfare. We have to speak of a scientific rebellion, which has nothing to do with animal welfare, inasmuch as we would not campaign for abolition if animal experiments were of any use to medicine. But we have now become convinced that we should put an end to animal experimentation not out of consideration for animals, but out of consideration for human beings. I won't speak now of the pharmacological disasters due to animal experiments, that would be too simple. I mean the constant, daily harm caused to medical science by the belief in the validity of animal tests."

"The abolition of vivisection would in no way halt medical progress, just the opposite is the case. All the sound medical knowledge of today stems from observations carried out on human beings. No surgeon can gain the least knowledge from experiments on animals, and all the great surgeons of the past and of the present day are in agreement on that. One



cannot learn surgery through operating on animals. Animals are completely different from Man from the anatomical standpoint, their reactions are quite different, their structure is different and their resistance is different. Animals can only mislead the surgeon. If one has performed many operations on animals, one loses the sensitivity, the delicate touch necessary for operating on humans." (Prof. Dr. Bruno Fedi, Director of the Institute of Pathological Anatomy at the General Hospital in Temi, Italy, in a video interview with CIVIS in Rome, January 11, 1986)

Paul Carrao, M.D., former head injury researcher with the U.S. Navy, analysing the head injury experiments on baboons conducted in the laboratory of the University of Pennsylvania in the 1980s: "I just know what the literature shows, and I know what our results were, and I challenge anybody to show that any of that has advanced the cause of the treatment of human head injury one iota. The bulk of the knowledge that now exists and upon which the treatment of human head injuries is predicated is that which has been derived from head injuries in the past, whether in the civilian sector or in the military. In many ways the results which were obtained with animals have been misleading, because in the case of quadrupeds the physiological mechanisms are different, so that the kinds of data obtained from different systems - circulatory, the blood pressure and so forth, respiratory, the cardiac - are different from those obtained from human head injuries."

"During 1986 Britain's Committee on Safety of Medicines obtained the cooperation of manufacturers of the anaesthetic halothane in strengthening the warnings of liver toxicity: the drug had caused 150 deaths between 1964 and 1980, but no evidence of liver toxicity had come from the initial animal tests." (SCRIP, 2, 2 October 1987)

In the *Israel Zootechnical Association Quarterly*, Dec. 1985, Dr. Andre Menache, said: "I would now like to go on to answer the questions which speakers in this session have been asked to consider. 'Is modern research possible without the use of live animals?' My answer is definitely "yes". I think that results from animal experiments for use in human beings is one of the greatest tragedies, and one of the biggest mistakes in medical history, and we unfortunately have not yet learned from our mistakes."

"It is incomprehensible how parties with vested interests repeatedly assert the necessity and purposefulness of animal experiments, paying no regard to the views of many who think otherwise, and at the same time conceal the fact that the defence used against claims for damages resulting from side-effects caused by extensively used animal-tested medicaments and chemical substances is precisely that the animal test results could not be applied to the human organism." (Dr. med. Werner Hartinger, Specialist in General and Accident Surgery, in a lecture entitled "Vivisection - False path of medicine?" on October 4, 1985, at the Kunsthhaus in Zurich.)

When the Swiss people were preparing to go to the urns to vote for or against the popular Initiative for the Abolition of Vivisection, the all-powerful Swiss chemical industry spent uncounted millions of hard-currency Swiss francs in the little country and abroad on a ruthless

campaign of persuasion and misinformation. Among the several new organizations financed by the industry was an Action-Committee based in Lausanne, POB 1069, which sent out stacks of propaganda pamphlets to every Swiss physician with the advice to display them in their waiting rooms. The pamphlets warned the waiting patients of the dire consequences for their health if the Initiative were accepted, and were signed "Your Doctor". But a surgeon in Zurich, Dr. med. Christoph Wolfensberger, wrote on November 27, 1985, to that Action Committee:

"Gentlemen - Being a sustainer of the Initiative for the Abolition of Vivisection, I do not intend to display your pamphlets in my waiting room. In fact they have already landed in the trash can. During my years of professional training, I could convince myself again and again how horrible and senseless the experiments on animals are. You won't succeed in foisting on me and my patients, with the help of your literature, the notion that the safeguard of our health depends on vivisection."

"It is well-known that animal effects are often totally different from the effects in people. This applies to substances in medical use as well as substances such as 245y and dioxin." (A.L. Cowan, MD, Acting Medical Officer of Health, New Plymouth, New Zealand, *N.Z. Listener*, August 31, 1985, p.10)

From the medical Newsletter of Robert S. Mendelsohn, M. D., *People's Doctor*, No. 815, August 25, 1985:

WHEN IS POLIO NOT POLIO? Dear Reader: Some of you may remember my warning that whenever third party payers reward physicians for a certain diagnosis, you can be sure that there will be a remarkable increase in the incidence of people who have that disease.

My favorite example stems from my early medical experience in the 1950's when the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis would pay for the diagnosis of polio. You can't imagine how many sprained ankles suddenly turned into "possible polio" cases! When the polio vaccine came on the market, the criteria for the diagnosis of polio became far more narrow.

Due to the previously inflated diagnosis, this in turn led to a sharp drop in "polio" and enabled vaccine enthusiasts to justify their product. Now, 30 years later, here is what the *The New York Times Magazine* (July 7, 1985) has to say about the "post-polio syndrome":

"During the epidemics of the 1950's, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis - the March of Dimes - assumed many medical expenses for patients whose physicians reported diagnoses of polio. In order for patients to receive economic support, some doctors diagnosed other paralytic syndromes, such as Guillain-Barre syndrome, as polio. Thus, physicians are now discovering that some patients who are complaining about the late effects of polio never had polio in the first place."

The more things change, the more they remain the same.

A letter sent by Richmond C. Hubbard, M.D. (chairman, Medical Research Modernization

Committee) to *The New York Times*, August 5, 1985:

“Better to Study Humans Directly”

“To the Editor: "Cruelty to Research Animals" (editorial July 31) misses the point stressed by the Medical Research Modernization Committee. We are a committee of 650 health-care professionals - mainly M.D. 's and Ph.D.' s - and we feel that recent advances in technology, such as tissue-culture techniques and mathematical and computer modeling - have not yet been integrated into the research methodology. Moreover, CAT scans, nuclear magnetic imaging, PET scans and lab methods such as high-performance chromatography allow human beings to be studied non-invasively and safely.

“Doesn't it make more sense to fund research dealing directly with humans, and thus avoid the problem of extrapolating to humans the results obtained in animal testing?”

“An example of an area in which human research is imperative is AIDS research. Non-human primates being used to study AIDS take years to develop a disease that has some similarities to human AIDS (we are not certain that it is the same); and once developed it is claimed that these monkey models can then be used to test new vaccines and therapeutics. But long delays mean more human deaths, and humans with AIDS are available who would be willing to volunteer in clinical studies that might help save their own lives or the lives of future AIDS victims.

“The first sentence of your editorial, "Medical research would be impossible without experiments on animals," is untrue. Our position is that the tradition of animal research needs modernization and that much of its funding should be switched to research studying human illness directly. For example, patients with intractable arthritis, multiple sclerosis and cancer (as well as those with AIDS) can be studied directly.

“It is well known that all vaccines derived from animal sources can cause severe damage to the nervous system of human beings, including paralysis, meningitis, and brain tumors, besides provoking in a healthy subject the very infection the inoculation was intended to prevent.”

Article in the *Guardian*, July 16, 1985, by Andrew Welch, Medical Correspondent:

"Drug brain damage toll put at 25 million."

“Powerful tranquillizers such as Largactil which is used to deaden the emotions of psychotic patients in hospitals and prisons should be banned, the World Mental Health Congress in Brighton was told yesterday.

“More than 25 million patients have suffered irreversible brain damage as a result of the drugs, said Dr. David Hill, senior clinical psychologist at Walton Hospital, Chesterfield. Drug companies must be forced to take them off the market, he added. Until they did so, doctors should tell patients of the risks of brain damage, and prescribe them for a maximum of two

months.

“British doctors issue some 10 million prescriptions a year for powerful tranquillizers, a consultant psychiatrist, Dr. Farrukh Hussain, of St. Augustine's Hospital, Canterbury, warned: "It is criminal not to tell patients of the risks. Informed consent is a must. We should give honest, clear advice. "

“Most psychiatrists accept that major tranquillizers cause tardive dyskinesia (T.D.) which make patients lose control of their muscles. It starts with involuntary movements of the tongue and facial muscles. In more extreme cases the arms and legs jerk uncontrollably.

“Roche, the main manufacturers, calculate that 150 million people in the world are taking the drugs, and 3 to 6 per cent of those may have T .D. in three quarters of cases, the effects were irreversible.

“Independent studies had shown that one in four patients given the drugs suffered T.D. Dr. Hill told the congress. At a conservative estimate, 38 million people had T.D. and more than 25 million had been rendered permanently unable to control the muscles in their tongues, or in many cases their entire bodies.

"Giving people chemicals that cause brain damage to this extent is silly," he said. Elderly people, particularly women, seemed more susceptible but that might be because they were the ones who had been given high doses for the longest period.

“Damage could be caused within three to six months on average doses - 14 per cent of all people suffering T.D. developed it within the first year, he said. Giving patients drug free holidays - taking them off tranquillizers for a month to see how they progressed - often made the problem worse.

“The drugs block dopamine receptors in the nerves. They dampen emotions and slow reactions until patients are only just able to talk. When the drugs are withdrawn, the nerves become hyper sensitive. The argument that the side effects should be tolerated because of the risk of schizophrenic patients relapsing when the drugs were withdrawn was false, said Dr. Hill.

“The relapse rate among those taking the drug were around 20 per cent compared with 50 per cent of those not taking the drugs, which suggested they were protecting less than one third of patients from a relapse.

“The only way of stopping the symptoms was to increase the dosage, he added. That masked the side effects but might worsen the underlying brain damage. In many cases the symptoms only appeared when patients stopped taking the drugs, so some faced the agonising choice of living under sedation or risking the effects of T.D.”

Article in the *Guardian*, March 18, 1986:

"Boy demands compensation from GP and health authority: Whooping cough vaccine 'linked

to brain damage'. There is a casual link between a vaccine that gives immunization against whooping cough, diphtheria and tetanus and brain damage, counsel for the 16-year-old brain-damaged boy told the High Court in London yesterday. The issue had divided the medical profession and caused considerable public disquiet, Mr. Justice Stuart-Smith was told..."

Article in *Weekly World News* (U.S.A.), May 28, 1985: "98 million people doomed? Brain cancer virus found in polio vaccine." Experts say 98 million Americans who took polio shots in the 1950's and 1960's may get a deadly brain cancer from the inoculations.

"Researchers at the University of Chicago medical center say that a virus contaminated the polio vaccine and they have now found genetic material from the virus in a number of brain cancer victims. The virus, called SV40, has never been found in normal brains or in brains where the cancer spread from elsewhere in the body, according to Dr. Jacob Rachlin, head of the research team.

"These results suggest that SV40 may be a good candidate as a possible cause for human brain tumors", he told a meeting of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons. He cautioned that his results "are very preliminary". Dr. Rachlin and his colleagues identified genetic material from the virus in several brain tumor victims, including three children born to mothers who had had polio shots while they were pregnant."

The following letter by J.D. Bradshaw, M.D. was printed in the *Desert News*, Salt Lake City, Utah, July 1985: "I am a retired surgeon and for several years worked in a Chicago laboratory experimenting on animals, mostly through vivisection, and I'm not proud of it. The writer of "Benefits in animal experiments", *Desert News*, May 1, speaks about "a whole lot of misinformed people" and I think she is one of them.

"She speaks about the infinite benefits derived via animal experiments, but fails to provide any proof of a single one. In pure fact, there is not a single benefit obtained that could not have been obtained by alternative methods. Some countries have abandoned experiments on animals, and in time so will the U.S."

An article by Dr. Andrew Salm, M.D., from the monthly magazine *Fur 'n' Feathers*, May 1985:

"Dog labs' taught him about animal abuse. Although I am a physician, and very much a minority on this subject, a recent letter on animal abuse has led me to review the reasons why I became opposed to vivisection and abuse of animals by the research establishment.

"My opposition to repetitious and stupid "experiments" and "research" upon helpless animals stems from my student days in medical school. In those days, our planet was not yet overpopulated, and animal life was very cheap. In freshman physiology "dog lab", held twice weekly for one semester, a live dog was assigned to each two students. Thus, our class of 135 students massacred 135 dogs a week.

"Twice weekly, three hours each session, we were assigned to repeat elementary physiological experiments that had been done a million times over during the past 100 years.

Nothing was learned that was not already known from all that bloodletting. This freshman class alone probably massacred 2,500 dogs during that semester.

"In theory, the dogs were anesthetized with ether. After the "experiment" was finished, the dog was supposedly "sacrificed" either by an ether overdose, or by the cutting of its carotid arteries. But the students were green, and always in a hurry. They were freshmen, and this was the first experience with cutting up living creatures. The bell which signaled the end of the session would ring so soon, and very often the students rushed off, not making certain that the unfortunate animal was really dead. The "used" animals were simply tossed into a trash bin behind the laboratory.

"I considered it a blot upon the teaching and medical professions that we freshmen students were merely supervised in this "dog lab" by other freshmen or sophomore students who acted as "monitors". The teaching staff was absent and did not concern itself with this butchery. This was no research. Ever since freshman "dog lab" I have been an anti-vivisectionist.

"Unfortunately, most research today is just repetitious protocol, done to write papers, to complete educational requirements, and to obtain federal grant money. Ninety percent of animal experiments are done carelessly, callously, in filthy surroundings, upon starved and mistreated animals (these things the public will never be allowed to see), for the sake of research is an end in itself, and done when the outcome is already well known."

Moneim A. Fadali, M.D., F.A.C.S., Diplomate American Board of Surgery and American Board of Thoracic Surgery wrote in May 1985 a Foreword to Brandon Reine's book *Heart Research on Animals* from which we excerpt: "The study of humans is the only sure way to unveil the mystery of humankind, to find cures for human ailments, and to prevent suffering".

"Contrary to the customary present-day opinion, I am of the view that no animal experiments whatever are ethically, morally or scientifically justifiable according to the present practices for carrying out animal experiments. As Director of the Research Institute for Orthopaedics, I am able to report from many years' experience that all the developments of this kind in medical technique can be tested on humans themselves without animal experiments, without any injury to them." - Executive Medical Officer Dr. Leopold Zemann, Specialist in Orthopaedics and Orthopaedic Surgery, Chief Physician at the Sanitarium St Andrae, Director of the Research Institute for Orthopaedics, Vienna. In a letter addressed to Prof. Dr. Konrad Lorenz, March 20, 1985.

American heart surgeon William De Vries, who surged to fame when he tried to by-pass the catastrophic implants of natural hearts by using artificial, mechanical hearts instead: "You can't know the answer to strokes by looking at animals." Quoted by *V.S. News & World Report*. Dec. 2, 1985.

In February 1985, France's biggest publishing house, Hachette, brought out *Les Mensonges de la Medecine (The Lies of Medicine)*, by Roger Dalet, M.D., who filled 228 pages with what he defines as "lies", propagated as truths by the medical establishment. We shall cite here

just one single item; on page 40, Dr. Dalet recalls the Interferon bluff, which we remember made the title page of *Time*, *Newsweek* etc., and consequently also of most European publications. Dr. Dalet writes:

"The word gets around. Some experiments seem hopeful. Rats, to which Interferon had been administered, healed of their cancer. The media spread the news that the miracle was imminent, that cancer would soon be defeated. There was a rush on this new substance...Numerous drug manufacturers pitched into the production of Interferon to fill the orders from the USA, Switzerland, Japan, etc..."

"But suddenly, the crash! Interferon doesn't keep its promises...And then, the tops, the bubble bursts. France's medical journal, *Quotidien du medecin* (No.3671, April 21, 1982, p. 11) reports: An American doctor, Shelby Berger, of the NCI, announces that Interferon, rather than retarding the development of cancer, favors its growth..."

Dr. med. Karlheinz Blank, West Germany, in *Der Tierschutz*, Nr. 62, 1985, Journal of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Tierschutz: "A drug that is tested on animals will have a completely different effect in man. There are uncounted examples that could be cited."

From an article in *Bunte*, No. 50, one of Germany's major weeklies, by its Medical Correspondent, Dr. Peter Schmidsberger:

"... For the listeners it was a shock. The expert who joined in the discussion already attracted attention through his eloquence and his heavy stature. But what he said was of even more weight. Although it was only one sentence, the information it conveyed was highly explosive.

"'Painkillers,' he stated, 'must be held responsible for about 50 per cent of kidney transplants. '

"Organ transplants are extolled as one of the greatest advances in medicine. Almost everything is held to be justified by their use - even the heavy costs. All the more serious is it when one comes to learn that this irreplaceable masterpiece of modern medicine is to a large extent serving the purpose of warding off the worst effects of misuse.

"Are 50 per cent of kidney transplants a result of the irrational use of painkillers? Since this information came from a specialist in medicines and poisons, it is of particular significance. When used over a long period, painkillers cause serious kidney damage, extending to cancer of the bladder. Due to this, the expression "painkiller kidney" became established a long while ago.

"Painkillers are among those drugs about which we have such a mass of information and experience that it is hardly possible to keep track of it all. They have been tried out over decades on millions of people. One can speak without exaggeration of wholesale experiments on human beings.

"Nevertheless, experiments on animals continue to be made, even though these drugs have already gone through all the stages of animal experimentation - otherwise they would never

have come onto the market in the first place. But despite this, the injuries to health, which are known today, had not been foreseen.

"The animal experiments are now continuing, so as to investigate how the serious damage from painkillers came about. It is more than doubtful whether this will be successful. The experimenters complain that there are no suitable animal models for kidney damage. Not only because animals do not take painkillers, but above all because the injuries brought about in the experiments cannot be transferred to human beings."

The opponents of vivisection received quite unexpected help in 1985 from the notorious Dr. Hans-Joachim Cramer, who directs the Press and Information Department of the German Federal Association of the Pharmaceutical Industry ("Bunderversband der Pharmazeutischen Industrie e.V.") - an office which demands great inventive talent and strong nerves. In the magazine *Medikament und Meinung* (February 15, 1985) he fell into a trap of his own making when he promised to expose the alleged "faking and falsifications" in the quotations of the antivivisectionists, and then unconsciously proceeded to prove precisely the opposite. Dr. Cramer complains that the name of Nobel Prize winner Ernst Boris Chain crops up frequently in the writings of the antivivisectionists, and that he is on each occasion deliberately quoted falsely. Cramer writes:

"At the Contergan (Thalidomide) trial Chain is said to have stated that the results of animal experiments cannot be extrapolated to human beings. Now, what did he really say? On February 2, 1970 he stated before the District Court in Alsdorf: 'No animal experiment on a medicament, even if it is carried out on several animal species including primates under all conceivable conditions, can give an absolute guarantee that the medicament tested in this way will act the same on human beings, for in many respects man is not the same as animals...' (quotation from the records, published in *Der Contergan Prozess*, Verlag Wissenschaft und Forschung GmbH, Berlin, pages 17-19)."

Thanks to Dr. Cramer, the reader now knows precisely what Nobel Prize winner Chain, summoned by the accused manufacturers Chemie Grunenthal as a defence witness and appearing after traveling from afar, actually said under oath at the Thalidomide trial - and it is precisely what the opponents of vivisection have always stated. The fact that Chain, a vivisector over many years, contradicted himself shortly afterwards by adding that animal experiments represent "a minimising of the risk for humans" (and this, of all things, just when the Thalidomide tragedy was under discussion, the international scale of which is known to be attributable solely to the "safety tests" which had previously been carried out and repeated over many years!), once again shows the confused state of mind of the advocates of vivisection, who would like to pretend that animal torture is not carried out simply for reasons of personal gain or childish curiosity, but in order to protect humans from being harmed by medicaments, or even to heal them of illnesses..

In 1972, a book was published about the manner in which the drug manufacturers, who are facing prosecution, obtain defence witnesses from among their scientist allies in the pseudo-



medical industry. Entitled *Thalidomide and the Power of the Drug Companies*, it was published by Penguin Books and written by Henning Sjoestroem, a Swedish lawyer, and Robert Nilsson, a researcher in the chemical industry. But care was taken to have this documentation, very incriminating for the entire pharmaceutical industry, quickly swept under the carpet exactly the same fate as that suffered by similar exposes of earlier and later date.

Extract from an article written by a member of the Swiss National Council, Dr. med. Paul Gunther, Senior Anaesthetician at the Regional Hospital of Interlaken, which appeared in the *Solothurner Zeitung* on November 15, 1985: "It is precisely the most modern research methods, such as cell cultures with human cells, that are producing new discoveries...In spite of all the animal experiments, all medicaments ultimately have to be tested on the human being...As a physician I, therefore, support the campaign for the abolition of vivisection."

"I carried out animal experiments over many years, following an unsound logic which had been drummed into me during my studies at the university and a long time afterwards. Until one day I said to myself: something must be wrong in the thinking and practice of medicine; something basic, meaning the method is totally wrong...It would be very difficult to find anything that could be more misleading for biomedical research than animal experimentation." (Prof. Pietro Croce, M.D., internationally trained researcher and physician, visiting lecturer at the University of Milan, in his book *Vivisezione O Scienza (Vivisection or Science - a Choice)*, 2nd edition, 1985)

"As a researcher I am involved with mutagenesis and cancerogenesis, two areas in which experimentation is fundamentally indispensable. I therefore know what I am talking about. And I say "No" to vivisection. Not only on ethical, but above all on scientific grounds. It has been proved that the results of research with animals are in no case valid for man. There is a law of Nature in relation to metabolism, according to which a biochemical reaction that one has established in one species only applies to that species, and not to any other. Two closely related species, like the mouse and the rat, often react entirely differently..."(The Italian parliamentarian Gianni Tamino, researcher at the University of Padua, the most important medical university in Italy, in an interview with *Domenica del Corriere*. No. 48, December 1, 1984)

From a speech by the same Gianni Tamino, in the Chamber of Deputies in Rome, Italy, on November 16, 1984:

"I talk not just as a Congressman, but as a person who works on the problems which are being discussed in this order of the day: I mean as a researcher who works on experimenting chemical products, studying mutagenesis and cancerogenesis, actually using - as had been requested in the document about which we are discussing - those other forms of studies that do without the use of animals.

"It isn't merely a matter of humane concern in regards to other living beings, but much rather a more correct choice, from the scientific point of view, than animal experimentation, which can rarely be significant, because of the animals' different metabolism and other

characteristics that man has. Animal experimentation is very often just senseless speculation and cruelty, which don't guarantee in any way that the sought-after result will be obtained, while, at the same time, involving enormous expenditures.

"Other methods, based on the usage of cells cultured *in vitro*. based on biological systems *in vitro*. provide much greater economy, quicker answers, and, thanks to technological refinement, more reliable results, more likely to be extrapolated to human beings. Thus we are asked to make a choice which is coherent with the progress of biology and to refuse a method that evokes medieval barbarity and certainly not any experimentation done for the sake of prevention and an increase of the quality of human life."

*LA Times*. October 10, 1984:

"Cancer-causing genes and the processes that can make them dangerous appear so important in normal life that the disease probably never will be eradicated. researchers said. Cancer seems to stem from mutations in special genes that appear otherwise important in normal life, and "there's no way we're going to completely abolish mutations," said William Hayward of Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center in New York. "I don't think it likely on the basis of our present trajectory (of research) to eliminate the process' of cancer development," said Dr. Paul Marks, president of Sloan-Kettering.'

"Tests on rats and guinea-pigs are controversial because animals and human beings do not always have the same response to chemicals. In addition, huge doses administered to test animals raise questions about the application of the test-tube environment to real life. Tests are also costly. Animal tests for a single chemical may reach \$11 million. Says John Dull, professor of pharmacology at the University of Kansas Medical Center: "You can never prove safety for these substances." (Abstract from an article by Clemens P. Work and Ronald A. Taylor in *U.S. News and World Report*. May 21, 1984)

CIVIS comment: Spending 11 million dollars on animal tests for a single chemical while knowing they will never prove safety seems a pretty high price to pay for stupidity, unless the whole scheme has been cooked up by the Laboratory Animal Breeders Associations.

A letter from Lenore Brewer, quoting Donald E. Doyle, M.D., a science adviser to the Animal Protection Institute, in *The Milwaukee Journal*. March 4, 1984:

"Arguments which attempt to persuade us that pound animals are necessary for the further advancement of medical science and the education of our future doctors and surgeons, I feel, are totally without merits...Not only is it unnecessary for physicians in training to practice surgery upon animals, but it may also be a waste of time. One is either born with manual dexterity in surgical skill, or is not...practice can be learned best by assisting in a hospital surgery unit. "

The Thalidomide tragedy largely spawned routine teratogen (physical defects in off-spring) testing in rabbits and rats or mice but because of extreme species variability these do not

safeguard humans and it is only a matter of time before the next major drug disaster occurs. As Dr. Mann points out in *Modern Drug Use* (1984):

"The difficulty of predicting human risk from animal teratogenicity tests is illustrated by the fact that, although aspirin is a proven teratogen in the rat, mouse, guinea-pig, cat, dog and monkey, it is also one of the substances which has been widely used by pregnant women and yet not been shown to produce any kind of characteristic malformation."

Even the Office of Health Economics, an organisation funded by the Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry, admits in regard to Thalidomide: "In this particular case, therefore, it is unlikely that specific tests in pregnant animals would have given the necessary warning: the right species would probably never have been used."

What the Thalidomide affair should demonstrate is the short-sightedness of placing misguided faith in animal tests instead of attempting to develop humane alternative research techniques and devoting massive efforts towards preventing women from taking drugs during pregnancy.

"The infamous anti-inflammatory drugs phenylbutazone and oxyphenbutazone are responsible for an estimated 10,000 deaths worldwide. The chances of harmful effects occurring in people compared with laboratory animals are considerably increased because it takes much longer for patients to metabolize the drugs. In people it takes 72 hours to break down a dose of phenylbutazone but the corresponding times in rhesus monkeys, dogs, rats and rabbits are eight, six, six, and three hours, respectively. For oxyphenbutazone it takes 72 hours for people and only half an hour for dogs to metabolize the drug. The time taken for Opren to be eliminated from the blood stream was much longer in elderly patients than in laboratory animals." (Estimate by Dr Sidney Wolfe, director of the Ralph Nader Health Research Group - in *Lancet*, 11 February 1984.)

A View, by Richard Moskowitz, M.D., reprinted from the *Journal of the American Institute of Homeopathy*, March 7, 1983:

"Since routine vaccines introduce live viruses and other highly antigenic material into the blood of virtually every living person, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that a significant harvest of auto-immune diseases will automatically result.

"It is dangerously misleading and the exact opposite of the truth to claim that a vaccine makes us "immune" or PROTECTS us against an acute disease. In fact, it only drives the disease deeper into the interior and causes us to harbour it chronically with the result that our responses to it become progressively weaker and show less and less tendency to heal and resolve themselves spontaneously. Far from producing a genuine immunity the vaccines may act by actually interfering with or SUPPRESSING the immune response as a whole."

In a letter dated the 2nd of March 1983, Prof. Dr. Giulio Tarro, Head of the Dept. of Virology and Oncology at the Medical Faculty of Naples University and partner of Albert Sabin (see *Slaughter of the Innocent*, page 262) expressed himself as follows: "I have finally come to the

conclusion that no serious importance can be attached to any laboratory experiment on animals in the study of analgesics, for the results cannot in any circumstances be extrapolated to human beings."

"My efforts to head off the poisoning of hundreds of women with breast cancer with a dangerous drug that could destroy their host defense systems failed. The National Cancer Institute went right ahead. Now a few women with breast cancer have paid with their lives for this stupidity. The moral is that animal model systems not only kill animals, they also kill humans." (Dr. Irwin D. Bross, Director of Biostatistics Roswell Park Memorial Institute, in *Experimental and Applied Toxicology*, Jan./Feb. 1983)

Steven Tiger, a Physician-Assistant-Certified, registered to practice in New York State, formerly in clinical practice, editor of two medical journals and full-time medical instructor, in a pamphlet published by the ISAR, 421 South State Street, Clarks Summit, PA 18411: "If every experiment now underway were successfully concluded tomorrow, it would have far less benefit than adoption of a wellness oriented lifestyle. No research is needed for that, and the time and money now devoted to medical research would be better spent on fostering wellness, which would do much more good for far more people. The supposed "benefits" from animal experiments are a myth."

"As regards animal experiments in medicine, I answer as a doctor with a clear NO. Not only do animal experiments not have to be carried out, they are totally useless and contribute nothing whatever to so-called progress in medicine. For a result obtained in a series of experiments on a sick cat (or are laboratory animals or cats with electrodes implanted in their brains supposed to be healthy?) cannot for one minute be applied to the corresponding healthy animal, and much less so to man." (Dr. med. Jurg Kym, general practitioner, Zurich, special publication, 1983)

"In 25 years I have never yet seen an animal experiment in pure research which could not have been carried out with other methods." (Prof. Dr. Bruno Fedi, Director of the Institute of Pathological Anatomy at the City Hospital of Temi, Italy, during the public hearings of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg on 8th, 9th December 1982. NB - The word "not" in the above sentence of Prof. Fedi was omitted from the French text of the statements, which were subsequently photocopied in summarised form and sent to all participants. The gap left by the removed word was clearly visible, and Prof. Fedi protested sharply against the clearly intentional falsification of his statement. The hearings, which were conducted and dominated by the British chemical lobby interests, had the purpose of giving animal experiments a legal anchor in all the countries of the Common Market for the future.)

"It is the outrageous lie of the supporters of vivisection, a lie serious in its consequences, that animal experiments take place for the good of mankind. The opposite is the case: animal experiments only have an alibi function for the purpose of obtaining money, power and titles. Not one single animal experiment has ever succeeded in prolonging or improving, let alone saving, the life of one single person." (From a paper published by Dr. med. Heide Evers, D-

7800 Freiburg, 1982)

Experts often assert that it is senseless to compare a tumor which has artificially been provoked in an animal with a tumor that has spontaneously developed in a human being. - Dr. Peter Schmidberger, Medical Correspondant of the German weekly, *Bunte*, No. 21, 1982.

John Fabre of Oxord's Nuffield Department of Surgery, describes how positive results from animal experiments in the 1960s suggested that there might be important advances in transplantation and thereby prompted a large amount of further research into heart and kidney transplants in rats. But tissue differences between humans and rats meant that animal experiments once again proved misleading:

"The many encouraging results raised hopes that a major advance in clinical immuno-suppression for transplantation was in the offing, but these hopes have now faded and nothing of the great mass of work has been translated into clinical practice." (J.W. Fabre, *transplantation*, 223-234, vol. 34,1982.)

#### ANIMALS IN CANCER RESEARCH: A MULTI - BILLION DOLLAR FRAUD.

An article in *Fundamental and Applied Toxicology*, November 1982, by D. Bross, Ph.D., former Director of the largest cancer research institute in the world, the Sloan-Kettering Institute, then Director of Biostatics, Roswell Memorial Institute, Buffalo, New York 14263. Excerpts:

"... From a scientific standpoint, what is pertinent is what are called "animal model systems" in cancer research have been a total failure.

"For instance, not a single essential new drug for the treatment of human cancer was first picked up by an animal model system. All of the drugs in wide current clinical use were only put into animal model systems *after* finding clinical clues to their chemo therapeutic possibilities. A few relatively ineffective drugs were developed in animal systems. However, more effective drugs found in the clinic can be substituted for any of these. Thus; the tens of millions of animals killed in the mass screening for new cancer drugs died in vain. The hundreds of millions spent by the National Cancer Institute on this futile effort were diverted from genuine cancer research that might have provided useful drugs.

"When NCI enthusiastically supported the mass screening using animals, there was plenty of good evidence that the mass screening program would fail. There was almost no factual evidence to suggest that it was going to succeed. The money was spent and the animals were killed for two main reasons. First, it was a highly profitable undertaking for certain medical schools and research institutes that were incapable of doing any genuine cancer research. Second, it was sustained by a superstitious belief in a grossly unscientific notion: Mice are miniature men...

"Since there is no way to defend the use of animal model systems in plain English or with scientific facts, they resort to double talk in technical jargons... In sum, from the standpoint of

current scientific theory of cancer, the whole mystique of animal model systems is hardly more than superstitious nonsense...

"The virtue of animal model systems to those in hot pursuit of the federal dollars is that they can be used to prove anything - no matter how foolish, or false, or dangerous this might be. There is such a wide variation in the results of animal model systems that there is always some system which will "prove" a point. Fraudulent methods of argument never die and rarely fade away. They are too useful to promoters...

"The moral is that animal model systems not only kill animals, they also kill humans. There is no good factual evidence to show that the use of animals in cancer research has led to the prevention or cure of a single human cancer."

"Over a 25-year period, the United States National Cancer Institute screened 40,000 species of plants for anti-tumour activity and, as a result, several proved sufficiently safe and effective on the basis of animal tests to be included in human trials. Unfortunately all of these were either ineffective in treating human cancer or too toxic to consider *for* general use. Thus, in 25 years of this extensive programme, not a single anti-tumour agent safe and effective enough *for* use by patients has yet emerged." (N.R. Farnsworth and J.M. Pezzuto, paper presented at the University of Panama workshop sponsored by the International Foundation for Science, 1982. Reproduced in *The Cruel Deception* by Dr Robert Sharpe, 1988.)

A. D. Dayan of Wellcome Research had admitted in *Risk-Benefit Analysis in Drug Research*. Ed. J. F. Cavalla, 1981 (MTP): (In A'- Def. Jan./Feb. 86):

"The weakness and intellectual poverty of a naive trust in animal tests may be shown in several ways; e.g. the humiliating large number of medicines discovered only by serendipitous observation in man (ranging from diuretics to antidepressants), or by astute analysis of deliberate or accidental (human) poisoning, the notorious examples of valuable medicines which have seemingly 'unacceptable' toxicity in animals, e.g. hepatic necrosis in mice, the stimulant action of morphine in cats, and such instances of unpredicted toxicity in man as the production of pulmonary hypertension which appeared during animal tests. Because of the often misleading nature of animal experiments this could divert attention from other possible side-effects which may arise. In any case, human trials should involve careful clinical observation whatever animal or alternative tests have indicated. "

But just one year later, this same A. D. Dayan, as one of the two main lecturers at the Hearings of the European Council at Strasbourg in December 1982, asserted just the opposite. Why? Because his truthful admission cited above was meant for his colleagues who knew the score, and he would have made himself look ridiculous if he had claimed otherwise. But he had no such qualms in addressing the European Parliamentarians, who were no medical experts, but merely uninformed politicians sent to Strasbourg to receive instructions from the "experts".

As the Hearings were organized by the British Chemical Industry, this industry had provided

both the spurious "opposition" (see CIVIS Bulletin No.1, 1983) in the persons of Richard Ryder and Judith Hampson, and the two main "experts", who practically monopolized the Hearings - vivisector Prof. W.D.M. Paton, representing the most important sounding European Science Foundation stabled at Oxford University, and A. D. Dayan, heading the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries Associations.

And in this capacity, speaking for the Pharmaceuticals, it was Dayan's task to foist off the false notion of the necessity of animal experimentation on the Parliamentarians, in order to provide legal alibis for any past and future health damages caused by drugs developed through a false methodology. Said he: "Society has demanded that governments throughout the world should require manufacturers of potentially hazardous products to test them first on animals. Scientists and manufacturers have no alternative but to conform to the laws of the land in which they operate."

(The truth is that "society" had never made such a demand. It was the pseudo-scientists, presenting themselves as self-styled "experts", as an insurance against product liability damage suits. A smart alibi.)

"Between 1962 and 1982, the numbers of people who contracted or died of cancer both increased. Cancer deaths rose 8.7 percent "The bottom line is that despite all the billions of dollars, and the promises and the claims of success, more people are dying of cancer than before..." - Dr. John C. Bailer III, bio statistician, Harvard University School of Public Health, Co-author of report on cancer in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, May 1986.

"Human disease occurs as a result of a combination of factors including genetics, growth and development, positive or negative lifestyle activities, and social and environmental influences: These factors are profoundly dissimilar in humans and animals. Experimental research on animals to find the causes and cures for human ailments is pure folly - at best an appalling waste and diversion of resources and at worst the cause of much human suffering and disease." - Les Stewart, D.D.S., Feb., 1987. *Last Chance for Animals*, Tarzana, California.

From an article titled 'Why Cancer Research Has Failed', in *The Star*, Johannesburg, April 10, 1981: 'The use of animals, which tend to develop different cancers from those in people, could be the reason why cancer research has been so unsuccessful. This is the view of Dr. Robert Sharpe, guest speaker at the symposium on animal experimentation. Dr. Sharpe said alternative methods for testing in cancer research existed, but were not being widely used.

An authoritative study has shown an alarming increase in the incidence of cancer in Britain. This concentration on animal experimentation for research could be a reason why this research has been so unsuccessful. '

"Indeed, while conflicting animal tests have often delayed and hampered advances in the war on cancer, they have never produced a single substantial advance either in the prevention or treatment of human cancer." (Dr Irwin D. Bross, Director of Biostatistics, Roswell Park Memorial Institute for Cancer Research, 1981.)

"Heart transplants 'dead end' "read a headline in the *Lethbridge Herald* on February 11, 1981. This article, from Calgary, ran:

"The hope of giving heart victims spare parts has run up against some harsh biological facts, says heart surgeon Dr. John Callaghan, chief of chest and heart surgery at Edmonton's University Hospital. The operation is impractical, he said, because it can easily cost \$300,000 a patient and produce no more than one or two years of extra life. The huge cost is due to the need to continually monitor the patient for signs of rejection and treat him with preparations that keep the body from rejecting the donated organ.

"Mechanical hearts, Callaghan said, generate too much heat. This is true of even the most efficient pumps made today...People must accept the fact that they bear the biggest responsibility for preventing heart disease, he said. Changes in lifestyle would save more lives than all the scientists, surgeons and hospitals in the country".

'A "Miracle Drug" That Backfired' was the title of an *International Herald Tribune* article on January 14, 1981. It began by recalling that American physicians had started prescribing Clofibrate massively 13 years before, because:

"The drug seemed to offer modern man the luxury of having his cake and eating it too - that is, of continuing to devour steak and butter without fear of heart attack just by taking a little capsule four times a day... Far from saving lives, it now appears Clofibrate actually increases the death rate among its users. A decade long study run by the World Health Organization (WHO) recently reported that men regularly taking the drug were 25 percent more likely to die of a broad range of disorders, including cancer, stroke, respiratory disease and, ironically, heart attack, than those who got a placebo capsule".

A. D. Dayan, who represented the European Federation of Pharmaceuticals industries at the European Parliament of Strasbourg in 1982 and also works for the Wellcome Research Laboratories, revealed: "Practolol was prescribed for over 4 years before doctors realised it caused corneal damage including blindness - a side-effect not predicted by animal experiments." (C. T. Dollery in *Risk-Benefit Analysis in Drug Research*, Ed. J. F. Cavalla, 1981, MIP) (Mr. Dayan overlooked many tens of thousands of other drugs that had all been withdrawn from the market by the health authorities of various nations who had first approved them on the basis of animal "safety" tests on animals. Those "health authorities" included Mr. Dayan himself. CIVIS note.)

For instance, *The Cancer Conspiracy*, by Dr. Robert E. Netterberg and Robert T. Taylor, Pinnacle Books, New York, 1981, said: "The directed research practices and other activities of the National Cancer Institute and of the American Cancer Society have been scandalously counterproductive in the conquest of cancer, in spite of the billions of dollars expended. The cancer establishment is closed to new approaches and ideas, thus creating a self-perpetuating system with no clear objective even remotely in sight."

Dr. J.D. Whittall, M.D., in his book *People and Animals*, London, 1981:



"If there had been no vivisection and reliance had been placed on clinical research and observation for finding out about the human body; and if there had been a real study of the human being as a person rather than as a machine, we would doubtless not now be threatened by science with such monstrous scientific goals as head transplants, deep freezing of human beings and indefinite prolongation of life, radical alteration of the human mind by drugs and other means, remote control of humans by means of electrodes implanted in the brain, the creation of man-animal chimeras, etc...The world would not be saddened and threatened by the increasing number of scientists and technologists who are being conditioned by their laboratory employment to callous disregard of animal suffering, leading inevitably to callous disregard of human suffering. There would not now be a growing number of people greatly distressed by the appalling cruelties which they know go on in laboratories. There would not now be a world-wide epidemic of torture where techniques are used similar to those that have been used on animals for many years.

"There would not now be a predominantly experimental medicine in the western world instead of a clinical medicine. There would be less disease and greater happiness. And perhaps this planet would not now be in greater danger of destruction due to cruel and greedy exploitation of its treasures by its human inhabitants than at any time since the world began."

CIVIS adds: And there would probably not be AIDS, and the inevitable following of "better" and more profitable maladies to come.

"There are no alternatives to animal experimentation, for one can only talk of alternatives if these replace something of the same worth; and there is nothing quite as useless, misleading and harmful as animal experimentation. In its stead, however, there is a "medical science", and the latter has absolutely nothing to do with animal experimentation." (Prof. Pietro Croce, M.D.)

"... the sad reflection must be that countless animals that have died in psychological experiments have died not only cruelly, but in vain." (Don Banister, Medical Research Council External Scientific Staff, High Royds Hospital, in *Animals in Research*, 1981)

"Drug induced illness has become a public health menace of major and alarming proportions, producing more deaths annually than are caused by breast cancer and ranking among the top ten causes of hospital admission." (*Medicine in Society*, Vol. 7, 1981)

It has been nine years since SMON victims first undertook legal action in court against the State, Ciba-Geigy (Japan) Limited, Takeda Chemical Industries Ltd., and Tanabe Seiyaku Co., Ltd. The number of plaintiffs since that lawsuit on May 28, 1971 has now reached 5,500. The Tokyo District Court ruled on the SMON case on August 3, 1978. At that time, the Court noted:

"The Ciba-Geigy head office in Basel investigated reports that dogs given Entero-Vioform or Mexaform often developed epileptiform seizures and died, and the company circulated a warning among veterinarians not to use these drugs in veterinary treatment. However,

although these drugs were produced for human use, the company not only took no measures to warn against the dangers of use by humans, but also, as previously mentioned, they continued to stress thereafter the safety of Entero-Vioform and Mexaform in Japan..."

They still continue selling Clioquinol in many countries without adequate warning...

Mrs. Heidi Anderson, a Swedish woman who participated in this press conference, had been diagnosed as having multiple sclerosis, but today it is clear that she is a victim of Clioquinol-induced SMON. So we presume that there are still many other SMON victims in Europe.

It is a criminal act that Ciba-Geigy and other multi-national pharmaceutical companies continue to sell drugs in the Third World, which are prohibited in the developed countries (Emphasis supplied). (Geneva Press Conference on SMON, Proceedings, Copyright 1980 by the Organizing Committee of Geneva Press Conference on SMON, 5th Ft., Yamaichi Bldg., Tokyo 160)

In the *Human Life Review*, New York (Winter issue 1980, Vol. VI, No. 1) Muggeridge published an in-depth analysis of the Christian Barnard transplant experiments and of the mental make-up of the man behind them.

Speaking of Washkansky, Barnard's first heart-transplant patient, Muggeridge tells us: "The heart worked, and the patient, in a manner of speaking, lived. At the end of 18 days, he thankfully expired. 'They're killing me', he managed to get out before he died. 'I can't sleep, I can't eat, I can't do anything. They are at me all the time with pins and needles...All day and all night. It's driving me crazy'".

Washkansky's successor, Dr. Philip Blaiberg, a dentist, managed to survive for two years, though his private account of how he fared roughly coincided with his predecessor's. As Blaiberg's own daughter, Jill, told it in an UPI dispatch from Cape Town, the 19 months her father lived with a transplanted heart were "hell".

"I don't know if it was the drugs or the transplant, but he was a different man," Miss Blaiberg, 22, said in an interview. "Physically, my father's life was hell after the transplant. He was suffering terribly all the time, but he did not want the world to know this..."

"Our entire medicine is today dominated, practically terrorised, by analytical science, which is unfeeling and heartless. Its medical research has nothing to do with health. The stifling of symptoms is erroneously considered as the restoration of health, but has nothing to do with it. On the contrary, it harms and impedes true healing. A child whose fever is hastily eliminated by administering antibiotics is more ill than before, becomes more prone to diseases and chronically ill. Analytical science has formed doctors whose mental abilities do not extend beyond the equation  $2+2=4$ . They are blind to the most elementary observations, which they despise as "subjective". This ignorant attitude is also responsible for the disgusting animal experiments, which are only a sign of spiritual deafness." (Prof. Dr. med. Helmut Mommsen, pediatrician in Frankfurt am Main, in *CIVIS-SCHWEIZ Aktuell*, Zurich, December 1980)

Prof. R. J. Belcher, at the Congress of Thoracic Surgery, held in Florence, Italy, Feb. 14-16, 1980, stated that the thoracic surgeon must be introduced gradually into his speciality, but directly on humans, to the exclusion of any previous exercises on animals, which are not only useless but can be dangerous for the preparation of the thoracic surgeon."

"Biomedical research does not need animals any more, but should use computers. It is pointless and even dangerous to continue following the traditional paths, for the difference between man and animal is so great that it mostly leads us into error. We are increasingly recognising that artificial organs can be applied directly to humans without testing them first on animals. Artificial heart valves, for example, and also the pacemaker for the heart, were first tested on humans, and only later was it established that they also function if they are implanted in animals." (Professor Luigi Sprovieri, one of the originators of extra corporeal circulation of the blood, a long-time collaborator of the famous French experimenter Charles Dubost, at a medical congress in Sorrento, Italy, reported by *La Nazione* Florence, October 5, 1980)

"Normally, animal experiments not only fail to contribute to the safety of medications, but they even have the opposite effect" (Prof. Dr. Kurt Fickentscher of the Pharmacological Institute of the University of Bonn, Germany, in *Diagnosen*, March 1980).

Dr. Carl E. Pochedly, identified by *Science Digest* in its January issue as an oncologist (cancer expert) specializing in infantile cancer, made the following confession: "The large number of chemotherapeutic drugs now available increase the oncologist's ability to cope with the child with cancer whose disease is becoming refractory to therapy. Always having a new drug to try increases the physician's composure in this situation. Having a large repertoire of drugs means fewer situations in which the frustration of nothing one can do predominates".

"If one damages a healthy animal (in order to simulate in him a human disease), the animal will overcome the inflicted damage by its own powers, and recover naturally. But our animal researchers attribute the animal's recovery to the chemical substance they have administered - and then they are vastly surprised (presuming the matter interests them in the first place) - that this chemical substance won't heal the human patient. But the human disease was due to the fact that the immunological system has failed to act properly, and now the sick organism is being further damaged by the administered drugs. Evidently, all this is too difficult to understand for the experimental researchers, that's why they remain stuck in the stereotyped thinking and continue experimenting on animals". (Herbert Stiller, M.D., founder of the West-German league "MDs against Vivisection", 1979)

"TB Vaccine Fails Indian Trial" was the title of an article reported by the *New Scientist*, November 15, 1979, by K.S. Jayaraman, New Delhi, and it began thus: "The world's biggest trial (conducted in south India) to assess the value of BCG tuberculosis vaccine has made the startling revelation that the vaccine "does not give any protection against bacillary forms of tuberculosis". The study, said to be "most exhaustive and meticulous", was launched in 1968 by the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) with assistance from the World Health

Organization (WHO) and the U.S. Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia.

The incidence of new cases among the BCG vaccinated group was slightly (but statistically insignificant) higher than in the control group, a finding that led to the conclusion that BCG's protective effect "was zero".

Scientists' Comments, *Archives of Toxicity*, 1979, Vol. 43: "The prime difficulty is the misplaced confidence that many place on animal testing. It is a pathetic illusion that simply doing enough animal testing will predict all human toxicity...Two year's studies on rats and twenty month feeding experiments in mice will, it has been calculated, lead to false results 50 percent of the time when conducting studies on agents to look at their cancer causing potential. Tests for the chronic toxicity of contraceptives on dogs yield totally different results than those found in rodents or monkeys".

One of the latest "heretics" was Robert Mendelsohn, M.D., a Chicago pediatrician who is being called an eccentric by the medical powers that be, in spite of his impeccable credentials: He's been practicing and teaching medicine for more than 25 years, has been the U.S. National Director of Project Head Start's medical consultation service, Chairman of the Medical Licensing Committee for the State of Illinois and the recipient of numerous awards for excellence in medicine and medical instruction. What has caused the ire of his superiors was a book he published in 1978, *Confessions of a Medical Heretic* (Cosmopolitan Books, Chicago):

"I confess that I believed in the irradiation of tonsils, lymph nodes and the thymus gland. I believed my professors when they said that the doses we were using were absolutely harmless. Years later the "absolutely harmless" radiation sown a decade or two before was reaping a harvest of thyroid tumors. I no longer believe in modern medicine. I believe that the greatest danger to your health is the doctor who practises modern medicine...

"Don't trust your doctor. Assume that if they prescribed a drug, it's dangerous. There is no safe drug...Modern Medicine has succeeded in teaching us to equate *medical care* with *health*. It is that equation which has the potential to destroy our bodies, our families, our communities, and our world...Hundreds of thousands of women are still lining up every year for breast X-rays, despite the well-publicised statistical evidence that the mammography itself can cause more breast cancer than it will detect...I believe that more than 90 percent of modern medicine could disappear from the face of the earth - doctors, hospitals, drugs and equipment - and the effect on our health would be immediate and beneficial."

Richard F. Perkins, Tonawanda, optometrist, in *Buffalo News*, June 9, 1979: "Your editorial "Threat to Health Research" is a prime example of misinformed and brainwashed thinking shoved on the public by the drug-medical clique. It has been proved by enlightened doctors that no actual progress in surgery or treatment of disease has been made by experiments on animals. In fact, progress has been held back by false results".

From an article in *Time*. April 23, 1979, titled "Surgery in the Asylum": "The allegations

sounded like excerpts from the script of *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*. Lawyer Patrick Murphy, who filed suit in Chicago last week, charged that between 25 and 100 patients in Illinois Manteno Mental Health Center underwent "unauthorized and secret" experimental surgery in the 1950's and 60's at the University of Chicago Billings Hospital. The surgery removed their adrenal glands, which produce cortisone and other hormones. The supervising surgeon: Dr. Charles B. Higgings, 77, winner of a Nobel Prize for his pioneering work on hormonal treatment of cancer".

"Most cancers still on rise, expert tells U.S. pane." This was the headline in the *International Herald Tribune* of March 7, 1979 for a story that said in part: "Most types of cancer are still on the increase, some drastically, a National Cancer Institute official told a Senate Health subcommittee yesterday. Among men - eight out of 10 major types - including bladder, prostate, lung, and intestinal cancers - are increasing. Among women, eight of 13 types - including lung, uterine, breast, bladder and kidney cancers - are increasing."

"As a cancer specialist engaged in clinical practice, I can't agree with the researchers who believe that results obtained with laboratory animals are applicable to human beings." (Prof. Dr. Heinz Oeser, in one of the leading German weeklies, *Quick*, March 15, 1979)

"Animal experiments should be forbidden everywhere." (Dr. Julius Hackethal, the best known German surgeon and author of medical books, in an interview with *Die Zeit*, October 13, 1978)

"The animal and human organs show striking differences in their sensitivity to chemical combinations. Allergic reactions, as typical human injuries resulting from medicaments, can hardly be foreseen by means of animal experimentation...The question is a justified one as to what medical discoveries of any significance have ever come about through animal experiments." (Dr. Balz Widmer, *Schweizerische Aerztezeitung*, August 16, 1978)

"Drug Firms Trick Patients Into Becoming Human Guinea Pigs", was the title of an article by Chris Pritchard in *National Enquirer*, August 1978, which said in part: "One of the cases involved a researcher who lied to a group of expectant mothers, revealed Dr. Michael Hensley, medical officer in the FDA's division of scientific investigations. Dr. Hensley said the researcher got the women to try an analgesic without telling them that the drug could cause respiratory problems in their newborn babies. In fact, Dr. Hensley said, the specific purpose of this study was 'to induce a mild respiratory depression in the infants', and then see whether another drug was effective in treating that..."

Prof. Ferdinando de Leo, M.D., professor of Surgery, Special Surgical Pathology, and General Clinical Surgery and Therapy at the University of Naples, and head surgeon at the Pellegrini Hospital. Excerpts from a televised one hour interview in Rome, Channel 5, in 1978:

"I am thankful for your invitation to appear on your program, because I think that the word of a man who has practiced surgery for half a century, in every branch of general surgery, can help dispel some of the prejudices and misconceptions that are prevalent today even in the

minds of highly educated and cultured individuals in regards to vivisection. Having had first-hand experience of what goes on in the laboratories, and having in the company of Mr Ruesch publicly debated vivisectionists, I can testify both to the utter uselessness of the horrors that are routine in those institutions, and to the infinitesimally low moral stature of the vivisectionists...

"Reading their papers, the expert must really ask himself whether those gentlemen have any brains at all...Not only are they not contributing in any way to the preservation of human health, but they create the premises for future errors and horrors, which suggest madness, delirium, as when they propose head or brain transplants. At this point, I feel, not the surgeon but the psychiatrist should step in...

"Vivisectionists claim that vivisection helps the beginner to acquire manual dexterity. But how can anyone imagine that one can acquire such dexterity by operating on a cat, on a dog, on a rat, whose intestines are much smaller, whose various organs have an entirely different anatomical relationship to each other than in man, in no way comparable to the human. The same goes for the consistency of the innards, their colour, their resistance to the scalpel and so on. It's a joke.

"For centuries, the proper surgical training has consisted, first of all, in observing the master surgeon in the operating room, and then starting on a road that is very long, tortuous, and exceedingly hard, but brings results: assisting the chief surgeon and collaborating with him, helping him while he operates. And then you see the human lungs, you see the human liver, the gall conduits, you learn their size and consistency, you see the human heart and how it functions...

"Now why is vivisection still being done? There are two reasons: First, mental laziness, inherited from those famous researchers of the last century, of the Claude Bernard school. And then there is something else: do our viewers really believe that in a vivisection laboratory the rules of sepsis, of antisepsis, of analgesia, or any other rule is being respected? Nothing is being respected, because vivisection generates sadism, I've seen the sadists, I know them, I could name them, I won't name them here, I only hope they are listening, I know they are deriving pleasure from vivisection, they are deriving great pleasure... "

From a conference held in Naples, Italy, June 1978, by Dr. Albert Sabin: "Laboratory cancers have nothing in common with natural human cancers. Tumorous cells are not unrelated to the organism that produced them. Human cancers are greatly different from the artificial tumors caused by the experimenters in the laboratories." (Cited by Prof. P. Croce in *Vivisezione 0 Scienza*, 2nd ed., p. 35)

Morarji Desai, who had imposed the first export ban on rhesus monkeys in spite of his country's dire need of foreign currency when he was Prime Minister of India, imparted a fine lesson in humanity, ethics and medicine to baffled U.S. news people at the National Press Club in New York on June 21, 1978.

Question: "Mister Prime Minister, considering your deep concern for human needs, can you explain your stand against exporting rhesus monkeys for research? "

Answer: "If we're real human beings, we ought not to inflict cruelty on any living being. That is the philosophy which India has always had. It is therefore that we do not want to subject any animals to cruelty and that is why we refuse to export them. Research is not the only answer to human welfare. Human welfare or human health can be achieved more by following natural laws: for this no medicines are required. I have not taken them for years and I don't now."

From the Bantam book *The Ion Effect* published March 1978: "Professor Felix Gad Sulman, M.D., University of Jerusalem, Israel...Sulman is a German-educated doctor and veterinarian who emigrated to Israel in 1932...'Scientific caution is necessary, but no one can really prove that the bad winds really are bad because you cannot duplicate nature in a laboratory,' he said. 'Similarly, you cannot always rely on laboratory tests to find out what works for people, because people are not like mice or rabbits. '"

*Newsweek* Magazine carried on March 27, 1978 a long article titled "Animals in the Lab", signed Peter Gwynne with Sharon Begely, who took pains to find new defenses for an indefensible and unscientific practice. Excerpts: The use of laboratory animals is part of the natural order of things to most scientists. 'It goes back to the Judeo-Christian tradition, that God gave man dominion over animals", says Dr Tburman Grafton of the National Society for Medical Research.

Medical students are taught that Pasteur solved the "problem" of rabies in the last century - thanks to experiments on dogs. They - and the public - are not told that neither he nor his successors have ever been able to identify the virus which is supposed to cause rabies; that in spite of - and probably due to the efforts of Pasteur, rabies has since then not decreased, but increased, throughout Europe. That it has still never been scientifically proved that Pasteur's vaccine has saved even one single human life, whereas several deaths have, in fact, been scientifically shown to have resulted from Pasteur's vaccinations, which for this reason were long since given up in favor of "new and better" vaccinations. Here is just one more example:

In 1977 the World Health Organization (WHO) in Geneva announced the discovery of another new vaccine which the WHO officials described as a "fantastic breakthrough".

On December 4, 1977 two German psychiatrists, Dr. Herbert Stiller and Dr. Margot Stiller, wrote a letter to the *Hamburger Abendblatt* saying: "Too much consideration has been paid up to now to Dr. Barnard's sensitive, applause-hungry soul. It is well-known that he is seized by asthma attacks whenever he gets criticized...We would suggest that one should be somewhat less concerned about Prof. Barnard' s tender sensibility, and a bit more about all his potential, unsuspecting patients."

"Conclusions derived from experimental systems under laboratory conditions and using animal tumours are almost totally irrelevant to our understanding of human" breast cancer."

(Dr. Paul Strickland, *World Medicine*. September 21, 1977)

On June 22, 1977 a news item from Cape Town reported that a 25-year-old Italian woman had died at Cape Town's Groote Schuur Hospital two and a half hours after Barnard had implanted a baboon's heart into her chest, hitching it to her own heart. Quote from Italy's leading daily, *Corriere della Sera*, commenting on the young woman's swift demise:

Barnard's latest operation is rather disconcerting, especially in view of the fact that the Italian patient was entrusted to his care for the implantation of a heart valve, which is a routine operation even in this poor Italy of ours..."Clinical nonsense", were the words with which France's authoritative *Le Monde* dismissed Barnard's wild experiment.

From "Our Ailing Health System", an article in *The Progressive*, January 1977:

"...The performance of America's health delivery system in the past year suggests there are good reasons to be apprehensive - and not just about the swine flu program. As that program got under way in September, a report prepared by a special panel of the V.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) pointed out that while no medication exists that will cure or prevent the common cold, American pharmaceutical manufacturers manage to market some 35,000 different cold remedies, for which consumers shell out \$350 million a year...Priorities are dictated by the drive for private profits. The major drug firms held up production of swine flu vaccine until they were guaranteed that the taxpayers would insure them against possible liability claims."

To believe that tests on monkeys will bring us closer to medical truths is just one more delusion of the animal experimenting maniacs.

"We find only a very few comparative studies on this subject in the worldwide literature, and the result is rather discouraging. No help is given, either, by the reference to the general biological affinity of animal and man, or to the theory of evolution. It has been shown, for example, that the monkey is a much worse model than the dog with regard to many harmful side - effects on man, indeed that monkey experiments can actually lead to a negative intrapolation with regard to the human being; in other words, the substances that are harmless to monkeys are precisely the ones that injure man. It would therefore be an illusion to believe that one can prevent future pharmaceutical catastrophes by means of animal experiments, however carefully these are carried out." (From *Biologische Medizin, Grundlagen ihrer Wirksamkeit*, by G. Huttner and H. Hensel and others, Verlag fur Medizin Dr. Ewald Fischer, Heidelberg, 1977)

"There are, of course, vast differences between animals and humans. In addition it is impossible to test psychological and neurological effects properly when dealing with animals. So testing a new drug on human beings must be an integral part of the testing procedure for any new drug... All humans are different and a drug which might be perfectly safe for a hundred people may, because of some genetic abnormality, kill the one hundred and first patient. There is also the possibility that the drug may cause delayed effects. None of these



things can be found out immediately. Phenacetin, for example, was thought to be an extremely safe drug and it was only after it had been in use for forty years that the dangers became apparent". (Dr. Vernon Coleman, Fellow of the Royal Society of Medicine, in *The Medicine Men*, Arrow 1977, p. 60)

No laboratory animal gets to live forty years or the time to help ascertain such delayed adverse effects.

"According to our present knowledge, the animal experiment can provide no more than a starting-point for forming hypotheses, the acceptance or rejection of which can only be decided by the observation of the human being. These hypotheses have the character of irrational forecasts, which means that the uncertainty is not only of a statistical kind; rather, the animal experiment basically permits no calculations of probability to be made with regard to the human being.

"To stick to the example of the pharmaceutical drugs: there is so far no theory which would permit one to forecast systematically the therapeutical effectiveness or injurious side-effects of a drug on human beings on the basis of animal experiments". (G. Kienle: *Drug Safety and Society*, Stuttgart, New York 1974, Schattaucker, H. Hensel, Arzneimittelsicherheit und Tierversuch, Z. Rechtspolitik 8, pages 286-288, 1975)

"A new U.S. study challenges claims made for the last 35 years that women can prevent breast cancer by regularly taking estrogen pills...The report seems to indicate the drug actually may cause the disease...Physicians have been prescribing estrogen for an estimated 5 million to 6 million middle-aged women in the United States alone". (*International Herald Tribune*, August 17, 1976)

The number of doctors who are realizing at last the nature of antibiotics is evidently growing, but they do not know what to do, for they have been following the wrong path all too long and can now find neither the strength nor the courage to change course. According to the conservative Rome newspaper *Il Tempo* (July 31, 1976), Nobel Prize winner James Banielli has stated: "Antibiotics have caused damage which far exceeds their positive effects". Among other things, he lists chronic disease conditions, specific infections, allergic reactions, cell tissue poisoning and vitamin deficiency.

"Various species of animals react differently to the same drug. Not only do the variations in the metabolism of a drug make it difficult to extrapolate results of animal experiments to man but they create a serious obstacle to the development of new therapeutic drugs". (Dr. Barnard B. Brodie in *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*)

"So why can't we cut out some of the required animal tests, which have been devised by theorists and purists without much regard for practical politics and the urgent need for therapeutic progress." (Dr. Laubach at 8th Assembly of the International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1976)

"With only a few notable exceptions, such as some senior official of the American Medical Association, almost everyone agrees that modern medicine is as sick as the patient it treats." (Opening sentence of the book review of *Medical Nemesis* in *Time Magazine*, June 28, 1976)

"A plant should not be considered safe simply because a pet animal nibbles on it without ill effects; it could still be harmful to humans." (From an article in *Time Magazine* of March 1, 1976, quoting Dr. Guy Barman, veteran pediatrician and caretaker of a garden of popular but poisonous plants at the pediatrics clinic of the Kaiser-Permanente Medical Center in Fontana, Calif.)

Dr. Bernard Barber, chairman of Columbia's Department of Sociology, recently made a thorough survey of the ethical stand of American research doctors. His results were reported by *Scientific American*, and the *Sunday News* of Feb. 1, 1976.

"What little ethics training there is, is apparently not very effective", Barber said. "Research is their business. Research is their mission and predominant interest, not applied ethics or active advocacy of patients' rights."

An essay in *Newsweek* (January 26, 1976) titled "What Causes Cancer?" reported what that magazine apparently believed to be big news: "Cancer may be a man-made disease." The article went on to say: "Already the World Health Organization estimates that up to 85 percent of all cancer cases are a direct result of exposure to environmental factors of one kind or another - in many instances almost fatalistically self-inflicted by such habits as overeating, smoking, overdrinking and excessive exposure to sunlight and dangerous chemicals in the factories...Despite all the warnings, the majority of Americans continue to indulge themselves in the potentially harmful pleasures that their opulent society provides, and so far they are apparently content to take the perils along with the pleasures. 'Right now we've decided that this is the way we want to live and die', says Dr. David Baltimore, who won a 1975 Nobel Prize for basic cancer research."

James Schardein summarised the Thalidomide situation in *Drugs as Teratogens* (1976) as: "To date, in approximately 10 strains of rats, 15 strains of mice, 11 breeds of rabbits, two breeds of dogs, three strains of hamsters, eight species of primates, and in such other varied species as cats, armadillos, guinea-pigs, swine and ferrets in which Thalidomide has been tested, teratogenic effects have been induced only occasionally."

"Practically all animal experiments are untenable on a statistical scientific basis, for they possess no scientific validity or reliability. They merely perform an alibi function for pharmaceutical companies, who hope to protect themselves thereby." (From *Tierversuch und Tierexperimentator (Vivisection and Vivisector)* by Herbert Stiller, M.D. and Margot Stiller, M.D., Hanover, 1976)

For 1976, the new French Minister for Health, Madame Simone Veil, decided to reduce her government's subsidies to scientists, with a special view to cancer research. There were loud outcries of despair and dismay from the science corner, but Simone Veil remained

unflustered: "You can well mention the hundreds of millions of dollars given to the American National Cancer Institute, but they have brought no results. The deaths by cancer have not diminished - on the contrary. We are not willing to spend any more money on futile research, but only on prevention: We campaign against alcohol, for early diagnoses, for improvement of housing. This is the kind of support the nation's health can expect from this Ministry."

According to Ivan Illich's researched *Medical Nemesis* (pantheon, New York, 1976) at least 60,000 people died in 1974 in the U.S. because of medicaments. That new drugs are particularly hazardous for no other reason than that they are preventively tested on animals, was inadvertently confirmed by Dr. William Bean of Iowa State University in his testimony to the Kefauver Committee as far back as 1957:

"The richest earnings occur when a new variety of a drug is marketed before competing drugs can be discovered. Under this system it is impracticable to do tests extending over a long period to establish the range of usefulness and potential dangers from toxicity... Thus after extensive laboratory tests on toxicity and pharmacological properties, but sometimes with a minimum of clinical trial, a drug may be marketed."

Ivan Illich, in *Limits to Medicine*, 1976: "The medical establishment has become the major threat to health."

Dr. Alice Heim, Fellow of the British Psychological Society: "How, I ask you, can the results from animals be applied to humans, if the animals are so different from us that experiments are performed on them which nobody but a Nazi would dream of inflicting upon another person?"

Hippocratic good sense and wisdom are irreconcilable with the technological arsenal on which today's official medical science feeds. When some courageous and intelligent voice is heard, it is studiously ignored by the health authorities and the public at large, as when Prof. Roger Mucchielli of Paris University wrote, "Official medicine keeps disregarding the signs heralding its own ruin, but it is already imbued by a current that finds again the profound Hippocratic inspiration." (*Characterologie a l' Age Scientifique*, ed. Griffon, Neuchatel, 1960)

In the supplement to the *Neue juristische Wochenschrift (New Legal Weekly)*, in the *Zeitschrift für Rechtspolitik* (issue 12, 1975), Prof. Dr. Herbert Hensel, Director of the Institute of Physiology at Marburg University, writes:

"Nobody denies that no effect on a human being is predictable with certainty from an animal experiment. But if any scientifically-based prediction is to be at all possible, one must at least be able to indicate a definable probability. Only then is the prediction rational, and only then can a norm be applied to it by means of appropriate guidelines. If this is not the case, then the prediction is irrational. It is only based on personal experience, intuition and chance. It cannot be rationally applied. In the opinion of leading bio statisticians, it is not possible to transfer probability predictions from animals to humans, because neither the tested parameters nor the animal species nor the tested substances can have any validity as random samples in

terms of the theory of probability.

“At present, therefore, (CIVIS: almost 150 years after Claude Bernard!) there exists no possibility at all of a scientifically-based prediction. In this respect, the situation is even less favorable than in a game of chance, for in the latter the chances of success are known...In our present state of knowledge, one cannot scientifically determine the probable effect, effectiveness or safety of medicaments when administered to human beings by means of animal experiments... The example of the Thalidomide disaster, often cited as an argument for stricter testing and also mentioned several times in the justification for the Government's draft proposals to reform the law relating to medicines, illustrates this problem particularly clearly. Such a medicine-caused disaster could no more be prevented with adequate certainty through animal experimentation today than it could at that time.”

On December 13, 1975, under the title "The Medicine Bluff", an interview was published in the French weekly *Paris-Match* with Dr. Henri Pradal, a specialist in pharmaceutical toxicology, concerning whom *Paris-Match* stated: "Henri Pradal spent twelve years in the camp of the industrial laboratories, before leaving it in order to say what he could no longer keep silent about."

Dr. Pradal forgot to explain that the fraudulent "safety tests" on animals were what lay behind the whole swindle. What he did say applies to all the industrialised nations. Such as: "The medical profession is not informed, or, rather, it is instructed almost exclusively by the journals and brochures from the laboratories, and thus by advertising.

“A certain messianic belief in progress has persuaded us that a eased use of them represent man's victory over disease, a proof of his power, a sign of progress. Whence comes this blind trust, when intelligence should in fact lead us rather towards mistrust? It stems from an illusion which has been imposed on us by the all-powerful pharmaceutical industry, by a giant brewing house that makes billions out of it. The guilt for all this lies with the powers-that-be in the Public Health Department, the Government Ministry and the health insurance associations, whose apathy and negligence have resulted in the sanctioning of no less than 11,000 medicaments, although only a couple out of 100 are of provable worth, as has been confirmed by the World Health Organisation.

“The doctors can't see further than their own noses. They have become convinced by the laboratory-financed medical literature that medicines have turned them into demi-gods, and that attacks on the pharmaceutical industry mean attacks on medicine. When the people finally discover the cause of the illnesses, the sale of medicaments will abruptly drop. But we must first get them to understand it”

"In spite of extensive research carried out over many years there are still no completely satisfactory methods for carcinogenicity testing of drugs and other chemicals. The extrapolation of the results of animal experiments to man presents particular problems." (From the Report No. 563 of the *World Health Organization Technical Report Series: Guidelines for Evaluation of Drugs for Use in Man*, Geneva, 1975, p.29)

Owen B. Hunt of the American Anti-Vivisection Society in his speech at the Hotel Mediterranee in Geneva, Switzerland on July 26, 1975:

"Lederle Laboratories found a non-violent vaccine in a duck embryo six years ago - vast improvement on the Pasteur treatment where painful and dangerous shots are administered to the patient for weeks. But the Pasteur violent method is still being used in the United States. Why? Easy government money. Salk and Sabin vaccine taken from monkeys - over a million monkeys used so far. Dr. Hayflick's human cell culture can produce enough vaccine to last the world forever, the vaccine cells reproduce themselves and can be permanently frozen until used, and every laboratory in the world has access to these cells. Yet monkeys are still used by the tens of thousands. Why? Easy government money. The D.S. Army and Air Force got \$3.5 million in July 1973 to test gases -on 600 beagle puppies, who would eventually all die. But a quick method of identifying pollutant gases in the air has been devised by Bell Laboratories scientist Lloyd B. Kreuzer. Using a laser and a computer, his system is capable of identifying concentrations of gases as low as one part in 10 million, a ten times greater sensitivity than most present regulatory standards require. The Army and Air Force were fully aware of this and many similar, previous information when they requested the \$3.5 million appropriation, insisting on using beagles for experiments that would last as long as two years."

On March 26, 1975, an article by the NEA-London Economist News Service, titled "Is Cancer Research Worth Cost?" appeared on the editorial page of *The Galveston Daily News*. It said in part:

"The sums that are being spent (on cancer research) are enormous - \$600 million in the present financial year - and the fear of getting the disease universal.. One million Americans have it. Recently Dr. James Watson, who is listened to because he helped to discover the molecular structure of life's genetic material, derided the national cancer program as a fraud. Dr. Watson said that the government's newly created cancer research centers around the country are institutions that are ' starting out lousy and will stay lousy'."

The WHO Technical Report Series No. 563 (1975): "Carcinogenicity - In spite of extensive research carried out over many years there are still no completely satisfactory methods for carcinogenicity testing of drugs and other chemicals. The methods in use, therefore, represent the best that are currently available, but there is a great need for further research to improve them. The exploration of the results of animal experiments to man presents particular problems."

"...The maximum life-span has not changed at all. Old people become increasingly prone to illness. No matter how much medicine they take, no matter what care is given to them, life expectancy of 65 years has remained practically unchanged over the last century. Medicine cannot do much for illness associated with aging, and even less about the process of aging itself. It cannot cure cardiovascular diseases, most cancers, arthritis, advanced cirrhosis, or the common cold. It is true that some of the pain which the aged suffer can sometimes be

lessened. Unfortunately though, most treatment of the old requiring professional intervention not only tends to heighten their pain, but, if successful, also protracts it." (Ivan Illich in *Medical Nemesis*, Calder & Boyars, London, 1975, p. 45)

"Modern medicine is a negation of health. It isn't organized to serve humans' health, but only itself, as an institution. It makes more people sick than it heals." (Famed Yugoslav-born Ivan Illich, sociologist, philosopher and theologian, author of *Medical Nemesis*, in an interview at the Italian-Swiss TV station of Lugano, in 1975)

In *Die Weissen Magier*, Bertelsmann Verlag, 1974, Kurt Bluechel gives the following figures for West Germany: "Only 25 years ago, among every 100,000 children born in the Federal Republic there were 3 cases of malformation. Today, 5 children are malformed for only 1,000 births. Within a quarter of a century, therefore, the malformations have increased more than a hundredfold." (page 259)

Bluechel's book further informs us: "The animal organism frequently reacts quite differently from that of man...Many preparations which damage the fetus in animals cannot do any harm to human babies. Others, on the other hand - and therein lies the great danger act in precisely the opposite way. It can therefore not be ruled out that many medicines will turn out to be 'time bombs' for the next generation." (page 357)

And on page 257 Bluechel states: "The average German citizen today consumes about five times as many medicines as in the years immediately preceding the Second World War. Is he also five times healthier? Of course not. On average, the West German population is far more frequently ill today than it was in those days...Unexpectedly, an industry which was created to heal diseases has become the starting point for new ailments."

The *Journal of the American Medical Association* finally revealed (October 20, 1975) that it had been established that man is 60 times more sensitive to Thalidomide than the mouse, 100 times more sensitive than the rat, 200 times more sensitive than the dog and 700 times more sensitive than the hamster - all of them favorite laboratory animals. Why all these tests, then? The eternal question elicits the eternal answer: because there's money in it. A mass of money.

Dr. Harry F. Harlow, head of the University of Wisconsin primate laboratory, has at least one great quality: candor. In contrast to his Swiss colleagues, who all claim to be great animal lovers and to suffer more than the victims themselves from the pains they are obliged to inflict on them. Dr. Harlow didn't conceal his real feelings when he declared to *the Pittsburg Press* (October 27, 1974): "The only thing I care about is whether the monkeys will turn out a property that I can publish. I don't have any love for them. Never have. I really don't like animals. I despise cats. I hate dogs. How can you like monkeys?"

"Unfortunately, we shall learn the effect on our health of the thousands of chemical compounds at some unforeseeable future date only, for they act very slowly, in the course of time, and by accumulation." (Dr. John Higginson, head of the International Agency for Cancer

Research, as reported by Milan's *Corriere della Sera*, October 22, 1974)

A medical commission nominated by Chile's President Salvador Allende, himself, a medical man, shortly before his assassination in 1973, had come to the conclusion that in the whole world there are only about two-score medicines that have a demonstrable therapeutic effectiveness, and that the world's pharmacopeia could be reduced accordingly." (*Nouvel Observateur*, October 20, 1974)

"At the time when millions are starving in the world, and our economy is in great trouble, Congress is allocating billions of dollars annually in grants for "basic" no-goal research on living animals. Careers in torture are as financially rewarding as they are morally bankrupt. Reports in the medical journals recorded by the experimenters themselves are indisputable indictments of their gross inhumanity." (Barbara Schultz, a member of the Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz's advisory committee on the treatment of animals in New York State, writing in *Newsday*, July 12, 1974)

"Can we justify cruel experiments on animals on the grounds that psychologists can learn more about behaviour? I do not believe any of the suffering I have caused to laboratory animals - and, alas, there has been some - has helped humanity in the slightest." (Dr. Richard Ryder, senior clinical psychologist at Warneford Hospital, Oxford, *Sunday Mirror*, London, February 24, 1974)

Columnist Bob Cromie wrote in the *Chicago Tribune* of January 19, 1974, as a result of his extensive studies done on American experimentation habits: "My personal opinion is that many of the experiments being conducted are supervised by sadists, idiots, or those greedy for the federal grants involved... It seems obvious that some scientists no longer are content with the use of lower animals, in view of recent experiments conducted on inmates of prisons and other institutions, and the quicker this Nazi mentality is curbed the better."

The 1970 Nobel laureate for Medicine, Ulf S. Euler of the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm, declared at the International Medical Conference in Manchester in 1973 that: "If drugs were tested on people and less on animals they might be better and safer. Proper caution would have to be taken with human testing, but in the long run it could give increased security on the side- effects of drugs and increase the prospect of new and better drugs. " (*Yorkshire Evening Press*. York, September 20, 1973)

From an item in the *Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin* of August 26, 1973. It quoted Julie Mayo, a registered nurse of Brigantine, New Jersey: "I would rather a butcher slaughter my dog than have him fall into the hands of research scientists. Researchers are disguised as civilized people, but have the heart and hands of barbarians. No matter what the meaning, no matter how grisly the experiment, they will claim the end result is justification. Their lives revolve around pithed frogs, scalded rabbits, decerebrated cats and dismembered dogs. But don't just shrug and turn your back - you could be next!"

"It is almost a cliché among research workers that findings in animal studies cannot be

extrapolated to man. Nevertheless, the temptation is ever present...Dutch investigator H.G.S. van Raalte blended recent laboratory findings with data from human epidemiology and experience from clinical medicine, to conclude that any inference from animal experiments that dieldrin causes hepatomas in man is unwarranted." (From an article in *Medical World News*. August 24, 1973 - the medical magazine published by McGraw-Hill, New York)

In the weekly magazine *Welt am Sonntag* (July 29, 1973), Dr. Werner Lehmpfuhl, general practitioner in Hanover, wrote as follows: "Every month, millions are in fact being damaged by treatment which is supposed to be helping them."

"Human experimentation has become a major industry in America." Millions of baffled Americans heard this statement on the hour-long *NBC Reports* TV program that Robert Rogers wrote, produced and narrated on prime time of the evening of May 29, 1973.

As Professor J. Clausen of the Institute of Preventive Medicine at the University of Odense stated in March 1973: "Millions of people have been vaccinated with the polio vaccine, which contains the cancer-forming SV-40 virus originally found in monkeys. It is possible that it will take 20 years or still longer before the possible damaging effects of this virus come to light." CIVIS: They have in fact started to come to light with the insurgence of AIDS, due to the failure of the natural immunity which every organism has if nobody interferes with it. Vaccinations are recognized as among the principal interferences.

On March 31, 1973, Rome's daily *Messaggero* quoted Prof. Arrigo Colarizi, director of the Pediatric Clinic of the University of Rome and member of the International Society of Pediatrics, as declaring: "The physical improvement that we notice is partly spontaneous and partly due to the improved social, economic and hygienic conditions. Drugs have nothing to do with it."

An editorial in *The Economist*. London, January 6, 1973, opened thus: "Thalidomide is not the first nor the last drug to have brought heartbreak where it was meant to bring help. There have been quite a number of other tragedies since Thalidomide went wrong 13 years ago."

According to the *Deutsche Aezteblatt* (No. 45,1973), U. Fiebig, member of the German Federal Parliament, stated: "I have received only evasive answers to my question as to how efficient and reliable animal experiments really are."

Alarming is the statement by pharmacologist Holtz: "A comparative test of Aspirin and Thalidomide on rats would give the go ahead signal for the use of Thalidomide on humans, but not of Aspirin, now in use for more than half a century. "

In *Mental Hygiene*. March 1973, wrote Peter Roger Breggin, M.D.: "Lobotomy and psychosurgery are upon us again! In Philadelphia a black man dies of an overdose of heroin, and a reporter notices peculiar scars on his head. A portion of his brain has been burned out in an experimental attempt to cure his addiction. The neurosurgeon is located by the reporter and admits that his monkey experiments were inconclusive before trying his operation on human addicts."



After DES had turned out to be the first drug that the medical confraternity itself had recognized as being responsible for creating a new type of cancer in human beings, animal tests with DES were started all over again, and again with no results: the test animals did not develop cancer.

Dr. Robert W. Miller of the National Cancer Institute of Bethesda, Md., who in 1973 wrote the official warning hastily published by Geneva's WHO, revealed in that paper: "Experimental animal studies: There was no correlation between the types of tumors obtained in experimental models (i.e. laboratory animals - H.R.) and types of childhood cancer."

In *Science Digest* (Nov. 1972), a scientist, W. H. Wheeler, has written: "Most of the work on brain research has been done on cats and monkeys. It is risky to extrapolate such data to the human brain... The electrodes may be simply picking up signals in transit to some other part of the brain -like tapping a telephone line. Listening to a conversation doesn't necessarily indicate where the speakers are. The same holds true for electrodes implanted to control behaviour... The control of behaviour by means of electrodes does not provide any certain data on how the brain's functional areas are organized. The very existence of functional areas as such has been widely debated and solid evidence is still elusive."

Dr. Robert L. Brent of *Jefferson Medical College* made a by now monotonous point when he wrote in *Prevention* (July 1972): "Some drugs that are teratogenic in the human in therapeutic doses are innocuous to many pregnant animals," while "some drugs that are innocuous to a pregnant woman are teratogenic to some animal species." (It's the case of aspirin and insulin, harmless to human fetuses, causing birth defects in mice.)

In the Sixties a mysterious epidemic killed so many thousands of asthma sufferers in various countries that Dr. Paul D. Stolley of Johns Hopkins Hospital - who in July 1972 finally found the killer in Isoproterenol, packaged in England as an aerosol - spoke of the "worst therapeutic drug disaster on record."

Prof. Dr. Med. Hardegg, Animal Experimenter, at the Conference on Laboratory Animals, in Hanover, 1972: "Animal tests conducted to establish the effect of medicaments for humans are nonsense."

*The Lancet* made one more monotonous admission (Apr. 22, 1972): "We know from drug toxicity studies that animal tests are very imperfect indicators of human toxicity; only clinical experience and careful control of the introduction of new drugs can tell us about their real dangers."

"No animal tumor is closely related to a cancer in human beings." (*The Lancet*, April 15, 1972)

The March 20, 1972 issue of *Newsweek* Magazine reported that a new vaccine developed without resorting to animals by Dr. Leonard L. Hayflick, professor of medical microbiology at Stanford University, had satisfied the Division of Biologies Standards, a United States agency: "Dr. Hayflick set out to develop a strain of human cells using cells taken from the lungs of a

fetus aborted in Sweden. This strain, known as WI-38, produced a virtually limitless number of completely uniform cultures that could be stored in a frozen state for periods of years and thawed out when needed to provide the growth medium for vaccines anywhere in the world. By contrast, culturing vaccine with monkey kidney cells requires a fresh set of cells for each new batch of vaccines."

In a *Medical News* article of March 10, 1972, Dr. John A. Oakes, professor of medicine and pharmacology, at Vanderbilt University, stated: "We don't know how to extrapolate from results of animal tests to humans."

In his studies of the effects of protective vaccination against smallpox, the German senior medical officer Dr. G. Buchwald recently confirmed that it can lead to encephalitis (inflammation of the brain), and he thereby contributed to the fact that obligatory vaccination was abolished in Germany. In several writings he expressed his suspicion that multiple sclerosis could also be an after-effect of smallpox vaccination. (*Der deutsche Arzt*, 1971, Volume 19, page 100; id., 1972, Volume 3, page 58, and *Medizinische Welt*, 1972, page 758.)

In reference to the Thalidomide tragedy, 1968:

"The first expert to give testimony was Professor Otto Rudolf Klimmer from the Institute of Pharmacology of the University of Bonn. When questioned by Dr. Weber (the chairman of the court), Klimmer had to admit that it was not possible to produce polyneuritis in animal experiments, caused by such agents as barbiturates and phenuron, even though their nerve-damaging properties in man were a medically established, undisputed fact. If animal experiments fail to reveal polyneuritis for compounds which are known by medical science to produce polyneuritis in man, then clearly the experiments are not suited at all to a study of such toxic reactions. A negative finding in such an experiment can be used even less as proof that such and such a compound is not apt to cause neurological damage in man. As Professor Schmetz of Munich had pointed out to Chemie Gruenthal in the late spring of 1961, it is extremely difficult to simulate this disease in animal experiments because of the subjective nature of the symptoms." (*Thalidomide and the Power of the Drug Companies*, a Penguin Special, 1972, p. 218-219, by Henning Sjoestroem, a Swedish lawyer, and Robert Nilson, a research chemist.)

Synthetic vitamins have caused serious damage to health, and are still doing so today, because the preceding "safety tests" on animals are unable to give proper warning. In fact, even the highly-praised vitamins belong to the "miracle cures" which have worked wonders only for the manufacturers. Prof. Guido Fanconi of the University of Zurich was in practice as a pediatrician and enjoyed the reputation of medical authority when he published his historical book *Der Wandel der Medizin* (Verlag Huber, Berlin 1970). In that work he denounces synthesised Vitamin K, as well as sulphonamides, as having caused "acute haemolytic anemia" (which can be a forerunner to laukaemia), and holds overdoses of Vitamin D responsible for numerous disturbances of health, including kidney damage, hypertension and heart complaints.

He expresses the suspicion that idiopathic hypercalcaemia which impedes body growth in children, is attributable to an excessive supply of Vitamin D. It has been shown, incidentally, that hypercalcaemia - a metabolic anomaly with an increased level of calcium in the body - is often linked with heart defects and serious damage to the pulmonary arteries.

"In the conduct of the largest research laboratory in America for many years, I have not used an animal. It is my earnest belief that the use of animals has been...utterly barren of results in progressive medicine." E. M. Perdue, M.D., Director of Johnson's Pathological Laboratory in Cancer Research (AAVS, Philadelphia, PA).

Even Prof. Widukind Lenz, the German scientist who through posthumous tests with primates had been able to obtain some malformed offspring, testified at the Thalidomide trial in West Germany in 1970 that "there is no animal test capable of indicating beforehand that human beings, subjected to similar experimental conditions, will react in identical or similar fashion".

The London *Times* reported on October 15, 1970, that pregnant rats, forced to inhale marijuana smoke at a New York laboratory, produced malformed offspring, but Dr. William Geber, who conducted the experiments, made the point that "as a rat is not a human being, no positive conclusions could be drawn".

"Much of the experimental animal work on atheroma has held back our progress rather than advanced it." (*Medical News Tribune*, London, September 18, 1970)

According to the Washington *Science News-Letter* of August 22, 1970, three French scientists had made pregnancy tests forcing a great number of animals to take the hallucinogenic drug LSD. The fetuses and the newborns showed no evidence that the drug produced deformities, but the scientists cautioned that "it is impossible to conclude from these experimental data that LSD may not be teratogenic (producing malformation) in man."

In respect to the safety of human virus vaccines, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the risk for cancerogenity of human virus vaccines is greater for those vaccines produced in animal cells than for those vaccines produced in human cells: the potential cancerogenity for any vaccine is diminished if the vaccine is produced in the cells of the animal species to which the vaccine is to be administered." (*Laboratory Practice*, January 1970, pp. 58-62)

As Dr. M.H. Pappworth, the eminent London physician and internationally known teacher of clinical medicine, wrote in *Human Guinea Pigs* (Pelican Books, 1969): "No doctor, however experienced, can balance precisely the expected period of survival without transplant against the period of the apparent acceptance of the transplant before it is finally rejected."

As Dr. Pappworth further stated in *Human Guinea Pigs*: "I am far from convinced that this state of affairs is any more tolerable to the patient than the disease for which the transplant was done... The public should know that transplant surgery never cures the original disease and never makes the recipient a healthy person...All transplant surgery is a confession of failure, of unsuccessful early diagnosis and treatment."

"Science, which gave promise of delivering mankind from superstitions, has itself turned into the most pretentious and the bloodiest superstition in history. This may well prove to be the tragedy of modern civilisation...Science, once the most brilliant form of common sense, was reborn as a god. Populace (laity) and scientists (priests) were alike told from on high that Science says this and Science requires that. Science was, however, a mechanical god...Other gods have required their priests to castrate themselves. Only science requires them to pluck out their human sympathies." (Brigid Brophy in *The Listener*, 1969)

On July 10, 1969, the *New York Daily News* reported: "Col. John (Shorty) Powers, who resigned five years ago from NASA, today criticized the abortive flight of Bonny, the space monkey, as 'a complete and total waste of \$92 million of my money'. Powers, who kept the public informed about previous space efforts as the 'voice' of mission control, said, 'You can learn more from a computer than a monkey. We finished with monkeys five years ago.'"

Henry E. Sigerist, the Swiss who held the chair of history of medicine at the Universities of Leipzig and Johns Hopkins, and whom many consider the outstanding historian of our time, describes Hippocrates' medical philosophy thus: "Nature heals. The doctor's task consists in strengthening the natural healing powers, to direct them, and especially not to interfere with them. The dietetic treatment is the best. Through food the power regenerates itself. Hippocratic dietetics reached a level that to our day merit our great admiration." (*Grosse Aerzte*, 6th ed., Lehmann, Munich, 1969, p. 28)

In the German medical journal *Muenchener Medizinische Wochenschrift* (No. 34, 1969), Dr. W. Chr. Mueller of the 1st University Hospital for Women, Munich, reported after one of the most comprehensive studies in this area of medicine that "61 percent of all deformities in new-born infants, and 88 percent of all stillbirths, must be attributed to the effects of medicaments."

Protective vaccination against smallpox can also trigger off cancer in the form of malignant tumours, as was shown in the case of 38 people whose tumors resulted from the vaccination scar. This was the report on the front page of the journal *Medical News* in 1969. Dr. Willard L. Marmelzat of the University of Southern California reported at the second International Congress of Tropical Dermatology that none of these patients had ever been in contact with carcinogenous (cancer-forming) chemicals, and not one had ever received any injury or mechanical traumas at the site of the vaccination scar.

Rene Dubos, Pulitzer Prize-winner and professor of microbiology at the Rockefeller Institute of New York, wrote in *Man, Medicine and Environment* (Praeger, New York, 1968, p. 107): "Experimentation on man is usually an indispensable step in the discovery of new therapeutic procedures or drugs...The first surgeons who operated on the lungs, the heart, the brain were by necessity experimenting on man, since knowledge deriving from animal experimentation is never entirely applicable to the human species."

"We are sorcerer's apprentices, especially in the scientific area. We boast of discoveries that are poisoning us. I believe that the future generation will need much time and courage in

order to cope with the catastrophic consequence of our research." (Prof. Pierre Lepine, Director of the Bacteriological Department at the Pasteur Institute, Member of the Academy of Science and the National Academy of Medicine, in an interview with the French daily *Alsace*. March 17, 1967)

"In part because of possible major differences in responses to drugs in animals and man, the knowledge gained from studies in animals is often not pertinent to human beings, will almost certainly be inadequate, and may even be misleading. " (Arnold D. Welch, Department of Pharmacology, Yale University School of Medicine, in *Drug Responses in Man*, 1967)

*Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics* by T. Koppanyi and M.A. Avery, Vol. 7, 1966, pp. 250-270, confirming a report that has appeared in *Slaughter of the Innocent*:

"...Fleming was worried that penicillin (discovered by chance, without animal experimentation - H. R) might be de-activated by blood, and his worst fears seemed to be confirmed when he injected a sample into rabbits. The result so discouraged Fleming that he progressively lost interest and restricted penicillin's use to surface infections.

"Later, Oxford scientists Florey and Chain resurrected penicillin and found that it cured infected mice. But the program failed to tell us that the choice of species was another piece of 'good fortune'. If the usual guinea pigs had been employed for the test (all guinea pigs were already dead in Florey's and Chain's laboratory when the tests began - H.R.), penicillin might have been discarded for ever, since it is fatal to this common laboratory species even in tiny amounts (and to hamsters too, incidentally).

"The good luck didn't end here, though. In order to save a dangerously ill patient, Fleming wished to inject penicillin into the spine, but the results of such administration were unknown. Florey tried the experiment with a cat but there wasn't time to wait for the results if Fleming's patient was to have a chance. Fleming's patient received his injection, and improved, but Florey's cat died. The lessons still haven't been learned."

Albert Schweitzer is better known as a philanthropist than animal lover. But the last of his famous "messages to the world" from his bush hospital in Lambarane, delivered a few weeks before his death in 1965, concerned vivisection. Addressed both in the French and German language to the World Congress for Abolition, which was being held in Zurich, it was also read on the Swiss TV station and said: "We must fight against the spirit of unconscious cruelty with which we treat animals. Animals suffer as much as we do. True humanity does not allow us to impose sufferings on them. We have come too late to this realization. It is our duty to make the whole world recognize it"

Dr. Charles Henry Kempe, University of Colorado. After a 20-year study, Dr. Kempe recommends abolishing smallpox vaccination. Since 1948 there have been no deaths from smallpox in the United States. In the same period more than 300 persons have died from smallpox vaccinations, including vaccine-induced encephalitis. (*The Evening Bulletin*, Philadelphia, May 7, 1965)

*British Medical Journal*, February 13, 1965, p. 399: "The effects of exposure (of sulphur dioxide) under experimental conditions may not be comparable to those of naturally occurring air pollution, since sulphur dioxide may perhaps act synergistically with other pollutants such as respirable particles. An effect of this sort has been demonstrated in the guinea-pig. Experiments showed that the increase in the pulmonary flow resistance after inhalation of sulphur dioxide can be enhanced by the addition of an inert aerosol of sodium chloride. Yet careful experiments have failed to confirm that this occurs in man."

*The Lancet*, February 6, 1965, pp. 308-309 ("Side effect of Drugs"): "...Other effects, however, are unsuspected - for several reasons. Firstly, there may be a species difference in toxicity; for example, the dog cannot acetylate sulphonamide drugs, and so it is less likely than man to suffer from renal or ureteric precipitation of the less soluble acetylated metabolites of sulphonamides, on the other hand, the dog is very susceptible to quinine and becomes blind at plasma concentration readily tolerated by man."

Dr. Fernand Attlan: "I consider the results of these abominable experiments are illusory. In addition the horrors which accompany these useless practices will always be incompatible with the sense of dignity and moral greatness of man." Faculty of Medicine of Paris, Villers-Saint-Paul, Oise, France. (1964 )

Dr. Maurice R. Hilleman, director of virus and biology research at the American Merck Institute, stated in the *American Review of Respiratory Diseases* (90:683, 1964): "Another advantage of diploid cells is their freedom from contamination by undesirable viruses, naturally present in many animal cultures. In fact, had such cells been available in the earlier period, it is problematical whether monkey-kidney cells would have been chosen for preparing polio vaccines and more recently developed vaccines."

Dr. Hilleman also stated that Diploid Cells permit the growth of viruses that cannot now be grown in animal cells, adding: "This could pave the way for development of killed and live virus vaccines, especially the rhinoviruses, which are a principal cause of the common cold and for which there is no specific control."

Dr. Ross Nigrelli, who directed the Laboratory of Marine Biochemistry and Ecology in New York, has been widely quoted as saying: "In testing drugs we use sea-urchin eggs. We could have told them about Thalidomide quickly had we tested it on sea-urchin eggs." (Margaret B. Kreig, in her book *Green Medicine*, 1964 Rand McNally, Chicago)

Dr. Henry Woglom (Leading cancer researcher, 1964): "It must first be realized that the output of work on cancer research is enormous. It may be true that from this mountain of labor nothing so far has emerged but a cancer bearing mouse."

"The idea, as I understand it, is that fundamental truths are revealed in laboratory experimentation on lower animals and are then applied to the problems of the sick patient. Having been myself trained as a physiologist, I feel in a way competent to assess such a claim. It is plain nonsense." (Sir George Pickering, Regius Professor of Medicine at the

University of Oxford, *British Medical Journal*, December 26, 1964, pp. 1615-1619)

"Thorough wound cleansing is the only treatment for a wound, and when it is carried out correctly antibiotics are not necessary unless either the circumstances under which the wound was obtained, or the general condition of the patient, make the development of infection either likely or undesirable." (H.K. Bourns, B.A., M.B., B.ch.; B.A.O., F.R.C.S., in the *British Medical Journal*, August 29, 1964)

Professor E.P. Lossouarn: "Animal experimentation is an error on the scientific plane, a bad action on the moral. This martyrization of living creatures, which has not even the excuse of utility, is a wrong action by which man turns against humanity." (*Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy*, Nantes, France, May 4, 1964)

Dr. Pierre Jeandidier, Ex chief of Dermatological Clinic of the Faculty (Diseases of the skin, scalp and legs), France, April 1964: "There are no arguments or considerations that could justify all the pain inflicted on all those unfortunate defenceless animals, and it is not too much to say that such practices are entirely inhuman, if reference to man has as yet any weight on the moral plane. The State owes it to itself to condemn them unequivocally and without restrictions."

Dr. Eugene Lob, Faculty of Paris, General Medicine & Diseases of the Eyes, Wasigny, France, April 16, 1964: "I have the honor to enclose herewith a certificate against vivisection, cruel and useless."

Dr. Frederic Benoit, Surgeon, Maternity Hospital, Wassy, France, April 1, 1964: "It is nonsense to believe that vivisectional experiments are necessary or useful for scientific progress - circumstances of vivisection are too arbitrary to have real interest, and the reaction of experimental animals cannot be identical to that of man."

Dr. Raymond Lefevre, professor of the School of Medicine, Director of the Regional anti-Cancer Center, Reims, France, March 27, 1964: "The utility of vivisection does not seem to me to be fully determined. Such products tried out on animals produce results ineffective in man."

"Another basic problem which we share as a result of the regulations and the things that prompted them is an unscientific preoccupation with animal studies. Animal studies are done for legal reasons and not for scientific reasons. The predictive value of such studies for man is often meaningless - which means our research may be meaningless." (Dr. James G. Gallagher, Director of Medical Research, Lederle Laboratories, *Journal of American Medical Association*, March 14, 1964)

Dr. B. Ossipovski, Formerly Interne of the Hospital of Paris, Chief of Clinical Medicine of the Faculty, Chief of the Laboratory of the Saint Louis Hospital, Mac-Mahon, France, March 16, 1964: "My accord, my assistance are yours concerning the terrible practice of maniacs and neo scientists. Men believe they are able to acquire physiological results by torturing animals

and formulating theoretical deductions which, in most cases, have revealed themselves absolutely erroneous."

Dr. A. Maignien-Courard, Ophthalmologist (Surgery of the Eyes), Nantes, France, February 6, 1964: "I am totally opposed to vivisection and experiments on animals, and have always recognized its cruelty and uselessness."

Dr. Gunther Kraus of Roswell Park Memorial Laboratories at Buffalo, New York, wrote in the *American Veterinary Medical Association Journal* (Vol. 143, No. 9, November 1, 1963): "In our laboratory devocalizing dogs is necessary because of human patients in neighboring wards. We have used electrocautery for devocalization of more than 3000 dogs."

*New Scientist*, January 17, 1963:

"Recently a number of drugs have been shown to be teratogenic in animals...The latest drug to be incriminated in animal tests are the salicylates and aspirin, which Professor P.C. Fraser of McGill University has observed are teratogenic for mice.

"A drug can be teratogenic in one species and not in another. We must not jump to the conclusion that aspirin is teratogenic for the human. Some four thousand million tablets of aspirin, or preparations containing it, are consumed in Britain every year. If it were teratogenic for man the congenital abnormality rate would have risen considerably in the last few years in consequence and it has not... "

*The Lancet*, January 26, 1963, page 222 ("Animal tests for teratogenicity: "in fact, the pitfall is that, having found no teratogenic effect in a 'sufficient number of different species of laboratory animals', one can still not be sure of the effects on the human foetus, which is always the ultimate purpose of investigation. "

*British Medical Journal*, January 26, 1963 ("Powerful analgesics"): "...such differences are very difficult to measure accurately, and many claims are put forward on wholly inadequate grounds. Animal species differ from one another in their sensitivity to drugs, and estimates made in experimental animals are not reliably applicable to man. "

In *Drugs, Doctors and Disease*, historian Brian Inglis wrote that "the figures for animal experiments have continued to rise every year, not because ever better and safer drugs have been coming on the market, but simply because more drugs have been coming on the market. Paradoxically, the increase in tests on animals have reflected the growing recognition of how inadequate the tests have been in the past. 'It is commonplace in biological research,' the 1963 Report of the British Pharmaceutical Industry's Expert Committee on Drug Toxicity has admitted, 'that information from one animal species cannot be taken as valid for any other.' ...It is no longer, then, a matter of balancing the cruelty of suffering animals against the gain to humanity spared from suffering, because that is not the choice. Animals die to enable hundreds of new drugs to be marketed annually; but the gain is to industry rather than mankind. "



Dr. Louis J. Vorhaus, New York City Physician (*The Saturday Evening Post*, May 11, 1963): "Sick people need care, not research. Too many medical researchers seem to be less interested in human welfare or the quest for truth than in persona aggrandizement."

"The abolition of vivisection would not only have the effect of enabling research workers to avoid the pitfalls and fallacies associated with animal experimentation and the dangers to human health and life upon the application of these results to mankind, but would, in fact, promote in the highest degree the true progress of medical science." (M. Beddow Baily, Member of Royal College of Surgeons, Licentiate Royal College of Physicians, in the Preface to his book *The Futility of Experiments on Animals*, London, 1962)

The amount of damage that has been caused by antibiotics and by the inability of modern science to understand health, biology and nature, can no longer be denied. Here is a summary of a series of articles which Dr. Raiga published between 1962 and 1963 in the French *Bulletin de l'Association Generale des Medecins de France*:

"In the past ten years the number of penicillin-resistant strains of staphylococcus has constantly increased, especially in the hospitals, where we can see with our own eyes the extent to which serious staphylococcus infections are arising and multiplying during the treatment of quite different diseases. That occurs above all in maternity hospitals, where epidemics of such infections have reached disastrous dimensions. Today's therapies are tragically to blame for the fact that staphylococcus infections are constantly spreading; they were - at least at the beginning - chosen for the purpose of fighting infections... These cases take a still more dramatic turn when they are caused by antibiotics which are used by the doctor in order to treat harmless illnesses which would also be cured without any treatment. In such cases the medicine is without question the cause of death by therapy."

A French physician, Prof. Maurice Delort, did some plain talking at the inaugural session of the Academy de Bourges (December 16, 1962): "Today's medicine is at the end of its road. It can no longer be transformed, modified, readjusted. That's been tried too often. Today's medicine must die in order to be reborn. We must prepare its complete renovation."

Excerpts from the testimony of Fred Myers, who represented the Humane Society of the United States in the Congressional hearings of 1962:

"I indict Harvard University, Northwestern University, Chicago University, Creighton University, the University of Pittsburgh, the National Institutes of Health, Western Reserve University - every one of which I know to have been guilty of neglect and mistreatment of animals. I can and will supply details to any extent that this Committee desires... At Johns Hopkins University I have seen closely caged dogs suffering from advanced bleeding mange, without treatment... At Tulane University we found cats confined in cages suspended from the ceiling, with the wire mesh of the cage floor so widely spaced that they could not walk, stand, or lie down in a normal manner. At New York University I walked for hours, on a weekend, through several floors of caged dogs, cats, monkeys, rats, rabbits sheep and other animals, scores of them wearing bandages of major surgery, and many of them obviously desperately ill, without

ever encountering any doctor, veterinarian or caretaker... In the Children's Hospital in Cincinnati one of our investigators found small rhesus monkeys chained by their necks inside steel cages so small that the animals could barely move... I have myself seen men with no academic degrees and with no pretense at professional qualifications performing the work of a surgeon in a laboratory of the National Institutes of Health. I have seen a fully conscious dog, with an open incision into the thoracic and abdominal cavity, lying on the concrete floor of a corridor on that same laboratory, writhing desperately but unable to rise, while men and women passed without so much as a sideways glance..."

A long array of research authorities confirmed in court, explicitly or by implication, what Dr. Raymond Green had written in *The Lancet* (September 1, 1962): "We must face the fact that the most careful tests of a new drug's effect on animals may tell us little of its effects on humans. There can be no doubt that Thalidomide was subjected to the most careful scrutiny. I myself took part in a trial to investigate its possible goitrogenic effect on man, even such improbable hazards having been considered by its British distributor... There are no drugs which do good which do not sometimes do harm. Animal experiments cannot obviate the risk and may even prevent the use of excellent substances. We must accept some risk or - perhaps the wiser course - do without new drugs."

*British Medical Journal*, August 18, 1962, page 462: "...Even after thorough testing for toxic effects in the laboratory a drug harmless to animals may yet be found to be injurious to the human being..."

In connection with the assertion that it is not possible to argue with any certainty from animals to humans, consider the following testimonies from experts:

D.V. Parke, Department of Biochemistry, St. Mary's Hospital Medical School, University of London, *New Scientist*. August 9, 1962, page 313: "... the empirical testing of the toxicity of drugs in a few animal species is, by itself, of doubtful value in assessing the safety of a drug, since the results obtained with animals can seldom be translated to apply to human patients. "

Bernard B. Brodie, Ph. D., National Heart Institute, Bethesda, Md. (*Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*. Vol. 3, No. 3, May/June 1962): "Numerous difficulties are met in applying data obtained from animals to man. One of the most important of these is the factor of species difference in the metabolism of drugs. Thalidomide had been tested on many thousands of animals before being thrown on the market. In its February 23, 1962 issue, when the first warning signs of the tragedy were appearing on the world horizon, *Time Magazine* reported that Thalidomide had been marketed "after three years of animal tests."

"In his lectures around the world, Dr. Harry Lillie, of England, distinguished both as Physician and Surgeon, makes the point that the trade of poisoning living things and the manufacture of disease is big business today. 'I can say emphatically we are not going to find the cure for the diseases of our wrong living by the imposition of suffering on other living things. I know of no long term benefit, and I stress the words *long term*, that has come to the human race in the past by any research that has involved such suffering to other creatures.'" (From *Town and*

Country. February 1962)

There is a 392-page volume published in 1962 by the U.S. government, oddly titled *Humane treatment of Animals Used in Research: Hearings before a Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives* (U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington D.C.)

Sample extracts: "In any class of medical students you can always spot a certain number with sadistic tendencies." (page 218) "Trying to produce convulsions in dogs is terrible. I know they wouldn't let you see that, though. Shock experiments, removal of organs, blocking intestines, or the urine outlets so the bladder ruptures are only run of the mill...You'd be surprised to hear what professors and some students can think up. At night I keep thinking about the dogs. Imagine, after you have major surgery and you are between life and death... your little square of cold, draughty, cement flooring is cleaned by having a hose of cold water squirted over you. The dogs are soaked by this cold water - dogs right after recovering from surgery. No wonder most of the dogs die. If they live, within a couple of days or a week, they are used for a different experiment. One dog survived seven experiments." (page 250)

"I'm a student studying veterinary medicine. I was never and am not now in the employ of any humane society...This is a cry and a plea from a young person still holding on to a few ideals I have grown to believe in - and I am beginning to wonder if there is any real humane goodness among humans. I am not a sentimentalist, a crusader, or a fanatic; but I cannot, under any code or way of human life, condone what I, in a few short years, have seen." (page 251)

"There is no check whatever upon the wasteful repetition of experiments for which the taxpayer pays; no check on careless planning; no check on the outright sadist, who surrounds his real subconscious motive with a fog of scientific terms." (page 264)

"I recently asked a young physician how the newer medical students can judge the need for sedatives if the dog has been 'devocalized', as the scientists phrase it. His answer was startling. He said: 'It is the prevalent attitude in medical schools now that dogs can't feel pain - dogs do not suffer. (page 311)

"I attended Chicago Medical School last September. I withdrew of my own accord...One of the conditions which led to my contempt towards this school was the cruel treatment which was given to the experimental animals." (page 346)

Dr. Ronald T. Grant, Guy's Hospital Medical School, London (*Federation Proceedings*, Vol. 20, No. 2, Part 3, Supp 9, July, 1961): "The proper study of mankind is man. I think we are gradually coming to recognize more clearly...the gross differences not only of anatomy but also of physiology, both physical and mental, of animals from each other and from man..."

In May 1961, Dr. Pierre Bosquet had written in France's *Nouvelle Critique*: "Research is strictly subordinated to an immediate commercial profit. Currently, disease is one of the major sources of profit for the pharmaceutical industry, and the doctors are willing agents of those profits."

Already many years ago, Dr. Waiter Modell of Cornell University's Medical College, whom *Time* had described as "one of America's foremost drug experts", wrote in *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics*: "When will they realize that there are too many drugs? No fewer than 150,000 preparations are now in use. About 15,000 new mixtures and dosages hit the market each year, while about 12,000 die off...We simply don't have enough diseases to go around. At the moment the most helpful contribution is the new drug to counteract the untoward effect of other new drugs." (*Time*, May 26, 1961)

Writing in the *New York Daily News* (March 13, 1961), the long-time staffer William H. Hendrix recalled an interview, printed many times before, of the famous Dr. Charles Mayo (not to be confused with a later Dr. Charles Mayo): "I abhor vivisection. It should be abolished. I know of no achievement through vivisection, no scientific discovery that could not have been obtained without such barbarism and cruelty. The whole thing is evil."

"The causes of diabetes mellitus remain unknown in both man and animals." (From an article in the *Veterinary Record* of July 9, 1960)

"It is not possible to apply to the human species experimental information derived from inducing cancer in animals." (Dr. Kenneth Starr, of the New South Wales Cancer Council, reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, April 7, 1960)

"There really exists no logical basis for translating the result of animals to man." (Dr. L. Goldberg, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm. *Quantitative Method in Human Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, Pergamon Press, London, 1959)

"Dr. P. Richter, of the famed Phipps Psychiatric Clinic at the Johns Hopkins, conducted controlled experiments with drugs and hormones commonly in use and his results were published in the August issue of *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*: His conclusions are a warning that, while certain drugs and hormones may have an immediate beneficial effect, the patient may suffer permanent damage which will not appear until months after discontinuance of the medication. These medicaments had already been 'proved' by the usual tests on animals, chiefly rats, to be perfectly harmless." (Cited from *News-Post*, Baltimore, August 5, 1959)

"The most phenomenal accomplishments in tuberculosis eradication have been achieved where little or no B.C.G. has been used, including Iceland, Hawaii and the Netherlands." (From an article signed by seventeen doctors in the *British Medical Journal*, June 6, 1959)

Dr. M. Beddow Baily, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Member Royal College of Surgeons, in his book *More Spotlights on Vivisection* (London, 1958): "Vivisection appeals to the basest instincts of fear and cowardice. Before the bar of justice vivisection stands condemned on three main counts: cruelty to animals, uselessness to man, and obstruction on the path of real knowledge."

Dr. Robert Gesell, Chariman, Department of Physiology, University of Michigan, April 1958:

"Consider what we are doing in the name of science, and the issue will be clear. We are drowning and suffocating unanesthetized animals in the name of science. We are determining the amount of abuse that life will endure in unanesthetized animals in the name of science."

Dealing with the assay of oxytocic drugs (i.e. drugs supposed to hasten parturition): "With the exception of drugs acting on the soul, the most striking differences between animal and human experiments are probably to be found in drugs acting on the uterus. Much time and effort have been spent in trying to find new oxytocic drugs by experiments on animals, which later proved to be completely inactive when tested on the human uterus. There is thus a need for assay methods by which oxytocic drugs can be tested on the human uterus." (Dr. H.O. Schild, reader in pharmacology, University College, London; joint author of Clark's *Applied Pharmacology: Quantitative Method in Human Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, Pergamon Press, London, 1959. Report of a Symposium held in London, March 1958, p. 154)

"How are we to know that when a drug has been tried on 15 different species of animals, including primates, and shown to be harmless, it will be found harmless to man? The reverse consideration also applies. How are we to be sure that a drug shown to be toxic to 15 different species of animals will also be toxic to man?" (Dr. A.L. Bacharach, Wellcome Chemical Research Laboratory, in *Quantitative Method in Human Pharmacology and Therapeutics*. Pergamon Press, London, 1959, p. 196. Report of symposium held in London, March 1958)

The French medical journal, *Revue de Pathologie Generale et de Physiologie Clinique*, reported in January 1958: "The vaccine modifies the soil of the vaccinated person and turns it into an alkaline and oxidised soil - the soil of cancer. This fact can no longer be denied. "

"This widespread animal experimentation...is of practically no use whatever in furthering the art and science of medical practice. It is certainly up to the well-instructed members of the medical profession to denounce it. As regards to this journal at any rate. we shall continue to do so." (Editorial in the *Medical Review* for September 1957)

"It is a melancholy thought that hundreds of research workers spending hundreds of millions of money have been at work for well over thirty years on this problem, tobacco-smoking and lung cancer and at the end of this period we have advanced so little. if at all. The very volume of money and effort has built up an organized research which is no longer original. Its very bulk forces it through well-known channels." (Dr. W.A. Ball. Surgeon. *Lancet*. July 6.1957. p. 45)

"Contrary to the widespread belief based on studies in the lower animals the xanthine drugs consistently produce significant cerebral vasoconstriction in man." (Dr. Seymour S. Ketty. Chief, Laboratory of Clinical Science, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland. *Triangle*, Vol. III. No. 2. June 1957. pp. 47 and 51)

"The intensive research on carcinogenic substances which has been undertaken during the past quarter of a century has complicated rather than simplified the problem." (*The Lancet*, February 16. 1957, p. 334)

"Pacatal was tested in animals by Nieschultz et al. (1954) and found to be well tolerated. Unfortunately, the high incidence of toxic side-effects in this group of patients suggests that the widespread use of Pacatal is unjustifiable..." (Dr. P.H. Mitchell, Dr. P. Sykes. surgeon and Dr. A. King. Surgeon, *British Medical Journal*, January 26, 1957. p. 207)

Dr. James Burnet, M.A., L.B., M.D., R.R.C:P.E., in medical practice for half of the present century, (he died in 1957) a medico-legalist of high qualifications and former editor of the *Medical Times*: "Nothing I was taught regarding the results of animal research was of the slightest value in the diagnosis and treatment of disease, but rather the reverse."

"The evanescence of our knowledge is something we rarely mention. We go from one cocksureness to another. Read your lecture notes of 1928 or 1929 if you have any. It is embarrassing to see how little those giants knew. But we are just as ignorant now. We have acquired a great many more wrong data since, if we have tried to keep up to date. Only we won't admit it, even to ourselves." (*The Lancet*, November 24, 1956, p. 11(0))

"... No drug is ever given a clean bill of health on the basis of animal testing. It is taken into the clinic and tried on human beings. Many don't know they are being used as guinea pigs... " (Evidence given by Dr. W.M. Hoskins, Professor of Entomology, Berkeley, California, quoted in *Our Daily Poison* by Leonard Wickenden, published in New York, D.S.A., 1956)

In his book *La sperimentazione sugli animali* (2nd ed., 1956), Gennaro Ciaburri, one of Italy's anti-vivisectionist doctors, provides among many others the following insight: "Normally, pressure on one or both eyeballs will slow down the pulse...This symptom has opened up a vast field for vivisection. Experimenters squashed the eyes of dogs to study this reflex, to the point of discovering that the heartbeat was slowing down - owing to the death of the animals..."

"Knowledge of the endocrine control of these processes is derived mainly from experimental studies on a number of different animal species. So great is the variation in response of these species to the hormone concerned that it would be imprudent to assume that the human breast behaves in a manner similar to the mammary gland in any particular species studied." (Dr. P.M.F. Bishop, *The Practitioner*, June 1956, p. 630)

"In animal tests (methylpentynol) was shown to possess high activity, desirable duration of action, low toxicity...one fatality for which methylpentynol itself was responsible has been described, the dose being between 4.5 and 6 gm. Death was caused by cardiac arrest. In view of this occurrence it has been questioned whether in fact methylpentynol is as safe as animal experiments seemed to indicate..." (*Medical World*. March 1956, p. 216)

"While still appreciating the great curative action of modern drugs, we now recognise that there are many infections which they cannot overcome - either because the organism is not a species which responds to that particular drug or because resistance has developed; moreover the toxic effects are now becoming evident and the medical papers are full of instances where the patient has suffered more harm from this treatment than he would have

experienced from his original infection..." (From a Clinical Article on Modern Chemotherapy by the head of the Chemotherapy Division of the National Institute for Medical Research, *Medical World*, March 1956, p. 473)

"Vivisection diverts the doctor's attention from the sickbed and he devotes it to the study of some utopian ideas that have nothing to do with practical medicine. "Dr Gennaro Ciaburri, M.D., biologist in Bologna/Italy, in his book *La Sperimentazione Animale* (Animal Experimentation), 1956, 2nd ed., p. 177.

"During the past 50 years scientists experimenting with thousands of animals had found 700 ways of causing cancer. But they had not discovered one way of curing the disease." (Dr. J.F. Brailsford, M.D., Ph.D., F.R.C.P., in the *Birmingham Evening Despatch*. January 10, 1956)

"... there are still people who feel that the rat will guide us to a perfect diet, me, I think it merely guides us to the garbage heap." (Dr. Franklin Bicknell, D.M., M.R.C.P., *The English Complaint*, January 1956)

"Surgical heterodoxy is rife in operations on the stomach, for peptic ulceration is a very common disease, becoming commoner every year, and the claptrap and sales talk of animal experimentation can be had for the asking and can be served up to support any theory, however bizarre, and any operation, however unsound." (Sir Heneage Ogilvy, K.B.E., D.M., M.Ch., F.R.C.S., in the *Lancet*. January 21, 1956)

"... Largely as a result of animal experiment, during which parts of the hypothalamus have been stimulated or destroyed, a concept of its function in its different parts has been built up. Results of these experiments may be confusing since a destructive lesion may produce an entirely different clinical state from that caused by an irritative lesion..." (*The Medical Press*, September 21, 1955, p. 272)

Once again, our sorcerer's apprentices cannot say that they haven't been given enough warning. Here is an example of the warnings as to the carcinogenic danger of smallpox vaccination. Dr. B. Duperrat, of the Saint-Louis Hospital in Paris, wrote in the French medical journal *Presse Medicale* on March 12, 1955: "Vaccination also causes leukaemia to break out."

"Recently, Dr. Harald Okens, Professor of Anatomy in the University of Copenhagen, stated that there is no compelling argument which can justify scientific experiments on dogs. For his part he categorically prohibited such experiments at the Institute of which he was head. In his opinion much good would be won if such experiments were forbidden by law." (*Dog's Bulletin*, February 1955)

"It must be pointed out that a phenomenon observed in a given organism under normal condition... is one thing, and a phenomenon observed under pathological conditions, especially when they are produced in the laboratory, as, for example, the stimulation of the brain, is another thing. They are, of course, absolutely different phenomena." (Ivan Petrovich

Pavlov, *Selected work*. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955, p. 383)

"In contrast to our detailed knowledge of the importance of Vitamin E for laboratory animals, great uncertainty remains as to its value in the treatment of disease in man..." *The Lancet*, Oct.1, 1955.

"Let us not deceive ourselves. The guinea-pig's reputation is spurious." (Editorial, *The Medical Press*, January 19, 1955, p. 45)

In Great Britain surgeons have had for a century experience with human patients only, for under the Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876 it is provided that no experiment shall be performed on animals for the purpose of attaining manual skill. And it would be very difficult for anyone even today to disclaim Sir W. Heneage Ogilvy, medical doctor and Consulting Surgeon to Guy's Hospital and Royal Masonic Hospital, who declared in the *British Medical Journal* (Dec. 18, 1954, p. 1438): "British surgery has always stood high because it can be claimed, and not without reason, that every surgical advance of major importance has come from this country."

Compared to such examples of British hypocrisy, which abound, the out-spokenness of their less inhibited American colleagues sounds almost refreshing, like the statement of Prof. George Wakerlin of the Chicago University, reported by *The National* (June 1954): "I want nothing to do with anything having the word 'humane' connected with it."

"The argument from man is so much more convincing than the argument from mice - which, indeed, may be completely misleading as in the case of urethane, which has some inhibitory action on human tumours, but a marked, though temporary one on chronic human leukaemias." (Dr. C.G. Learoyd, Surgeon, *Medical World*, Aug. 1954, p. 172)

"Few neurological and probably no psychiatric disorders can be adequately reproduced in animals." (Review, *British Medical Journal*, June 12, 1954, p. 1364)

"One is seldom justified in carrying over observations from one species to another. This includes the carrying over to human beings the observations made on experimental animals." (Dr. Carlos Hines, Physician and Clinical Researcher for Eli Lilly & Co. in the *Indianapolis Star*, March 16, 1954)

"It must never be forgotten that the results of animal tests may be of little value in forecasting the effects of a substance on man..." (Dr. J.M. Barnes, World Health Organization Monograph No. 16, 1954, p.45)

"No experimental worker can provide a single fact about human disease." (Dr. D.A. Long, London, from the National Institute for Medical Research, *Lancet*, March 13, 1954, p. 532)

"It is readily granted that a fracture and a burn on a dog are not the same as on a human." (Drs. Harvey S. Allen, John L. Bell and Sherman W. Day, Chicago, Illinois, *Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics*, Vol. 97, November 1953, p. 541)

"Well-established facts about human disease have been ignored by experimentalists and



have had to be re-discovered before fallacies were recognised and corrected." (Dr. Clifford Wilson, *The Lancet*, September 19, 1953, p. 579)

"Although lung tumours have been described in many species, there is no laboratory animal which spontaneously develops tumours comparable to the ordinary squamous or anaplastic carcinoma of the bronchus of man..." (Dr. Richard Doll, *British Medical Journal*, September 5, 1953)

"The folly of founding the actions of drugs on animal experiments cannot be over-emphasized. This is the case with chloramphenicol (chloromycetin). This drug was tried out for long periods on dogs and was found to produce only a transient anaemia, but fatal results have followed its use in human disease..." (Editorial, *Medical Review*. September 1953)

"The hypothesis that acid acting on nerve-endings in the floor of the ulcer is the primary cause of ulcer pain is based upon unnatural experiments, false anatomy, and faulty pathology... Many patients with 'ulcer pain' have no nerves in the ulcer floor, some, have no acid, and some even have no ulcer..." (Dr. V.J. Kinsella, Sydney, *Lancet*, August 22, 1953, p. 361)

"One of the newer antibiotic drugs, chloramphenicol, has been recorded as a cause of fatal aplastic anaemia in human beings. But extensive experiments on dogs have failed to show any evidence of injury or disease to the canine species." (*Bulletin*, Easton, Massachusetts, April 2, 1953)

"Mice were used in the initial toxicity tests because of their small size, but what a lucky chance it was, for in this respect man is like the mouse and not the guinea-pig. If we had used guinea-pigs exclusively we should have said that penicillin was toxic, and we probably should not have proceeded to try to overcome the difficulties of producing the substance for trial in man..." (Dr. Howard Florey, Nobel laureate, co-discoverer of penicillin, "The Advance of Chemotherapy by Animal Experiments", *Conquest*, January 1953, p. 12)

"I am particularly concerned not with the wickedness but with the folly of experiments on animals... To apply the results of experiments on dogs to the aetiology and treatment of peptic ulceration in man is as scientific as to base a course on post-natal lectures to mothers on a study of the maternal habits of the female kangaroo." (Address by Sir Heneage Ogilvie, M.D., surgeon, to Leeds Medical Society, December 12, 1952, *The Lancet*. March 21, 1953, p. 555)

"Most of our knowledge of transplantation is based upon experiments in animals; but these, it seems, differ as much from man in their response to homografting as in the diseases from which they suffer..." (Leading article, *Lancet*, November 29, 1952, p. 1068)

"So long as the research worker plays about with mice and other animals and becomes completely divorced from the clinician and the pathologist, no progress will ever be made with cancer research. So far it is a total failure, and is likely to remain so for so long as it is conducted on what we consider to be entirely wrong and fallacious lines." (Notes on Books,

*Medical Review*, November 1952)

"We confess disappointment with the practical issues of experimental research in cancer. It has told us much about malignant tumours in the lower animals but this, if applied to man, does not tally with experience." (Medical Officer, 1952.)

"Any work which seeks to elucidate the cause of disease, the mechanism of disease, the cure of disease, or the prevention of disease, must begin and end with observations on man, whatever the intermediate steps may be...Man is a species that in many respects is quite unlike any species kept in cages and subject to the kinds of experiments that can be made by any discipline other than clinical science. " (Sir George Pickering, M.D., University of London, *The Lancet*, November 8, 1952, p.895)

Dr. Ludimar Hermann, former Professor of Physiology at Zurich University, was quoted by Lord Dowding as follows in the House of Lords on October 14, 1952: "The advance of science, and not any usefulness for medicine, is the real aim of vivisection. No true researcher thinks of the practical application of his work. Science can do without this justification, with which it still has to defend itself in England."

"I will not discuss the research work that has been done to find the cause of peptic ulceration, because it leads to nowhere. Most of the work has been done on animals, and animals do not get peptic ulcers." (Sir Heneage Ogilvie, M.D., surgeon, *Nursing Mirror*, October 21, 1952)

"Experimental evidence may be dangerously misleading, for in the words of one gastric surgeon, 'not all of our patients behave exactly like dogs' " (Annotation, *The Lancet*, September 20, 1952, p. 572)

"Vaccines prepared from animal brain tissue, containing either killed or a mixture of killed and live virus, are capable of protecting animals, but are potentially dangerous for man when inoculated parenterally. Feeding live virus to animals is quite another matter from doing so to man." (Leading article, *British Medical Journal*, September 6, 1952, p. 551)

"Warning is given not to carry over, without reservation, to man, the conclusions based on animal experiments. In the monkey none of the powerful carcinogens has been shown to produce cancers." (Review, *The Lancet*, August 9, 1952, p. 274)

"Vagotomy is unsound, in the way that any procedure based chiefly on animal experiments is apt to be unsound..." (Sir Heneage Ogilvie, M.D., surgeon, *British Medical Journal*, August 9, 1952, p.302)

"There were important differences between the reactions of the uteri of different species to pituitary hormones and between in vivo and in vitro experiments. Great caution was therefore necessary in making any inferences about the action of drugs on the human uterus from such data." (Prof. G.H. Bell, at the 13th British Congress of Obstetrics and Gynaecology: *British Medical Journal*, August 2, 1952, p. 281)

"When Forssman, in 1929, by repeated cardiac catheterisation upon himself, showed that the procedure was not only possible but apparently without undue danger, a new era in cardiovascular investigation began." (*Practitioner*, July, 1952, p. 40)

"The discovery of the ovarian hormones, oestrogen and progesterone from 1917 onwards, and later the gonadotrophins of the anterior pituitary, opened a wide field in physiology. The astonishing effects of all four hormones when given to small laboratory animals led to great expectations of their therapeutic value in obstetrics and especially gynaecology. These early hopes have been disappointed." (Dr. Alec Bourne, surgeon, *Medical World*, June 13, 1952, p. 4(0))

"I cannot over emphasize the fallacies inherent in the efforts to apply directly to man the results of animal experiments in the field of hormones." (From the testimony of Don Carlos Hines, M.D., before the Delaney Committee of the House of Representatives, Jan. 31, 1952)

"In the pursuit of discovering the cause of cancer it cannot be gainsaid that organized research has failed. In every civilized country in the world innumerable scientists of all grades, working indefatigably in all manner of institutions and laboratories, are using up uncountable man-hours, irreplaceable materials and millions of pounds - all to agonizingly small human profit... Many of our greatest discoveries resulted not from endless experimentation but from the processes of native thought." (Article "Ab Ovo Cancer", *Medical World*, Jan. 25, 1952, p. 576)

"Thomas Addison's monograph of 1855 opens with the words: 'It will hardly be disputed that at the present moment the functions of the suprarenal capsules, and the functions they exercise in the general economy, are almost or altogether unknown.' Like so much of his writings, these words are still true. We have accumulated a mass of facts, but we still can say little about the organism." (Dr. F. G. Young, Professor of bio-chemistry, University of Cambridge, *British Medical Journal*, Dec. 29, 1951, p.1541)

"There has never been any justification for the assumption that a given experimental operation reveals the natural function of the cortex. What the experimentalist has produced is a disorder of natural function - what the clinicians would call a symptom - and we may not assume that a symptom is the same as a normal function or process. Yet that is the assumption that generations of cortical stimulators have made, and this is predominantly why we have not yet got a satisfactory generalization as to the control of purposive movements by the cerebral cortex." (Dr. F.M.R. Walshe, *The Lancet*, Nov.17, 1951, p.898)

"... Much of the work consists of long feeding tests on the experimental animals, but the results can be strictly applied only to these animals - usually rats." (Leading article, *British Medical Journal*, Oct. 13, 1951, p.897)

"At the CIBA Foundation, London, on July 3rd, Prof. Houssay reviewed his group's work on the influence of sex hormones on the incidence and severity of experimental diabetes in the rat; but he first warned his audience not to accept these results for other animals or for

humans." (Annotation in *The Lancet*, July 14, 1951, p.70)

"...results obtained experimentally in such animals (guinea pigs) certainly cannot be taken to hold also for rheumatic fever in man, since argument by analogy of this sort has only too often proved fallacious in the past." (Leading article, *British Medical Journal*, July 7, 1951, p.37)

"The gastro-intestinal tract in man is unfortunately very different from that of animals, and the results of a new operation for gastric disease cannot be predicted from operations on dogs." (Editorial, *The Lancet*, May 5, 1951, p.1003)

"Localization is an artificial observer-made attribute of the brain...The brain and its ordinary owner have no knowledge whatever of localization, and except for those interested in it as a subject for study, it is of supreme indifference to the individual and his behaviour. Localization in a rigid sense is an abstraction of the sort which may take us further and further from reality." (Dr. William Goody, Assistant Physician to National Hospital, and Consultant Neurologist University College Hospital. *Lancet*, Mar. 17, 1951, p.627)

"As the years pass, cancer seems to be on the increase. The search for the cause has up till now met with a very poor result, largely owing to the fact that cancer research has been and is being conducted on laboratory animals... We believe that until research switches over to the clinician and leaves the laboratory investigator of cancer to grieve over his failures, no real progress will be made." ("Cancer, an Abstract Review," *Medical Review*, Feb. 1951)

"It was difficult to foresee from experiments on animals how far a muscle relaxant was likely to affect respiration in man...It was equally difficult to foresee, from laboratory experiments, the duration of the effect of the drugs in man." (Dr. H. O. Collier, chief pharmacologist at Allen and Hanburys, Ltd., *British Medical Journal*, Feb. 17, 1951, p, 353)

"The characteristic effects in leukaemia were detected solely as a result of clinical observation. The various leukaemias in the mouse and rat were relatively refractory to the influence of urethane, and the remarkable effect in the human might have eluded discovery if attention had been directed to the animal alone. That illustrates the hazards of such work." (Prof. Alexander Haddow, *British Medical Journal*, December 2, 1950, p. 1272)

"It seems clear therefore that one is not justified in depending on the result of animal assays to determine the relative potency of oestrogens in the human subject." (Drs. P.M.F. Bishop, N.A. Richards, M.B. Adelaide, and Neal Smith, *The Lancet*, May 6, 1950, p. 850)

"Practice on dogs probably does make a good veterinarian, if that's the kind of practitioner you want for your family." So wrote Dr. William Held, internationally famous Chicago physician one of the many great medical men who regarded the practice of vivisection as dangerously misleading for medical art.

"When oestrogen first became available for clinical use, there was an understandable over-enthusiasm for its application... If one depends on the beautifully embossed brochures which exhort the practitioner with every mail, one falls, unhappily, into the security of the illusion that

there are neither contraindications nor side-effects in the use of oestrogen." (Drs. Robert A. Kimbrough and S. Lion Israel, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 138, December 25, 1949, p. 1216)

Dr. Charles Lyman Lamer, as cited by Morris Bealle in *The Drug Story*, 1949: "Since the regimentation of Medicine by quacks and medical gangsters in control of the American Medical Association, this organization has become one of the most vicious rackets in the country. "

The famed German Doctor Erwin Liek - of whom the major German encyclopedia, *Der Grosse Brockhaus*, says, "he advocated a medical art of high ethical level, which takes into consideration the patient's psyche" - gives us the following information:

"Here is another example that animal experimentation sometimes can't answer even the simplest questions. I know personally two of Germany's most authoritative researchers, Friedberger of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Nutritional Research and Prof. Scheunert of the Institute of Animal Physiology at Leipzig. Both wanted to investigate the simple question as to whether a diet of hardboiled eggs or of raw eggs is more beneficial. They employed the same animals: 28-day-old rats. Result: over an observation period of three months, Friedberger's animals prospered on a diet of raw eggs, while the control animals, which got hardboiled eggs, pined, lost their hair, developed eye troubles; several died after much suffering. At Scheunert's I witnessed the identical experiments, with exactly opposite results." (From *Gedanken eines Arztes*, Oswald Arnold, Berlin, 1949)

But even more revealing is what the vivisectors themselves say in their unguarded moments about the uselessness of vivisection for medical science. In *Experimental Surgery*, the monumental vivisection manual (Baltimore, 1949) J. Markowitz gives fair warning in his introduction that "The operative technique described in these pages is suitable for animals, usually dogs. However, it does not follow that it is equally and always suited for human beings. We refuse to allow the student the pretense that what he is doing is operating on a patient for the cure of an ailment"

So this top expert states explicitly that vivisection doesn't really help train the surgeon, he even says it can be misleading, and furnishes a memorable example: "In our student days intrathoracic surgery sounded very mysterious and formidable. We know today that it need not be so. What caused the difficulties was that the surgeons assumed the nature of pneumothorax as encountered in the dog to be similar to what will occur in man. This is only true for the side that is opened, for a man has two separate chests, each harbouring a lung, and each capable of sustaining life...In the dog, even a small puncture of one pleural cavity will cause fatal collapse of both lungs."

"The sensitivity of animals varies from laboratory to laboratory, and therefore it is impossible to compare potencies arrived at in one laboratory with those of another. It has been usual to assume that the sensitivity of all mammals is roughly the same for oestrogen, but there is now considerable evidence that such is not the case, and that it is most unwise to assume that the

human female will react in the same way as laboratory animals. This work is of very great interest in that it shows the folly of applying results obtained on animals to the human being." (Prof. Dr. E.C. Dodds, *Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology*, Vol. I, No. 3, 1949, pp. 143-45)

Atomic radiation (from atomic bombs) - In *Clinical Excerpts*, Vol. XXIII, Nos. 9-10, Sept./Oct., 1948 (p. 85), there is an article on "Medicine and the Atomic Bomb". Under the heading *Effects of Irradiation*, the following comment occurs: "These depend on the species. Thus the pigs, goats and guinea-pigs exposed on the vessels of Bikini were not affected in the same way, and different experimental animals tolerate greatly different quantities of radiation without death. This is unfortunate from the research worker's point of view, since it prevents the application to man of conclusions from animal experiments."

Sir Macfarlane Burnet, M.D., Sc.D., Ph.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.A.C.P., F.R.S.: "It is notoriously dangerous to apply experimental results from animals to the treatment of human beings, because human and animal physiology show subtle but important differences." (*The Lancet*, July 3, 1948)

"The Folly of Torturing Animals", an article by Millicent Morden, M.D., Physician and Surgeon, New York, in *The Abolitionist*, Sept./Oct. 1947:

"The supposed utility of the practice of vivisection is a misconception. Animals are entirely different from man. Nothing of value to man has ever been discovered by vivisection. We do not need to experiment on animals to know our soil is so depleted that man and animal are both half-starved. If the money spent on vivisection were used, instead, to help the soil, people would not have to buy vitamins.

"Some of the highest paid salaries go to the boosters of vivisection. When this money talks it makes queer claims. We may not be able to argue with the noted individual who claimed to have learned how to sing by means of experiments on the throat muscles of a dog, but to all similar assertions we would answer: There is a better way of accomplishing the same purpose without torturing the animal.

"Animal experiments have brought forth some very dangerous drugs, vaccines and serums. We have all seen horrible results. Animal tests, including Wassermann, are considered unreliable by experienced doctors. Medicines can all be accurately standardised without the use of animals. Several chemical houses have stopped using animals in testing the strength of digitalis, because the strength varied 300 per cent when animals were used. The action of drugs on animals is different from their action on man. Animals have different digestive juices and a blood that has only a fraction of the oxidising power of that possessed by man. Man's blood-stream makes a quick improvement when given the juices of raw vegetables and fruits. The animal's response is much slower.

"I have done a great deal of laboratory investigation. I have worked without pay, taking the place of experimental animals. Human remedies must be tried on human beings. Surgery

made tremendous advances owing to the emergencies of this recent war and not because of animal torture.

"I cannot question the honesty of the doctors who say that animals do not suffer in the laboratories. I do say they must be blind to suffering. After their tortures, the agony expressed in the eyes of the animals is unforgettable. Vivisection is the rock on which the noble medical profession - as well as the lives and health of humanity - is being dashed to pieces."

Dr. Salvador Gonzales Herrejon, Director of the Mexican National School of Medicine, published a long article condemning vivisection in the *New York Journal American* (July 13, 1947), including:

"Anything the students might learn of anatomy by working on dogs is unimportant in relation to humans, for the location of the viscera, spleen, nerves etc., of the animal, although somewhat similar, is different. We see clearly that in vivisection students perform high surgery with results which are gained only by the high physical tolerance of the animal, and they operate with the irresponsibility which this high tolerance induces. Is it prudent to teach the student that he can open the stomach of a human with such facility? And is it not unjustifiable cruelty to permit students to make an unnecessary and mutilating operation on a dog today, make another tomorrow, and again another, and so on until the dog dies? Is it not an immoral method of teaching, destroying respect for life, proper sentiment and piety? Obviously it is."

"We well remember how there was a boom in hormonal therapy. Much of the vaunted good results obtained were wrongly deduced from animal experiments...These results, when applied to humans clinically, were found to be not only erroneous but in some cases highly dangerous." (Review, *Medical World*, June 6, 1947, p. 471)

"Tuberculosis in human beings and tuberculosis in animals are distinctly different, although they are produced by the same micro-organism. The disease in animals is relatively simple in character, and fairly predictable in its course, whereas in the human being it is far more complex; so one must not assume that a drug that is effective in the laboratory animal will be equally effective in man." (*The Lancet*, July 20, 1946)

Dr. Arthur V. Allen, one of Chicago's best-known physicians, a specialist in industrial medicine, Fellow of the American Medical Association, graduate of the Chicago College of Medicine and Surgery, for 26 years chief surgeon for the Commonwealth Edison Company, in the *American Weekly*, July 1, 1945, under the heading "Animal Torture Worthless to Science": "Both as a medical man and a human being I am opposed to vivisection. As a physician, I believe vivisection to be wrong in principle. I do not believe it is right to create disease and suffering in order to study it. I know it is not necessary to do so. Animal experiments have been going on for more than 300 years. If they were ever going to be of benefit to the human race, surely they should have proved themselves by now."

In the *National Magazine*, which folded in June 1954 because it kept attacking the vivisection business with articles written by honest physicians, the same Dr. Allen wrote in an article that

made anti-vivisection history and was titled "Vivisection is a business": "Few persons seem to realize that vivisection is a business. Men enter this business for the same reason they enter any other business: to make money and to further their own interests. The leaders in this business must know it's phony."

"...Facts incontrovertible in the laboratory are applied to clinical medicine in a manner quite unwarranted. The best examples are the indiscriminate use of hormones and the ready acceptance of the biased blurbs of research propagated by commercial travelers." Dr. Frangcon Roberts, *British Medical Journal*, June 16, 1945, p. 848)

Dr. Alfred Gough, Hon. Consulting Surgeon to the Leeds Hospital for Women, writing in the *Medical Press and Circular*, March 14, 1945, stated that: "The practical results of treatment with sex hormones fall far short of what might be wished. One reason is that the results of animal experiments cannot be applied to women." (Quoted by Dr. James Burnet in *Medical World*, May 18, 1945, p. 431)

"The great onrush of laboratory and animal experiments is in so many respects threatening the very foundations of practical medicine. Diseased conditions cannot be correctly imitated in experimental animals, so why persist in making such experiments?" (Extract from *Medical World*, May 18, 1945, by Dr. James Burnet, one of the best known British physicians, late Examiner to the University of Aberdeen)

*Current Topics Medical Press*, May 16, 1945: "Physiology of the Pancreas", p. 306. "There can be no doubt that observations on human subjects are of more importance than animal experiments."

In an article entitled "A Surgeon Looks at Two Wars", published in *The Lancet*. September 30, 1944, (p. 428) Colonel Cutler, M.D., F.R.C.S., M.C., referring to the effect of penicillin on gas-gangrene declared: "Here we see an example of the fallaciousness of transmitting laboratory data directly to man. No animal responds to infections as man does."

"No experimental shock in animals can be completely identified with clinical shock as we do not know in what the latter consists." (Dr. G. Ungar, Paris, *The Lancet*, April 3, 1943, p. 421)

# **1000 DOCTORS (AND MANY MORE) AGAINST VIVISECTION**

Edited by Hans Ruesch

First published 1989 Ó Hans Ruesch Foundation

(PART 3 OF 4)



In *The Lancet*, October 10, 1942 (p. 431), reference is made to the work of Duncan and Blalock in producing 'experimental shock' in dogs by various crushing injuries. The comment is made in the Annotation that all these experiments were inconclusive since renal failure, usually the cause of death in man, did not occur at all in dogs.

"In the old days we were taught, as the result purely of animal experiments, that digitalis raised the blood pressure. We now know that this is utter nonsense. Indeed, it is a remedy of very great value in certain cases when the blood pressure is found to be abnormally high."  
(Dr. James Burnet, *Medical World*, July 3, 1942, p. 338)

An article, "Medical Research", by James Burnet, M.A., LLB, M.D., March 1942:

"One of the chief causes which has led to this disastrous state of affairs is the gradual rise into prominence of the experimental physiologist and pharmacologist. Students attending classes of physiology nowadays learn little or nothing, save the results of animal experiments. Unfortunately, too, these results are never definite or final. What one physiologist teaches today is refuted by another physiologist tomorrow. The same remark is true of pharmacology. Students of today can seldom write a decent prescription, but they know all about the action of certain drugs on cats, dogs and even rats. We must constantly bear in mind that we can very rarely apply to humans the results obtained with experimental animals. Animal research is often quite misleading when its results are interpreted in relation to disease. Feeding experiments are notoriously fallacious. Take one striking example. As the result of experiments on rats (i.e. rodents) fed on oatmeal we have been told that children should never be given oatmeal as it is prejudicial to their teeth. This, we can say from practical clinical experience is utter nonsense. As a matter of fact, we are now being constantly told to use more oatmeal.

"After all, our real function as medical men is to diagnose and efficiently cure diseases. A knowledge of the results of research carried out on animals will not help us here. In fact, it may hamper us. A very obvious case in point is cancer. Until we cease pinning our faith to the results in the laboratory of experiments on mice and other animals we venture to submit that no real progress in discovering the cause, much less the cure, of cancer will ever be made. The cause and cure of this disease will never be discovered in the laboratory by doctors of science or of philosophy. How long will this important truth remain unheeded by some of the heads of our profession?

"If our knowledge of disease is to make any real progress, it must be by research work carried on at the bedside of the patient. By careful and close observation, of which only the trained mind of the practical clinician is really capable in this sphere, we may detect variations in disease and in respect to treatment which may help us to understand better the nature of many pathological conditions. After all, we have to deal not with lower animals but with man whose complex organism is something apart from that of the former. As practical men we must be made to see for ourselves that we are slowly but surely becoming the mere slaves of the research worker. We are being taught to ignore clinical work which, we submit, is

paramount in every branch of medical science.”

*Medical World*, January 16, 1942, in a review of *Essentials of Endocrinology* by Dr. Arthur Grollman: "So much of the work done in connection with these various substances has necessarily had to be carried out on laboratory animals, and when these results have been applied to humans they have been found to be hopelessly misleading and even dangerous in not a few instances." (p. 482)

"Another form of substitution therapy for men is injection of male hormone solutions, of which synthetic products have recently been put on the market... At present, many contradictory reports of animal experimentations becloud the issue for the clinician, and only too often create an almost hopeless confusion." (Review, *Medical World*, January 17, 1941, pp. 504-505)

"I am always sorry for the clinician who tries, in the best scientific manner, to translate academic research work, carried out, unfortunately, for the most part on the lower animals, with different metabolic rates and life spans, into terms of practical dietetics." (Professor E.P. Cathcar, in a preface to *Diet in Health and Disease*, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1940)

Sir Arbuthnot Lane, Bart., C.B., M.B., M.S., F.R.C.S.:

"Cancer is by no means a mystery disease, the secrets of which can only be discovered by scientists, armed with microscopes, ultramicroscopes, test tubes, etc. Unfortunately the researchers have obscured the causation of this commonplace malady by the investigation of countless relatively unimportant scientific details which they have discussed in papers and books, in language quite incomprehensible to the general public and to the great majority of medical men themselves...Cancer is a disease of civilisation. It is practically unknown to the primitive races leading primitive lives. Hundreds of medical men who have practiced for decades among the South African negroes have never seen a cancer case...On the other hand, cancer is not uncommon among the South African negroes in the coast towns who for decades have lived more or less on the white man's diet...

"Cancer is...essentially a nutritional disease. It is far more prevalent in the towns where people subsist on artificial food than in the country where men eat fresh natural food, take plenty of exercise and are less troubled with intestinal stagnation and auto-intoxication than are the sedentary inhabitants of the larger cities. We need not abolish civilisation in order to abolish cancer. We need only reform our lives in accordance with the dictates of nature...

"Cancer is currently supposed to be a disease due to old age... Mr. Barker points out that the cancer mortality among the short-lived public house workers and butchers is approximately three times as great as it is among the long-lived agricultural labourers and clergymen...

"Cancer is a disease of faulty feeding, not a mysterious disease which can be fathomed only by eminent scientists who have specialised in microbiology, chemistry and other sciences... Cancer...results from chronic poisoning of the tissues of the body during decades...

"Cancer mortality has increased by 50 per cent during the last 15 years...The foundation of cancer is laid in the kitchen and in the dining-room and women have it in their power to limit its ravages and even to eliminate it altogether."

H.W. Magoun, M.D., Ph.D.: "I regard vivisection as not only horrible - it is criminal. Moreover I am convinced it does more harm than good to the practice of medicine and surgery."

Dr. C. Mathieu, Paris: "While studying medicine in the hospitals I was at one time charged with the functions of preparing the physiological experiments. It was for a short time only as I could not support the sense of horror which these vivisections caused me. I consider them to be useless cruelties. I never learnt anything from them, and I consider the campaign against vivisection noble and humane."

H. Fergie Woods, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., etc., in an article, "Rabbits, Silicosis, and Aluminum" in the July 1940 issue of the Abolitionist: "One is tempted to predict that the experiments, and the conclusions derived from them, will be relegated to that great mass of useless and misleading exploitation of animals, which unhappily persists in poisoning the minds of the medical profession."

As has been repeated countless times in these and other pages, it is impossible to argue safely or scientifically from animal to man. In another issue of the same journal, H. Fergie Woods wrote: "I have studied the question of vivisection for thirty-five years and am convinced that experiments on living animals are leading medicine further and further from the real cure of the patient. I know of no instance of an animal experiment that has been necessary for the advancement of medical science; still less do I know of any animal experiment that could conceivably be necessary to save human life."

"For years I have carefully studied the annual reports of the Ministry of Health, the Medical Research Council and the two Cancer Research bodies, but I have been unable to discover what benefits they have conferred on the community, although I must confess I have often admired their easy flowing rhetoric and their naive assumption of the value of their own efforts as essays in subtle propaganda for the extraction of yet more money out of the generous and credulous British public." (Dr. W. Mitchell Stevens, *Medical World*, July 5.1940.

"Of very considerable importance is the attempted treatment of prostatic enlargement by means of male hormones. Experiments with mice and monkeys unfortunately proved misleading when their results were applied to man." (Review. *Medical World*, May 3. 1940. p. 226)

"Vivisection is mostly undertaken in the expectation that the goal which has been mentally erected is attainable. The results never justify the means as erecting goals is an idle pursuit as evidenced by research conducted on these lines, retarding instead of advancing progress." (Dr. J.E.R. McDonagh. Surgeon, in *The Universe Through Medicine*, Heinemann. London. 1940. p. 371)

An article, "Fallacies About Vivisection", by M. Beddow Bayly, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., in the *Abolitionist*. September 1940:

"Professor C. Lovatt Evans was reported to have told the British Association at Glasgow in 1928 that "no doctor can use a stethoscope, feel a pulse, take a blood-pressure, administer a hypodermic, give an anaesthetic or a transfusion, perform any modern operations or indeed take any steps in diagnosis, prognosis, or treatment without utilising at every turn knowledge derived from results of animal experimentation and obtainable in no other way.

"This is a statement fairly typical of the almost incredible nonsense which pro-vivisectionists have the temerity to 'broadcast' in their public utterances and writings. It seems almost an insult to the reader's intelligence to assume that it requires an answer. However, let us take the claims in order.

"The stethoscope was invented by Flaennec when, in 1819, he screwed up a roll of paper in order to listen to the chest of a stout patient.

"Hua Tu, one of the ablest physicians of all time, lived in China 2,000 years ago and developed a high degree of accuracy in diagnosis by feeling the radial pulse; he was also a pioneer in abdominal operations (under anaesthetic drugs), and removed diseased lengths of bowel, suturing sound portions without infection. He was also versed in the action of the glands upon the body and practised organotherapy.

"In this latter connection it is interesting to recall that Dr. Langdon Brown told the British Medical Association in 1925 that 'the pioneer observations were made at the bedside. Gull and Ord discovered the functions of the thyroid, when the laboratories had made no more helpful suggestion than that it was merely helpful to improve the contour of the neck. Addison was the first to point out the function of the adrenals, while the role of the pituitary was recognised clinically from the symptoms of acromegaly.'

"Ability to estimate blood-pressure was gained by a study of the laws of hydro-dynamics. In 1733, experiments upon animals, in which tubes were inserted directly into the animal's arteries, had been found to be totally inapplicable to man; they contributed nothing to our knowledge of human blood-pressure nor to the invention of the apparatus now used to record it; this was not achieved until many years had elapsed since the futile and cruel animal experiments were performed.

"The hypodermic syringe was invented by Charles G. Pravaz, a surgeon of Lyons, in 1852; in the following year Alexander Wood, of Edinburgh, used this method for injecting morphia for the relief of neuralgia and thus paved the way for local anaesthesia. Drugs subsequently invented for this purpose could obviously only be tested for efficacy upon human volunteers.

"Of the respiratory anaesthetics, chloroform was first used by James Simpson in 1847; ether by William Morton in 1846, after experiments upon themselves and friends. Nitrous oxide gas had been suggested by Sir Humphrey Davy as an anaesthetic in 1800, but it was not until

1844 that it was first used during the extraction, by a colleague, of a tooth of a dentist named Horace Wells.

“According to the *Medical World*. May 12, 1939: ‘The father of spinal anaesthesia is August Bier, a German doctor who in 1898 injected a 1 per cent solution of cocaine into his own spinal canal in order to observe its effects.’

“The new basal anaesthetics, which are applied by rectal injection, were the direct outcome of clinical observation of the action of Avertin, first used to allay the spasms of whooping- cough. Other drugs of the same chemical series followed.

“As the *Report* of the Royal Commission on Vivisection (1912) declared: ‘The discovery of anaesthetics owes nothing to experiments on animals.’

“The first human blood-transfusion was made by Andre Libavius in 1594 when, for a large reward, the blood of a young man was passed into the veins of an older man. Modern technique depends upon a careful matching of blood types, and no animal experiments have, or could have, helped in this essential particular.

“Animal experiments for surgical skill have already been shown to be illegal in this country; abroad, we may sum the matter up in the words of Dr. A. Desjardins, President of the Society of Surgeons in Paris: ‘I have never known a single good operator who has learned anything whatever from experiments on animals.’

“There is hardly a useful drug in the British Pharmacopoeia which owes anything to animal experiments. Even the so-called biological standardization is so unreliable that efforts are continually being made to replace it by chemical tests in the few cases in which it is employed. There is plenty of evidence to show that animal experiments on creatures differing from man in nearly every particular have been both misleading and dangerous. Moreover, there is one complete system of medicine, the Homoeopathic, practised by an increasing number of physicians for over a hundred years, which is based upon principles that entirely rule out the validity of animal experiments, all tests of the action of drugs being made upon human volunteers.

“Did space permit, every branch of knowledge utilised by medical practitioners might similarly be shown to be independent of animal experiments, but this brief article may fitly be concluded by a quotation from an article in the *Medical World*. April 12, 1940, in which G.E. Donovan, M.B., B.Ch., B.A.O., D.P.H., declares: ‘Instruments like the stethoscope, thermometer, microscope, ophthalmoscope, X-rays, etc., made modern clinical medicine. Take them away and you have practically nothing left.’ Yet none of these was discovered, or its use developed through experiments upon animals.”

-----

Dr. Erwin E. Nelson, in his presidential address to the section on pharmacology and

therapeutics at the 1939 Annual Session of the American Medical Association, asserted that the minimum lethal dose of a drug, determined by injection, as in the case of digitalis, only applies to 50 percent of animals tested, for "actually any individual animal may be killed by an amount which is much smaller than this, or it may require a considerably greater amount. Some cats require more than two and one-half times the dose required for others." (*Journal of the American Medical Association*, Oct 7, 1939, p.1373)

"All sulphonamide compounds, though singularly free from toxic reactions demonstrable in animals, have proved, as clinical experience widened, to be capable of causing peculiar and undesirable effects in the human patient" (Leading article, *British Medical Journal* Aug. 19, 1939, p405)

"Even when a drug has been subjected to a complete and adequate pharmacologic investigation on several species of animals and found to be relatively non-toxic it is frequently found that such a drug may show unexpected toxic reactions in diseased human beings. This has been known almost since the birth of scientific pharmacology." (Dr. E. K. Marshall, Baltimore, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Jan. 28, 1939, p.353)

"The entire teaching of pharmacology is wrong at the present time. The reason is that it is being taught by experimentalists accustomed to the laboratory and animal experiments instead of, as it should undoubtedly be, by clinicians with experience of human disease." (Editorial, *Medical Times*, July, 1938)

*Medical World*, Apr. 15, 1938, in its editorial (p.246) declared in regard to the teaching of the medical student: "We calmly assert that he is taught little or nothing that will be of any ultimate value to him. He is lectured to about decerebrated cats, nerve-muscle preparations of the frog, the theories of fatigue in muscle and similar matters, all of which are hopelessly useless for his practical requirements as a medical man. Take the comparatively recent drug, acetylcholine. As a result of animal experiments this is stated to be of great value in paralytic ileus. We know that it is by no means safe in this condition in humans, and has actually caused death when administered after operations."

"Cats are no good for scientific research, because each gives different results from the other. We gave powdered glass to see how it affected their lungs. They lapped it up and thrived on it." (Dr. A. E. Barclay, Nuffield Professor of Medical Research at Oxford, at a conference on TB, as reported by the *Sunday Express*, Apr. 10, 1938)

"The difficulties which beset the licensed experimenter are many. In the first place, it is well known that it is almost impossible, in an experimental animal, to reproduce a lesion or a disease at all comparable to such as is found in the human subject." Dr. Lionel Whitby, *Practitioner*, Dec. 1937, p.651)

"...Let us by all means get back to the bedside, and leave the laboratory worker to his experiments and his often hopeless contradictions." (Editorial, *Medical Times*, Nov. 1937, p. 170)

Dr. A. J. Clark, writing upon 'Individual Response to Drugs' in the *British Medical Journal*, Aug. 14, 1937, stated that (to discover the lethal dose of a drug): "Until about twenty years ago the method employed was to give varying doses to a dozen or a few dozen animals...As soon as systematic investigations were made it was found that animals showed a considerable individual variation in their response to drugs, and that consequently the methods that had been in use for a century were inherently inaccurate." (p. 307)

"This divorce of science from the art of medicine is most regrettable. It is slowly but surely operating to relegate the investigation of disease to the laboratory and to found the treatment on the very doubtful results obtained from experiments on animals that in most cases have been rendered absolutely abnormal by anaesthesia and operation." *Medical World*, July 9, 1937. Editorial article.

"The stomachs, which he had examined postmortem in human beings who had died of pernicious anaemia, showed severe atrophy of the fundic region...but practically no change in the pylorus or duodenum - a finding completely the reverse of that which he had anticipated from his animal experiments." (Report, *The Lancet*, Jun. 12, 1937, p.1404)

"The sooner we relegate the pure laboratory worker to his proper place in medicine the more likely we are to advance in our diagnosis and treatment of disease. At present we are being grossly misled by the experimentalists." (Review of the *Medical Annual*, 1937. *Medical World*, May 28, 1937, p. 462)

"We wish to know when the medical profession will unite in expressing their dissatisfaction at the way in which they are being misled by the published results of experiments on animals in physiological and pharmacological laboratories." (Editorial, *Medical Times*, Apr. 1937)

"Clinical research is the only key - progress, in the sphere of medicine at least." (Review, *Medical World*, Feb. 12, 1937, p.847)

Commenting upon experiments on dogs, cats and pigs, the *Medical Times*, Dec. 1936, said: "The experimenters state that it must be frankly admitted that human peptic ulcers are not caused by such drastic alterations of the gastro-intestinal canal as were occasioned in the animals experimented on. Then why were those experiments performed at all? The entire business sounds some what ridiculous to anyone with a really critical mind." (p.187)

"The problem of dental caries is essentially one affecting the human race...for it has not been possible to produce with any certainty, in animals which can be kept in a laboratory, dental caries in a form comparable with that occurring naturally in man." (The Imperial Bureau of Animal Nutrition, *Nutrition Abstracts and Reviews*, Vol5, No.3, Jan. 1936)

"The wasted time and energy over the modern lines of cancer research are to be greatly deplored. We are sorry to think that so many able research workers are being tricked into believing that the cause and cure of cancer will be discovered by animal experiments." (*Medical Times*, Jan. 1936, p.3)

Dr. A.S. McNeil, L.R.C.P .E., L.R.C.S.E., L.F.P.S.G., writes in *The Abolitionist* Aug.1, 1935:

"The law, whose provisions are enacted and enforced by your representatives or their agents, has made exceptions in the laws relating to what would ordinarily be known as cruel treatment of animals, in that it expressly allows the practice of animal vivisection to a comparatively very small number of persons, to whom it issues certificates, authorising them to undertake what is known as animal experimentation. Thus, the laws of this country, which we are all supposed to endorse and uphold, definitely condemn large and vastly increasing numbers of animals to long-continued and frightful sufferings. Nay more, the law, through its accredited agents, actually encourages and with your money subsidises the performers of these practices. Moreover, according to Sir Ernest Graham-Little, at a meeting of the Royal Institute of Public Health, about half the cost of medical education is 'borne by the State' - that is to say, by the taxpayers.

"In dealing with this question of vivisection it must be borne in mind that there are huge powerful commercial interests involved, who themselves employ many of the vivisectors. Moreover, the League of Nations has agreed to some unfortunate regulations regarding the testing of certain drugs on animals before acceptance of their suitability for use by man.

"In this connection, I may say that I have, in the past, used animal-tested and ordinary digitalis, and that I got better results from the ordinary one than the animal-tested one. Another medical man to whom I have mentioned the matter had similar results.

"The commercial interests have found vivisection methods very profitable financially, and they put on the market increasing quantities of attractively packed vaccines, serums and foods which are dependent for their advertised properties on the sufferings endured in their laboratories by large numbers of animals, some of them, alas, bred for this specific purpose. In the case of those experimenters - many of whom have no medical qualification - who are not actually attached to business interests, it used to be understood that they were entirely engaged in their pursuits for the relief of human suffering. But now, it has been stated that 'it would be possible to extend such a list of purely scientific advances almost indefinitely, many of these coming into the category of science for science's sake.'

"Now it is impossible to believe that men with their way to make in the world carry on these vivisectional practices purely and simply for the acquiring of knowledge, or what may be regarded by them as knowledge. There is great personal and national rivalry amongst vivisectors, in spite of their vaunted internationalism, and, moreover, any outstanding achievement in vivisection - however worthless it may appear to be to many as to real value to humanity - is sure to bring the experimenter more in line for promotion. Thousands of animals are experimented upon as demonstrations of experiments performed on animals years ago. Tens of thousands more are vivisected as 'controls' to other animals being experimented upon, or in confirming or rejecting the published claims of other vivisectors. As reported in *The Abolitionist* of August 1, 1934, there were, in 28 months commencing December, 1931, more than 22,000 stray dogs vivisected in Chicago alone. Can it be



wondered at that the criminal activities of that city have become a byword? What are the results of this world-wide practice of vivisection, for which we, in part, find the money, and are therefore to a certain extent responsible? Over and above the 'science for science's sake' experiments, which I cannot think the ordinary taxpayer would regard as a good return for his money if he took the trouble to inquire into the matter, what has vivisection done for the various disabilities of mankind?

“Because animals are cheap and plentiful, and in their case to a very great extent beyond the protection of the law, vivisectors are encouraged to take undue liberties with the mental and physical susceptibilities of their victims, and this is one of the reasons for their failures. But each species of animal- including man - has a different bodily make-up. Their cells, and the methods of their division, are different. Their organs, blood, cell juices and contents differ, as well as their nervous systems. Yet the vivisector attempts to draw analogies from artificial injuries, implanted disease products, mutilations, or other unnatural means, inflicted upon one or more animals of a species, to the process occurring naturally in animals of another species, such as man. It will at once be seen that no reliable results can be obtained by such methods, and, moreover, vivisectors are at last discovering that what were at one time thought to be quite simple processes occurring in the bodily organs and cells of animals are, in fact, exceedingly complicated. Indeed, they are so complicated that it is impossible to elucidate them in anything like their entirety by such crude methods. Why then are such methods pursued with such persistence? The vivisectors are in a hurry, and he who pays the piper calls the tune. Mankind desperately cries out for help in alleviation of a condition due largely to his own carelessness, folly and indiscretion, and the vivisector produces as near as he can, in some totally different creature, the condition in entirely alien tissues to the condition in man. It would be just as reasonable in many cases to attempt an analogy between a farm cart and a motor car, or a cow and a prima donna.

“A tumour in an animal other than man is of a totally different nature to ORe of an apparently exactly analogous nature in man. And so it will be apparent to you that to paint an animal with tar, in order to make a tumour comparable to one appearing on a human worker in tar, and to hope to find there-from anything of value is pitifully like trying to make castles from sand. Millions of pounds have been subjected to long-drawn-out suffering ending in death in this chimerical pursuit of the cancer problem during the past 50 years, and it is more than time for its entire prohibition. (Applause.)

“For the reasons I have given you, I believe that vivisection of any animal is essentially detrimental to the progress of the human race and certainly totally misleading to medicine. Nevertheless, I was one of more than 30 medical men who in 1928, in Liverpool, signed the petition to Parliament for the Dogs' Exemption Bill. So long as such a Bill provides for the total abolition of dogs for vivisection, I, for one, would support it, on the distinct understanding that I would at once press for total abolition of vivisection of all animals. (Applause)

“I am afraid that the practice of vivisection in this country is increasing in volume, and I believe that this is largely due to encouragement and help from one of our Government departments -

the Ministry of Health. In this connection, also, it would be well to notice the vastly preponderating attention and consideration given by the B.B.C. - a concern working under license by the Government - to supporters of vivisection, as compared with their attitude to those who condemn and oppose it. For reasons not redounding to the credit of Parliament, the Ministry of Health has been presented with practically autocratic powers in very many matters concerning the mental and physical well-being of the people of this country. "

-----  
As to the induction of labour by the injection of ovarian extracts: "Such experiments have been almost uniformly successful when applied to animals such as the rodents, but they have been a complete failure in the human subject." (Drs. A. Layland Robinson, M.M. Datnow, and T.N.A. Jeffcoate, Hon. Surgeons, Liverpool Hospital for Women, *British Medical Journal*, Apr.13, 1935, p.749)

"Regarding the endocrine preparations, although there have been lately some very important discoveries, great care must be taken in using them. There has been much dangerous misuse in this respect because of the hurried application of animal experiments to man, and also because of the streams of propaganda flowing from the various pharmaceutical firms." (Dr. A.P. Cawadias, *Medical World*, Apr.5, 1935, p.191)

Excerpt from the article 'Insulin' in *The Abolitionist* Mar.1, 1935, H. Fergie Woods, M.D. (Brux), M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. writes:

"The title of the article, to begin with, is open to argument. It has never been satisfactorily explained why, in spite of the almost universal use of insulin in diabetes since 1923, the death-rate from this disease has been steadily rising year by year, not only in this country and in Canada (the land of insulin's birth), but in other civilized countries where statistics are obtainable.

"Varied excuses have been made for this, but the awkward fact remains. It is interesting in this connection to note the analogy of insulin with diphtheria antitoxin. The latter has held sway for upwards of 40 years, and only in the last decade has it been admitted, and this on no less an authority than leading articles in the *British Medical Journal*, that antitoxin has failed in its promises, and that both the total mortality from diphtheria and the case mortality have been rising in spite of the general use of the ' specific'.

"One has to note, however, that this admission was not made until a substitute was to hand, viz., anatoxin, which is now, of course, being universally extolled. As a matter of fact, substitutes for insulin have already been evolved and put forward as superior to the original, but it will probably be some years yet before the momentum with which insulin was launched will have expended itself.

"It is reasonable to infer, however, that when it is recommended in various quarters that a substance be replaced by a substitute, the said substance must have some very obvious and

incontrovertible drawbacks, quite apart, be it said, from its failure to stem the rising death-rate.

"First of all, it is no longer claimed that insulin is a cure for diabetes. It is a sort of feeding which must be continued usually for the remainder of the patient's life, and moreover injected under the skin twice or perhaps three times a day.

"One sentence in the article reads, 'May 16, 1921, and here he was at last, a scientist. '

"Can Banting and his discoveries claim to be scientific? Here is what one independent observer at any rate thinks of it. He is a Dr. Roberts, who, writing from the Cambridge Physiological Laboratory to the *British Medical Journal*, says, 'the production of insulin originated in a wrongly conceived, wrongly conducted, wrongly interpreted series of experiments and gross misreading of those experiments.'

"And a writer in the *Lancet* stated, 'unfortunately the condition of a dog with a small, but healthy, part of his pancreas left is essentially different from that of a person suffering from diabetes,' and he goes on to say that' in human diabetes two factors are present: (1) an essentially progressive lesion absent in experimental animals, and (2) the detrimental effect of improper diet.'

"In fact, insulin and the methods by which it was discovered cannot be scientific, since, as is the case with all experiments on animals, the conditions under which the work is done and the morbid processes produced are artificial, they bear no analogy to what obtains in human subject.

"They (gastric and duodenal ulcers) never occur naturally in animals, and they are hard to reproduce experimentally. They have been so produced, but usually by methods of gross damage that have no relation to any possible causative factor in man; moreover, these experimental ulcers are superficial and heal rapidly, and bear little resemblance to the indurated chronic ulcers we see in our patients." (Dr. W. H. Ogilvie, Consulting Surgeon to Guy's Hospital, *The Lancet*, Feb. 23, 1935, p. 419)

-----

"Digitalis is invaluable in cases of cardiac insufficiency associated with arterial sclerosis. Too long we were taught otherwise, thanks to erroneous application of the results of animal experiments to man." (Review, *Medical World*, Feb. 8, 1935, p. 724)

Dr. med. W. Weyneth, dentist, Zurich: "Nowhere do the catastrophic consequences of intellectualism, with its potential decadence, appear more painfully than in the field of medicine, biology and physiology. They want to research the nature of Life, and think they can discover this from the mangled body of a defenceless living animal that has been tortured to death." (Zurich, Dec. 15, 1934)

Prof. Enrico Ricca-Barberis, M.D., clinician in Turin: "Vivisection is an abomination, a disgrace and a real crime. We have the right, indeed the holy obligation, to fight it and to demand its

abolition...There are a heap of reasons which show that vivisection is not an educative method, and they are the following: the indifference towards pain, which can develop into brutal cynicism and derision of pain; the open insult to the weak, which acknowledges no limits and no qualms of conscience, absolutely sure of going unpunished; the holding back from any impulse or instinct to hurry on compassionate grounds to the aid of the animals' heart-rending pleading to be saved; the approval given to exceedingly cruel and criminal actions; the performance of brutality in the full meaning of that word, in hundreds of different forms; selfish and repulsive distortion of the expressions 'honesty' and 'justice'; the triumph of violence and cowardice. And finally, the practical use of immoral forms of expression and language and, in some cases, incitement to evil tendencies, sadism and criminality."

G. Bouzom, M.D., formerly Head of the Surgical Clinic at Bordeaux University, etc.:  
"Scientifically, one cannot state with any certainty that conclusions can necessarily be drawn as to the similarity of human and animal reactions on the basis of animal experiments. This objection was made by a scholar, with reference to a particular case about experimental stomach tumours in the dog. He said: 'How can one deduce facts from this about the situation within the human stomach tumour, because all the special experimental circumstances in which the animals are placed simply never arise for the human being?'" (From a letter to the journal *Le Defenseur des Animaux*. Paris, Oct. 20, 1934, p.6)

Dr. E. H. Blakeney: "I was already an opponent of vivisection when I studied in Cambridge. I had connections with the great minds Robert Browning, Ruskin, Tennyson, Martineau, Lord Shaftesbury and others, who all sympathised with those who fought against vivisection. Ruskin even renounced a professorship in Oxford as a protest against the practice of vivisection in that University." (*The Record*, Sept.21, 1934)

Edward Pittwood, M.D.(dentistry), of Spokane, Washington, U.S.A., in a letter to the *Humanitarian and Antivivisection Review*, July-Sept 1934: "On reading through my letters sent to you, you will see why I did not give a detailed description of certain disease germs introduced into the teeth of dogs. I consider this procedure to be useless, just as I consider vivisection to be useless, because such experiments prove nothing. An experiment on animals is simply not to be compared with a test made on humans, for the two belong to different species."

Dr. G. H. Walker, M.R.C.P., Sunderland (Member of the Royal Society of Medicine):

"I assume that everybody well knows that an ever growing number of competent men and women and cultured people, belonging to all branches of art, science and literature, loathe and condemn vivisection. It is known that among the experts the doubt is constantly growing as to the relationship between vivisection and medical science..."

"An enormous number of valuable advances in the field of medicine are made by us without resorting to animals, and even less to vivisection..."

"As far as diabetes is concerned, I can speak with particular authority. I have used insulin

since the first day it was discovered. The research into diabetes via vivisection began in 1889. More than 30 years later, as the result of more or less advanced vivisectional experiments, the discovery of insulin was proclaimed. Today, insulin is the main argument used by the vivisectors. As a result of data gathered from clinical experience I can assert, without having to fear any refutation that insulin, which was obtained after 30 years of vivisection, is neither a remedy nor a means of prevention against diabetes, but is only an irksome therapeutical surrogate. (CIVIS: Diabetes has prodigiously increased since the introduction of insulin.)

"I have already said that to use the expressions 'medicine' and 'vivisection' together is a slander and a defamation, and I must now add that an ever growing number of doctors despise vivisection and have no belief in it.

"The more one studies the history of medicine, the more one sees that the real triumphs of medicine are the conclusions of patient observation of natural phenomena in human beings, and not the consequences of the confused activities of the experimenters, who draw their conclusions from the phenomena created artificially in animals...The Russian physiologist Pavlov carried out experiments on dogs for 25 years. His work is a monument of naivety...Vivisection confirms with pedantry truths that which has been known since the times of Adam...

"The way I view vivisection, it seems to me that it has put back the clinical application of new remedies. Eight years ago some Americans announced the treatment of anaemia with liver preparations.

"The preparation was tried out on many animals - as usual, on dogs. Their blood was extracted We now ask ourselves for what purpose they made use of even one single dog for research into anaemia? Liver is not poisonous, and there are a large number of humans who suffer from anaemia. It would have been possible, working by clinical methods, at least to carry out an experiment on the sick human being himself. We ask ourselves why the clinicians did not simply give the liver to the sick patients, so as to conduct a conclusive experiment? ... In the past 50 years energy and money have been used for performing experimental research on the stomachs, kidney and hearts of animals, and yet we do not know the cause of many illnesses from which man suffers in those same organs. Is it not time to look at the income and expenditure on this balance sheet, so as to see whether the amount that vivisection has cost us tallies with what it has given us in return? My definitive opinion is that vivisection is of total insignificance for medical study..." (*Scienza e Coscienza* No.3, Sept. 1934)

-----  
From an article by yet another medical authority, the late Dr. J. Stenson Hooker, M.D., in the *Abolitionist* of July, 2, 1934:

"As a medical man (and, I may interpolate, of 55 years' standing) you will expect the medical aspect of the question to be dealt with mostly. You have heard from Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, in the

first place, that it took him a long time to come to any decision upon the matter. It took me (and I will tell you presently) just one minute to make my decision.

“Now, we heard nothing and we knew nothing of vivisection when we were at the hospital. The only case in which it was employed, that I know of, was at a lecture in physiology when a rabbit was shown in the course of the lecture pinned down and cut open in the chest to show the beat of the heart. I believe that has been carried on in course after course and perhaps year after year. I did not see the usefulness of it, because a rabbit is not a man. (Hear, hear.) It has not the same rhythm; it has not the same rate of heartbeat, or the same conditions at all.

“To pass from that: Later in life I was being coached for the higher degree of M.D., and this included physiology and one of the matters that arose from my coach was this, that he went into the question of how long certain very sensitive organs in a horse can be squeezed before it faints (cries of 'oh!') Now, that was an eye-opener, and I said: If this is anything like vivisection I have done with it once and for all. (Applause.) It was so devilish that it went to my very heart. At the same time, I knew it to be useless from the medical side. I have also, I am glad to say, a little feeling left in my nature.

“Well, we went on, and then came the big question when I came to London and got a general practice and went into the whole theory and the whole study of it More and more every day, almost every hour that I lived, I have been corroborated in my belief that there is nothing whatever of use in vivisection. (Applause.)

“Now with regard to diabetes. I was sorry to read the other day the most astonishing assertion that Dr. Banting was the man who 'conquered diabetes' those were the words. I was very sorry to see that, because that was read by millions, or, at any rate, by more than a million. No, friends, diabetes has not been conquered, and medical men themselves are coming to admit that. They say insulin is no cure. They admit that it may stay it; it may put it back for a time, but it is not a cure. Contrary to that statement there are statistics which actually show that diabetes is on the up-grade. in spite of your insulin and every other method that has been tried.

“Yet we have cures from India; we have cures from Australia, and I believe there are other countries which are sending over simple plant medicines which have been known to cure diabetes, but we cannot get these things before the medical profession. I spent a whole year in writing my *Newer Practice in Medicine*, and it has been what is commonly called a frost. I had good notices, but the medical men will not have it; they will not look at it; but we must go on to the best of our ability in using these newer methods.

“In June 1934 the Institute of Experimental Surgery was inaugurated by some scientists in Buenos Aires. Questioned about this institute, Ramon P. Silva M.D. of Buenos Aires answered as follows: "The human being has a peculiar somatic (bodily) structure, as is seen from observation, study and experiment. The body is the first stage, whether in topographical, operative or necroscopic anatomy. We have gathered enough experience. we learn from the sick patient, by following the lessons of those who already have knowledge, and do this by

practice, at first under the guidance of the expert. Only then can one make use of the rights that one has gained through one's title, starting with what is simple and then moving on to the complicated. The doctor must always be mindful of the suffering of his patients. He must strictly avoid any unnecessary suffering and all his attention and science must be aimed at bringing about improvement in his patient.

“The unnecessary experiments on animals with toxins (poisonous substances), bacteria, drugs, etc., and even more so vivisection, kill that spiritual leadership which binds us to ethics and compassion....

“When one operates on animals (vivisection) one is working on organisms which are very different from ours. One is working on healthy organs and on tissues which are functioning physiologically, whereas one operates on a human being because he is ill, because his organs and tissues show great changes, degeneration, ulcers and so on. These are not physiological conditions. One does not earn one's living as a surgeon by practising vivisection, but by operating on creatures like oneself, guided by a sound knowledge of the causes that have brought about the physiological disturbance and by the endeavour to find the best way of healing without altering the relationship and interdependence which exists between tissues, organs, glands and so on.

“The experience and the development of human skills, and the thorough knowledge of pathology from which the knowledge of the healing method for each individual case is derived, form the basis of surgical knowledge and of medicine in general. For these and other reasons I repeat that vivisection, carried out in good faith or criminally, as well as the experiments performed on any living creature, destroy that feeling that is part and parcel of a civilised person. Carrying out surgery on sick animals produces an experienced veterinarian, but performing it on healthy animals on the pretext of acquiring surgical dexterity for human beings is an untruthful fabrication, if not an exercise in a sickly sport.” (From *Scienza e Coscienza*, No. 1, 1934)

-----

Dr. Gennaro Ciaburri, doctor and surgeon, Bologna: "Is vivisection indispensable for teaching purposes? That is the greatest myth, one which you should attach no credence to."

Dr. med. Renaud, former medical assistant in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, special assistant for the study of cancer at the Cantonal Hospital in Lausanne, Switzerland: "I am of the opinion that vivisection should be banned from the courses and practical work at the medical faculties." (*L'Antivivisectionniste*, No.4, Dec. 1934)

Prof. E. Ricca-Barberis, physician, Turin: "The victim of curare (arrow poison) is totally paralysed and incapable of making any movement, although he is fully conscious and retains his sensitivity to pain; he then dies of asphyxiation as a result of paralysis of the respiratory muscles. It is therefore easy to understand why this poison has become the vivisector's most diabolical aid. One only needs to set up artificial breathing and then one has a complete ex-

perimental object for the vivisection bench, fully alive and conscious, but, unable to move in the slightest. even when in extreme anxiety and dreadful pain....Only one conclusion is possible. As a method of instruction vivisection is, apart from being unavoidably immoral and scandalous, also totally useless and even harmful. These demonstrations can and must be totally abolished." (*L'idea Zoofila*, Milan, May 1934)

*Medical Times*, March 1934, leading article on 'Vivisection': "Will any unprejudiced physician state that we have advanced one single step in solving the cancer question? Thousands of pounds have been spent on animal experiments in this branch of research, but without practical result...Carefully elaborated theories may be developed, but they lead to no practical result and the deaths from cancer meanwhile multiply. It is useless to continue in such a way with costly research."

"Then there is the physiologist. Here we are up against the most flagrant example of the uselessness of animal experiments...Such experiments lead us nowhere. In fact, they hamper the progress of medical science." (Leading article, *Medical Times*, Mar. 1934 p.37)

Dr. L.A. Parry delivered a talk about vivisection on Mar.2, 1934 in Brighton, England. According to the *Sussex Daily News* his conclusions were as follows: "I am convinced that vivisection is not only useless, but also harmful. It does not promote the advance of medicine, but impedes it."

"The testing of drugs on experimental animals is very apt to give fallacious results in the case of human beings. By animal experimentation, it was for long regarded that digitalis raised the blood pressure. We now know that it does nothing of the sort. In fact pharmacology has been greatly hampered by these experiments, and is still being held back by the preference given to animal experiments rather than to clinical observation." (*Medical Times*, Mar. 1934, p.37.)

Dr. Olga Alcott Wilhelm wrote as follows, under the heading *Worthless Vivisection*, in the *Chicago Daily News* of Feb.26, 1934: "I am a doctor and surgeon and as a student I had to work on animals in laboratories. But I can honestly say that none of my colleagues had the impression of having widened his knowledge through this mass murder of dogs. Why? Because the time allowed is too short, the student is unprepared for the surgical intervention, the dogs are not properly anaesthetised; after the experiment they are in a pitiful situation. No antiseptics are used, nobody investigates the result of the surgical procedure, which is necessarily different from the treatment of humans due to the anatomical differences. The mass slaughter of dogs should be abolished. Why are dogs used? Because they are devoted and loyal, as well as easy to obtain without the university incurring heavy costs."

"For many years, at great expense, cancer research has been carried out by large numbers of devoted workers in the laboratories of this and other countries. The continued failure of distinguished scientists to obtain any useful results, so far as the disease in man is concerned, shows that they must be working on unfruitful lines suggested by false conceptions of the nature of this human scourge." W. Mitchell Stevens, M.D. F.R.C.P., *British Medical Journal*, Feb. 24, 1934, p.352.



"Many people do not see the moral side of the question; so we must convince them by presenting the scientific arguments. On the scientific side, the whole basis of vivisection rests on the assumption that it is possible to apply scientific conclusions from animals to humans. There are countless examples that contradict this assumption." (From *Abolitionist*. Feb. 1, 1934, p.14)

The February 1934 issue of *Medical Times* writes: "We declare without hesitation that progress in medicine is extraordinarily impeded by many of these absolutely worthless experiments."

Dr. med. dent. Gaston Guerard, Doctor of the University of Paris, Professor of Dentistry and of Human and Comparative Anatomy at the Dental School of France; Dental Surgeon of the Medical Faculty of Paris, Vice President of Anatomical Section at the 8th International Congress of Dentistry, holder of the Medal of the Ministry of Public Health and of the Medal of Honour for Public Welfare, wrote as follows in 1934 in his treatise on the futility and cruelty of the experiments on dogs' teeth planned by the International Dental Federation (the treatise won him a prize awarded by the 'Bureau International Humanitaire Zoophile'):

(pages 22-25) "At present (and in view of the expansion of our physiological knowledge) vivisection could not perform any service either to surgery or to medicine. This truth, stated by practitioners of undisputed competence, is based on what is called the 'biological personality'. Important scientific papers confirm the view that the reaction to a stimulant is specific and not common to all creatures.

"In these circumstances, vivisection is, whether one likes it or not, nothing else but a useless and crude procedure, a pointless one even, due to the anatomical-physiological dissimilarities, as recently expressed by one of the long established French medical journals. By the way, the physiologists admit themselves that their research method 'would be cruel' if it did not have the good of mankind as its aim.

"The cruelty of the experiments proposed by the 'International Dental Federation' is undisputed, as we have amply demonstrated. These experiments are not only useless, but are also immoral".

Dr. Guerard reached the following conclusions:

"Our conclusions will be short:

"1. The principles on which the experiment is based are false throughout. In reality, the biological similarities which the 'International Dental Federation' think exist between the teeth of human beings and those of the other mammals (particularly of dogs) do not in fact exist.

"2. The prescribed experimental method is contrary to scientific truth and is therefore a source of errors.

"3. The results obtained will therefore be of absolutely no worth from the scientific viewpoint. A

false starting basis leads to misleading experiments, and these unfailingly lead to a negative final result

"4. These worthless experiments are also cruel; they will inevitably cause pain, because as a result of the multiple focuses of infection this will be increased by the operations carried out under narcosis. The suffering is inescapable, and is actually an integral part of the conditions for the experiments; it is also of long duration and extremely severe."

"To show by further example the completeness with which observations on man himself must govern the establishment of medical remedies, digitalis is named, for which there is not more valuable remedy in the pharmacopoeia today... The most essential information, the profound effect which digitalis is capable of exerting in auricular fibrillation, could not have been won through observation on the frog or normal mammal, but only as it was won, by observation on patients" (Dr. Thomas Lewis, Surgeon *Clinical Science*, Shaw and Sons, Ltd., London, 1934, pp. 188-9)

-----

Prof. De Castro, M.D., Valence, France: "It is extremely unscientific, and at the same time cruel and absurd, to state that the physiological reactions of the animals can serve to bring relief to the very sensitive human organism. The mountains of animal corpses are nothing else but the burnt offering of bloody vivisection. Under idle pretexts, a jumble of stupidity is created upon which a civilisation that boasts of its culture erects its monument!" (*Scienza e Coscienza* No.6, 1934).

"Looked at from the scientific viewpoint, the vivisection question is resolved in less than a minute: the dog is not comparable with the human being, either from the anatomical or physiological or even from the pathological standpoint. It is completely different from the human being and in no respect similar to him. I would even state that we learn nothing, absolutely nothing, from the vivisection demonstrations given to us at medical schools, unless it is errors! I can assure you that I am not the only one who thinks in this way." (Quarterly bulletin of the International Antivivisection League, Brussels, 1934, No.41).

From the statement of Dr. Fergie Woods, in a doctors' debate at the Town Hall of Colchester, G.B. Dec. 8, 1933:

"There are a good many who do not see the moral aspect at all, and one must endeavour to convince them on the scientific side. The whole basis of vivisection on the scientific side is an assumption that it is possible to argue scientifically from animal to man. There are innumerable instances which contradict that assumption. I want to give you two or three instances to show you what a misleading thing that assumption can be. I want to take the three great diseases tuberculosis, syphilis and cancer.

"With regard to syphilis there are two facts: the result of clinical observation and the result of observation of human beings, which no one would dream of refuting, because they are

absolutely irrefutable. Syphilis in human beings is a disease which is capable of attacking most parts of the body. There is hardly a part of the body which is immune. The second point is that it is almost the only disease acquired hereditarily, from mother to child. A few years ago, experiments were made upon rabbits in this connection. Rabbits were inoculated with syphilitic poison. Of course, rabbits and other animals are not attacked by syphilis, and it is an artificial thing to make them syphilitic. But it was found as a result of this experiment that the disease when inoculated remained strictly local, and 'was not transmitted to the progeny. So if we were trying to base our knowledge of syphilis on animal experiments, we should be led utterly astray. In consumption, one of the recent treatments which has been found successful in tuberculosis of the lungs is that known as artificial pneumothorax, that is, the injection of gas of some kind to give the lung rest. These experiments were also performed on rabbits, and as a result it was found that not only did the artificial pneumothorax not stop the disease but it became more rapid and more fatal. So there again, if we had based our treatment of human beings on experiments on animals, many lives might have been lost.

“Then we come to cancer, and I suppose cancer accounts for more experiments on animals - the present time than any other one disease. It is difficult to say how long these experiments have been going on. To give a conservative estimate, say a quarter-of a century; hundreds of thousands of animals must have been used, but they have not yet succeeded in inducing human cancer in an animal. Tumors of various kinds, yes, but nothing approaching human cancer. For another example of the futility of these experiments there is the striking instance of the Copenhagen experimenter, who conceived the idea of producing tumours in rats by means of injecting a parasite obtained from cockroaches. After many experiments he succeeded in producing some sort of a tumor, but could not get a tumour in black rats, but only in black-and-white rats, piebald rats. So it is not only different animals, but different species of the same animal that have different reactions. How much more difference there is between animal and man!

“...Many eminent men are beginning to say in the medical press what they think. For instance, in the Harveian Oration, delivered before the Royal College of Physicians of London, on October 18, Sir Thomas Lewis made the following statement: ‘A method of studying human disease, advocated since Claude Bernard's time, is first to reproduce such disease in a lower animal, and then to proceed to investigate it in that animal. In theory ideal, in practice this is rarely possible of full accomplishment. Strictly speaking, you cannot, by cutting or trying operations, reproduce any human disease other than one arising out of injury. It is possible to produce disease closely akin to that seen in man by introducing into animals the original agent of the human disease, bacterial or otherwise, or by withdrawing some essential from the diet; but because the animal and its reactions are different, the disease is not accurately reproduced.’

“Dr. Mitchell Stephens had an article in the *Medical World* a week or two ago, and stated that ‘the results of drug experiments upon animals were, as far as their application to man was concerned, absolutely useless and misleading, and until there is a reaction from this state of affairs no great progress in the art of medicine can be effected.’ The insistence on the result

of animal experiments in the education of medical students is having a bad effect, and the reliance upon the laboratory finding as against the clinical is harmful to the best interests of the patient and deleterious to medicine generally." (The *Abolitionist*. Feb. 1, 1934)

-----  
"My own conviction is that the study of human physiology by way of experiments on animals is the most grotesque and fantastic error ever committed in the whole range of human intellectual activity." (Dr. G. F. Walker, *Medical World*, Dec.8, 1933, p.365)

"It is almost a hundred years since Raynard, a veterinary surgeon at Lyons, discovered that removal of the thyroid gland in dogs was rapidly fatal. Fifty years later, Schiff showed that while this was true of cats as well as dogs, it was not true of rabbits and rats." (Leading article, *The Lancet*, Dec. 2, 1933, p.1267).

"As regards feeding and other experiments upon animals with these substances (vitamins), the results obtained, whatever they may be, can be of little useful application to the prevention and treatment of disease in man." W. Mitchell Stevens, M.D. F.R.C.P., *Medical World*, Dec. 1, 1933, p.335

"Experimental pharmacology is now receiving State aid, but the results of drug experiments upon animals are, as far as their application to man is concerned, absolutely useless and even misleading." W. Mitchell Stevens, M.D. F.R.C.P., *Medical World*, Dec. 1, 1933 p.335

Alice Ker, M.D., L.R.C.P. + S.E., etc. Excerpts from an article in *the Abolitionist*, Nov. 1, 1933:

"As I gathered more knowledge and accumulated a certain amount of wisdom, I gradually came to realise the uselessness and immorality of vivisection, and my difficulty now is to deal with the multiplicity of reasons against it.

"The moral side can be dealt with by anyone who tries to understand and live according to the plan on which our world has been created and is being carried on, realising that the rights of the higher creatures imply responsibilities toward the lower, and the duty of helping the lower ones on in their evolution.

"From a professional pen, the scientific side is the one to be stressed. To begin with, can the reactions of even the most highly evolved mammals be assumed to be the same as those of human beings? Even different races of men suffer pain and illness in different ways. A North American Indian has been known to endure an amount of torture going beyond what would kill a European from shock. Still greater is the difference between a human being and what is called one of the lower animals. It is well known that some drugs poisonous to men are harmless to other animals, and vice versa. When Hahnemann, the founder of homeopathy, tested his drugs, he did so on himself, and so obtained more accurate information as to their properties than he would have done had he tested them on animals.

"...The time, effort and money that are expended today on vivisection could be used more

advantageously for other methods.”

Dr. Petrie Hoyle, from the *Medical World*. Oct. 6, 1933: "I am pleased to have contact again with the work against this extraordinarily absurd and inhuman system called vivisection...My course is directed at those leaders of orthodox medicine and vivisection who dominate the 'masses' of the medical fraternity by refusing them the right to form their own judgement and opinion."

Dr. Pibre, Surgeon at the hospitals in Nimes, France, wrote the following to the Nimes Animal Welfare Society on Sept 29, 1933: "My surgical practice, which I have been engaged in for 12 years, has so toughened me that none can accuse me of faint-heartedness or sentimentality. Having made this important point, I can say openly and unhesitatingly what I think about vivisection. Vivisection is a gross mistake and cannot be defended by anything, regardless of whether one speaks of animal experiments for medical, surgical or dental purposes."

"To draw analogies between the pathogenesis of poliomyelitis in man and the experimental disease in monkeys might lead us far astray...We know from other diseases, such as yellow fever, that a virus might behave very differently in different hosts. "Dr. Jean Macnamara, *The Lancet*, Aug. 19, 1933 pp.421-2.

"It so happens that the whole of our knowledge of the structure, symptoms, diagnosis and treatment of the neoplasias (cancers) of man comes from those who approach the subject by direct clinical methods. To this extensive knowledge the contribution of laboratory experimentalists is practically nil." (Dr. Hastings Gilford, Surgeon, *The Lancet*. July 15, 1933, p.157)

Alonzo Austin M.D., (of New York, former physician to John D. Rockefeller):

"...How can great things be achieved by the medical profession when such cruel experiments are performed on poor, helpless animals, to which we are under such an obligation for proven services? In times of war dogs have gone across desolated territory with messages; they guide blind soldiers, rescue drowning children, protect us day and night...But in times of their own sorrow and suffering they have no power to demand their rights before a Supreme Court; they receive no compensation for useless experimentation. Are they to be nailed needlessly to the Cross on account of the sins of our incorrect style of living and our violations of the laws of Nature?" (*Humanitarian and Antivivisection Review*, Apr. - Jun. 1933, p.85)

Dr. G. F. Walker, doctor at the Royal Hospital and at the Children's Hospital, Sunderland:

"...I now come to the most serious charges that I have to level against medical training. During his whole period of study it is impressed on the medical student, mostly by teachers with financial interests, that knowledge of the human body can only be achieved by observing and carrying out animal experiments. Now I know quite well that animal experiments are condemned on all sides on emotional, moral and ethical grounds. For the moment I will not concern myself with these matters of dispute, however reasonable they may be. My own

conviction is that the study of human physiology by way of experiment on animals is the most grotesque and fantastic error ever committed in the whole range of human intellectual activity. Like all such errors, this one is defended by its supporters either with presumptuous and confused fanaticism or with self-opinionated excitedness. But this way of thinking is made out to the student to be a public-spirited and unbiased keenness for truth. The fact is that most students, although they are not aware of it, are damaged for life in their mental abilities as soon as they have once been persuaded to pay physiology more than the superficial interest that is taught to them in conventional medical studies; one of the most saddening phenomena is the otherwise good-natured and reasonable student who passionately defends animal experiments because his teachers, who have a financial interest in such experiments, have transferred their depravity to him on the strength of their position and personality. " (From his article *Reflection on the Training of Doctors* in *Medical World*, Oct. 6, 1933)

"I am strongly opposed to the experiments on dogs in medical and surgical research. I am of the opinion that the much-discussed research based on animal experiments is crude, and far removed from true science. Much too much value is attached to animal experiments in the training of the doctor. I know that my opinions are shared by thousands of practising doctors of both sexes..." (*Medical World*. Mar.3, 1933)

Dr. med. Ignaz Seidl, Vice-Chairman of the Austrian Society of Anti-vivisectionist Doctors:

"People were, out of reverence and admiration for the results of medical science, accustomed - and a certain portion of the Press does this deliberately - to consider its representatives as semi-gods, whose actions were sacrosanct from the ethical viewpoint because their efforts were after all serving suffering Mankind. We young medical students, who chose the profession of doctor out of enthusiasm for its lofty ideals, thought exactly the same. We had no idea that our revered teachers, through their experiments on animals, were punching ethics in the face and, through their cruelty and heartlessness towards the innocent creatures, doing exactly the same as the Druids did to the old Celts when they acted according to the law which stated: 'Prisoners of war shall be slain at the altars or be cast into the flames... '

"One shakes one's head in disbelief at the backwardness of a culture that still makes use of such atrocities. We attend highly aesthetic, philosophical and artistic lectures, we let ourselves be pleased or shocked at the theatre or opera, listen to the sublime soaring tones of the church organ, the solemn singing of the choirs, go through the finest sensations of spiritual life when we read an aesthetic book, admire a painting, wander happily in the open air, are exhilarated by the enjoyment of Nature, experience all the qualities of inner movement but all this time, in the basements of the University institutes and many hospitals, the groaning dogs are biting in pain at the iron bars of their cages after coming to from the anaesthetic, they are writhing in unspeakable agony on their straw bedding, they are dragging themselves whimpering to the water bowl so as to cool their thirsting tongues, or are showing in their such very devoted canine eyes the madness of despair when the cleverly placed gadgets prevent 'them from easing the unbearable itching of their wounds with parrying movements; other animals brood apathetically, shuddering again and again with painful convulsions, maimed,

tom apart and poisoned, or must run day and night, to the point of exhaustion, in the revolving drum, endure frightful bum wounds, hunger and thirst, freezing and asphyxiation experiments until they are often only finally released from their suffering by a merciful death. Anyone who has once seen this must, doubting in God, clench his fist at the most vicious of all creatures, homo sapiens, and vow to help expose the brutality of such a pitiless and hypocritical science with all his might, and to help eradicate such a crime against civilisation. How empty and hollow must any honours and titles appear that are striven for and achieved on the basis of such shameful! Where can there be any excuse for such an abomination? Only the soul blindness - not in the medical sense - of the doctors, only their blindness of soul towards such a shaming of science and all humanity, of true humanity, can excuse this or make it at least explicable.

"However, as the defenders of this horrific means of research are immunised against feelings of compassion and are deaf, I have preferred to show, in their language and plain way of thinking, what dangerous sources of error animal experiments are, how many people have been killed because of them and how unnecessary they now appear to be in the judgement of many doctors with modern training." (1933)

-----

Dr. med. Steintel, Berlin, on "International Medical Policy":

"Some 50,000 people earn a living in Germany as doctors, and they are joined by an additional 15,000 each year, so that there will soon be 60,000 doctors, which means one doctor to 1000 inhabitants. Can that mean that we are healthy? In order to feed the doctors, to provide them with work through illness, one has to get iller and iller. The number of doctors must be reduced if this situation is to be ended. In order to practice their 'art' the medical profession requires millions of animals for torture, on whose sufferings their science is based.

"But when it dawned on some people that the system was rotten, and clear-sighted individuals fought against it, the medical profession also saw that their livelihood was being threatened. Their medical policy is primarily the line of withholding information. 'The amount of information to be given is determined by us,' said Dr. med. Neustedter.

"The prerequisite for today's medical policy is naturally the currently dominant system of medicine. The sick are the source of income, therefore it is necessary for sick people to be there, yes, it proves advantageous if one makes the people artificially sick.

"Hundreds and thousands of perjuries have been committed via scientifically false reports. I say this, because I can prove it. By means of these the high standing of the doctors is forced on the public. Damage thus comes about as a result of vaccination, and is constantly proven. But it is portrayed in a very toned down form by official sources. Since 1930 many doctors have declared themselves opposed to vaccination. But the vaccination law continues to prevail. In many German States there is compulsory vaccination, although even the supporters of vaccination were originally against compulsion. In 1929 it so happened that a

father abducted his own child three times so as to save it from the persecutions of those who wanted to use force in order to vaccinate the child. For the fourth time the officials succeeded in taking the child for vaccination, they dragged it out of the car. After the vaccination encephalitis (inflammation of the brain) set in, and within eight days the child was dead! In this way vaccination has at times become a legally sanctioned judicial murder, committed by custodians of the law. Vaccination can, as has been proven, cause encephalitis.”

-----  
Prof. Theodor Lessing, Dr. med., Dr. phil., Hanover:

"This science, which so prides itself on its exactness, is in truth unbearably muddled.

“One good example of this rupture between physiology and bacteriology, and of all the accompanying confusion, is provided by the history of the fight against tuberculosis. Just as the triumphant advance in bacterial research began with the so often lauded discovery of the tuberculosis bacillus by Robert Koch, so has research into tuberculosis first seen success at the point when the premises on which bacteriology is based are now suddenly becoming dubious. I need only refer to the colossal work of Sauerbruch, whose research on bone tuberculosis certainly arouses suspicion that this researcher, starting from the ideas inaugurated by Koch, arrived year by year and stage by stage at new viewpoints, until finally nothing more remained of the serum therapy and a nutritional sickness called for help, the sickness: poverty, the demand by the great masses for reforms of feeding and living conditions.

“It is astonishing how a researcher of Paul Uhlenhuth's rank either fails to recognise or falsifies these relationships. For him, the present treatment of beriberi or pellagra is "the triumph of animal experimentation." And in reality precisely the opposite is the case. It was precisely these metabolic diseases that first made clear the senselessness of the chaotic torture experiments on animals. When Joe Goldberger first came on the idea in 1923 that pellagra, even if it was transmitted by a specific bacterium or had a connection with bacteria, could nevertheless only be a metabolic disturbance which one could heal by diatetic and physical therapy, he found himself facing the rage of all the bacteria researchers. But when his thoughts proved to be true, then the bacterial researchers began to switch course. They now no longer hunted for bacteria, but for 'vitamins' (which only amounted to the creation of a new word).

“They had sacrificed whole hecatombs of animals. It now clearly emerged that this had been done unnecessarily. All that would have been needed was simply to alter people's way of life. I don't want to speak here about the figures which every serum-injection fanatic and every protege of the chemical industry can serve up at any given moment. No person can ever check on these figures. They say: 'Figures are proof!' But they should add: 'Of everything and anything.' When Uhlenhuth so wittily says: 'Whereas nobody was formerly safe from smallpox and love, thanks to compulsory vaccination they have now disappeared completely in Germany, whilst in England (where there is only voluntary vaccination) 14,769 cases were still recorded last year,' no one can check whether this is correct, because in some English



statistics we read the opposite: 'We have no compulsory vaccination, but thanks to our better hygiene we remain almost totally protected from smallpox so long as this is not brought in from abroad, whereas in Germany 9,872 children contracted the disease last year as a result of vaccinations, and several hundred died from it.'

"What use, for example, has Marion Dorset's abominable mass murder had in combating foot-and-mouth disease? Around 1900 everyone was convinced that in order to put an end to an epidemic, one must isolate the whole herd once one animal falls ill, kill them and burn the bodies. This is how they acted in America. Millions of animals were wiped out. Even whole populations of game. There were also scientific fanatics who would have much preferred to kill off all the syphilis patients, to isolate the sufferers from consumption, to send all the lepers into the land of pepper. Today we see error in such barbaric practices. Everyone knows that an epidemic is the penalty for unnaturalness, for uncleanness and wrongness of living." (From an article "The Meaning of Animal Experimentation" in the publication "The failure of animal experimentation in medicine, especially in combating epidemics," published in 1931 by the Anti- Vivisection Societies of Basle, Berne and Zurich)

-----

Dr. med. Gustav Riedlin (from the essay "Die Hoelle der stummen Kreaturn):

"At this point I wish to refer briefly to the effects of the greatest crime of civilised mankind, to "scientific animal torture." Most of our contemporaries are not informed or are misinformed about it, or they are so concerned with their own problems that, out of indifference and bitterness, they do not preoccupy themselves with the suffering of the "lower creatures," the animals. Very much to their own detriment from the health and economic viewpoint!

"For decades the most noble minds and the warmest hearts have fought in speech and writing for the abolition of vivisection, attacked animal cruelty and its priests, and despite all this they have so far achieved precious little. The reason for this lack of success lies mostly in the combination of vivisection with capitalism. Today vivisection is business, an appalling, sad business!

"The big chemical/pharmaceutical financiers have almost a monopolistic hold on the medicines market. Vivisection flourishes in their laboratories. Money, fame and careers are made out of the sufferings of the laboratory animals. But the law of inherent justice for our actions inevitably has its repercussions on those who benefit from the broken moral law, i.e. on human society, so long as it tolerates such devilries.

"We do not need any cruelty to animals for healing purposes. There is no longer any place for torture of people or of animals in any civilised nation. So long as we still have breath in our bodies: Down with Vivisection!" (*Tierrecht und Tierschutz*, No. 4, 1933).

Dr. med. Bischof, Chairman of the Association of Anti-vivisectionist Doctors, Austria:

"We demand the unconditional prohibition of all animal experiments, with severe penalties.

The public amateurishly believes in the orthodox medical fairy tale of the usefulness of animal experimentation for the art of healing, while the vivisectors, under the pretext of serving this art of healing, perpetrate the most despicable trickery. The defenders of vivisection like to speak of the exalted aims of scientific aspiration. The gentlemen cannot roll their eyes enough, and talk hypocritically about the welfare of suffering mankind. A poor mankind, that can only keep on its feet by torturing defenceless animals. The House of Science should be a temple; it has now become a den of torture, from which the wailing of the animals cries out to Heaven. He who approaches the Temple of Science with reverence does not do so in order to attend an orgy of bleeding and mangled animals, who were created with infinite wisdom and are destroyed with stupid cruelty by so-called scientists. Because many orthodox doctors cannot conceive of any more worthy task, because they are not endowed with any better intuition in their barren materialism, they become enslaved in the pastime appropriate to their mental level, torturing people and animals and bestowing their errors and foolishness on mankind.

"We accuse the State, because it pays for the cowardly animal slaughter with our money and lets these people carry on their wretched handiwork. We accuse the Church, because it pursues a head-in-the-sand policy and acts as if it cannot see that public morality is undermined and destroyed through its silent condoning of animal experiments. " (*Tierrecht*, 15 December 1932)

Dr. A.J. Maurice, dentist, editor of *The Dental Surgeon*, wrote concerning the competition organised by the International Dental Federation:

"As a dentist with many years of experience I am convinced that on this question no experiments on dogs' teeth would be of any value whatever in finding a suitable treatment for human teeth." (*Abolitionist*, 1 November 1932)

"Pituitrin (a hormone) is a diuretic in cats, having the opposite effect in human beings." (*Journal of Physiology*, Vol. LXXVI, Nov. 1932, p. 384)

From an article in the *Lincolnshire Forward* of September 17, 1932 reprinted in the *Abolitionist* of Nov 1. 1932:

"That vivisection is the most revolting and useless method of science is obvious; yet vivisectors are legally allowed to subject hundreds of thousands of animals, yearly, to the most horrible torment ever designed by the cunning mind of science.

"We are assured by our heroes of science that vivisection is not cruel; that all the experiments are done under anaesthetics; that the opponents of vivisection are merely trying to thrust back progress; and that all our knowledge of disease today resulted from vivisection experiments. What utter nonsense!

"In the first place, it should strike any casual observer that if these experiments were performed without the infliction of pain, they would, even from the scientists' point of view, be

failures. But as a matter of fact, it is recorded officially that only four per cent of vivisection experiments are done under anaesthetics. So much is the scientists' profession of innocence!

"It makes one feel sick to read of the matter-of-fact way in which the vivisectors publish reports of their abominable deeds. Animals are compelled to exercise on treadmills after certain internal organs have been removed; they are baked alive in ovens, and frozen to death in cold water; they are starved for long periods and fed on insufficient diets so as to produce deformities, they are dropped from great heights to give them shock; they are surgically joined together like Siamese twins; they are subjected to poison gases, drugs and inoculations, resulting in agonising diseases; they are - but there, surely these few illustrations are sufficient to make an anti-viviselector of the least imaginative of readers.

"However, even supposing that this hideous dabbling in the blood and agony of animals by maniacal scientists could achieve any result, can we claim that it has been of the slightest benefit to mankind? Has the cancer problem been solved by decades of cancer induction in mice and monkeys? Was the tuberculosis death-rate lowered by research work? Of course not!

"The only real advantage that science claims as the result of vivisection, is the abolition of smallpox by vaccination. Yet it is obvious to any sane person that smallpox, a filth disease, was abolished by the removal of filth, and not by the pollution of human blood by poisoned calf lymph.

"No, it is quite safe to say that no good has ever resulted from the black magic of science, and that vivisection is not only useless and cruel, but it positively hinders progress by turning scientists into criminal maniacs. Disease will not be removed by such beings, but by the return to a natural and wholesome living. Our greatest minds - in the Labour Movement alone there are Arthur Henderson, Lansbury, Kenworthy and many others - have realised this and call upon the people to stop such a degrading practice. It is the people's duty to answer that call."

-----

The same issue of the *Abolitionist* reports:

"After vaccination. After encephalitis, yet another awkward sequel of vaccination has been discovered! The *British Medical Journal* of September 24 reports 'a very rare sequel': 'The patients were middle-aged persons between 50 and 65, the subjects of leukaemia or subleukaemia, who had been vaccinated or revaccinated during their stay in hospital. The symptoms were both local and general- namely, a violent inflammatory reaction at the vaccination site, considerable enlargement of the lymphatic glands, both in the axilla and elsewhere, and aggravation of the general condition, as shown by anorexia, more or less considerable rise of temperature, progressive emaciation, and changes in the blood picture consisting in very pronounced anaemia and intense leucocytosis. Four of the five cases proved fatal, between two and seven weeks after vaccination. In the only case which

survived, which was one of pure Hodgkin's disease, there was a considerable aggravation of the general condition.”

Still in the same issue of the *Abolitionist*, about "Those Dental Experiments": Mr A.J. Maurice, J.D., L.D.S. (Editor of *The Dental Surgeon*), remarks in a letter to Miss Kidd: "As a dental surgeon of many years experience, I am convinced that no experiments on dogs' teeth in this matter would be of any value in finding out treatment suitable to human teeth."

-----

Dr. Graham-Little: "...It has become a burning question, whether the nation receives anything like a fair return for the money which it pays out to support research." (*Sunday Observer*, 23 October 1932)

Dr. med. Guttman (extract from *Biologische Heilkunst*, 1932/10): "Barn-yard medicine has not given us any vaccination procedure that really protects against illness, but many that endanger the body, that even bring death."

"In recent years research workers have been distracted and misled by animal experiments claiming to show that vitamin deficiency was the cause of this, that, or another thing, when indeed the actual cause may have been intercurrent disease resulting from the animals being kept in quite unnatural captivity (laboratory), and apart from vitamin deficiencies, fed on unsatisfactory diets, and deprived of exercise, fresh air, sunlight and perhaps warmth." (Dr. J. Sim Wallace, King's College, London, *Report in Medical Press and Circular*, Sep. 21, 1932, p.229)

Dr. med. Albert Eckhard (Chairman of the animal welfare society "Tierfreund", Hanover, and of the Association of Antivivisectionist Doctors Germany):

"...The objection that one must carry out animal experiments in order not to have to make any experiments on humans also does not accord with the truth, for the cruel experiments on animals have merely provided the foundation for the belief that one can also make reprehensible experiments on human beings. The bad thing is that they have performed the experiments on people, especially on children of poor folk, to whom they transmitted tuberculosis, diphtheria, syphilis and other horrible diseases, and did not even shrink back from conducting experiments on dying children. Several thousands were involved in these experiments, often with the most serious consequences for the "guinea pigs" concerned. The fact that many doctors are hardly any longer aware of their unsocial or really criminal way of thinking is apparent from the report of a doctor who wrote as follows about his attempts to inject smallpox: "Perhaps I should have first conducted experiments on animals, but the suitable animals, i.e. calves, were difficult to obtain and to keep due to the cost, and so, with the kind permission of the Senior Physician, I began my experiments on children at the General Foundling Hospital." (*Tierrecht und Tierschutz*, No. 9, 20 September 1932)

"Calm and self-controlled though he always was, he nevertheless became very enraged one

day. Before our eyes a doctor, a person who through his profession should be compassionate towards all those who suffer, was engaged in his torture laboratory in pouring boiling water over poor, bound, defenceless and non-anaesthetised dogs. This executioner, one of the sadists whom we so often discover among the vivisectors, had to break off his despicable work.

"My dear Edmond, may all that you did to improve the lot of these defenceless beings help in ensuring that this brutal, barbaric and cowardly practice, vivisection, one day disappears from our civilised nations. May all those who listen to me today in such great numbers think about this - and assist." (*Wiener Tierfreund*. Sept. 1932)

"Professor Dr. G. Battista Ughetti, Director of the Institute of General Pathology at the University of Catania, died August 20, 1931. All the various Italian and foreign newspapers and scientific journals that reported this sad news stressed the great intellectual importance of this scholar...After qualifying as a doctor of medicine and surgery, he worked at various hospitals in Naples, Rome, Paris and Basel. This outstanding teacher, a perfect example of Italian medical genius, was always a dogged opponent of vivisection. Prof. Ughetti always gave clinical observation preference over experimentation, and took every opportunity to sling darts at the vivisectors. We have him to thank for the discovery of the meningococcus in necroscopy (the examination of a corpse), and he did not consider it necessary to inject this into animals in order to study it. He also found it unnecessary to produce serums, which - as Dr. Ciaburri correctly states - 'are an inexhaustible source for the manufacturers, but less beneficial to the health and the... purse of the sick.'

"Prof. Ughetti was a true genius. This is shown by his numerous scientific works; such as the excellent essay on fever, which was translated into German, Russian, English and Spanish, his many publications on pathogenesis (the origin and development) of hysterical fever, on the pathology of the liver and many, many other subjects. When Dr. Ciaburri founded the 'Italian Anti-vivisection Union' in Italy Prof. Ughetti was one of the first to join." (*Der Vivisektionsgegner*, No. 3, September 1932)

Dr. Francis Donovan, dentist to the Royal Family, England:

"It is at best a capricious project, and it is extremely improbable that it is of any value.'

"This is the firm opinion of Francis D. Donovan, with regard to the prize offered by the International Dental Federation, Paris, under which experiments on dogs' teeth are prescribed.

This dentist further commented. "I am quite sure that no British dentist will participate in this prize competition, for we all consider it to be totally pointless. Very little prospect exists of anything good coming out of it. What is the point of deliberately infecting the teeth of dogs with the germs of human diseases, when there are so many people with bad teeth who can be studied by the dentists? I am of the opinion - and I think it is also shared by my English colleagues - that nothing can be gained by dentists creating the same conditions in dogs which

actually already exist in many of their patients." (*The Daily Mirror*, London, 12 August 1932)

Dr. G.N.W. Thomas: "...There is a superabundance of mutilations of the human body available

in our hospitals; there are more and more of them as a result of motor traffic. Such clinical material is also much more reliable for observation purposes than that obtained through the arbitrary maiming of animals, with the animals sometimes being kept alive in their suffering for months on end." (*Western Mail and South Wales News*, 28 July 1932)

"We do not venture to say that guinea-pigs are better or worse than people; but they are different, so different indeed, that had not the experiments been conducted under the auspices of the National Institute for Medical Research, we should have been inclined to describe them as futile, if not silly." ("The Effects of Alcohol", *The Morning Post*, July 9, 1932)

From an editorial in *Medical Times*, March 1932:

"The teachings of vivisection are often fallacious and act disastrously on the intelligence of those who trust them. Clinical medicine is still based on the sure foundation of the teaching of Hippocrates, the Father of Medicine, who flourished some 2.500 years ago. Strange that we should have to go so far back for the Golden Age of Medicine! Hippocrates knew nothing of vivisection, but based his teachings on logical induction and deduction applied to the observation of health and disease. Although he had not even the advantage of post-mortem examinations - so great was the respect of the Greeks for the human body - his teaching will last as long as the world endures.

"The modern fruit of such intellectual decadence is visible today. Misled by experiments of incredible cruelty on highly organised animals, soap was denounced as a cause of cancer, whereas it is absolutely certain that it is, on the contrary, not only a safeguard, but in some cases a cure. Cancer research has done much to obscure the problems of cancer and to obstruct its cure. a thesis which the present writer is much more ready to expound than his opponents to dispute.

"How then is the good surgeon formed? It has been most sensibly explained, among others, by Abel Desjardin, chief surgeon at France's most prestigious seat of surgical teaching, the College of Surgery of the Faculty of Paris. Here a summary of his speech at the Congress Against Vivisection, Geneva, on March 19, 1932:

"The basis of surgery is anatomy. That's why surgery must first be learned from anatomical treatises and atlases, and then by dissecting a very great number of cadavers. Thus you not only learn the anatomy, but also acquire indispensable manual dexterity. From there you go on to learn the practice of surgery. This can only be acquired in the hospital and through daily contact with the patients. You must have been an assistant before becoming a surgeon...At the end let's examine how one comes to the actual surgical operation. First you watch, then you assist a surgeon. You do this a great many times. After you have understood the various

phases of an operation and the difficulties that may arise, and have learned how to overcome them, then, and only then, may you begin to operate. First, easy cases, under the supervision of an experienced surgeon, who can warn you of any wrong step or advise you if you have any doubts on how to proceed... This is the real school of surgery, and I proclaim that there is no other... After I have explained to you the real school of surgery, it is easy to understand why all the courses of surgery based on operations on dogs have been miserable failures. The surgeon who knows his art can learn nothing from those courses, and the beginner doesn't learn from them the true surgical technique, but becomes a dangerous surgeon... Furthermore, vivisection corrupts the character, because it teaches you to attach no importance to the pain you inflict.

“That vivisection, being inhuman, has a dehumanizing effect on those who practice or even just stand by it, is self-evident, inescapable. In its March 1932 issue, *Medical Times* stated: "The moral damage caused by vivisection isn't only general but individual. What is the inevitable effect on the medical students' morals? It isn't difficult to provide examples showing that vivisection causes the vivisectionists' moral sense to degenerate.”

Dr. Michael Berchmans Shipsey writes in the *Medical Times*, March 1932: "We now laugh at the Babylonians of 3,000 odd years ago who looked upon 'spirits' as the cause of illness. Without a doubt the inhabitants of 1,000 years hence will also laugh at us for thinking germs to be the cause of disease."

Dr. Estcourt-Oswald (Speech at a public meeting in London, January 21, 1932):

"As far as the idea is concerned that surgeons have animal experiments to thank for their training, this is totally false. I believe that ninety per cent of all surgeons have never carried out an operation on an animal in their life. It's natural that the people become anxious. They believe that if vivisection were abolished it would also be the end of the doctor's skills. That is not the case at all. The people additionally say that the medical students must see vivisection experiments. This, too, is false. London University, which awards a very highly respected medical degree, one which I possess myself, in no way demands of its students that they attend animal experiments.

“We do not achieve health by locking up some wretched rats in a cage. It is foolish to imagine such a thing, for after all it is easy enough to make an animal sick. The difficulty is in healing a human being of an illness which one has not given to him...” (*Antivivisection and Humanitarian Review*, London, Jan. - March 1932, p. 21)

The English journal *Medical Officer* of March 5, 1932 wrote: "There are numerous and potentially terrible risks lurking behind the modern methods of treatment, especially through vaccines, serums and other biological products. Some of them lie in the very nature of these methods, and cannot be avoided."

Prof. Dr. A. Jacquet, Professor of Pharmacology at Basel University, caused considerable embarrassment in academic circles when he told his students in his farewell speech:

"Ladies and Gentlemen! Allow me to use this final hour of my teaching career to look back...I have often found it embarrassing to have to present to students as facts on which therapeutic treatment can be based, material which is teeming with uncertainties, with suppositions, with dubious experience, yes, even with superstition. The material from which we create the substance of a lecture is provided to us primarily through the results of experimental pharmacology and of experimental therapy...As far as the first source is concerned, one must be aware of the fact that the pharmacological experiment is a brutal operation. The animal is administered poison until such time as objectively perceptible functional disturbances set in. The delicate balance of mutually interacting functions is relentlessly interfered with, and insufficient account taken of the fact that the new pharmacology is basically nothing other than animal toxicology. Healthy animals are poisoned and made ill. That is something entirely different from influencing a changed function within a sick human being by administering a medicament I have always objected to the brutality of these operations... the young doctors enter into practice without sufficient preparation, and accordingly fall all the easier victims to the pharmaceutical advertising. The manufacturers' brochures become their therapeutical advisers..." (*Schweizerische Medizinische Wochenschrift*. 1932, No. 22, p. 513) (Only one criticism can be made of this statement: it's a pity that Prof. Jacquet made it in the final hour of his teaching career, and not in the first hour).

Dr. med. With. Metzger, Stuttgart: "...As a doctor and as a human being I am prepared to say: We have perhaps a right also to demand sacrifice from an animal, particularly if we are prepared to be sacrificed ourselves. But we have no right at all to commit cruelty. But vivisection will always be cruel. Works of erudition can never justify the frightful suffering to which the animal world is being subjected with increasing frequency by vivisection..." (*Tierrecht und Tierschutz*. No. 10, 1932)

William Howard Hay, M.D. (1932):

"Herewith is my opinion of vivisection, and as many times as I have openly challenged the friends of this practice to show any useful results, just so many times have I met with no constructive evidence of its utility.

"My own familiarity with the practice during my preparation for medicine convinced me that these experiments are undertaken in medical schools merely to make an impressive course, not to prove anything, for each experiment was merely a demonstration of things already well known, as a rule.

"Thus, useless experiments embodying the greatest cruelty, were repeated before class after class, ad infinitum and ad nauseam, till their cruelties became so revolting to many members of the classes that some stayed away, rather than witness them.

"I know of nothing that has ever been developed through vivisection that could not much better be proved in other and less cruel ways, and verily believe that there is now apparent a realization of both the cruelties and the uselessness of the practice that will never end till it is made a felony to cut alive any animal with knives, burn it or roast it to death, smother it, starve



it, or in any way maltreat it in the name of science...I will do all in my power to assist in any way their efforts to lay before the public the now well concealed and misrepresented facts of the vivisection laboratories."

Prof. Nigro Lico of Italy published in 1932 a book entitled *The Fallacy of Experimentation on Animals*. In the introduction he wrote:

"Much literature of this nature comes from those countries where there are many people, both scientists and laymen, who are bringing to the notice of the public the dangerous aberrations of medical science. Their arguments are of the utmost importance and merit serious, disinterested attention, divested of previous conceptions, because this matter concerns not only the painful problem of vivisection itself and its intense torture of animals, but it has resulted in filling the science of medicine with theories and systems which are having tragic consequence upon the health of mankind."

Dr. med. Olga Lautreppe (Paris):

"Vivisection is based on two false notions. One is that the experimental method - so successful when applied to inanimate bodies - should also be applied to living bodies. But the great Cuvier, the glory of France and of science, totally rejects the application of the experimental method to the science of life processes (physiology) and disputes the justification for vivisection, saying: 'All the parts of a living body are linked with one another, they only function correctly when they are acting together. To separate one organ from the whole means putting it into the class of inanimate matter; this means totally altering its nature.'

"The second false idea is that we can draw conclusions from experiments on animals in relation to human beings, because animals have a certain similarity to humans. In fact, however, there are more dissimilarities than similarities between human beings and animals."

(*Tier und Mensch*, No. 5, 1932)

Professor Henry J. Bigelow, Professor of Surgery at Harvard University:

"Any person who had to endure certain experiments carried out on animals which perish slowly in the laboratories would regard death by burning at the stake as a happy deliverance. Like everyone else in my profession, I used to be of the opinion that we owe nearly all our knowledge of medical and surgical science to animal experiments. Today I know that precisely the opposite is the case, in surgery especially, they are of no help to the practitioner, indeed he is often led astray by them."

In his preface to a book called *Cancer: The Surgeon and the Researcher*, by Mr. Ellis Barker, Sir Arbutnot Lane wrote in the *Sunday Express* of December 27, 1931:

"Perhaps no disease compels the attention of the lay public more than cancer, yet no progress is being made in affecting an incidence which is increasing rapidly in a community

already fairly saturated with this disease...In England, as elsewhere, vast sums of money are expended in obtaining radium and in developing other means for controlling and perhaps curing cancer. The result, however, shows that the published mortality increases with a startling rapidity in spite of this vast outlay of public money. To show how little use Medical Research has been in this direction one need only call attention to the fact that, within the last three years, an important research body, confirmed by eminent medical opinion, stated that food has nothing to do with cancer, that cancer came like a bolt from the blue. The unfortunate factor in all professions is that in proportion as one develops a special sense, one loses one's common sense. It is now dawning upon the profession that, while the use of drugs and operations is essential in the treatment of disease, it is the pre-eminent duty of the profession to study Health, to observe its reaction to diet and to educate the public in the simple laws of Health. Prevention is the duty of the Medical Profession and its study has unfortunately been hopelessly neglected...That all the diseases of civilisation, from pyorrhoea to cancer, are due to errors in diet, is absolutely certain."

Dr. med. R. Guenin, Geneva: "I testify before God and my conscience that vivisection is an ungodly atrocity. Its scientific value is meaningless, it cannot be used in practice and is simply useless to humans. People who carry it out are either sadists, torturers or bloodthirsty beings, mostly depraved souls, badly adjusted and so on. In the hospitals a great role is also played by the compulsion just to do something, the need to occupy one's time." (Geneva, 12 December 1931)

Prof. Enrico Ricca-Barberis, M.D., clinician in Turin, "The Voice of an Expert", *Scienza e Coscienza*, Nov. 1931:

"I beg forgiveness if I dare describe myself so presumptuously. But this is not a judgement on my merit, but simply a submission of titles that is absolutely necessary in the face of the impatience with which, where vivisection is concerned, anyone is rejected who has not had a dissecting knife in his hand or sat in the Holy Temples of Science.

"My credentials are really all there: degree in medicine and surgery, practice in scientific institutes and hospitals, almost thirty years' practice in the medical profession, and - what a coincidence! - especially in laboratories and in that biology which is one of the chosen fields for vivisection. Therefore, not only 'expert', but - please excuse me once more - 'very expert'!

"Well now, despite this expertise I cannot help but associate myself unhesitatingly with the ranks of 'inexpert' anti-vivisectionists by placing the result of my studies and experience at their service. What are in fact the results? First and foremost, the confirmation of the unbelievable, unimaginable horror of vivisection.

"I have already had occasion to confirm - and I repeat it, without fear of being contradicted - that everything that can be thought out by a sadistic and criminal imagination with regard to cruelty and mistreatment has in fact been carried out and exceeded. I have also already said that the 'non-experts', whether they are anti-vivisectionists or not, cannot ever form a picture

of the whole tragic reality of vivisection, even if they have heard or read about it or formed their own ideas about it. This reality is so appalling that if it could be shown to interested and uninterested persons outside the Holy Temples of Science, this alone would be sufficient to bring victory for the fight against vivisection.

“Secondly, emphasis must be put on the uselessness of vivisection, as well as on the cruelty that it involves...It is certain that in my thirty years of practice in laboratories and hospitals I have not had the consolation of even once seeing a single animal chloroformed for the experiment. And every time that I drew the attention of the others to this question I found myself faced with the most complete and genuine astonishment, as if that were something that they had never thought about and that was inconceivable, or I was given the categorical explanation that it was not worth the effort of bothering about such pointless matters. Also taken into consideration at the same time was the rightful anger of the laboratory attendant, for whose dinner table the slaughtered animals were destined as a gift.

“It is painful, very painful even - but it is totally true - that one must say: no chloroform, but pushing, pulling, lashings and cursings, and, on top of that, total indifference and mocking smiles, and this - I say this, because I have myself seen it - from the University Senator Professor to the assistant, the student, the laboratory attendant. The latter, with his less educated mind, follows the example he has learned from his superiors, and thus becomes the absolute slave-driver and torturer of the animals entrusted to him, both before and after the experiment.

“That is the evidence that I can and must submit, as an ‘expert’, about the mysteries of vivisection.”

-----

“Dr. Horatio Matthews, M.D., Ch.B. said: ‘Our difficulty is to awaken the public to the facts, for the medical profession hides its head in every possible way. It hides this practice in dark, unsavoury rooms. Its instruments are a disgrace to any medical man, its laboratories and operating theatres are disgusting and revolting.’ (In response to interruption by medical students Dr. Matthews added, amidst laughter and applause: ‘If I were marking your examination papers I would fail every one of you, and there are a lot more on the Medical Council I would fail.’)

“The British Medical Association, Ltd., sets up the ethical law which governs the medical profession. Its recommendations are passed on to the Medical Council, and invariably adopted by that Council, and, in addition to that, it is fairly evident that the British Medical Association employs agents as “agents provocateurs” to trip up reformers. A doctor was struck off the register within the last fortnight for having broken “ethical” medical rules. Lord Knutsford, a layman, is allowed to write in the columns of the *British Medical Journal* on vivisection, whilst I, a doctor of 25 years’ standing, am refused.

“I would ask you to do your part in ventilating these facts, and you can help me to ventilate it

to the profession by cutting my page out of the *Abolitionist* and circulating it widely amongst the profession.” (Applause.) (*Abolitionist*, Aug. 1, 1931)

Major Reginald Austin, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., after referring to "the very common fallacy that there are two sides to every question", added:

“All of us are brought up on certain tenets, we have to be taught a belief in certain practice before we can pass our examinations. It was many years before I arrived at the knowledge of the points I am going to bring forward. One of the most misleading things we are taught is the knowledge concerning the question of vaccination, and I am going to deal with that subject pretty deeply, because it is the first point which made me become an anti-vivisectionist.

“In the year 1894 I was sent out to India full of the wonderful theories as to what vaccination would do for one. I was sent to Hyderabad, Sind, a hotbed of smallpox. The troops were over a mile away from the town. So obsessed were we with the value of vaccination to prevent smallpox, that the Medical Officer of the district insisted on our having frequent parades.

“My enthusiasm for vaccination, however, diminished at a time because three of the native followers who had been vaccinated contracted smallpox three months afterwards. I was talking to one of the native sub-assistant surgeons and he told me it was quite a common experience in this country.

“During the last war I was Commanding Medical Officer stationed at Calcutta, and during that time I had five cases of enteric fever diagnosed by various medical officers in the hospital, and I put them down in my hospital record as enteric fever. The Chief Medical Officer of the district looked at my books and said: ‘I see you have five cases of enteric fever, but this should not be, as they have been inoculated.’ I had to ‘cook’ my books and change the name of the disease for fear of upsetting the general belief in inoculation.

“The relation between vaccination and vivisection is this, that whereas lymph used for vaccination against smallpox used to be taken from a cow suffering from cowpox, healthy animals are now deliberately inoculated with virus and given diseases in order to provide vaccines and serums for human beings. (Interruption and applause.)

“The Chairman, after inviting questions which were not forthcoming, declared the meeting closed, after it had been unanimously agreed to send a telegram of sympathy to Dr. Walter R. Hadwen in his illness. (*Abolitionist*, Aug. 1, 1931)

-----

Dr. Ad. Scheidegger, communal doctor, Langenthal, Switzerland: "In agreement" Volunteers for membership of an association of antivivisectionist doctors, if possible in Switzerland. (Langenthal, 22 May 1931)

Again and again, leading medical men have pointed out the futility of vivisection for studying the brain of man, but to no avail. Dr. Bernard Hollander wrote in the English magazine

*Medical Press* as far back as 1931 (May 20, p. 411):

"Sixty years ago it was confidently anticipated that experiments on the exposed brains of living animals would speedily disclose the inner working of the brain and make mental disorders disappear forever. These extravagant hopes have not been fulfilled. It was fantastic to expect a solution of the working of the human brain, or to get any light thrown on the origin of mental disorders, from the stimulation or destruction of bits of the cerebral tissues of monkeys, dogs or cats."

Dr. med. Eckbard, Hanover:

"I have been an opponent of vivisection ever since my student days, when I witnessed this terrible cruelty to animals which I had *to* look at with the utmost revulsion, without being able *to* prevent it. The pictures of vivisection I saw then, which still appear before my mind's eye, have so far lost nothing of their dreadfulness for me..."

"Today's orthodox medicine has, on the basis of a vivisection-oriented method of treatment and as a result of the disastrous effects of big capitalistic influences, led medical science onto totally false paths; it has established the purely materialistic, soulless therapeutic treatment for which the human being is seen merely as a product of chemistry and physics, in which everything is only measured and weighed..." (from his speech in Locarno, 4 May 1931)

Dr. med. Steintel, Berlin:

"It's not one-sided causes that we have *to* champion here; opponents of vaccination and anti-vivisectionists must work hand in hand. The planned diphtheria law will have really disastrous consequences! All schoolchildren are to be vaccinated three times per year. By multiplying the number of schoolchildren by three *or* nine injections per year, anyone can himself calculate the dividends that this flood of vaccinations must yield!"

"The fear of the bacillus serves as a pathway to intimidation. In what *direction* are we going? Goodness and wholesomeness have always triumphed, the world will get better, it must get better! The medical political edifice will undoubtedly topple, many doctors will have *to* take thought within themselves and humbly resign. We need doctors who preserve health." (Extract from a speech held in Locarno, May 3, 1931)

Dr. med. Huber, Uetendorf: "I hate any cruelty to animals. I condemn vivisection, under which name I mainly refer to bloody experiments. I have been opposed to them since my student days..." (Uetendorf, 28 March 1931)

"The size of the animal was found to be no criterion of its ability to survive. With the toxin at a lethal concentration dogs died before cats, rabbits earlier than rats, and all those expired before goats and monkeys. It is difficult to understand why there should be this difference in the time factor." (Article on "Poisoning by Hydrocyanic Gas" in *The Lancet*, Feb. 14, 1931, p. 362)

Dr. Bachmann, Medical Officer of Health (Article in *Die Reinheit*, No. 1/2, 1931): "The cruelties to animals, vivisection, carried out in the name of Science, are morally indefensible atrocities which are incompatible with a true spiritual culture. "

Biagio Miraglio, Professor at the Hospital for the Mentally Sick at the University of Naples, a famous phrenologist, was a zealous campaigner against vivisection. He also held various conferences about vivisection in Naples, at which he confronted this difficult question very courageously and candidly. At one of these meetings, on September 3, 1882, he spoke as follows:

"Vivisection is not only useless as a method of research, but, still worse, it is a dishonest and false method. I have already indicated several reasons for this at another conference. Vivisection has added absolutely nothing new to what we already knew or what we had already achieved through other positive research. On the contrary, it has diverted the observing intellect away from the right path, so that the young people, satisfied with those seemingly brilliant results, have neglected clinical work and pathological anatomy, the study of which must go hand in hand with that inductive philosophy which teaches that, if any result conflicts with logic, with certain laws which one cannot dispute and with morality, that experiment is either false or to be looked upon unfavourably..." (From *L'idea zoofila e zootecnica*, No. 1, 1931)

Prof. Dr. Nelaton, famous French surgeon, wrote to Claude Bernard, the well-known vivisector: "...that every system based on experimental physiology is false, and that a big book could be written about the physiologists' contradictions of one another."

From a speech by Dr. P. Pijl, physician, President of the "Anti-Vivisection Association", The Hague, Holland:

"In order to be healthy and avoid illness, we must live hygienically, that is live simply and naturally, and for this purpose one does not need a single school that works with a laborious system of medicine geared to vivisection; all that is needed, besides a suitable diet based on plants and minerals, is the simple use of sun, light, air, rational clothing and so on, and last but not least: proper housing and a good mental balance. And this still holds true if the body becomes ill, in which case the non-vivisectionist art of healing to be discussed later may possibly play a part.

"Trespassing against the cosmic laws produces illness; and this trespass becomes all the more negatively woven into the lot of mankind the more mankind kicks against these laws, as we have explained here, which is what the vivisection-based system of medicine - among others - does, which violates the cosmic laws in violating life.

"The vivisectionist allopathy, by contrast, dreadfully increases mankind's debit balance. One only needs to think of the fact that at present some 3,000,000 animals fall victim to it every year, not to mention the thousands of vivisections carried out on people.

“With a system of medicine that bases itself on vivisection experiments, we ever more reduce our knowledge of the nature of illnesses and impede healing.

“Cuvier said: one must not force Nature's secrets from her; one must observe Nature, then one learns everything. The allopathic school (of medicine), on the contrary, does nothing but constantly snatch Nature's secrets from her in the most cruel and cunning manner, it thereby corrupts the students, causes the doctor to enjoy no confidence any more among the people, brings the profession into disrepute among the public and prepares the way for vivisection on humans, which is what one can arrive at through only one short step from vivisection on animals, which under the practice of this school is a senseless reflex action.”

-----  
Dr. F. Bachmann, senior medical officer, Berlin-Charlottenburg: "We reformers, however, have for a long while favoured medical instruction which rejects every animal experiment as scientifically unnecessary, indeed misleading, as depraving and nothing short of criminal, and we also champion the construction of vivisection-free hospitals." (From a letter protesting against the Tomarkin Institute in Locarno, 1931)

Dr. Emit Schmid, physician, Etzgen: "In agreement. What is your view about the creation of a Swiss association of anti-vivisectionist doctors? - That will come." (*Palm Sunday*, 1931.)

"It has long been recognized, by those who have had most experience in the propagation of tumours by cell-grafting, that the whole process is absolutely artificial and has no counterpart in the natural genesis of a tumour." (Dr. W.E. Gye, *The Cause of Cancer*, London, 1931, p. 22)

In 1931, an article in the Paris daily, *Le Matin*, reported: "Once more the census proves that France's decreasing population is not due to any decline in births but to increased death rate... The increasing death rate is greatest among infants, the very class that is being subjected to wholesale 'protective' vaccination."

Dr. Med. S. Besshard, Cham: "An animal is not a human being, by a long chalk. But people are often beasts, including the most famous professors of physiology. That's for sure." (1931)

Excerpt from the article "Why I Object to Vivisection" in the *Animal's Friend* of December, 1930, by the well-known English surgeon, M. Beddow Bayly, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.:

“Vivisection appeals to the basest instincts of fear and cowardice, and excuses any cruelty on the plea of utility to man's material welfare. Before the bar of Human Justice vivisection stands condemned on three main counts: cruelty to animals, uselessness to man, and obstruction on the path of real knowledge.

“1) The painful nature of vivisection is admitted by many leading vivisectors, is the shameless boast of not a few, and is proved by the official records of the experiments performed. The Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876 now contains a "pain" clause, which expressly permits an

animal to be kept alive in severe pain if not prolonged, or in prolonged moderate pain until the main object of the experiment has been achieved; after this the animal may be kept in moderate pain if not prolonged, the sole judge in each case, both of its severity and likelihood of persistence, being the person most interested in the experiment, the vivisector himself.

“Recent painful experiments, performed within the last twelve years, include:

“a) Injection of boiling water into the pancreatic artery of a dog until it became unconscious through the pain. (1)

“b) Production of intestinal obstruction in dogs by tying off the intestinal canal with tape at various points from the stomach downwards. No food or water given for forty-eight hours before the operation, nor until they died. (2)

“c) Water in excessive amounts pumped into the stomachs of dogs and cats until vomiting, convulsions, and death occurred. (3)

“d) Removal of adrenal glands from pregnant bitches, with consequent vomiting, yelling fits, tetanic spasms, convulsions at intervals, with birth of puppies and eventual death. (4)

“e) Injection of faeces into the peritoneal cavities of pregnant bitches, causing acute peritonitis, convulsions, and death. (5)

“f) Closing the anal canal of pregnant bitches with purse-string sutures, so as to prevent the passage of anything from the bowel, while feeding continued, the animals lingering as long as eleven days before dying or being killed. (5)

“g) Investigation of "question whether pain and trauma can produce shock in experimental animals", in the course of which sensitive organs were crushed and sciatic nerve stimulated at two-minute intervals for one and a half hours until "central nervous system shock supervened". Some of the dogs used were only given morphia, a drug which stimulated the sensitivity to pain in these animals instead of dulling it. (6)

“h) Experiments in starvation in deprivation of water (7) in running to death in motor-driven revolving cages, (8) in exposure to high temperatures, (9) to poison gases and various infections, (10) and in the injection of poisons and disease products which result in a painful and lingering death - these are becoming so numerous and varied that one is left wondering if ingenuity could devise any new method of inflicting torture, until the perusal of a fresh report from a research laboratory shows anew to what base ends the imagination of man may be prostituted.

“2) That the knowledge so gained is useless is proved daily by the failure of medical science to make headway in the control of disease. This is especially noticeable in those diseases, such as cancer and diabetes, etc., in which the greatest number of painful experiments have been performed.

“Remedies from time to time are hailed as triumphs of scientific research, but experience



discredits them, and they pass into oblivion, while the death-rate from the disease all too frequently continues to rise.

“3) Vivisection is a hindrance not only by reason of diverting research from profitable channels, but because of the degrading effect it has upon the character of those who perform or sanction it. How can it be possible for a medical training which inures the student to witnessing acts of atrocity on the defenceless, and leads him to laugh in derision at the bare mention of such words as "pity", "compassion", or "motherhood", to produce a type of mind and heart capable of fathoming those deep causes of ill-health which lie within man himself?”

References:

1 *American Journal of Physiology*, March, 1924

2 *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, vol. XLVIII, 1928

3 *Lancet*, October 13, 1923, p. 838

4 *American Journal of Physiology*, January, 1927

5 *Lancet*, May 24, 1930, p. 1115

6 *American Journal of Physiology*, June, 1918, p. 314

7 *Medical Press*, November 28, 1928

8 *American Journal of Physiology*, September, 1927

9 *Archives of Pathology*, vol. VIII, No. 4, October, 1929

10 Continually performed at present day at the experimental station, Porton, England.

Note. All the foregoing experiments were performed in British or American laboratories.

CIVIS comment: More than half a century after Bayly wrote this article, the two maladies for which the greatest number of animals have been sacrificed, cancer and diabetes, have continued their rise. Diabetes, which was one of the rarest maladies at the beginning of the century, began to rise sharply after Banting and Best introduced insulin and is now the third cause of death in the USA, cancer being the second. (Cardiovascular diseases, another favorite playground of the animal researchers, is first)

-----

Dr. Fielding-Gould (1930): "We cannot find any justification for the continued use of cats and dogs in research."

Sir Berkeley George Moynihan, M.D., K.C.M.G.: President, Royal College of Surgeons: (The Journal of the American Medical Association) 1930.

"Lord Moynihan's criticism of physiologists, in his recent address at the opening of the Banting Institute in Toronto, has started a controversy. He complained that physiologists were neglecting research on man ('hominal research') and were concerned too much with research on animals; that their aloofness from medicine was increasing year by year, and that their discoveries were becoming of less use to the clinicians...As to surgery, he pointed out that the advances in knowledge of gastric and duodenal ulcer and cholelithiasis had been made by surgeons with little help from the laboratory. Indeed, the contribution of the laboratory to the surgery of the stomach was not only almost negligible but was potentially dangerous, because so divergent from human experience..."

"Hominal physiology, indeed, has awakened or sustained an interest in few physiologists, whether at home or abroad. It is true that they have been busy in the practice of animal research, but not seldom their labour has seemed aloof from human problems, and the results incapable of application to the maladies of men."

Lord Moynihan wrote in *The Lancet* on 11 Oct 1930: "The material of the human body is neither the same nor subject to the same influences as that of animals nearest to man; similar functions are not wholly discharged by precisely similar mechanisms...Other reservations are also necessary in respect of the validity of animal experiments. The changes produced in experiments upon normal animals are relatively gross; the changes produced by disease in man are minimal, and of so fine a texture that we cannot properly compare them with these coarser induced conditions."

Prof. Henry J. Bigelow, MD, LLD, late Prof. of Surgery, Harvard University: "The grounds for public supervision, is that vivisection immeasurably, beyond any other pursuit, involves the infliction of torture to little or no purpose. The law should interfere. There can be no doubt that in this relation there exists a case of cruelty to animals far transcending in its refinement and in its horror anything that has been known in the history of nations. There will come a time when the world will look back to modern vivisection in the name of science as they do now to burning at the stake in the name of religion."

Dr. med. Gustav Riedlin, Freiburg im Breisgau (*Der Versuch am lebenden Tier*):

"We anti-vivisectionist doctors oppose the abuse of pure research, the scientific animal torture, and we demand its banning under criminal law. We demand its total abolition and would also demand this even if - which is not the case some great use for suffering mankind were to emerge from it. Apart from the depraving cruelties and the impossibility of carrying out most experiments without causing pain, experimentation on the weak body, i.e. the torture of the defenceless animal, is unreliable and misleading in its results on the part of ambitious pushers and illusionists with no moral scruples."

"...But we do not content ourselves with condemning animal experiments from the standpoint of sympathy, moral laws and religion; we wage our fight against animal torture also from the purely scientific standpoint, and can prove that it is superfluous, useless, harmful and disastrous for our race." (From *Der Arzt*. August 1930, No. 8, special issue)

"The serum treatment against cattle disease, carried out by the authorities in South-West Africa, destroyed the herds belonging to the Herero tribe, drove them to desperation and rebellion and cost the German Empire much money and blood. The preventative injection against whooping cough, measles and scarlet fever urged by the serum producers does not in a single case meet with the undivided approval of the orthodox medical world.

"Illnesses created artificially in healthy animals cannot be compared with the maladies which occur spontaneously in human beings burdened with foreign matter. The outstanding researcher and M. D. Professor Hans Much of Hamburg cannot draw enough attention to the basic error of a system of medicine which claims to be precise but in truth, in its practice of animal experimentation, inevitably commits the grossest inexactitudes (see Much: *Hippokrates der Grosse*, 1926, and *Das Wesen der Heilkunst*, 1928), Looked at under this light, the whole of serum therapy is a scientific aberration. All the inoculating and injecting is wicked blood-sucking, it damages our people, only serves the interests of the big chemical-pharmaceutical capitalists and the serum producers...

"The statement as to the indispensability of animal experiments is untenable in the face of these facts. There are not only grounds, there is a duty, to subject vivisection, carried out as it is with such inhuman cruelty, to a searching examination. It should be emphasised again here that the supporters of animal experiments constantly talk of their successes (extremely dubious successes, as has been shown), but no word is uttered about the failures which far exceed the successes in number, whereas they would have to be included in any serious and honest examination. There is no doubt that more people have been killed by vivisection than have been saved by it... " (From the report for a petition to the Criminal Law Committee of the German Parliament, August 1930)

-----

In the *Abolitionist* of Aug. 1, 1930: (CIVIS: This article is as true today as it was when it was written)

'The President Waiter Hadwen, M.D., in introducing Mr. Alasdair Alpin MacGregor, referred to the fact that his indignation at the support given by his University to vivisection had led him to throw up his M.A. degree. (Applause.)

'Mr. Alasdair Alpin Macgregor said:

"I am glad that some very slight reference has been made to this University business, because I consider that the Universities throughout the so-called civilized world are the ringleaders in this matter. If it be true that medical research cannot progress without experiments upon defenceless animals, as they tell us in Universities, then Universities have outlived their usefulness. (Applause.)

"I have challenged any vivisectioning professor to debate with me the moral issues involved. They have not come forward.

“What have they done instead? They have gone round the country incensing students against this movement. They go to meetings and kick up a noise like a lot of infants when you give them the chance of a public debate, and when it comes to question-time they fallout. Anyone who supports the practice of vivisection is a coward, and anyone who is involved in vivisection is a bully, because as I have said, you are inflicting upon a creature which is powerless in your hand something that you would not have inflicted upon yourself. The great progress made in medicine and surgery has emanated from the sacrifices of men and women who have gone through it themselves. There is no doubt about that. The evidence of vivisection, the evidence before the Royal Commission, the reports we read in pseudo-scientific journals like the *British Medical Journal* show us that they themselves have been, and are likely to remain, at sixes and sevens on the fundamentals. They are not agreed upon a single important fact. They have doped the public for centuries with black magic and superstition. If it be true that the results that have emanated from vivisection have been beneficial to the human species, how is it that disease is on the increase? You cannot give us one example where scientific benefit has been derived from experimentation upon animals. It is absolutely unsound scientifically.

“Until you realize that vivisection is a vested interest you will never understand what it means. It is one of the best-entrenched interests in this country. If you have tried to do any propagandist work on this subject you will know that. Here is one public aspect that occurs to me. The British Broadcasting Corporation, under the jurisdiction of one department of the State, the Post Office, will not allow anti-vivisectionists to give their views on this matter. A great deal of unintelligible nonsense about the germ theory has already gone through the other.

“Take another department of the State - the War Office. We are alleged to have signed a Protocol abolishing gas warfare; and yet every year we are spending tens of thousands of pounds of public money in trying different poison gases upon defenceless animals in this country. If we are sincere about our Protocol, as any man who was in the war (as I was, unfortunately) ought to be, why is it that even this Government - and I am a Socialist - is following the example of its predecessors and allowing these abominable experiments to go on living animals?

“Vivisectionists tell us that vivisection is on behalf of the human race. How in the name of God can gas warfare be in the interests of the human race? Yet there are animals now in their hundreds upon which this filthy devilry is being tried. It is bad enough that men should be murdering one another, but to me it is a thousand times worse that they should be preparing a means of organised murder upon something more defenceless than themselves. That is the War Office. Something will have to be done about that, and quite soon.

“Then we come to another department of the Government called the Ministry of Health, a Ministry that I think, upon its own showing, is more deserving of the title of the Ministry of Ill-Health. The Ministry of Health, with public money, is now going on with these disgusting experiments on animals - tying the ducts of dogs and cramming them with linseed, and arguing from this to the human species. Even a schoolboy could tell you that you cannot

argue from the intestine of a dog to the intestine of a human being. Scientifically it is absolutely unsound, as they themselves have proved.”

-----  
"Certain of the cyanogen compounds used in gas warfare while being extremely toxic to dogs, leave goats and man unharmed." - Mr. J. E. R. McDonagh, F.R.C.S., *The Nature of Disease*, Vol. 1, p. 210. (1930)

From Dr. W. Hadwen's speech on June 12, 1930 at the Central Hall, Westminster:

“The practice is unscientific because it is quite impossible to reason from a lower class of animal to a higher class. You remember the case of Sir Frederick Treves. He told a large body of medical men that he went abroad to perfect himself in abdominal surgery; that he there performed his experiments; and he had to confess that, instead of helping him, they had only led him astray. He had, he said, to unlearn everything that he had learned, and begin over again. When you remember that a great surgeon of the calibre of Sir Frederick Treves had to acknowledge that, it shows how difficult it is to reason from an animal to a man. You cannot do it. Nothing whatever has been gained by vivisection that has been of the slightest benefit in the amelioration or cure of any human disease. (Applause and dissent.) Moreover, the whole practice is useless. I say nothing has been gained by it, and furthermore, what is worse than all, it is absolutely cruel.”

Lt. Colonel J. F. Donegan, M.R.C.R.S., M.R.S.M.: "...I think I am in the position to convince any impartial mind of the truth of my statement that vivisection has never been of the slightest benefit or use to mankind..." (From a speech at a protest meeting against vivisection at "Friend's House", London; quoted in *Antivivisection and Humanitarian Review*, March-April 1930)

Prof. Hastings Gilford, surgeon, in *The Lancet*, 1930:

"That research into the cause and nature of cancer is making no headway is obvious to everyone who has followed its drift since the movement began with the beginning of this century.

"And now, after thirty years of research, all that it has to show is a prodigious heap of facts and inductions got by much industry from animal sources, but, so far as man is concerned, no better than a tumor - an innocent tumor useless to man, and most decidedly of no use to mice...Laboratory cancer research has gone for so many years, contentedly grinding out data and spinning inductions without attention being drawn to the fact that it never produces any useful results. And now, after a quarter of a century of research, we can see to what a deplorable waste of energy and ability and money this academic, aimless toil may lead. One useful, if negative, induction, however emerges, which is that the problem of the causation of human cancer is not to be solved by experiments on lower animals in laboratories."

Dr. med. Will, Stralsund (*Methoden zur Bekämpfung der Vivisektion*): "I am a convinced and

radical opponent of every experiment on living animals, and am so on the following scientific grounds: The results gathered through animal experiments have no validity for human beings, since man's mental and emotional structure - but also his bodily structure - is organized quite differently from an animal's." (Abstract, *Tier und Mensch*, March 1930, No.2)

Dr. Fielding-Gould: "We are opposed to vivisection because it is idiotic. It is not possible to carry out experiments on animals that give us reliable information about the organism and physiology of the human being. One of the greatest men from the London Hospital, Sir Frederick Treves, told me that he had gone to Geneva to carry out vivisection when he was studying gynaecological surgery. I asked him: "What did you gain from it?" He replied: "I was misled, I came away knowing less than before I started." (Speech at a public protest meeting against vivisection at "Friend's House", London, 27 Feb. 1930; reported in *Antivivisection and Humanitarian Review*, March-April 1930)

Dr. med. F. Landmann, Oranienburg-Eden, *Tiu und Mensch*. Jan. 1930, No. 1:

"It is and remains a plain fact that man is just as subject to the laws of Nature as the tiniest worm, however proud he may be about his seemingly powerful position in the world. If he transgresses the laws of Nature, then Nature inexorably punishes him with disease, infirmity, death, and not only him but also his offspring into the third and fourth generations. No one can escape this iron law. What it amounts to here is either to obey and live, or not to obey and suffer and perish for it. One should not think that Nature allows itself to be traded with, to let us thumb our noses at it with the medicine bottle and the syringe of serum. Anyone who thinks that possible has not yet at all understood it and its powerful workings.

"Seen from this basic viewpoint, vivisection considered as a watchtower can only be described as a 'conning' tower, which in the long run serves no other purpose but to immeasurably increase the profusion of suffering in the world."

"The young doctor is made to believe that human beings in health and disease react in the identical way in which animals used for experimental purposes are reacting. That mistaken idea has been very harmful to the art of healing and to the patients themselves. This has been proved also by Prof. Hans Much, who has criticised this error in detail." (Dr. Erwin Liek, one of the most eminent German doctors, Surgeon of Danzig, in *The Doctor's Mission*, John Murray, London, 1930, p: 5. Prof. Hans Much of Hamburg University, author of a score of medical tomes and the discoverer of the granules of the tubercular bacillus, is one of this century's most distinguished medical scientists.)

"... It is only by the study of the effects on patients that we can hope to understand the effects of radium." (Dr. J. A. Braxton Hicks, *British Empire Cancer Campaign. Seventh Annual Report*, 1930, p. 58)

Prof. Dr. Carl Ludwig Schleich, the inventor of local anaesthesia: "When I had to look at six frogs being beheaded with scissors at the physiology department of Prof. Hermann in Zurich... and the lightning-fast puncturing of the spinal cord of some poor, cooing pigeons,

that was the end of my enthusiasm for medicine. I was seized with anger, and determined to say farewell to it forever. It seemed impossible to me to participate in this senseless cruelty. I wanted to be a doctor to the suffering on humane grounds, and I stood, disgusted, before a place of learning, before a cult of the most frightful indifference to suffering and death." (*Besonnte Vergangenheit, Lebenserinnerungen*, p. 128, Ernst Verlag, Berlin, 1930)

A. M. Mendenhall, M. D., Head of the Department of Obstetrics, Indiana University School of Medicine, in an article entitled 'Solution of Pituitary and Ruptured Uterus':

"It is a powerful drug even when greatly diluted, and no method has yet been developed that will positively insure a given strength. Too much cannot be said in warning those who persist in using this powerful drug that there is no dependable way of knowing the degree of effect they may expect from it until they try it out on the patient herself." (*Journal of the American Medical Association*, Apr. 20, 1929, p. 1341)

"As pointed out by Halban, the placenta stimulates the growth of the genitals and the breast glands. While this is true for animals, it does not hold good for human beings." (J. P. Greenhill, *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, Feb. 1929, p.254)

Dr. Andrew Sergeant McNeil, L.R.S.M, L.R.C.S.: "I am of the opinion that the total abolition of vivisection is a necessity, for it is useless and misleading, and animals show great differences from one another, just as people do, and this not only as individuals but as a result of changing circumstances... If one observes the lack of results from these animal experimentation methods after a long time, it must be clear to all reasonable people that another system of research geared to the prevention and treatment of cancer and many other illnesses is urgently necessary..." (From an article in *Anti-Vivisection and Humanitarian Review*, Dec. 1928, p. 164)

Gennaro Ciaburri, physician, Bologna (*The Cruelty and Futility of Vivisection*): "Vivisection is totally useless, both for clarifying purely scientific problems, since observation contributes more to that than does experimentation, as well as for medicine, since man and animal are not the same." (Italian journal *L'idea zoofila e zootecnica*, No. 10, Oct 1927, and Memorial, Jan. 4, 1927)

Dr. med. Boens: "Vivisection makes the man cruel, the surgeon insensitive, the young man brutal. Far from promoting the sciences, vivisection has mostly hindered their progress..." (Quarterly bulletin of the International Anti-vivisectionist League, Brussels, 1928, No. 19)

Dr. Hautekeit (letter to the newspaper *Etoile Beige*, July 3, 1927): "Every profession contains some conceited incompetents, our profession more than other ones. But why must it be that thousands of innocent victims, whose ingeniously thought-out torments the general public has not the least idea of, should suffer in this way for a so-called scientific or medical piece of flashy publicity?"

Dr. Herbert Snow, eminent physician at the London Cancer Hospital: "Due to the powerful

control exercised by business interests, the prospects for the public are all the more gloomy and bad the more the power of these basically selfish money interests is centered on the large-scale manufacturing chemist. The latter holds a despotic rule over doctors, hospitals, teaching establishments, pharmacies, charitable foundations. It is unnecessary to add that his

guiding star is vivisection, in other words, the exploitation of the animal world under the guise of "scientific research."

"Every day one hears of some wonderful discovery in the field of remedies produced in this way, which achieve enormous sales for a while, after which their harmfulness and uselessness become apparent. Then the demand drops...

"It matters not how worthless the alleged "remedy" may be; despite the harmfulness which many cases have amply proved it to represent, the artificially created reputation which it enjoys continues for many years, in fact it never ends. So long as it is worthwhile for the chemical factories to manufacture and sell the medicament, the serum, the vaccine and so on, the business goes on and on." (*Starry Cross*, Philadelphia, Apr. 1927, p. 57)

Major R. F. E. Austin, M.D. Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians: "Experiments on animals do not only mean torture and death for the animals, they also mean the killing of people. Vivisection is a double-edged sword." (*Abolitionist*, March 1927)

Dr. John Shaw: "...I hear that Lord Dawson of Penn (personal physician to the King of England) said a while ago that the medical profession is losing some of the confidence of the public. My conviction is that this is attributable to vivisection. I was present at the first meeting of the anti-vivisection) league in Geneva. I made the acquaintance there of a Swiss doctor who told me that the medical profession had formerly been a sacred calling, but was now rather like a trade. Isn't this so, and isn't vivisection responsible for this?" (From his speech at a meeting of the "Animal Defence and Anti-vivisection Society", London, Dec. 7, 1926; quoted in *Anti-Vivisection and Humanitarian Review*, Jan -Feb. 1927)

Dr. E. Laplanche, Nice, a well-known researcher and writer: "What shall we say about the stubbornness of those who, since the times of Claude Bernard, have only discovered complications and increasing difficulties while following in their Master's footsteps, and who, instead of finding light, have found the darkness in which they are struggling to be growing more and more intense...There is no reservation to my condemnation of vivisection in the name of Science." (Speech at the Anti-Vivisection Congress in Geneva, Feb. 26, 1927)

Dr. Hastings Gilford, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, formerly 'Hunterian Professor': "...I have had the opportunity to carry out a general study of the cancer question from all points of view, and I do not believe that anyone who does so without prejudice can come to any other conclusion than that it is useless to do research on the cause or healing of cancer by means of animal experiments." (*Reading Standard*, Feb. 12, 1927)



"...Is a period of practical training in physiology (vivisection performed by students) in the form which we experienced really indispensable for the future doctor? Formerly I answered this question in the negative with my feelings. Today I do the same with my reason..." (From *Der Arzt und seine Sendung, Gedanken eines Arztes*, Munich, 1927).

Dr. Erwin Liek, (mentioned in *Slaughter*) distinguished physician, whose books awakened great interest in the reform of the art of healing and convinced many doctors of the need for reforms: "Medicine is a history of errors...The purely institutional researcher is not a physician. The only one who can judge medicine is he who is beside the sick...What we learn about therapy is very little, what we learn about the basics of therapy is still less, and all the more inaccessible the more it is based on animal experiments...The attempts to establish the effectiveness of antitoxins on humans by means of animals are frankly ludicrous...The bactericidal sera amount in fact to a total bankruptcy...The layman, as well as the physician, should realise that not one single human illness can be transferred to the guinea-pig. That sounds incredible, but it is true..." (From *Moderne Biologie*, Vol. 10, Leipzig, 1926)

"It is the doctor at the sick-bed who has to have the last word about the value of a medical discovery..." (From *Die zukunfftige EntWicklung der Heilkunde, Zeichen der Zeit*, Vol. 3)

Lt. Colonel J.F. Donegan, 33 years a military doctor in the British army:

"During my medical studies I learned what a doctor should and should not do, and I believed honestly and sincerely in these dogmas. For years I was one of those who accepted everything without criticism. I vaccinated thousands of people without understanding anything about it; it was simply the right thing to do. In my earlier years it seemed just as self-evident to me as the fact that a doctor wore a frock coat and a top hat, because that was the fashion.

"In this way I was myself vaccinated against nearly every disease, because that was the practice, and I was only too ready to excuse the failures of the anti-toxins; I was likewise a convinced champion of their supposed benefits. Then I began to think one day, and to study both sides of the question. My ideas were totally changed by what I learned.

"The manner in which the medical profession, misled by false teaching by the vivisection and antitoxin (serum) manufacturers, has made animals responsible for human ills, can be described as extremely vindictive..."

"It can be described as energy-wasting and a gross injustice when a vivisectioner experiments on a dog in order to study human illnesses, for he will by this means only reach false conclusions which are inevitably dangerous for human beings.

"Vivisection and antitoxins (serums) are to be seen as one and the same thing. For the collapse of one of these industries would also lead to the collapse of the other; the sooner the better. Many may not believe me when I say that antitoxins are totally useless." (From a speech during the Animal Welfare Congress in Philadelphia in Oct. 1926).

Dr. Rudolf Bussmann, Berlin (doctor of medicine and of law), *Warum die*

*Tierschutzbewegung unterirdischen Widerstandfindet:*

"... A much wider field of animal cruelty is found in the chemical factories in the production of serum from various animal species, allegedly for the purpose of healing human suffering which would not otherwise be curable. And the same rule applies here. The doctors answer: Are we to let mankind perish, to let the child suffocate with diphtheria, or are we to spare the horses?"

"The fact that there is another system of healing, with hundreds of doctors in Germany, which does not use serums and yet cures those diseases without the medicaments which the majority of doctors obtain from the sacrificing of the animal world, that also goes against the time and its way of viewing things..."

"On top of this comes the fact that capital is at work in the entire pharmaceutical manufacturing industry, capital that is interested in achieving profit and, therefore, also interested in combating everything that can reduce this profit."

"The public must therefore not learn too much about the fact that one can heal without medicine obtained from animal torture, and the Press is commanded to ridicule the animal welfarists. Who is aware that this Press is not allowed to publish anything favorable to the animal welfarists?" (*Tierrecht und Tierschutz*)

Report on the lecture on "Doctor, Brutality and Animal Experiments" held by Dr. Rudolf Bussman (doctor of medicine and of law) at the Hohenzollem High School, May 3, 1926:

"Dr. Bussmann, himself a practising physician, who runs his practice on a basis of reformed medicine, and who studied law only in order to be able to defend himself against the medical hierarchy, gave shattering insights into the present-day practices of the medical training establishments; almost every clinic and almost every hospital had their own laboratories for practising vivisection: By means of observing and practising vivisection, every feeling the young students had for living creatures was systematically destroyed: It was no wonder that any sensitivity towards suffering human beings, and the human contact between doctor and patients, also disappeared. The custom of carving up animals like a lump of inanimate matter was by nature necessarily transmitted to the treatment of human beings, who were in many cases no longer seen as persons to be healed, but only as objects to study, or, when they were well-to-do, as sources of income."

"The professional tribune, which was trying to muzzle Bussmann himself, saw to it, with its draconian fines and its ostracism of those who did not think likewise, that no member of the profession dared to speak out against these gruesome practices..."

"After a few striking words against the daily press, which suppresses any criticism of the medical hierarchy and their vivisection methods, but on the other hand broadcasts every supposed success - which afterwards has often turned out to be a failure (diphtheria serum, tuberculin, etc.) - as the greatest scientific achievement, the speaker came to the conclusion

that the opponents of vivisection could only achieve their aims by joining forces with the representatives of the alternative methods of healing, which served the well-being of mankind without animal experiments." (*Der Tier- und Menschenfreund*, Issue No.2, 1926)

Dr. med. Karl Struenckmann: *Gedanken eines Arztes ueber Vivisektion und was damit zusammenhaengt*:

"... and one must be aware of a third factor, if one wants to understand the attitude of modern science to vivisection. Medicine has become dependent on the giant chemical industry. The doctors are perhaps no more than unknowing agents, serving the interests of the capital which is invested in the huge chemical factories. A well-known chemist, Dr. G., told me how things operate nowadays in such large chemical plants. First of all new chemical materials are discovered, then the new chemicals are tested on the animals in the laboratory...A professor or doctor can always be found who will make experiments with this newly-developed material in the hospital or in his normal practice. And one day the stuff is thrown onto the market. extolled in every way, the sick are doctored with it, a lot of money is made, but after 5 to 10 years the stuff is replaced by a new preparation. So the big chemical industry calls the tune and the medical system is dependent on the big chemical works, i.e. so long as official medicine is dominated by private capitalistic interests, vivisection will not disappear from the world. Modern industrialism pays no consideration to human life. What value can it attach to the animal world? ... " (*Der Tier- und Menschenfreund*, Issue No.2, 1926)

In 1926, one of the best known and most respected MDs in the United Kingdom, Waiter R. Hadwen, M.D. universally known as "Hadwen of Gloucester", (see biography) wrote the following thoughts in the Journal of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection of which he was President:

" A call for pioneers. To oppose vivisection, when every year seems to establish it more as a State supported, Press-advertised "boon to humanity", requires COURAGE. So does every advance that humanity has made. Those who uphold this practice thoughtlessly, because it is the "proper thing" to do so, would equally, had they been born earlier, have supported the tortures of the Inquisition or negro slavery, and would, of course, have agreed with every dogma of medicine, however absurd or revolting, that belonged to the age in which they lived. We call for pioneers. Our appeal is to those who have a more alert intelligence, greater courage and daring, and a higher ideal than the rank and the file."

Prof. Quenu, the outstanding French surgeon: "No, in no circumstances should vivisection be used to serve the purpose of instruction. Even Vulpian, the great physiologist, was opposed to this form of demonstration. I heard this from the master's own lips... I also reject vivisection on animals from the surgical standpoint. The future surgeon does not need to perform operations on animals in order to learn his skills. Operating on animals has nothing in common with operating on humans." (*L' Antivivisection*, Paris, edited by Dr. G. R. Laurent, M.D. 1926)

Dr. Gennaro Ciaburri, physician and surgeon, Bologna: "A few courageous persons have had the strength and bravery to tear away the mask from those bunglers of science by clearly and

competently stating that vivisection is a pointless torment for the animals, who live and feel as we do, and that science has progressed far more through observation than through the results of the cruel manipulations by vivisectionists." (*L'idea zoofila e zootecnica*, 1926, No. 1)

William Howard Hay, M.D.: "You have guessed right. I am and remain an opponent of vivisection on animals or humans in any form, not only because every decent person recoils from causing unnecessary suffering to others, but also because I, after many years of practice as a doctor and after many years of painstaking research and testing, am not able to recall one single important gain for mankind that has been achieved through this inhuman slaughter of animals." (Letter from Buffalo, Richmond Avenue 338, dated November 11, 1925)

Dr. Abel Desjardins, President of the Society of Surgeons of Paris:

"Vivisection must be examined from three different viewpoints: from the human, surgical and physiological. Is vivisection justified from the human viewpoint? I consider it to be a monstrosity...Is vivisection useful when viewed from the surgical viewpoint? In contrast to the view taken by Dr. Tuffler, I will answer you that I do not know a single good surgeon who has learned anything useful from vivisection. One learns the profession of a surgeon by acting as assistant over many years to a skilled surgeon, observing how he overcomes the difficulties which arise, one follows his methods until one is sufficiently familiar with them and able to perform them oneself and to achieve advances in the operating technique. It seems to me that the surgeon, who must above all be compassionate, can gain nothing from the teaching of cruelty..." (*L'Intransigeant*, August 25, 1925)

The self-regulating body: "An acute illness, such as influenza, smallpox, diphtheria, (whooping cough), etc. is a vigorous effort of the body to restore health; ...Acute diseases are really, then, body purifiers. They cleanse it and lengthen life. Indeed, the re-established health is often at a level considerably above that obtained before illness." (R. Austin, M.D., in the *Abolitionist*, August 1, 1 (25)

Dr. Hans Much, Professor at the University of Hamhu - one of the most famous researchers on tuberculosis of our century: "The principal question concerning tuberculosis goes: Is there immunity against tuberculosis? To base research for humans on guinea-pigs means turning medicine on its head...The question can only be seen in relation to man...If we also make the little guinea-pig the measure of all things in this case, we must shrug our shoulders and say 'there is no remedy for tuberculosis' (in the guinea-pig)! All the more problematical is the curing of tuberculosis in the human being...In man, the immunity is a natural one following natural infection. But in the case of the guinea-pig the infection is artificial. For that reason alone, these little animals are totally irrelevant for researching these conditions. The guinea-pig behaves exactly the opposite to the human being." (From *Einige Tuberkulosefragen*, Zeitschrift für alle Fragen der speziellen Tuberkuloseforschung, special supplement to *Medizinische Klinik*, Berlin, 1925)

Dr. John Haddon: "...Consequently, vivisection can be renounced. Its advocates say that it has enabled the physiologists to further their knowledge of physiology and has thus been of

use in the treatment of illnesses. Their opponents dispute this, however, and I tend to agree with them." (*Medical World*, November, 1924)

Dr. Germain See, (Paris, 1924): "Because of its appeal to reason as well as to sentiment, vivisection will stand as a dark spot in the barbaric past - defended only by those who have a personal interest in defending it. It should be wholly eliminated from scientific research and the vivisector condemned by public opinion - held up to public scorn. The fight against vivisection is a movement born not of sentiment only, and the arousing of human hearts to pity by a few so called ignorant dreamers, but appeals to the deepest feelings of humanity, and can claim, not only a solid basis of scientific truth, but has its foundation in social, philosophic, and moral principles. "

Dr. Ph. Marechal, physician, and also Mayor of the 8th District of Paris, stated in 1914 (as reported in the Journal of the "International League Against Vivisection", Brussels, April/June 1924, p. 13): "Most of the dangerous medicaments, senseless operations and inapplicable theories stem from the criminal and crazy brains of the vivisectors. There have been and still are heroes within the ranks of the medical profession, but we do not want to tolerate monsters within it"

Dr. Eduard Reich, a well-known public health specialist, replied to an invitation to attend a congress against vivisection in Amsterdam: "There can be nothing more pressingly necessary than for the barbarity of vivisection to be fought precisely from the scientific angle. Vivisection is not only the most cruel and loathsome, but also the worst way of conducting research, a shameful discredit to science, the surest path to the brutalisation of doctors and of the whole of society...Every doctor who casts a stone at vivisection is performing a service to science, civilisation, religion and mankind." (*Der Tier-und Menschenfreund*, 1924, issue 2)

Dr. med. Eckbard, Hanover:

"1. Contrary to the opinion deliberately created among the public, by far the majority of cruel animal experiments are made without any anaesthetic. In England, for instance, the country with the best animal welfare legislation, out of 266,478 experiments in 1926, 253,481, that is about 95%, were carried out without any anaesthetic. In Germany there is unfortunately no official figure about this, but it is hardly likely to be significantly different, except for the difference that the number of so-called scientific animal experiments will be much higher here.

"2. The major part of these animal experiments is of no scientific character at all; on the contrary, daily and hourly the most pointless experiments are made. in which even the layman can immediately recognise that they cannot have any serious scientific purpose whatever.

"3. Apart from a few exceptions, animal experiments have led to the most dangerous false conclusions, a situation Professor Hans Much described with these words: "Today's so-called exact science, with its false conclusions drawn from animal to man and from the dead to the living, is the most hollow piece of fanaticism and nonsense of all times." (In a lecture to doctors in Hamburg, 1924).

“4. It is scientifically certain that almost all the medicines and serums produced in the world with such a great hullabaloo and discovered through so-called animal experimentation have in reality turned out to be a total failure. I would point out the damage caused by Insulin, the injuries from Vigantol, the failure of Koch's tuberculin injections, of the measles and scarlet fever serums and many others. Also, the fact that cancer research and treatment has not made one step forwards despite more than 25 years of experimentation on millions of animals, that the views of the leading cancer researchers of all countries do, on the contrary, sharply conflict with each other. Even a procedure anchored in law, such as smallpox vaccination, is now the subject of such strong doubts that Holland has abolished compulsory vaccination for an initial period of two years... (*CIVIS: By and by, all other countries followed suit, as it was proved that vaccination was the principal. and in some countries the only, cause of the infection. Also cancer cases have continued to rise, diabetes has skyrocketed since the introduction of Insulin therapies and, once a rare disease it has become the third cause of death.*)

“Reports on the crushing failures which one has in fact had most recently with diphtheria serum and vaccination have been provided by, among others, Prof. W. Stoelzner, Director of the University Hospital in Koenigsberg (DMW, 1929,) and Prof. Dr. Friedberger, Head of the Institute of Public Health and Immunity Studies in Dahlem. Friedberger stressed to the Pediatrics Association the total uncertainty about the scientific justification for diphtheria inoculation, the unreliability of the figures produced in support of inoculation, and quoted in evidence of the failure of inoculation the fact that out of 100 inoculated children who nevertheless contracted the disease, precisely as many died as did from 100 children who contracted the disease without being inoculated. An accusation made by Prof. Czerny at the Association for Internal Medicine and Pediatrics in Berlin also casts a revealing light on the question of diphtheria inoculation: "All doctors have been dragged into diphtheria inoculation, because a pressure was applied which was almost a compulsion. Such a procedure is unusual, and indeed had never existed before.

“The tuberculin put into the hands of orthodox allopathic medicine, acclaimed at that time as a triumph of vivisection research, killed thousands of people, so that special cemeteries had to be created for the victims of this renowned medicament With regard to the inoculation against canine rabies, I would refer to Pasteur's ‘death lists’. Over two thousand victims succumbed, but not as a result of the dog-bites, which were subsequently found to be non rabid, but due to the rabies injected into them at the Pasteur Institute. The remedies against cholera and the plague have proved to be useless.”

-----

Dr. Germain See, physician (from his essay *Vivisection, its Abuses and Errors*, 1924):

"Vivisection does not limit itself to cutting up living and conscious animals, which is already outrageous in itself. It goes yet further, it subjects unanaesthetised animals quite unnecessarily to the most hideous tortures imaginable. If we break through the sealed doors

of the physiological laboratories, better called torture chambers, if we penetrate the secrecy in which the executioners operate, the following spectacle will be revealed to us. Feeling, devoted and intelligent beings, much more loyal and devoted than ourselves, dogs which are cruelly and brutally shackled in an agonising position, tortured for hours on end by the most appalling methods that one can imagine... These are the experiments that the learned men carry out under the mantle of Science. Is that science?

"After the experiment the torment continues. What happens to these unfortunate martyrs after the experiment is ended? I have seen such poor animals, who were left lying there a whole night, sometimes longer, with their body slit open, a rod between their jaws, all their limbs bound together and unable to make the slightest movement. If the animal victim is unlucky enough not to die, it is used for later experiments. If it is not useful for any further purpose, this living, wincing and bleeding body is thrown into a corner, on top of another body...

"What defence is offered by the vivisectors in the face of these facts? They say that the animals are anaesthetised and that all the rules are followed in order to spare the animals any pain. Here is the truth, as admitted by Mr. Borel, himself a vivisector: 'It's impossible to use anaesthetics in such a way that the animals feel nothing. The pains to which the animals are subjected are so great that they suffer a veritable torment from which only death can release them. The use of curare in no way reduces their sensitivity to pain; on the contrary, it considerably increases it.'"

Mr. H.A.D. Jowett, D. Sc., of the Wellcome Chemical Works, writing on "The Limitation of Physiological Standardization" in *British Medical Journal*, December 8th, 1923, stated: "The chief objection to physiological standardization in the other cases (arsenicals, digitals, and pituitary) is its inherent inaccuracy; there are numerous reasons for this, one is that if intact animals are used, the worker is at the mercy of variations among individual animals, for living animals refuse to be standardized." (p. 1105)

Dr. med. HJ. Oberdoerfer: "In common with all the areas of culture, our entire Science, above all, is in need of reform and repair in all its branches. And especially in physiology and medicine we must re-think everything from the very basics. For these branches of Science have created a total fiasco. Life and experience have proved to be better teachers than hair-splitting and remote- from-life laboratory studies and cruel and unscrupulous vivisections... It would be no mistake, if one did away with the major part of the university professorships in which eccentric academics concoct the ephemeral products of their narrow minds." (*Der Tier- und Menschenfreund*, Nos. 7, 8, 9, 1920)

Dr. J.G.B. Bulloch, physician, Washington, U.S.A.: "When animal tissues are affected by certain procedures, can we assume it to be sufficiently proved that the human body will react in the same way?" (*The Western Medical Times*, July, 1917)

Dr. EH G. Jones, Buffalo: "When we introduce serum into the body to treat a disease, we thereby create disease. Serum treatment has caused heart disease and is one of the reasons why the number of deaths from heart disease has doubled in the past ten years. Our activity

as doctors consists in healing the sick, and we must never cause disease in the human body." (*Western Medical Times*, U.S.A., July, 1917)

Prof. Dr. O. von Herff, Basel: (Extract from an obituary tribute delivered by Dr. Paul Hussy to the Medical Faculty of Basel University, May 5, 1916) "He always emphasized that one could not transfer the results of animal experiments to human beings..."

Sir William Fergusson, surgeon. The work *Grundriss der Geschichte der Medizin (Outline of the History of Medicine)* by Dr. J.H. Bass, states on page 923: "The most important surgeons are brought together at the Hospital of King's College. The famous Sir William Fergusson, the Queen's Surgeon, is working there."

We read the following on page 480 of J. L. Pagel's *Geschichte der Medizin (History of Medicine)*, Berlin 1915: "Sir William Fergusson, an exceptionally skillful operator, who combined the eyes of an eagle with the heart of a lion and the hand of a lady..."

And in the *Korrespondenzblatt fuer Schweizer Aertze*, No. 38, September 28, 1918, it is reported that Prof. Dr. G. Courvoisier of Basel travelled as Assistant Physician to London, where he came into contact with the then great authorities of British surgery, Fergusson, etc. What was the opinion of this exceptionally talented surgeon concerning vivisection? He made the following declaration to the Royal Commission of Enquiry:

"I do not make any more vivisectional experiments. I did so formerly, but now I regret it. I did so because others did it...and because I had no mature insight into the matter." Regarding the way in which experiments are carried out, the same witness stated that "publication of the various details would probably lead to intervention by the public and the high reputation of many learned men would not only be brought down to its proper level, but far below it."

From an article by Walter R. Hadwen, M.D. in the *Abolitionist*, April 1, 1914:

"The fact is, experimental investigation with artificially-produced experimental disease is unscientific and fallacious whether conducted in animals or man. It must not be assumed that an artificially-induced disease is on all fours with a natural infection, or that the type in either case would be invariably the same or that the conclusions arrived at in regard to one particular investigation would be any guide whatever in the case of another.

"Even physiologically a similar fallacy is present. For instance, two American professors have recently been conducting a considerable amount of experimental work upon the spinal cords of dogs in order to discover the function of the anterolateral column. Similar investigations have been conducted by several other prominent men, and the result is that they are all at loggerheads, although the same experiments were conducted on the same parts, in the same way on the same species of animal.

"After the severe operation of cutting through the bony column and exposing the spinal cord, we read: the dog were carefully watched from day to day; generally the first observation recorded were made a day or two after operation, so that the effects of operation itself might



not be mistaken."

The writers (Dr. Williams B. Cadwalader and Dr. J.E. Sweet), whose contribution is published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, go on to remark:

"Here we wish to point out one possible source of confusion. Anyone at all familiar with animals, particularly the laboratory dog, should not lose sight of the fact that their general conduct and intelligence influence the manner in which they react to stimuli of any kind; even in health this may differ very greatly. Each dog has his own peculiarity, and has a distinct individuality not unlike man. Many are extremely dull and apathetic, and others highly-strung, intelligent and active, and accustomed to respond quickly to the various stimuli originating through the association of friends and master.

"After recounting the diametrically opposite conclusions arrived at by different investigators pursuing the same experiments, the writers conclude: Why such contradictory views should be expressed we have no explanation to offer unless it is that the character of the dogs has not always been considered.

"If, then, the nervous constitution of dogs so differs as to vitiate all attempted physiological conclusions, can we wonder if such contradictory views are held by vivisectors respecting disease itself where in most cases the nervous system plays so important a part? And if these differences exist among dogs themselves to such an extent as to prove a bar to truly scientific data, how much more are we likely to be misled in arguing from one human being to another, and still more from animals to man.

"The fact is, the deliberate diseasing of healthy subjects by inoculatory methods bears no proper relation to the contraction of disease by natural methods. The disorganisation of the system by the gradual inroad of disease through some fault of constitution or environment must perforce be an altogether different process from that of the direct injection of diseased matter into a healthy subject whose constitution has undergone no natural preparation for its reception.

"If, for instance, the products of pneumonic disease be injected into a healthy animal, even into the lung, instead of pneumonia, blood poisoning is produced; and we have every right to assume that the same thing would result if injected into a human being.

"The whole system of artificial inoculation is beset with fallacies. That 'the proper study of mankind is man' must be admitted, but let man be studied in a proper and scientific manner. Nature is ever performing her own experiments in accident and disease, and it is, in the study of these experiments and the justifiable attempts to remedy them or prevent them in accordance with natural and truly scientific laws that all our brilliant triumphs in the knowledge of preventive and curative methods have been achieved."

-----

Excerpt from Dr. Walter Hadwen's address delivered at Newcastle-on-Tyne, March 5, 1914,

with the title "A Medical View of the Vivisection Question":

"I maintain that the ordinary man in the street knows quite as much of this subject as the ordinary medical man, simply because the great bulk of both classes know nothing whatever about it. If you take the medical man and cross examine him upon it, I think he will confess, in the majority of cases, that he does not know anything about the subject. You cannot understand it unless you make the subject one of independent study. Unless you investigate from an entirely independent standpoint, unless you are educated upon it, you cannot understand it. The investigation of this matter forms no part of a medical curriculum. It is a great mistake to suppose that medical men generally are authorities upon the subject of experimentation upon living animals. We are not out to fight the medical men of this land - the 30,000 medical men upon the Medical Register, who know nothing about it - we are out to fight 400 or 500 vivisectors who are licensed by the British Government, and who perform their 80,000 to 90,000 experiments annually upon these poor, defenceless creatures. These are the men we are out to fight. The medical profession knows nothing about it, and practically, in this respect, the medical man is no better off than the ordinary man in the street.

"Now, you may ask, "What credentials have you? What gives you any authority to speak on this subject, more than any other ordinary medical man?" Simply this: I have studied both sides of the question, and the majority of my medical colleagues have only accepted one side. I was brought up to believe in vivisection; I accepted at my college and university all the assertions that were made in regard to vivisection, namely, that great discoveries had been made by this practice, and that it was the only means by which such discoveries could be achieved in the future, and I took all this for granted, and I accepted it as a matter of course. For some years after I was in active practice I still believed in it, still backed up the assertions which I had so readily accepted, until I was at last led to investigate the matter for myself from an independent standpoint, and as the result of that investigation I came to the conclusion that no knowledge whatever had been gained by experiments upon animals but what could have been gained, had been gained by other means of a harmless character; and further, I came to the conclusion that nothing whatever gained from experimentation upon living animals had been of the slightest benefit in the amelioration or the cure of any human ailment or disease.

"Now, that is a very bold assertion to make, you may say, in the face of the generally accepted opinion of the time. It is not a matter of whether I am in a minority amongst medical men or in the majority; that is not the point. We have not to deal with majorities or minorities, but, as I said at the outset of my address, we have to ask ourselves: Is Vivisection right or wrong? The unanimity, or otherwise, of the medical profession makes no difference to the right or wrong of a question, because the medical profession has been unanimously wrong so many times that really one has almost come to the conclusion that it never has been unanimous except when it has been unanimously wrong. Through the whole of history minorities have, as a rule, been in the right. But do not let us argue from that standpoint, but let me press upon you again and again, that we must ask ourselves: Is Vivisection right or is Vivisection wrong?"

"You may say: "What led you to the conclusion at which you have arrived?" Well, strange to say, it was the vivisectors themselves who converted me to anti-vivisection. I found that the contradictions among them were so great that no sooner did one vivisector bring forward one statement when another vivisector was already ready to come forward and contradict it while performing precisely the same experiment as his predecessor..."

-----  
Dr. med. Hans Fischer, Hohenhausen: "...what vivisectors do to man and animal is high treason. Vivisectors know what they are doing, are precisely aware of how criminal and how dangerous to the State their actions are when they carry out crimes in the service of Science on such people as they consider to belong to the lower classes - like the lord of the manor considered the coachman..." (*Der Tier-und Menschenfreund*. 1914, No. 1)

From an article in the *Abolitionist* of July 1, 1913, by Dr. Herbert Snow, M.D.:

"As a doctor I may be permitted to add my humble testimony to all that Dr. Hadwen has told you - that no useful advance in human knowledge has ever, so far as we can ascertain, proceeded from experiments on animals, and that all boasted triumphs in that direction are utterly false. And whenever knowledge proceeding from experiments on these animals has been relied on, it has been grossly misleading. You, my lord, said in your opening address that this is essentially a moral question. I do not dispute that, but I want to point out that it is also essentially a question of commonsense; in other words, it is not a question for the expert. Those who have mastered and accepted the principles on which we act, including the principle that no scientific inference is ever possible between phenomena in the lower animals and in man - a principle admitted universally by our adversaries - know that the whole thing must be a fraud, and nothing more.

"It is also essentially a question of ignorance. Doctors, unfortunately, are terribly ignorant of vivisection, of what is done in vivisection, and of the principles on which we oppose it There could be no better proof of that than a letter which appeared the other day in the Press, with about 150 doctors' names on it, praising the vivisectionists in reference to a recent deplorable trial of which I need not further speak. I know a great many of those doctors. They are what I hope all doctors are - well-meaning and inoffensive men. But they have never studied vivisection; they know nothing whatever about it.

"In conclusion, I would like to quote, as well as I can remember them, words which impressed me very much when I first read them. They were uttered a few years ago by Admiral Togo, the hero of the late Russo-Japanese war. He remarked that what counted most in a man throughout his life was the element of the soldier, the fighting spirit in him. That is just what we are called upon to show in reference to this question of vivisection - the fighting spirit to the utmost. And I am sure, from what we have seen and heard tonight, that there will be no thought of looking back. We shall all do our very best until this iniquitous, and unscientific, and utterly useless vivisection system has been rooted out from our midst." (Applause.)

-----  
The same issue carried an "Obituary" of another prominent antivivisectionist doctor, Dr. Forbes Winslow:

"Most of the leading London papers published lengthy obituary notices of Dr. Forbes Winslow, the eminent brain specialist, who died suddenly, on the morning of June 8, from a heart attack. He was in his seventieth year. Dr. Winslow was the founder of the British Hospital for Mental Diseases. He was remarkable as the first physician to urge the plea of insanity in criminal cases. This is now such a commonplace idea that it is difficult to realise that it required courage and independence of mind in a physician convinced of its truth to bring it forward in the first instance. It was violently opposed on moral and theological grounds, until the amount of evidence forthcoming in its support compelled attention, and finally acceptance.

"Dr. Winslow first came into prominence in connection with the Penge mystery, in 1877. He was intimately connected as an expert with many famous criminal cases, such as the Tichborne case, the trial of Mrs. Dyer, the Maybrick murder, and the series of terrible crimes laid to the door of the unknown 'Jack the Ripper', whom Dr. Winslow always regarded as a morbid religious enthusiast who had become insane. He received many letters signed "Jack the Ripper", the handwriting of which corresponded with that of the murderer, and when he published the result of his investigations the crimes suddenly ceased. Dr. Forbes Winslow was always emphatic in his condemnation of vivisection, expressing the view that it was specially misleading and ridiculous in brain investigations. He was indignant at the proposal to license Cardiff Mental Hospital for Vivisection. and took part in our protest meeting held there on June 8. 1911. He also wrote a letter to *The South Wales Daily News*, in which he remarked:

"Vivisectioning animals is only a lame excuse for experiments on human beings. This. I emphatically declare, is done, although unknown to the Commissioners in Lunacy.'

"And again:

"Forty years' study of the treatment of insanity in my official connection with three London hospitals has failed to elicit one single diagnosis or cure which I have to thank the vivisectioners for. In the last annual report of the Commissioners in Lunacy. who visited all asylums during the year and inspected 130,593 inmates, not one single line chronicles the cure of any patient through the medium of serum."

-----  
From a long article in the *Animals' Guardian* of January 1913, by Dr. William R.D. Blackwood, a Philadelphia physician:

"I have been opposed to vivisection all my life, and I have been opposed to it for several reasons. First of all, because of the frightful cruelty which is inflicted upon the victims who are vivisected, both animals and human beings, and because of the absolute senselessness and

inutility of the whole business. If a single fact has been established that is for the good of human beings by vivisection. I do not know it. I read everything I get hold of. I listen to all they have to say. I have been present at a good many vivisections in my time, and I have never yet seen anything demonstrated that was for the good of suffering humanity...

"Vivisection has never produced a solitary result for the good of humanity, although it has been in operation for several hundred years. and it never will produce any, because it is impossible to treat human bodies in the same way and obtain the same results as you would in animals. It is absolute nonsense. and I hope the day will come, and I think it is coming, when vivisection will be looked down upon and vivisectionists will not be considered gentlemen, but will be looked upon as cowardly, miserable rascals, and that is what they are!!!

"I am satisfied that the light thrown upon medical knowledge from a hundred carefully conducted post-mortem investigations has been of more value to the profession and to mankind than all experiments of all the vivisectors that have ever lived."

Dr. W. Dodge. physician: "The vivisector's laboratory is a veritable chamber of horrors, a real brothel of pseudo-science. Vivisectional experiments are not one jot less cruel, godless and shameful than the horror of the auto-da-fe in the Dark Ages. Moreover, vivisection is totally useless, because experiments on living animals have never taught us anything useful for human surgery and medicine, and for obvious reasons can never teach us anything."

*(The Open Door, Jan. 1913, No. 6)*

Dr. George Wilson, LL. D., a Medical Officer of Health, who was appointed a member of the Royal Commission on Vivisection (1906-12) declared in a Reservation Memorandum appended to the findings of that Commission: "The real advance in modern medicine has depended almost entirely on clinical diagnosis, therapeutics, and pathology, guided by a careful study of natural causes, but not upon experiments on animals, which are inherently misleading in their application to man, and therefore, always more or less unreliable."

Dr. Stephen Townsend, M.R.C.S.: "I studied physiology for three years at the London Hospital, and I passed the examination in physiology for admission to the Royal College of Surgeons without ever having been present at an experiment on a living animal or having any need for this. After that I lectured for two years at the physiology classes at a Scottish university where these experiments were performed for demonstration purposes. I had to come to the conclusion that these experiments were not only unnecessary, but actually caused a totally unjustified waste of time." *(The Anti-Vivisection Review. Sept.-Oct. 1912)*

Dr. med. Marie Heim-Voegtlin, Zurich: "The fact that all these experiments are repeated for the hundredth time in the lecture- hall is irresponsible, and quite certainly a brutalizing influence on our young doctors, many of whom quite definitely carry over their hardened attitude towards the tormented animals into their subsequent medical practice." (Letter dated Aug. 1912)

Excerpt from an article in the *Abolitionist* of May 1, 1912, reporting in full an interview with Dr. Doyen, a French researcher, which had appeared in the *Paris Journal* and of which *The Morning Leader* of February 22, had already published a brief summary: "For my research I use neither guinea-pigs nor mice nor rabbits; I consider it, in fact, a grave error to try to study the whole of human therapeutics on small animals. The tuberculosis of the guinea-pig is not that of man, any more than the cancer of mice is identical with that of man. It is precisely because masses of animals are killed so uselessly in all the laboratories that therapeutical research has been sterile for so long. I have made, like other savants, hecatombs of guinea-pigs. I have proved that the results obtained with these animals do not in the least apply to man. For example, one can inject twenty doses of atrophine under the skin of a guinea-pig which would be fatal for an adult man. I have tried my vaccines on myself in order to prove their innocuity to the human system."

Dr. med. E. Fries, specialist, Zurich: "It is thoroughly illogical to seek to draw conclusions regarding physiology or normal life from experiments performed on living animals in enforced and therefore pathological circumstances." (Zurich, Apr. 11, 1912)

Dr. Fratscher, general practitioner, Kreuzlingen: "... is in agreement with the aims of the International Alliance against Vivisection." (Letter dated Apr. 1, 1912)

The wife of Dr. Emmenengger, Lucerne: "In reply to your praiseworthy literature about vivisection, I am writing to inform you that my husband would certainly have joined this movement, but he died in February." (Lucerne, Mar. 28, 1912)

Dr. H. Boucher, physician, Issy-les-Moulineaux, France: "In all ages Man has sought to justify the cruelty of his actions by decking them under the mantle of a lofty ideal...In our present age, in which cruelty has in fact only changed its form, but in which we profess to be more enlightened than in former times, living creatures are tortured in the name of higher interests of humanity, in the name of Science...It goes without saying that today's torturers, like their predecessors, boast of the gratifying results of their cruel methods. Thus in all the journals at their disposal, in all their classical works, they turn the heads of the young by asserting that it is thanks to vivisection that Harvey discovered the circulation of blood, Galvani electricity, Claude Bernard the causes for the formation of sugar in the human organism, and so forth. Finally, in order to prove the triumph of their method, they remind us that it resulted in the invention of the "healing" sera for diseases. Well, we are not afraid to say all these statements are in fact false, that tortures, whether religious, legal or scientific, have always produced only hideous results, and that they have led only to error, disaster and degeneration..." (From his lecture at the Fifth International Anti-Vivisection Congress in Zurich, 1912)

Dr. Duekow, general practitioner in Poltawa, Russia: "... Brought up in this unhealthy atmosphere of both clinical and experimental violence, the doctor gradually loses all compassion for living creatures and gets a quite perverted conception of his extraordinary superiority, which enables him to consider himself the sole master of all creation and to sacrifice everything to his supposed Science. This feeling of superiority finally becomes

habitual to him, so that he also looks down upon his fellow men, the sick, as mere objects for scientific investigation and experiments, and considers them as clinical material which he can handle just as he chooses for the purpose of settling his "scientific" doubts. So it is not at all strange or unusual if the doctors, in this atmosphere so destructive to all human feeling, seize on the new vaccination method with pleasure, in order to use it both on healthy as well as on ailing "human material", as they think fit, partly for experimental purposes... " (*Ueber die Notwendigkeit einer Reform der gegenwartigen medizinischen Universitaetsbildung - On the need for reform of current medical training at universities* - Leipzig, 1912, p. 42)

Dr. med. Segesser, Degersheim: "Vivisection has no right to exist. Only through a natural way of living and healing, and in certain cases a surgical operation, can one prevent and heal diseases, but not by applying to human beings the results obtained through experiments on animals." (Letter dated Feb. 1912)

"An experiment on an animal gives no certain indication of the result of the same experiment on a human being." (Dr. Robert Koch, *Report of the Second Royal Commission on Vivisection*.

1906-1912, p.31, par.48)

"The discovery of anaesthetics owes nothing to experiments on animals. " (*Report of Royal Commission on Vivisection*, 1912, p. 26)

The well-known German physician, Dr. Wolfgaog Boho, in the medical journal *Aerztliche Mitteilungen* (No. 7/8, 1912): "The proclaimed purpose of vivisection has not been achieved in any field, and it can be predicted that it won't be achieved in the future either. On the contrary, vivisection has caused enormous damage, has killed thousands of people... We have a great number of medicines and therapeutical techniques which have been perfected without torturing animals, but they have not been used and propagated as they deserve because our generation of researchers don't know any other method than the vivisectionist one... The constant spread of the vivisectionist method has achieved but one thing: to increase the scientific torture and murder of human beings. We can expect this increase to continue, for it would just be the logical consequence of animal vivisection."

## **1000 DOCTORS (AND MANY MORE) AGAINST VIVISECTION**

Edited by Hans Ruesch

First published 1989 Ó Hans Ruesch Foundation

(PART 4 OF 4)

Dr. Ernest de Coster, Brussels, senior physician in the Belgian Army: "I am not a supporter of vivisection, for medicine has learnt nothing from these experiments. The conditions of life are completely different for the human being and the animal..."

Dr. med. Reuss: "But I should like to warn against one thing, against overestimating experiments on animals. Animals often react basically differently to poisons, ie. to narcotics, than humans do. The maximum human daily dosage hardly produces any significant effect on a dog, but many animals, on the other hand, have immensely lower resistance to the fatty narcotics such as chloroform." (*Zahnaerztliche Rundschau*, Berlin, 1912, p.48)

Dr. G.R. Laurent, physician (from his work *Qu' est-ce que la vivisection?* - "What is vivisection?" 1912):

"The physiological laboratories are nothing but torture chambers, and animal experiments are a real barbarity. Whereas in past, times one encountered representatives of an advanced humanity, people who were ahead of their time and already dreamed of brotherliness and goodness, nowadays there still exist representatives of a type of human that belongs to the savage and cruel past. In today's society there are primitive, retarded beings such as the alcoholics or those who have retained predatory and murderous instincts - such as burglars, murderers - and vivisectors..."

"Vivisection is dangerous. It is dangerous not only because it results in depravity, but also because it proliferates errors, since the experimental animal is put by vivisection into an abnormal condition which never arises in practice. Vivisection is additionally dangerous because it draws conclusions from animals and applies them to humans. The experimenters dispute with each other; they overturn the theories that have been slowly and laboriously worked out in the laboratories, as soon as they are presented. It is impossible to learn anything from this flood of contradictory opinions. All of them contradict each other. The experimental results are different for animals of different species, even for individual animals of the same species, some times even for the same animal at different times during the experiment..."

"What can we learn of use to mankind from experiments like the following? The vivisector, Schiff, filled the stomachs of his experimental dogs with sand, pebbles, and limestone, after the pylorus had been sewn up. He also poured water at temperatures of 60 to 120 degrees into the stomachs of rabbits; the suffering of these unfortunate animals only ended with death a few days after the experiment. Wertheim poured boiling oil or turpentine over dogs and then set fire to them. Paschutin and Petermann stripped the skin from living dogs. What is the value of freezing living animals, or boiling them to death in water heated by stages to ever-higher temperatures? Of what use are the experiments with poisons, when we know that they have nothing like the same effect on animals of the same species, and even less so on animals of different species?"

"How does one expect to deduce, from the results obtained on certain animals, what results one would obtain with humans? But the vivisector Bennett carried out six hundred and



nineteen experiments of this kind, and Orfila sacrificed six thousand animals for his poisoning experiments! For these ludicrous and abominable experiments, Schiff alone massacred fourteen thousand animals.

"Why all these cruelties? For nothing. only for the pleasure of it! Not one single discovery can be undisputably attributed to experimental physiology. Its result is a pathetic zero. Not the slightest advantage has been derived from the numerous painful, maiming and deadly experiments..."

-----

L. Forbes Winslow, DCL, MD, LLD. MRCP (1844 - 1913): "Vivisection is against all principles of religion...As a result of forty years experience I say that vivisection should not be tolerated. (From his address given at Caxton Hall, Dec. 5. 1910)

Dr. med. E. Reich: "Surely nobody can be so stupid as to believe that the same experimenter who in the morning has caused animals this appalling suffering will in the afternoon treat his fellow-men with brotherly love. On the contrary, in 99 out of 100 cases it is certain that this treatment can only be a series of experiments and will ultimately deliver the patients to the dissection slab of pathological anatomy." (Scheveningen, Villa Sabina)

Med. Dr. Hans Tumpach. general practitioner, Deutsch-Gabel (Bohemia): "Ailing mankind gets little use from animal experimentation." (Dec. 4, 1909)

Med. Dr. Leopold Schmelz, Vienna: "Only he who has himself helplessly faced human beasts some time in his life can perhaps sense some part of the unutterable suffering that a poor, tortured, vivisected animal has to endure." (Oct 21, 1909)

Med. Dr. Franz Cemy. Prague: "I am happy to sign this petition, for I too am of the opinion that today's vivisection is nothing but cruelty towards animals. " (Oct. 1909)

Med. Dr. Anton Mastny, gynaecologist, Prague: "Any humane doctor must be an opponent of vivisection."

Med.Dr. Ludwig Salus, district panel doctor, Hernkretschchen a-d- E.: "I can only most warmly welcome and recommend the action which has been started against vivisection. The latter is cruel, is brutalising in its effects, is misleading and, therefore, unscientific." (Oct. 18, 1909)

Med. Dr. Carl Schmiedel, Vienna: "Modern diagnostics certainly did not reach the high level at which it now stands through animal experiments, but through diligent study at the sick-bed; vivisection is highly irrelevant to therapy; animal experiments do not belong in the lecture room; the lessons gathered from animal experiments are well-established axioms which it is totally unnecessary to repeatedly demonstrate. Vivisection is, like hunting, to be seen as the hobby of mentally decadent people, and must be legally forbidden." (Oct. 15, 1909)

Med. Dr. Karl Kornfeld, specialist in diseases of the stomach and intestines, Prague: "I am opposed to vivisection on principle." (Oct. 14, 1909)

Dr. Ludwig Kalteis, district physician, Strasswalchen near Salzburg: "I am a convinced opponent of vivisection." (Oct. 11, 1909)

Med. Dr. Hermann Schiffer, general practitioner, Krems (Lower Austria): "Away with the knacker's men with their scientific arrogance! To keep repeating the same experiments on gagged animals is no longer an urge for research, but pleasure in torturing - perversion." (Oct. 6, 1909)

Med. Dr. Leo Zamara, district and health resort physician, Rauris near Zell a.S.: "... Away, away with animal experiments, at least, the most flagrant wrong done to animals!" (Oct. 6, 1909)

Med. Dr. Josef Drobny, district physician, Moraschitz, Bohemia: "I am fully in agreement with the bills against vivisection, for the abolition of vivisection can only be seen as an advance in public education." (Oct. 6, 1909)

Med. Dr. Max Neumann, general practitioner, Vienna: "I have never been a supporter of vivisection." (Oct. 5, 1909)

Med. Dr. Pretislav Pacal, dentist, Prague: "I have pleasure in welcoming your fight against vivisection, which is a scandal of the 20th century." (Oct. 5, 1909)

Med. Dr. Adolf Petschauer, Prague: "I can only wish the (anti-vivisection) society's efforts the best of success." (Oct. 5, 1909)

Dr. Karl Praitschopf, general practitioner, Maria-Saal (Carinthia): " 'Only a good person can be a good doctor' says Nothnagel. I cannot consider those who remove half of a dog's thorax wall- in order to demonstrate the movement of the heart - good people." (October 5, 1909)

Dr. Franz Kohut, district physician, Schichowitz (Bohemia): "The undersigned has been and remains an opponent of vivisection." (October 5, 1909)

Dr. med. Hugo Kecht, Ear, Nose, Throat and Chest Specialist: "Doctors who speak out in favour of vivisection do not deserve any recognition in Society, all the more so since their brutality is apparent not only during such experiments, but also in their practical medical lives. They are mostly men who stop at nothing in order to satisfy their ruthless and unfeeling lust for honors and gain." (Linz, October 5, 1909)

Med. Dr. Hieronymus Svetineich, general practitioner, Mauer (Lower Austria):

"If one declares vivisection to be indispensable, that is a matter of opinion. But it is a fact that the results of animal experiments have continually proved to be dubious, contradictory, often misleading and even harmful. As a dividing line between experimentation and cruelty to animals also seems hardly possible in the case of vivisection, and since the profession of doctor cannot be identified with that of an executioner, I am, in keeping with the intentions of my widely-renowned teacher Hyrte, for the unconditional abolition of vivisection, for it only spreads dangerous brutalization on the one hand and barbaric destruction on the other."

(October 5, 1909)

Med. Dr. Emil Schwarzkopf, general practitioner, Vienna: "The many experiments on animals, which often stem from a sickly obsession with immortality, cause more harm than good and lead to deadening of the doctor's humane feelings. One day of sound observation beside the sick-bed teaches us more than a hundred days of cruel animal experimentation." (October 5, 1909)

Med. Dr. Josef Wolf, district physician, Helfenberg (Upper Austria): "I have always been a firm opponent of vivisection." (October 5, 1909)

Med. Dr. Rudolf Neumann, general practitioner, Vienna: "Anyone who experiments 'scientifically' on an animal will also not hold back from 'scientifically' experimenting on a human being. Such science, however, is deserving of condemnation by everyone." (October 4, 1909)

Med. Dr. Ottokar Hanel, general practitioner, Neu-Bydzow (Bohemia): "The learned lawyers of earlier centuries also considered torture to be absolutely necessary for obtaining evidence!" (October 4, 1909)

Dr. med. Hans v. Hepperger-Hoffenstal, former clinical assistant, specialist in nervous diseases and psychiatry, Bolzano: "In order to prove extremely unimportant, so-called 'scientific' facts to us students, poor helpless animals were tormented in the most irresponsible way." (Bolzano, 4 October 1909)

District veterinary surgeon Dr. Zermecke, Elbing: "The horrible disease-causing agents are injected under the skin, in the most varied body cavities - even into the brain and eyes - of these unfortunate animals, so that a slow infirmity sets in, lasting for many weeks, until the animals finally perish dreadfully from the results of this transmission of infectious diseases. It is a deliverance when they are finally found dead one morning, on the floor of their cramped cage..." (*Aertzliche Mitteilungen*, September 1909, No. 9)

Dr. med. Wolfgang Bohn - *Surgery and Vivisection*: "...Animal experimentation has helped lead us into the errors of vaccination and serum therapy, it has helped the growth in the excessive use of surgery, without rendering any service to surgery itself, it has provided mankind with a stream of drugs and with a hundred mishaps, which it would have been better for mankind never to have got acquainted with, vivisection has not in any way shown how to heal disease, or pointed the way to natural healing...In hospitals one has got used to violence being canied out on the sick for experimental purposes..." (*Aertzliche Mitteilungen*, 1909, No. 7189)

Dr. Guido Kretz, general practitioner, Braunau am Inn: "Anyone who has no feeling for an animal can also possess no feeling for a human being." (December 3, 1908)

Dr. Josef Dalbosco, district and health cure physician, Rabbi (Trentino, Tyrol): "As I am convinced that nobody and nothing in the world is absolutely necessary, and that animals

have the right not to be tortured, something which doctors should know and understand better than anybody, I declare my opposition to every scientific experiment on living animals."  
(November 22, 1908)

Dr. Peter Galzigna, district physician in Arbe, Dalmatia: "Being convinced and aware of how painful even the slightest knife incision is for patients, I can clearly deduce how great the torment must be for the poor animals under vivisection. Such a practice must therefore be called inhumane, and I join with my humane colleagues who are taking action against such a practice." (November 19, 1908)

Dr. Eduard Fischer, consultant to the Emperor, holder of the Golden Distinguished Service Cross and Crown, physician at Gross-Tajax, Moravia: "I have been and remain a determined opponent of vivisection." (November 18, 1908)

Dr. Gustav Blankensteiner, general practitioner, Straning, Lower Austria: "I am totally in agreement with a stand being made against vivisection..." (November 18, 1908)

Dr. Bronislav v. Majerski, general practitioner, resident physician, public medical officer, obstetrician and panel doctor, holder of the Golden Distinguished Service Cross and Crown, Czernowicz, Bukowina: "I am absolutely against vivisection; it reduces public confidence in the medical profession." (November 17, 1908)

Dr. Josef Kroo, general practitioner in Buczacz, Galicia: "From the ethical viewpoint, vivisection is an atrocity. From the theoretical standpoint it is a proved piece of nonsense, shown up as such by the most extreme contradictions of its findings and real facts. From the practical viewpoint it is quite useless, due to being damaging, because the young students are demoralised by it. People who torture a wretched animal for no purpose are perpetrating an inexcusable crime...I am an opponent of every vivisection experiment in any circumstances." (November 16, 1908)

Dr. Josef Ritter v. Lachmueller, doctor and dentist, Brixen, Tyrol: "I was always an opponent of vivisection before the big audience in the lecture hall. It is nothing but a pointless and cruel torture of animals, which every student who has any heart must abominate." (November 16, 1908)

Dr. Josef Fuchs, district physician in Brand, Lower Austria: "It still torments my conscience to have joined in looking at those demonstrations of long-known facts without protesting, and to have taken part in what is a crime." (November 16, 1908)

Dr. Karl Georg Panesch, specialist, Vienna: "I consider it cowardly and morally deeply contemptible when a doctor, although convinced of the total justification for the Austrian Anti-vivisection League's petition to the State Council, does not sign the declaration out of fear that his signature could make him enemies among his powerful colleagues." (November 12, 1908)

Dr. Heinrich Deluggi, general practitioner, Bolzano: "I am opposed to vivisection on principle, for true science should never resort to criminal activities." (October 20, 1908)

Dr. med. Rud. Roubal, district doctor in Wamberg, Bohemia: "26 years ago, as I recall, when I was a medical student, things were demonstrated to me on a laboratory animal which any normal brain could have expressed and understood with ten words." (September 30, 1908)

Dr. A. Laab, Graz: "Vivisection is unscientific and misleading, and therefore useless; what is more, cruel, brutalising and immoral; it is in truth a crime." (September 19, 1908)

Dr. Julius Winkler, general practitioner, Abbazia: "Vivisection awakens cruelty in the young doctor, and destroys in him the noblest human sentiments: compassion and humanity." (September 19, 1908)

Dr. Max Mader, general practitioner, Graz: "Vivisection is rooted in error and when the truth becomes known it will disappear." (September 16, 1908)

Dr. Eduard Emmel, consultant to the Emperor, health care physician, Graefenberg: "The horrors of vivisection are inhuman and a scandal for mankind, in fact, a crime which serves no purpose." (November 16, 1908)

Dr. Heinrich Moser, general practitioner in Trient, Tyrol: "I am totally against vivisection, for I consider it inhuman cruelty." (November 16, 1908)

Dr. Karl Zaleski, general practitioner, Sanok, Galicia: "Without vivisection, without the urge to do what is fashionable. Medicine would be able to achieve better results." (November 15, 1908)

Dr. Johann Maneth, public health and district physician, also a qualified veterinary surgeon: "I am against vivisection!" (November 15, 1908)

Dr. Johann Perco, general practitioner in Capodistria: "I have the greatest pleasure in signing the attached statement and enthusiastically welcome the honest and noble endeavours of my colleagues...The disgusting indifference towards cruelty to animals is certainly not justified by the results so far obtained through such tortures." (October 29, 1908)

Dr. Leopold Nemrad, general practitioner, Olmutz, Moravia: "Vivisection...no longer corresponds to the spirit of our time. It is inhuman, unworthy of medical science and in no way necessary to it." (September 14, 1908)

Dr. Felix Schaffer, district physician, Murzzuschlag, Steiermark: "Every vivisection experiment means torturing an animal, and this is a scandal." (September 13, 1908)

Dr. Jaroslav Barth, general practitioner, Prague: "Vivisection is just as terrible an error in the field of medical science as the medieval inquisition was in the Church - in both cases it was believed that it was beneficial to Mankind." (September 12, 1908)

Dr. Hermann Platter, district physician and medical consultant to the railway authorities, PetU1en am Arlberg, Tyrol: "Many vivisectors inject, insert and pour any possible poison and acid substance into this and that living animal, and then into all their organs, so as to see

what sort of effect this produces. This is a totally purposeless and senseless exercise, aimed at satisfying childish curiosity, but is also despicably cruel and cowardly, because the poor animal victim is completely helpless against these human monsters." (September 9, 1908)

Dr. Emanuel Pochmann, general practitioner, Linz: "Today's vivisection experiments on animals are devoid of any value for science as regards healthy or sick human beings. Any doctor who works scientifically has to abhor them." (September 8, 1908)

Dr. Franz Seidl, regimental physician to the 3rd Infantry Regiment, Kremsier: "Nothing good and lastingly good can ever come from behaviour that is in its nature bad; therefore no benefit can ever come to mankind from vivisection." (September 7, 1908)

Dr. Anton J. Aust, works doctor, district and panel doctor, Gaal: "Cruelty towards animals hardens one's feelings towards humans." (September 7, 1908)

#### AUSTRIAN AND HUNGARIAN DOCTORS

In 1908, at the time of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, the Anti-Vivisection League of Austria (long since defunct), with seat in Graz, addressed both Houses of Austria's Parliament with a memorandum (Denkschrift) protesting against the Vivisectionist method of "research". The following medical authorities signed the petition: (In the book '1000 Doctors' there follows a lengthy list of names, here omitted.)

Dr. Josef Theuille, senior district physician, Landeck, Tyrol: "Vivisection seems to me an atrocity and a contradiction of Nature." (September 7, 1908)

Dr. Karl Fischer-Colbrie, general practitioner, Vienna: "I have always been horrified at the cruelty of vivisection..." (September 6, 1908)

Dr. Josef Gratzinger, Vienna: "Vivisection has so far done precious little for suffering mankind, but has caused numerous living creatures unspeakable torments. " (September 6, 1908)

Dr. Julius, general practitioner and dentist, Bielitz (Silesia): "Away with animal experimentation!" (March 20, 1908)

Dr. Med. N.P. Krawkow: "Anyone who has ever chloroformed dogs knows how difficult that is to achieve and how pronounced the excitation stage is with them, even after a previous morphine injection. When chloroform is used alone, on the other hand, the blood pressure rises immediately after removal of the mask, and the animal soon begins to react to pain stimuli, and awakens...Following anaesthesia with chloroform the animals visibly feel very bad and recover more slowly..." (*Archiv fur experimentel/e Pathologie und Pharmakologie*, p. 322, 1908)

Dr. Rudolf Kaiser, district panel doctor, Pemitz, Lower Austria: "I endorse the above declaration and would add the comment that it is the duty of every humane-thinking doctor to give the utmost support to this movement. The more doctors support the abolition of scientific experiments on living animals, the more respect the medical profession will gain." (December

20, 1907)

Dr. Eugen von Kosierowski, Assistant in medical chemistry at the University of Lemberg, general practitioner and panel doctor in Grybow, Galicia: "I am in agreement, out of inner conviction, and with the greatest sympathy for this noble causer" (November 17, 1907)

Dr. Josef Ortner, general practitioner, Lambrechtshausen, Salzburg: "The abominable malpractice called vivisection, which is a sign of total mental as well as ethical depravity, must without question be abolished." (November 15, 1907)

Dr. Philippe Perco, general practitioner, Sitzendorf, Lower Austria: "I declare my agreement to the immediate and total abolition of scientific experiments on animals, without any exception whatever." (October 12, 1907)

Dr. med. Selss of Frankfurt delivered a lecture at the Palmensaal in Berne on March 21, 1907. This included the following passages:

"The young doctors are repeatedly required to join in animal experiments. Any feeling in the hearts of the students is systematically killed. The medical world is degenerating. Compassion is systematically being taken away from the students at the universities. A certain professor has stated that he would like to lead the young people to the point where they take pleasure in vivisecting. Young, pushy types who want to be on top in everything use animal experiments in order to acquire cheap scientific fame.

"Vivisection is absolutely not a scientific method. The practical doctor does not need it. Many a doctor who spurned this suggestion in his youth has, in later years, or on his deathbed looked back with desperation and remorse at the atrocities he perpetrated on animals in the past."

Dr. med. Ed. Berdoe:

"It is clear to any thinking person that there is a great difference between an operation for the purpose of a cure and vivisection for the purpose of an experiment. The surgeon wants his patient well, the experimenter demands of his victim the knowledge which he is looking for. In many cases anaesthesia 1) thwarts the result of the experiment; 2) endangers the life of the animal, if it is effectively administered, and; 3) can only be maintained for a short part of the time for which the pain lasts.

"I could fill a book; they are a great blot on the escutcheon of medical science and although they are unquestionably carried out by enthusiastic 'researchers' they are disapproved of by general medical opinion. But, from time to time, the laboratory experimenters find their way into the hospital wards and perform experiments on helpless patients that can only be described with very ugly words." (*Katechismus der Vivisektion*, p. 67 and 121)

Dr. Robert Koch, in Report to the Royal Commission of 1906, p. 31: "An experiment on an animal gives no certain indication of the result of the same experiment on a human being."

During the first decade of 1900, surgeon Stephen Smith contributed this testimony to the second *Royal Commission Report*: "The first time I saw a brutal experiment on an unanaesthetized animal I wished to leave the room, I was sickened by it. The next time I was less affected, and eventually I was able to look on at the most terrible things without my emotions being moved in any way...I submit that what occurred in my own case probably occurs to everybody..."

Dr. med. Artur Laab, Graz, in his paper *Fort mit der Vivisektion! (Away with Vivisection!)* (Graz, 1905):

"Any doctor is dishonourable who, contrary to his finer feelings as a person, contrary to the inner voice of his conscience and of what is right, and contrary to his convictions as a scientist, gives approval to, defends or even merely silently accepts physiological experiments on animals, otherwise known as vivisection, instead of courageously and uncompromisingly fighting against an extremely deplorable scientific aberration..."

"Under the mask of 'science', under the protective wings of a State which is dazzled and blinded by the hypocritical lustre of a brutalized, egoistical and self-seeking science of falsehood, thousands, whole hecatombs of mostly highly-developed and sensitive animals are tortured to death every year, by the day and hour and every minute of the day and night, in a cruel and brutal manner which is hardly conceivable by the human imagination, without - as we shall hear shortly - even the very slightest actual use of any kind emerging from this barbaric so-called 'method of enquiry'.

"Vivisection is unscientific, useless, misleading...Vivisection has never, ever served an actual truly incontestable scientific purpose, it is not doing so today and it will never do so, because it is incapable of doing so. But vivisection certainly has to be described and branded as unscientific; for it has conjured up the most gross errors, it has produced the most calamitous fallacies. Vivisection has never served the purpose of true science, but in fact only the contemptible purpose of self-advancement, ambition and personal gain.

"Vivisectors are known to suffer from a scientific epidemic, one which is furthermore steadily on the increase: from a rampant and contagious obsession with knowledge. They are no longer fully of sound mind, no longer competent to judge."

-----

Dr. James Burnet, senior physician at the Royal Hospital in Edinburgh (extract from a letter to the *Medical Times and Hospital Gazette*, July, 1905): "If medical or surgical science is to make advances in the future, this will not happen through the knowledge collected on the vivisection slab, but through careful observation and comparison in the laboratory and at the sick-bed...I am firmly convinced that medical science is hindered by vivisection, and that its total abolition, not only in our country but throughout the world, would be the right thing. I have expressed myself openly and presented my views sincerely because I have the courage to speak up for my conviction. But I am absolutely sure that every one of my professional



colleagues who gives thought to the matter must concede that my statements are not unjustified."

Dr. Lucas Hughes, M.C.R.S., L.R.S.M.: "I know that the vivisectors put on the act of chloroforming, which only suffices for light anaesthesia, but under the prevailing conditions it is practically impossible to produce real anaesthesia. The tight fetters impede the animal's struggling, and the muzzle stops it from groaning and howling with pain. It is perfectly true that the public is taken in by this illusion of the vivisected animals being chloroformed. There is no question of a dog in the vivisector's torture chamber inhaling chloroform in the same way as a patient; the convenience of the vivisector is taken into consideration, by injecting curare in order to paralyse the muscles, and so on. The statement that the animals receive chloroform is nothing but empty prattle, and the public has been totally deceived by this untruth. It's their humane feelings that have been anaesthetised." (Letter to the English Dog Protection League, April 7, 1905)

Dr. G.H. Pinder:

"You will naturally put the question: how does it come about that the medical profession as a whole defends vivisection to such an extent and that so few doctors oppose vivisection? I am firmly convinced that barely ten per cent of doctors have the slightest idea of what happens in the vivisection laboratories.

"...We are told by the defenders of vivisection that no cruelty arises in animal experiments, because the animals are anaesthetised. As a doctor I am in the position to declare that this statement is absolutely false, and unfortunately the public does not know that this is so... It is said that doctors always become insensitive. I do not agree with this. I am sincerely convinced that there is no better profession than that of the doctor, but I believe that the feelings become totally desensitized upon continual contact with vivisection and its cruelty to animals, upon which latter point we possess the confessions of the vivisectors themselves...

"It is a disgrace to England that it is permitted to misuse poor dumb creatures in today's laboratories, as in fact happens." (From an address to the annual general meeting of the Anti-Vivisection League in Manchester, February 28, 1905)

Replies to a questionnaire issued by the society "Amis des Betes" in Paris: Dr. J.M. Feuillet, Paris: "As a doctor I attach great value to the advance of medicine; but I am no supporter of vivisection, and as merely reducing it would lead to many abuses I am for its abolition. I join with those in Paris and abroad who are for total abolition, and will take pleasure in supporting them."

Dr. Jules Grand, Paris: "Vivisection must not be reduced, but totally abolished. May this scandalous blot on humanity disappear as soon as possible."

Dr. Henri Huchard, Paris, member of the French Academy of Medicine, an authority on the heart and circulatory system: "Twenty years ago I was guilty of vivisectioning a poor, harmless

dog, and the impression which that made on me has since then saved me from amusing myself again at such an anatomical feast"

Dr. Macgret, Paris: "No vivisection! One does not regulate a crime. One condemns it!"

Prof. Leon Marchand, Paris, former Professor at the Sorbonne: "The assumption that vivisection may have produced something or other that was reliable to surgery or medicine is an error. Exactly the opposite is the case. I have always found that the so-called 'scientific experiments' are not only outrageous and inhuman, but also misleading and dangerous, and I am astonished that not all my colleagues recognise the madness of the experiments made by the vivisectors."

On March 20, 1904, the Paris edition of the *New York Herald Tribune* published a long article that began "The assertion made by Dr. Ph. Marechal and published in these columns last week, that the antivivisectionist cause, to succeed, should originate in the medical body itself, is thoroughly endorsed by a large number of eminent French physicians, as the following opinions obtained during the last few days by the *Herald* prove."

Excerpts from some of the opinions reported by the paper:

Dr. Salivas: "I consider that vivisection is as useless as it is immoral. The immortal Hippocrates never vivisected, yet he raised his art to a height that we are far from attaining today, in spite of our alleged great modern discoveries, which are the result of introducing extravagant theories which it will be most difficult to eradicate."

Dr. Paquet, formerly doctor-inspector of the *Enfants Assistés de la Seine*: "Vivisection is useless for the study of medical science. It is also useless for the study of physiology, for, if we are today cognizant of the functions of the organs, it is through having treated them when injured. It is in the *clinique*, and not in the vivisection room, that we have learned the physiological role which each organ in the human body plays. In order to study the action of medicinal matters, would it for a moment enter into the head of a serious practitioner to imagine that what passes in the body of a healthy animal would be the same as in that of a sick person?"

Dr. Nicol: "From the scientific point of view I consider that vivisection cannot do otherwise than divert right judgement into error. As to the moral point, no beneficial result for humanity can be obtained by such cruel and barbarous practices. The only good result which could be obtained would be to vivisect human beings, and my advice to vivisectors is that they should commence by operating upon each other."

Dr. C. Mathieu: "During my medical studies I was charged with preparing the physiological experiments in the hospitals. They are useless cruelties, which have taught me nothing."

Prof. Dr. Leon Marchand: "It is an error to suppose that vivisection has given any true scientific nations to either surgery or medicine. It is quite the contrary. I have always found what are called 'scientific experiments' not only strange and inhuman, but illusory and

dangerous."

Dr. Edgard Hirtz, of Necker Hospital: "I am decidedly hostile to it. It is a useless torture, and a sterile cruelty."

Dr. Levoisin, physician, Paris: "It is extremely urgent that vivisection disappear from the instruction given to students."

Dr. Alex. Dowie, M.D., M.Ch., etc.: "There seems to be no doubt about it that vivisection is inseparable from cruelty. Dr. Stephen Smith, an eyewitness, testifies to this in the columns of your newspaper; the relevant literature is full of it on both sides. The degree of suffering varies from slight pain to intense and long-lasting agony. The hardly necessary anaesthesia which is used in certain cases cannot be used in most of the other cases, which are generally the most horrible experiments. The cruelty of the practice of vivisection is absolutely proven." (Letter to *Daily News*. August 29, 1903)

Dr. J.H. Thornton, London, general surgeon: "I and many others am of the opinion that vivisection operates against the interests of the people and should therefore be forbidden."

Dr. Stephen Smith, M.R.C.S.: "...I have published the facts about the pitiless, public and shameless experiments which I have seen in France, Belgium and Germany. Do such atrocities also occur in England? Yes indeed. Ten per cent of all the cutting operations in English laboratories are carried out with the use of curare. This paralyzes the muscles but increases the sensitivity to pain. However great the pain may be, the animal cannot make the slightest movement. On the basis of my experience I must state that it is practically impossible to achieve correct anaesthesia in the case of animals who have been given curare.

"...With regard to the vivisection question, one point is so important that it must be given primary consideration. Do animals feel pain as intensely as we do? Since the animals usually used for vivisection - dogs, cats, etc. - possess a similar or more developed sense of sight, smell, hearing and so on than human beings do, we can take it for certain that they are just as sensitive to pain...( *Daily News*. London, August 19, 1903)

Dr. med. F. Costa (*Serum - Wissenschaft - Menschheit*. Berlin, Hugo Bermuehler, 1903): "He points out that the laboratory experimenters 'must all too often suffer from temporary hallucinations', and attributed their 'discoveries' to what they really are: 'simply creatures of exaggerated fantasy, come into being through the maniacal desire to outstrip one another."

Prof. Dr. Johannes Mueller and Prof. Dr. Rudolphi. Who are these men? In the *Handbook to the History of Medicine*, by Neuenburger and Pagel (Berlin, 1903) we read on page 912: "Carl Asmund Rudolphi (1771-1832), Professor of Medicine in Greifswald, then Professor of Anatomy in Berlin, who, like Johannes Mueller (1801-1858), Professor of Anatomy and Physiology in Bonn and Berlin, assembled the entire current knowledge of physiology in a textbook and thereby passed it on to the medical world."

Page 370 contains the following words concerning Prof. Johannes Mueller:

"Johannes Mueller's great importance lies first in an unerring striving for objectivity...but also in his almost universal versatility, which mastered all the areas of biological science..."

Now what was the attitude of these great men to vivisection? Rudolf Virchow gives us fuller information about this in his memorial speech on Johannes Mueller, delivered the 24th of July, 1858:

"He was no more an experimenter than Haller, indeed the direction which experimental physiology had already taken through Legallois and Magendie in France actually filled him with revulsion. He always backed up this revulsion with objections both to the method used by the experimenters and to the admissibility of the experiments themselves."

He said the following about Prof. Rudolphi:

"He saw physiological experiments as bearing no relationship at all to the certainty of anatomy; no wonder that this splendid man, who expressed his aversion to vivisection whenever the occasion arose, adopted a hostile attitude to all theories and badly founded physiological experiments."

-----  
Dr. Arthur Guinness, M.C.E.S.: "When I reflect what dreadful cruelties the animals are subjected to by such desensitised creatures as Mr. Cyon and, to my regret I must say it, by many of my own compatriots, I am truly filled with dismay and also with disgust at how low mankind has sunk, that it is capable of such atrocities." (From a letter to the *Oxford Times*, October, 1902)

Dr. med. Voigt, Frankfurt am Main: "...But the fact of being shackled in itself means acute torture for the animals. For hours and often days on end the animals are stretched out in, or on, wooden and sharp-angled frames. The individual limbs are firmly fastened with cords. Since the imagination is seldom powerful enough to accurately visualise sensations which one does not experience personally, you should just try for once to tie up one of your own limbs tightly with a cord. How quickly will sharp pains set in, and how quickly will the offending cord be removed !In the case of the poor animals, however, whose cords are NOT removed, their limbs shortly begin to swell, and the cords cut all the more tightly and painfully into these inflamed and swollen limbs. This shackled and motionless imprisonment in one fixed position for hours and often days on end is in itself such an example of maltreatment that nothing needs to be added to arouse the disgust of any person with natural feelings...The sickening experiments, for which this maltreatment is only the preparatory stage, come on top of all this..." (*Gesundheit*, No. 5, Vienna, 1900)

"In spite of their scientific value, animal tests of medications have remained totally fruitless in the treatment of diseases, and the practicing physician hasn't learned anything useful from them for his patients that he didn't know fifty years ago." (Prof. Dr. Felix von Niemeyer, Germany's most respected medical authority.at the turn of the century, in his manual,

*Handbuch der praktischen Medizin)*

Dr. George Wilson, LL.D. (Edinburgh, DPH Cantab): "...the indiscriminate maiming and slaughtering of animal life with which these bacteriological methods of research and experimentation have been inseparably associated cannot be proved to have saved one single human life. I accuse my profession of misleading the public as to the cruelties and horrors which are perpetrated on animal life. The animal so innocently operated on may have to live days, weeks, or months, with no anaesthetic to assuage his sufferings, and nothing but death to relieve it. (From his Presidential Address to the British Medical Association, Portsmouth, August 5, 1899)

Dr. George Wilson (1899):

(Memorandum to Royal Commission):

"And if an animal is made insensible to pain, why the 'devocalizing of dogs,' accurately described in the popular magazine 'Science,' Vol. LXIV, No. 1664? This term merely means destroying the chords of the throat so that moans and shrieks cannot attract the attention of the public. Data is at hand as to places where this is done. Recently in New York city the less troublesome means of fastening the dogs' jaws together by the winding of adhesive tape was reported.

"The real advance in modern medicine has depended almost entirely on clinical diagnosis, therapeutics, and pathology, guided by a careful study of natural causes, but not upon experiments on animals, which are inherently misleading in their application to man, and therefore, unreliable."

Prof. Lawson Tait, M.D., F.R.C.S. (1899): Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh; Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, England; the most distinguished surgeon of his day: ("The Cullen Jubilee Prize given 'for the greatest benefit done to practical medicine by applying surgical means for the relief of medical cases', and the 'Lister Jubilee Prize' given 'for the greatest benefit done to practice surgery in the triennial period to June, 1890,' were awarded to Prof. Lawson Tait, by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Edinburgh.")

"Like every member of my profession, I was brought up in the belief that almost every important fact in physiology had been obtained by vivisection and that many of our most valued means of saving life and diminishing suffering had resulted from experiments on the lower animals. I now know that nothing of the sort is true concerning the art of surgery: and not only do I not believe that vivisection has helped the surgeon one bit, but I know that it has often led him astray"

One of the many articles against vivisection by the celebrated Dr. Walter R. Hadwen, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., L.S.A., etc., etc., published by the New York Anti-Vivisection Society, 456 Fourth Avenue, New York City, contains the following item on Lawson Tait, the most notable

creator of modern surgery:

"Lawson Tait wrote, twelve months before he died, in a letter which I have in my possession: *Vivisection has done nothing for surgery but lead to horrible bungling.*

"In the same year that he died, Lawson Tait published a letter in the *Medical Press and Circular*, May, 1899, as follows: 'One day I shall have a tombstone put over me and an inscription upon it I want only one thing recorded upon it, to the effect that 'he laboured to divert his profession from the blundering which has resulted from the performance of experiments on the sub-human groups of animal life, in the hope that they would shed light on the aberrant physiology of the human groups'. Such experiments never have succeeded and never can, and they have, as in the cases of Koch, Pasteur and Lister, not only hindered true progress but have covered our profession with ridicule.

"In the same year, namely, on April 26, 1899, he spoke at a great meeting in St James' Hall, London - the last meeting he ever attended, and moved the following resolution: 'That this meeting wholly disapproves of experimentation on living animals, as being crude in conception, unscientific in its nature and incapable of being sustained by any accurate or beneficent results applicable to man.'"

-----

At the turn of the last century, Dr. Walter R. Hadwen, one of Great Britain's best known physicians, reported the following experiments in the *Journal of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection* (BUAV); experiments that are still in vogue today.

"Dr. Rose Bradford (later, Sir John Rose Bradford, Br., K.C.M.G., C.B., C.B.E., President, Royal College of Physicians, London, 1926-1931) contributed to the *Journal of Physiology* of February 27, 1899, an article entitled 'The results following Partial Nephrectomy and the Influence of the Kidney on Metabolism.' The article enumerated various operations performed upon the kidneys of dogs:

"Chloroform and hypodermic injections of morphia were administered during the operative procedures. The animals - female fox terriers, 33 in number - were subsequently placed in glass cases with a glazed floor for observation. One died in six days from loss of blood. Two developed blood poisoning as the result of the wounds, no time being stated, and were killed.

"In another case, where a wedge was cut out of the kidney and an attempt made to graft it upon the peritoneum, the animal died in four days. One animal lingered 36 days after operation, the cause of its death being unknown.

"Five others died from causes immediately connected with the operation, after lingering various periods. Two animals were submitted to three various mutilations of the kidneys at separate intervals."

-----

Dr. med. E. Aenosch: "We have now arrived at another chapter of our evidence; namely, at the proof that all the bad, immoral and criminal principles upon which vivisection is based can in turn only be defended and protected by bad and immoral means. The end also has to justify the means by which it is defended. Among these means, the most conspicuous is the plain, bare-faced lie.

"Vivisection, with all its inconceivable, hair-raising, nauseating cruelties, perpetrated without interruption day by day in countless institutions and by individuals on hundreds and thousands of unfortunate animals of every kind, is portrayed by the defenders of this crime as the most innocent and harmless occupation in the world.

"Things are not at all as bad as the opponents make them out to be, so it is stated. Even if a few isolated and unavoidable cruelties occur here and there, the great majority of experiments involve no pain or suffering at all for the animals...

"The thoroughly dishonest statement is made that, with a few exceptions this keeps the loophole open - the animals are all anaesthetised and feel absolutely nothing of pain! The dishonesty and the most revolting hypocrisy of the vivisectors can be seen most plainly and glaringly as regards to "curare". Instead of anaesthetising the animals with chloroform or ether, they are given curare, i.e. injected with the arrow poison taken over from the savages. And what is the effect of this hellish poison? In fact, nobody knows the answer, although they've been "working" with it for decades in the vivisection laboratories. What we do know about it, however, is enough to make those who use it on animals in order to satisfy their curiosity - officially called "Science" - emerge as human ogres and devils. It is not anaesthesia that's achieved by administering this poison, as the advocates of vivisection have hypocritically endeavoured to let everyone believe, but only a paralyzing of the entire body musculature, but such a complete paralysis that the curarized animal is not even able to perform the slightest movement, is not even able to breathe, and would inevitably die in the first few moments had one not learnt to forestall this with artificial respiration by means of a bellows! But whilst the animal is, so to speak, turned into a rigid, motionless living corpse by the curare, all its sensory faculties are - just try to imagine the situation of the animal on the torture slab - in no way stilled, but - mark what I say - made even more acute. The animal hears, sees and feels every horrible thing that is done to him, and this much more intensely than when in its natural, healthy condition, but is not able to give any expression to its immeasurable suffering by even a sound, a movement, a glance or a facial expression. And the luckless victims of devilish Science are kept for several hours in this state of inexpressible suffering, and their tormentors and torturers stand there with very learned faces, they carry on cutting, stimulating, tugging and torturing as if that is really nothing at all or something of no significance as far as humanity goes. No trace of compassion. What trace of humanity is left in these people? Must they not be seen as more despicable in many respects than the torturers and inquisitors of the Middle Ages, whose aims at least were immeasurably more lofty than those of the modern physiological torturers, using their curare in the vainglorious service of a fiendish Science?" (From *Die Vivisektion*. p. 11, Dresden 1899)

-----  
Dr. Stephen Smith, a surgeon who had worked at the Pasteur Institute and at the Physiological Institute of Strasburg, wrote in his book *Scientific Research: A View from Within* (Elliot Stock, London, 1899): "I agree with the eminent English surgeons who have gone on record as asserting that vivisection is of no value to humanity."

Dr. George Wilson, President of the British Medical Society, is quoted in the *British Medical Journal* as saying the following at the Annual General Meeting of that Society in 1899:

"...I say frankly that we should call a break in the practice of these cruel experiments, so as to gain a considered, unprejudiced overall picture of the whole position of the bacteriological procedure...I have not joined the ranks of the anti-vivisectionists, but I accuse my profession of misleading the public as regards the cruelties and horrors perpetrated on animals.

"Pasteur's anti-rabies vaccination is - I believe, and others with me - a piece of deception... The much-praised serum treatment for diphtheria does not even enjoy the general approval of the doctors in the hospital in our capital city... The whole of bacteriological theory and practice is closely tied up with commercial interests. Behring has had his diphtheria serum patented on the Continent. Koch has made a princely income from his Tuberkulin..."

Sir Frederick Treves, Director of London Hospital, surgeon to the Royal Family and world-renowned authority on abdominal surgery, wrote in the *British Medical Journal* (Nov. 5, 1898, p. 1389):

"Many years ago I carried out on the Continent sundry operations upon the intestines of dogs, but such are the differences between the human and the canine bowel, that when I came to operate on man I found I was much hampered by my new experience, that I had everything to unlearn, and that my experiments had done little but leave me unfit to deal with the human intestine."

Dr. med. van Rees, Professor Extraordinary of Histology at the University of Amsterdam: "New times bring new thinking. The constantly growing stream of people with feeling and intellect has already opened the world's eyes to the truths which were hitherto known only to a few. This stream will grow bigger and bigger and put an end to the apparently immutable dominion of vivisection, in spite of the efforts of all the biologists..." (From the Foreword to a brochure of the Dutch Anti-Vivisection Society: *Is Vivisection of Use to Mankind?* 1898)

Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson, member of the British Academy of Science (1896): "Animal experiments are unnecessary for the advance of medicine; the difference which exists between the human and animal organism leads to very contradictory results; pain also always gives rise to error and obscures the natural functions...Of all scientific work, vivisection is the one most subject to error and likely to do mental and moral harm." (From *Biological Experimentation*)

Prof. Atkinson, in a speech given at St. James' Hall, London, May 10, 1898: "I have seen a



large number of vivisections...I have seen the operations of many great surgeons. I have also seen the horrifying effects of vivisection on human patients. I see these things every, day, and I say that vivisection is one of the greatest curses of our age for the scientists. I have come here only to tell you, from a scientific viewpoint, that vivisection is the greatest curse of our age...I must unfortunately say today that this terrible practice of experimentation in the hospitals - I don't want to describe what I have witnessed - is only too gruesome. When I think about it I feel disgust for all my professional colleagues. "

Dr. Eduard Reich, public health specialist, Scheveningen: "...In order to prevent most diseases it is sufficient to obey the laws of reason and hygiene. If all people adhered to them, serum treatment and vivisection would be seen by the most simple person as outrageous nonsense of which civilisation should be ashamed." (Article in the weekly newspaper *De Amsterdammer*. March 17, 1898)

Tying the ureter - On December 7, 1897, Dr. Rose Bradford read "a preliminary note on experimental atrophy of the kidney, caused by obstruction of the ureter." The experiments were performed on dogs at the Brown Institution. The ureter was ligatured in two places near the bladder through an incision in the groin and divided between the ligatures. After an interval of 10 to 40 days, the distended ureter was brought to the surface and fluid drawn off corresponding to a distension of the kidney to the size of a fist The experiment was repeated 12 times. The animals were killed by prussic acid at periods varying from 7 to 50 days. They must have been in great pain and suffering throughout the experiment. Some of the animals survived the treatment recorded in the *Journal of Physiology* for five or six months, confined all the time in the laboratory, where - Dr. Bradford admits - "the hygienic surroundings were not of the best." Thirst and vomiting were marked accompaniments of the operation: the passage of blood occurring sometimes for a week.

Starvation experiments - In other operations, where the lives of the animals were prolonged for varying periods, the Professor admits the dogs suffered from thirst, loss of appetite, great emaciation, weakness - so as to stagger and be unable to stand - ulcerated sores, superficial ulcers, bleeding from the gums, etc., and there must, in addition to these objective signs, have been considerable subjective symptoms of pain.

Starvation experiments were performed for days together in order to detect the quantity of urea passed under such circumstances. These latter experiments, if not actually painful, were productive of suffering.

The "conclusions" derived from these cruel experiments have not added anything to the store of practical knowledge. Some of the theoretical deductions are contested by other observers who arrived at different conclusions from similar experiments. Most of the "conclusions" were long ago established by clinical observation, and nothing has been gained by these procedures to assist in any way in the relief or cure of Bright's Disease or other kidney affections.

Dr. med. Anna Fischer-Duckelman: "I now come to that aspect of my medical studies which I

found hardest to bear, i.e. the inhumanity in the treatment of poor, elderly patients, especially those of the female sex. Although things are said to be better in the Swiss hospitals than at the state hospitals in the large neighbouring countries, I have nevertheless had to see a lot of bad things, and even had to go along with it. Upon each new example of cruelty that I had to witness in silence, I vowed to myself that I would work ceaselessly for the reform of medical instruction, in order to free myself of the guilt which had been imposed on me. The mentality in the state hospitals is a sad one. Countless trusting patients fall victim to the modern research and operation madness. The poorest and most deprived of the people are chiefly used as instructional material for the universities. There is little scientific medical treatment. I was an assistant at several hospitals. I made efforts to get an insight into everything, and I learned of many things that I would previously not have thought possible." (*Naturarzt*. No. 8, 1896)

"Chloroform is so toxic to dogs, especially the young, that had that anaesthetic been first tried on them it would have been withheld for many years from the service of man. Aourens, in consequence of the fatal effects that he observed in animals, discarded chloroform altogether as an anaesthetic, and Sir Lauder Brunton's experiments on dogs led to results which were ridiculed by all the leading English anaesthetists." (Dr. Benjamin Ward Richardson, *Biological Experimentation*, 1896, p. 54)

Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson (1896): "Intellectually I do not think my classes were assisted (by vivisectional demonstrations). I am sure it limited my sphere of usefulness by leading me in the limited space of time at my command to omit some parts of physiology of a simpler, less controversial, and more useful kind."

Dr. med. Edward Berdoe: "...Cruelty is no less cruel because one calls it physiology or bacteriology. The matter is all the more cruel because it is carried out systematically, is drawn out and is supported in hundreds of ways; (even) butchers, cattle slaughterers and hunters do not enjoy such a privilege. No ignorant person can do a thousandth part of the dreadful things that are carried out daily in the laboratories of Europe and America..." (In a speech at the International Animal Welfare Congress in Budapest, July 18-21, 1896)

Dr. Rowland: "It is difficult to anaesthetise a cat with any certainty for even ten minutes, and in the case of dogs it doesn't last as long as with cats." (*British Medical Journal*, March 7, 1896)

Dr. George Cbeverton, English veterinary surgeon, visited the French veterinary medical school in Alfort around 1895. Extract from his report: "...I saw how an operation was carried out on a horse without any anaesthetic. Its four legs were bound together with a rope, one of the students sat on the horse's head, another on its throat and a third on its shoulder, while a fourth one operated on a diseased hoof, cutting away a large part of it. The poor creature's groans were absolutely ghastly."

Dr. med. Franz Hartmann, Hallein in Tirol: "Formerly it was the lie under the guise of religion that deceived mankind; now it is the same lie under the guise of science that is deceiving the whole world, and there is no weapon against it other than reason. Reason teaches us that the

true healing of diseases and the maintenance of health consists in freeing the body of impurities and keeping it clean." (*Lotusblueten*, 1895)

Dr. Carl Gerster, Braunfels: "...Anyone who injects mice, guinea-pigs and nowadays even horses and rams year in, year out, and draws his individual conclusions from such individuals, will no longer be in the position to think individually, i.e. to properly appreciate the physical and psychological aspects of the human organism..." (*Arztliche Stimmen uber und gegen das Heilserum*. Stuttgart, 1895)

Prof. Dr. O. Rosenbach, Breslau: "...Bacteriology must arrive at false results, precisely because it treats the human being on the same level as the experimental animal and the dead soil of the breeding apparatus..." (*Aerztliche Stimmen ueber und gegen das Heilserum*, edited by Dr. C. Gerster, Stuttgart, 1895)

Dr. G. Baudry and P.G. Peabody visited the French veterinary medical school in Alfort in 1895. From their report: "...We neither saw any presence or any use of any anaesthetic in the laboratories or anywhere else. When we asked the highly intelligent gentleman about this, whose special task it is to show the visitors around and provide them with information, he replied that no anaesthetics were used there because the animals were tied up in such a way that any resistance was ruled out; therefore anaesthetics were quite unnecessary."

Charles A. Gordon, C.B., Surgeon-General, Hon. Surgeon to the Queen, Officer of the Legion of Honour, in *The Campaigner*, Nov/Dec 1895:

"Why I oppose vivisection - With reference to the double function of spinal nerves, the eminent author of that discovery repeatedly stated, that in pursuing his investigations he was guided by anatomical knowledge, and that he was altogether opposed to the performance of experiments on living animals for that, or indeed any other, purpose. From the date of that Commission to the present day successive discoveries, assigned to similar experimental methods, have been either disproved on further investigation, or have been proved practicable by other means.

"Bedside Study versus Experiments - In relation to the physician, the art of medicine is best learned by its practice, and by experience, superadded to study and reflection - not by experiments on animals. So also with regard to practical surgery. The claims of experiments such as suggesting the operation for aneurism have long since been disposed of, more recently those with reference to ovariectomy, and those relating to brain surgery have been disproved.

"The more 'advanced' experimenters, as if conscious that the plea of utility for the relief of human suffering is untenable, abandon it altogether. They declare their only object to be the advance of knowledge, and stigmatize those who are of an opposite opinion as endeavouring to retard or prevent the advance of science. On the other hand, it is asserted that the performance of such experiments is calculated to lower the reputation of scientific men, and to dishonour the emblem of science; it is not science, properly so-called, that should be fet-

tered, but those who, hiding themselves under the cloak of science, experiment at random on living creatures without any real advantage to physiology, properly so-called, or to medicine.

“The effects of the drugs upon different animals vary among themselves, and with few exceptions, are all different from those on man. In man they differ according to individual conditions and peculiarities, and also to poisons. The results of experiments with chloroform performed upon dogs, monkeys, and other animals, have been declared by professional anaesthetists to be worthless and misleading in their relation to man.

“Fallacious Experiments - For several years back I have made it my task to compare one with another the published statements of vivisectionists, and so far the result has been, that I have discovered in them nothing but mutual contradiction sufficient to nullify each other. I am happy to say for the sake of the profession to which I have the honour of belonging, that this practice is confined to a relatively small number of its active members.”

-----

From an article, "Why I Oppose Vivisection", by John Makinson Fox, M.R.C.S. in the *Animal's Friend*, October 1895:

“The new scientists are always telling us what they have discovered, or are on the eve of discovering. Now, as a Medical Officer of Health to one of the largest districts in England, I have no reason to think that there is anyone in the kingdom who has had more experience than I have had in dealing with infectious diseases among men and animals, and I affirm that I know of no discovery of any practical value which has assisted me in my official duties or in treating my patients. I have failed to see that the most useful science of pathology has advanced one single inch by means of vivisection. As I have always advocated, the proper school of pathology (that is, the science of disease) is the post mortem room, and the close observation of disease at the bedside of patients.

“I have been acquainted with the practice of vivisection for upwards of forty years. I well remember the experiments which I first witnessed, performed under skilful hands, but which were thought by a select audience of medical men to be cruel and without sense or use. Pigeons were shaved, and their brains frozen and twirled about in all directions. My next experience was with dogs in the laboratory of a London hospital, where these defenceless creatures were cut about and injected with "stuffs" to their terrible pain and suffering. And after forty years - what is the result? I do not know that I have received one atom of benefit on behalf of my patients for all the cruelty which I witnessed. I maintain that no useful end has been attained by this practice, and that by far the larger number of experimental tortures are inflicted for no practical or useful purpose. They are academic, sensational, conjectural merely, and, in some cases, theatrical. Dr. Addison discovered a relationship between a certain discoloration of the skin and an affection of the suprarenal capsules (situated above the kidneys) without any assistance from vivisection. The writer of this letter had the honour to be Dr. Addison's clinical clerk when this discovery was matured in the post mortem room of Guy's Hospital, not on the vivisectionist's table. Nor is it clear that the connection existing

between the disease known as myxoedema and atrophy (wasting away) of the thyroid gland (in the throat) owes anything to vivisection; though, after the suggestion had been made, it then became the fashion to extirpate thyroid glands from all kinds of living animals.

“It is not by any such unnatural procedures that valuable medical discoveries in the interests of humanity have been made. What is wanted is the rare intelligence and foresight of the discoverer.”

-----

Dr. Charles Bell Taylor, M.D., F.R.C.S.E., Fellow of the Medical Society, London, and late President Paris Medical Society, was the leading oculist in Great Britain. In the September 1895 issue of the *Animal's Friend*, he published a lengthy article, "Why I Oppose Vivisection", from which we excerpt:

“We are asked to believe that it is not cruel to torture animals, if such torturing is done in the interests of science, in the interests of commerce, or if the scientific men or others "can give a rational account of what they do"; but such reasoning would warrant assassination or any other crime or atrocity. It would justify the murderer of President Carnot, and the man who skinned cats alive simply in order to preserve the gloss on their coats. We are told that chloroform, ether, or other anaesthetics are administered and that vivisected animals suffer very slightly or not at all, but this statement is not true.

“2486 experiments under licence were performed in this country alone in one year, upon animals who were not insensible - that is, without any anaesthetic at all- and it is impossible to give anaesthetics in some of the most cruel of all the experiments. How is it possible to give chloroform, when chloroform would vitiate the result of the experiment, as in the most cruel operations which have been performed upon the livers of dogs, over and over again? How is it possible to give chloroform to dogs and other animals who are chased up and down a long corridor till they drop dead of fatigue? How is it possible to give chloroform to animals who are shut up in a tormenting machine and there subjected to every conceivable form of agony merely to ascertain how much actual pain, without serious lesion (destruction of tissue) it will take to kill them? How is it possible to give chloroform to a dog who is being slowly baked to death in an oven, who is being crushed in a machine by such an excess of atmospheric pressure that it becomes as stiff as a log and its brain runs like cream? How is it possible to give chloroform to a dog while subjected to such powerful electric currents that its temperature rises to 112 degrees, and it dies, though packed in ice, after days of agony, literally seethed in its own vital fluids? How is it possible to give chloroform to a dog who is being drowned and brought round again and again, suffocated and allowed to recover, and then suffocated again; packed in ice until frozen stiff, and, if it survives, then packed again or used for other experiments; starved to death by absolute deprivation of food and water, or killed by the slow torture of inoculation with all sorts of filthy and abominable diseases? Again, what use can chloroform be to dogs, even if given at the start, when they are plunged into boiling water and kept for days afterwards; soaked in turpentine and then set fire to; who

survive after having their brains half sucked out; or who are skinned alive and kept alive as long as possible afterwards.

“We are assured that great discoveries have been made by vivisectors, but this statement is not in accordance with facts. For instance, there is not a word of truth in the oft-repeated assertion that Galvani discovered the properties of electricity by vivisection. Galvani's discovery was due to accident and careful observation of the effects of electricity on a dead frog; vivisection has nothing whatever to do with it. It is not true that Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood by vivisection. Harvey's discovery was entirely due to his observation of the fact that the valves of the veins in the dead human body permitted the blood to flow only in one direction; vivisection had nothing whatever to do with it. It is not true that Hunter was led to the adoption of his treatment for aneurism by experiments upon animals. Hunter was led to the adoption of his treatment solely by observation of the fact that the artery in close vicinity to the aneurism was frequently too diseased to bear a ligature, hence he thought it wise to place it further off. Vivisection had nothing whatever to do with it. It is not true that Pasteur has discovered a cure for hydrophobia. Pasteur does not cure hydrophobia; as the late Professor Peter has remarked, "he gives it", and it is a fact that the deaths from hydrophobia have increased both in France and in England ever since he adopted his supremely ridiculous system of inoculating people with it. It is not true that Pasteur has discovered a cure for anthrax. Pasteur does not cure anthrax, he gives it, and his system has been condemned by the English, the German, and the Hungarian Scientific Commissions who have sat to consider it, while the loss to France is to be counted by millions ever since his system was adopted in that country. It is not true that Koch has discovered a cure for consumption; on the contrary his inoculations have led to death from initial fever, and the infection of the whole system of patients who merely suffered from localized disease. It is not true that Sir James Simpson discovered the anaesthetic properties of chloroform by experiments on dogs: Simpson experimented upon himself. Chloroform is so fatal to dogs that if he had tried it first on these animals he would never have tried it on man. It is not true that Lister was led to the adoption of his antiseptic treatment of wounds by vivisection. Antiseptics were used in the treatment of wounds long before his time, and his experiments were made upon the wounds, bruises and putrefying sores of patients in the hospitals of Edinburgh, Glasgow and London. It is not true that the great advances in medicine and surgery are due to experiments upon animals; they are due to the discovery of anaesthetics and to the use of antiseptics; vivisection had nothing whatever to do with it. It is not true that we owe our knowledge of drugs to experiment" upon animals. The effect of drugs upon animals is so entirely different from their effect upon man that no safe conclusions can be drawn from such investigations. It is not true that Von Graefe discovered a cure for glaucoma by vivisection; his discovery was entirely the result of clinical observation of hospital patients. Vivisection had nothing what ever to do with it. And it is not true, notwithstanding assertions to the contrary, that Ferrier has succeeded in localizing the functions of the brain by experiments on monkeys. Ferrier himself says: 'Experiments on animals, even on apes, often lead to conclusions seriously at variance with the well-established facts of clinical and pathological observation.' We are assured that it is impossible for science to advance unless experiments

are made upon animals, but this statement is not true.”

-----  
Dr. E. Dudgeon: "I have been engaged for more than 50 years in studying the effects of medicine as regards its use for simple and complicated cases of illness. I have been fed with many reports of experiments carried out on all kinds of animals, but I can state with a clear conscience that those reports have never given me a single hint that would have been of significance regarding the use of medical remedies. " (*Animal's Friend*. London, August 1895, p. 231)

Dr. Edward Haughton (1895): "I would shrink with horror from accustoming large classes of young men to the sight of animals under vivisection. Science would gain nothing, and the world would have a set of young devils let loose upon it."

Dr. E. Haughton: "Hygiene is not consistent with the injection of poison into the body...The occurrence of some piece of scientific foolishness may appear insignificant, for what one of us is always wise? But the constant creation of a disease through a system whose purpose is to cultivate it is no small matter, it is also no small matter when market criers are engaged in turning the heads of those who have the fine task of working *for* the good of all mankind..." (*Animals' Friend*, London, July 1895, page 215)

Dr. med. Franz Hartmann, Hallein: "Vivisection and sex murder stand on one and the same level, they are the product of spiritual blindness and moral depravity...The alleged objective of working *for* the good of mankind is a lie. I know that most vivisectors are seeking more to satisfy their vanity than their scientific curiosity. Each of them hopes somehow to make some discovery which, even if it is worthless, is nevertheless a discovery with which one can boast before everyone and throw sand into the eyes of the stupid." (From a letter to Ludwig Fliegel, dated April 22, 1895)

Dr. Guardia: "The craze for operating leads many surgeons to perform foolhardy, hazardous and murderous operations, and it is high time to put an end to these excessive operations. Too much experimental surgery is carried out in the hospitals. You wouldn't believe the extent to which the habit of vivisection influences all of today's operating practice." (*System der Chirurgie*)

Dr. Davies: "It is pure nonsense to say that we would not make any advance without vivisection. We would already have got much further without it." (Letter to Miss Frances Power Cobbe, 1894)

Dr. G. Herring: "I would only agree to an experiment on a living animal on one single condition, namely, that the experimenter first carried out the planned experiment on his own body. Then we would see who the true friends of mankind are, and who are only feigning to be such. I believe there would be precious few of the former! " (*Homeopathic World*, July 2, 1894)

Prof. Dr. Schweningen: "...We need doctors who have humane feelings and are not brutalized by the constant torture of animals; who carry on their profession humanely and are not cramped and confined by scientific blinkers..." (*Hygieia*. May 15, 1894)

From letters to the Anti-Vivisection Society in Zurich: Dr. med. Hauser, (letter dated May 13, 1894):

"New experiments and cruelties to animals are emerging which better serve the purpose of ambition than that of helping suffering mankind; thousands of poor animals are tormented in experiments the results of which were already established long ago, but which are carried out repeatedly for demonstration purposes or by unqualified students so as to convince oneself once again that they are correct. The public is too little aware of what is done under the name of vivisection, and of the dreadful way in which great masses of animals are tormented with the knife, poison, heat and cold, often for weeks on end, until they perish, and it is therefore necessary to inform them about this inhuman animal cruelty by means of speeches, pamphlets and articles in newspapers...The cruelty to animals which the animal welfare society investigates year by year, and seeks to have punished, is only child's play compared with the most brutal and unbounded cruelties perpetrated by the vivisectionists, and it is therefore also certainly its duty to support a campaign against vivisection in every way and as effectively as possible."

Dr. A. Wall: "Has vivisection eased a single pain, saved one human life? My answer is a decisive No. The danger of vivisection rests not only in false practice, it also rests in the ever-growing view that Man is the real animal on which experiments must be made." (*Zoophilist*, December 1893)

"Page 204 of the Royal Commission Report contains the description of an experiment carried out under curare (the most cruel of all poisons, which although it paralyses every movement, only raises sensitivity). Used as the experimental animal was a small obedient dog. A few minutes after the curare was injected under its skin, the animal tottered on its four legs, staggered around on the tips of its paws until it dropped to the ground, foaming at the mouth and with much water flowing from its eyes. Its windpipe was cut open and the pipe of a bellows inserted, this being attached to a gas-pump for artificial respiration. The throat, face and front paws were cut out at the sides, as well as the interior of the belly, and the sciatic nerve and other nerves exposed and galvanically stimulated. No anaesthetic was applied; the agony of the poor creature must have been dreadful. Despite this the torture was continued for ten hours, until the experimenters went home. But they did not release the experimental animal; it wasn't even put to sleep. They deliberately left it lying there, helpless and mutilated, so that the tests could be continued the next day without any loss of time. But the following day the poor dog was dead. The artificial respiration machine was still working. (I have been told that these machines are often working day and night in the laboratories, but it was pumping the air in and out of a dead body.)" (From a speech delivered at the Medical and Surgical Society in Nottingham, 1892, and at an Anti-Vivisection Conference in 1893)



Dr. John H. Clarke, London (from a discourse delivered at the Church Congress in Folkestone on October 6, 1892): "I hope that our nation will cleanse itself of this meanest of all crimes (vivisection)."

In *the Birmingham Daily Post* (Oct 4, 1892), Lawson Tait wrote: "Some few years ago I began to deal with one of the most dreadful calamities to which humanity is subject by means of an operation which had been scientifically proposed nearly 200 years ago. I mean ectopic gestation (extrauterine gestation). The rationale of the proposed operation was fully explained about 50 years ago, but the whole physiology of the normal process, and the pathology of the perverted one, were obscured and misrepresented by a French physiologist's experiments on rabbits and dogs. I went outside the experimentalists' conclusions, went back to the true science of the old pathologist and of the surgeons, and performed the operation in scores of cases with almost uniform success. My example was immediately followed throughout the world, and during the last five or six years hundreds, if not thousands of women's lives have been saved, whilst for nearly forty years the simple road to this gigantic success was closed by the folly of a vivisector."

Surgeon-General Sir Charles Alexander Gordon, K.C.B. (1892): (Formerly Honorary Physician to the Queen): "I hold that the practice of performing experiments upon the lower animals with a view to benefiting humanity, is fallacious."

Dr. Charles Gordeon, senior military physician, personal physician to Queen Victoria, in a speech at Westminster Palace Hotel on June 22, 1892: "I am of the opinion that the practice of carrying out animal experiments for the purpose of helping man is misleading...Performing experiments on a certain species of animal so as to benefit another species of living being defies logic."

Prof. Theophilus Parvin, M.D. of Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A., President of the Academy (annual address to the American Medical Academy, Washington, May 4, 1891):

"About two years ago Herbert Spencer (the English philosopher) urged the natural scientist Huxley to have a general practitioner sent for in the event of an illness, one who was familiar with experimental methods of treatment; but Huxley retorted 'Heaven protect me from falling into the hands of that doctor! If I were to think that any of my writings could offer the slightest excuse for the killings for which this man is responsible, that would be really painful to me...'

"If we take into account that: medicaments do not function the same way in humans as in animals; they can not possibly be dosed appropriately for such a function; animals differ from one another in their sensitivity to medicaments; these animals do not suffer from the illness for which the medicaments are intended in humans; in fact, in most of the experiments they are simply not ill, then it is plain that there are sources of error inherent in the method itself, and that false conclusions can be drawn from it

"I believe that undue importance is attached to bacteriology in medical study and instruction... Cannot the same also be said about vivisection? In my opinion the value of this method of research with regard to surgery and therapeutics has been exaggerated. As far as the former is concerned, we shall talk here of abdominal and brain surgery. If Lawson Tait's statement is recognised as correct - and no one can doubt his competence and skill - vivisection has harmed and not assisted abdominal surgery...

"Those who are involved in brain surgery refer here and there to the great advantages of the vivisection methods in localizing brain activity. Dr. Seguin, however, whose competence can be taken as read, made the following statement in connection with a treatise by Horsley: 'The author seems to assume that our progress in localizing the brain functions depends primarily on experiments. Here, too, we have to take a different opinion. Observation at the sick-bed and pathological facts (Broca for learning) came first; only a long time after followed the animal experiments with detailed evidence obtained by Hitzig, Ferrier and others. The firmly-established facts upon which we base our daily educational diagnoses were patiently accumulated by pathologists and would today be sufficient to support the teaching of brain localization even if not one single animal brain had been touched. In the field of the visual centre, incidentally, human pathological facts have overturned the result of animal experiments (perrier's angular-gyrus centre), so that the contradictory results obtained by Munk and Goltz are immaterial to us as far as practical purposes are concerned. One can state with certainty that every single one of the so-called "centrea" in the human brain has been determined by means of evidence obtained through the examination of corpses, quite independently of facts derived from experimentation...The first centre (speech) and the last (vision) were discovered through clinical and pathological studies.

"Sometimes I fear that the anaesthetisation of the laboratory animals often takes place only in name rather than in reality. Were it otherwise, why so many and varied pieces of equipment in order to shackle the animal during the experiments? This equipment is not used for surgical operations on human beings, whose immobility is ensured by means of deep anaesthesia."

-----  
Prof. Theophilus Parvin, M.D., LL.D. (1891): Jefferson Medical College; Ex President American Academy of Medicine: "...there are others who seem, seeking useless knowledge, to be blind to the writhing agony and deaf to the cry of pain of their victims, and who have been guilty of the most damnable cruelties, without the denunciation by the public and the profession that their wickedness deserves and demands. These criminals are not confined to Germany or France, to England or Italy, but may be found in our own country."

Prof. Dr. med. Beclard, Paris: "The experiments performed on animals cannot have the same value as pathological observations carried out on humans, due to the disturbances caused to the blood circulation and to the entire organism by the mutilations." (From *Elementary Study of Physiology*, page 219)

Dr. med. Alt: "Many laymen believe, because the truth is naturally concealed from them, that

the vivisectors are by the nature of their calling not totally brutal, and that, they do not torture the animals. But we must categorically refute this...No person - with the exception of the vivisectors themselves - can imagine the sorts of torture machinery that the various vivisectors have invented and constructed for their purposes. In the Middle Age frightful experiments were carried out in order to secure the confession of real or supposed criminals. But they were nothing in comparison with the truly hellish machines (for one cannot call them anything else) which have been dreamed up and invented to torture a living being by vivisectors, in other words by people who have spent years at university and of whom one is entitled to demand the highest level of moral education." (From *Die Greuel der vollkommen nutzlosen Vivisektionen* - "The atrocity of totally useless vivisection", page 11)

Dr. William Blackwood: "I dispute that our modern knowledge of brain disease is in any way attributable to the work of the vivisectors, and would say that the vivisectors are less able to deal with such diseases than ordinary intelligent doctors...The foundation on which vivisection is based is false, and its conclusions cannot possibly be correct." (From a speech delivered in Philadelphia, D.S.A. in 1885)

Dr. Owen J. Wister, said in 1885: "While vivisection has led practitioners into many errors, it has also led them away from other methods of investigation, the results of which are far less delusive - the microscope, post-mortem examinations, organic chemistry, and, above all, observation and thought."

Dr. Albert Leffingwell, U.S.A.:

"The learned vivisectors carry on their gruesome trade without thought and conscience, allegedly 'for the good of Mankind and Science'. One conclusion contradicts the other conclusion, one experiment contradicts the other experiment. Do we want to erect the Tower of Knowledge on that foundation? Vivisection is in no way a scientific method of research, because it lacks reliability.

"What on earth is the use to us of all these abominable things? Have the vivisection experiments of the past quarter of a century produced such marked advances in medicine that we have some clear evidence of these in a declining death-rate for some particular disease? Can one name one single disease that was resistant to all methods of healing 30 years ago, but for which today's vivisection-based science offers hope of a cure? The famous vivisector Claude Bernard already answered prophetically: 'Our hands are empty, but our mouth is full of promises for the future.' The countless and terrible experiments of all the many vivisectors have achieved nothing for the art of healing. That is proved by the death-rate statistics." (Extract from a speech, published in *Lippincott's Magazine*, 1884)

The name of Lawson Tait, the gynecologist from Birmingham, looms larger than any other in the period which is considered the age of giants in surgical progress. Several of the present-day surgical techniques originate from him. (See: *Slaughter of the Innocent*, p. 174-176.) In the *Birmingham Daily Post*, Dec. 12, 1884, he wrote:

"Like every other member of my profession, I was brought up in the belief that almost all of our most valued means of saving life and diminishing suffering had been obtained from experiments on the lower animals. I now know that nothing of the sort is true concerning the art of surgery; and not only do I not believe that vivisection has helped the surgeon one bit, but I know that it has often led him astray."

The Birmingham Philosophical Society's Basic Transactions include the very long paper that Lawson Tait read to his colleagues on April 20, 1882, and irrefutably denounce vivisection on every count. The paper comprises many pages. Here are a few excerpts, by way of example:

"I dismiss at once the employment of experiments on living animals for the purpose of mere instruction as absolutely unnecessary, and to be put an end to by legislation without any kind of reserve whatever..."

And further on:

"It must be perfectly clear that to answer all these questions specific instances must be given, and that they must be analyzed historically with great care. This has already been done in many instances, and I am bound to say, that in every case known to me, there is the utter disestablishment of the claims of vivisection...As a method of research it has constantly led those who have employed it into altogether erroneous conclusions, and the records teem with instances in which not only have animals fruitlessly been sacrificed, but human lives have been added to the list of victims by reason of its false light."

Resolution passed by the Congress of the Veterinary Surgeons of Great Britain and Ireland, London, 1881:

"The veterinary surgeons of this country generally accept that, both in theory and in practice, all aspects of their profession can be taught and studied on the basis of the dead body, and it is with deep regret that they learn that the students on the Continent of Europe carry out practical experiments on living animals during their studies. This national congress is firmly convinced that such operations are just as cruel as they are unnecessary for science and for technical skill."

Charles Clay, M.D., according to the (British) *Dictionary of National Biography* (Supplement 11, p. 30) "may fairly be described as the father of ovariectomy as far as Europe is concerned... He was also the first (1843) to employ drainage in abdominal surgery, and he brought into use the term 'ovariectomy'...President of the Manchester Medical Society and original member of the Obstetrical Society of London, he declared, as reported by the *London Times* (July 31, 1880):

"As a surgeon, I have performed a very large number of operations, but I do not owe a particle of my knowledge or skill to vivisection. I defy any member of my profession to prove that vivisection has been of the slightest use to the progress of medical science and therapeutics."

And this had been clearly predicted by Jean-Martin Charcot (1825-1893), the father of modern neurology: "Experiments on animals designed to establish the localization of cerebral functions can teach us at best the topography of that particular species - never the topography of man," said Charcot. Even Claude Bernard had realized that.

At the end of the nineteenth century wrote Dr. Anna Kingsford, Britain's first woman doctor: "The spiritual malady that rages in the soul of the vivisector is in itself sufficient to render him incapable of acquiring the highest and best knowledge. He finds it easier to propagate and multiply disease than to discover the secret of health. Seeking for the germs of life, he invents only new methods of death."

Dr. W. Gimson, M.R.C.S.: "The experiments performed on animals in order to determine the effects of medicaments offer a very insecure basis for drawing conclusions as to the effects on humans. The results of these experiments should convince the greatest doubter that they are a source of disappointment for the experimenter." (From *Vivisection and Experiments on Living Animals*, London 1879, page 86)

Of Claude Bernard's activity, his former assistant, Dr. George Hoggan, wrote in his now famous letter that appeared in *The Morning Post* on Feb. 1, 1875: "After four months' experience, I am of the opinion that not one of those experiments on animals was justified or necessary." And *the Report* of the Royal Commission of Enquiry, appointed in 1876 by Prime Minister Disraeli to investigate vivisection, included a testimony by Dr. Arthur de Noe Walker, another British doctor who had worked in Bernard's laboratory. After describing one of Bernard's experiments to the Royal Commission, Walker said:

"I decline myself to criticize this horrible experiment. I feel too much contempt for the experimenter and disgust with the experiment. I would have deprived that man of his position as a lecturer and teacher of physiology." (par. 4888)

Dr. Emanuel Klein, a German physiologist who taught at London's St. Bartholomew Hospital: "Except for teaching purposes I never use anesthetics...A man who conducts special research has no time, so to speak, for thinking what the animal will feel or suffer." (*Royal Commission Report*, 3538-3540)

Karl von Rokitansky, Professor of Pathological Anatomy at the University of Vienna: "In an article which appeared in the *Bremer Kurier* (No. 206) of July 27, 1878, it is said of this famous scholar, described in Prof. Paget's *Introduction to the History of Medicine* as 'the real founder of modern pathological anatomy' that he could not bring himself to see how living rabbits were cut open, how living animals' muscles were exposed, and so forth. Only with the greatest revulsion and heavy heart did he witness those vivisection operations which he was unable to prevent. He avoided it whenever this was possible. During his lifetime he dissected 30,000 corpses, but never performed a single animal experiment. He said: 'There are other methods of research than the experiment The history of evolution, pathological anatomy and clinical observation provide a mass of facts which are of more value than a thousand experiments.'" (*Kritische Beitrage zur Physiologie und Pathologie*. 1875)

Josef Hamernik, M.D., Professor of the University of Prague, Bohemia: "Some years since, some terrible cases came to light, which were falsely registered as an epidemic (epidemic of vaccino-syphilis), and which were caused by one vaccinator infecting a whole district with syphilis by vaccination! In the beginning of this year a similar misfortune occurred in the neighbourhood of Melnik, when a number of children in several districts got syphilis by vaccination, and several died of it" (*Anti-Vaccinator*, March 15, 1873)

Prof. Dr. Joseph Hyrtl, famous anatomist, professor at Vienna University:

"But these heartless and unfeeling bloodthirsty experimenters are joined by many much more dangerous people, who rehearse outrageous operations on dozens of dogs with the intention - if the animals do not immediately die in their hands - of also carrying them out at the next opportunity on wretched human beings suffering from tuberculosis or cancer. The medical journals have published hair-raising reports on this subject, and learned societies have provided a platform for lectures on these atrocities without expressing their indignation at the surgical killings which are becoming more and more common in our present age." (From *Lehrbuch der Anatomie des Menschen* - "Textbook of Human Anatomy", 15th and 20th edition)

Moreover, the anguish and sufferings of the animals, deprived of their natural habitat or habitual surroundings, terrorized by what they see in the laboratories and the brutalities they are subjected to, alter their mental balance and organic reactions to such an extent that 'any' result is a priori valueless. The laboratory animal is a monster, made so by the experimenters. Physically and mentally it has very little in common with a normal animal, and much less with man.

As even Claude Bernard (1813-1878), founder of the modern vivisectionist method, wrote in his *Physiologie experimentale* (p. 152): "The experimental animal is never in a normal state. The normal state is merely a supposition, an assumption." (*Une pure conception de l'esprit.*)

Dr. Charles Bell, M.D., F.R.C.S. (1824): "The public would not tolerate vivisection for a day if they did not believe that the animals were rendered insensible, and the plain fact is that they are not rendered insensible...It is the public who are anaesthetised...No good ever came out of vivisection since the world began, and in my opinion, no good ever can..."

In his fundamental book, representing "a republication of the papers delivered to the Royal Society on the subject of nerves". Charles Bell wrote: "Experiments have never been the means for discovery; and a survey of what has been attempted in recent years in physiology will prove that the opening of living animals has done more to perpetuate error than to confirm the just views taken from the study of anatomy and natural motions." (*An Exposition of The Natural System of the Nerves of the Human Body*, London, 1824, p.337)

## RANDOM ADDITIONS

More Statements by Physicians and Surgeons

Let no one confuse the kindly physicians who are turned to in times of physical suffering with hordes of so-called Research Workers who give their years to the laboratories. Some vivisection work is required from all medical students, but those whose natural tendencies (or what would better be called UN- natural tendencies) do not hold them to the cruelty or curiosity to be sated in the laboratory, desert it for what is termed "practice" and go into the world as healers.

Mr. Charles Forward: "Quite apart from the unanswerable objections to vivisection on ethical grounds, we have always contended that, so far from contributing to human welfare by assisting the medical profession to heal the sick and relieve the suffering, the tendency of vivisection has been to create a special profession with interests separate from those of the regular medical practitioner and directly conflicting with the interests of the general public."

The British Medical Journal: "The great surgeons of the past have not been vivisectors. Some of the most famous surgeons such as Bigelow and Lawson Tait, expressed their opposition to and detestation of vivisectional practices."

Charles Richet, M.D.: (A famous French vivisector): "I do not believe that a single experimenter says to himself when he gives curare to a rabbit or cuts the spinal cord of a dog, 'Here is an experiment which will relieve or cure the disease of some men.' No, he does not think that. He says to himself, 'I will clear up an obscure point. I will seek out a new fact.'"

William James, M.D., LL.D.: "Against any regulation whatever various medical and scientific defenders of vivisection protest. Their invariable contention, implied or expressed, is that it is no one's business what happens to an animal, so long as the individual who is handling it can plead that to increase science is his aim. The contention seems to me to flatly contradict the best conscience of our time. The rights of the helpless, even though they be brutes, must be protected by those who have superior power."

"The medical and scientific men who time and time again have raised their voices in opposition to all legal projects of regulation, know as well as anyone else does the unspeakable possibilities of callousness, wantonness, and meanness of human nature."

Letters from doctors to the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection and other societies:

Dr. James Gilroy, M.B., etc.: "I personally have always expressly disapproved of vivisection. As a student and as a practising doctor with nearly twenty years of experience I have at no time been able to see on what grounds I should alter my opposition to a method which we scientists should avoid."

Dr. D. Arthur Hughes, Member of the Royal Society of Medicine: "I have been an opponent of vivisection throughout my life, and as far as I know vivisection has not helped me in the slightest during my career as a doctor."

Dr. John McLachlan, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons: "As far as I can recognise, nothing good has so far been achieved through vivisection, either for humans or for other

beings; and this is also not to be expected. The country is full of the vivisectionists' empty and bombastic braggings about what they have achieved and will achieve in the future."

Dr. John Bowie, L.R.C.P., etc.: "For the medical profession vivisection has been a curse, as well as a hindrance instead of an aid towards increasing our knowledge. "

Dr. Augustus Brown, M.R.C.S.: "In answer to your question, what I think and feel about vivisection, I can only reply that I am totally opposed to it, because I consider vivisection very cruel and unnecessary."

Mr. James Horsley, Bachelor of Medicine, B. S. Durham: "... Vivisection, and all that goes with it, has been of no use to mankind and can never be of use to it. The effects of vivisection on the vivisectioners are as terrible as the effects on those who are destroyed by it I confidently look forward to the day when vivisection is totally abolished."

Dr. Edward Berdoe, M.R.C.S., M.R.C.P.: "I have witnessed the rise and fall of Pasteur's quackery, the failures of Koch's tuberculin and the diphtheria serum (antitoxin). Every day I become increasingly convinced that vivisection, which is based on cruelty, supported by lies and practised out of self-interest, is not a suitable method for furthering the merciful art of healing. It can also not be shown that any malady can be healed by a method arrived at through vivisection."

Dr. Alien Duke: "I do not believe that vivisection has increased our knowledge as far as the healing of disease is concerned."

Dr. Frederick A. Floyer, B.A., Bachelor of Medicine (Cambridge), M.R.C.S.: "I am certain that modern experimental medicine is leading us farther away from the truth, and I have already written and published a good deal to this effect..."

Dr. A. Stoddard Kennedy, L.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.: "I have long since been a strong opponent of vivisection as it is an insane, superficial and unscientific way of fighting illness. Vivisection is absolutely unnecessary and should be abolished."

Dr. E. J. H. Midwinter, L.R.C.P.S. (London Hospital): "After more than 30 years of experience in hospitals and in general practice I cannot see that anything useful has been achieved through inhuman vivisection, or that it has any beneficial influence on human life."

Dr. Henry Love, Bachelor of Medicine: "55 years of observation beside the sick-bed form the basis of my views. Sixty years ago, during my student days, I never saw a vivisection, but in my practice I have tested certain vaccines and sera, without, however, discovering any reasonable grounds for continuing such a form of treatment. I do not believe that the orthodox medical theory, according to which a certain bacillus is the sole specific cause of a given disease, has any true basis."

Dr. F. M. Cann, M.R.C.S.: "How is it to be presumed that men and women, by means of cutting open and otherwise mutilating living animals, even including the removal of various



organs, and by manufacturing serums in laboratories, can contribute anything at all worthwhile to saving life or treating diseases?"

Dr. S. A. Richards, M.R.C.P., M.R.C.S.: "More pain is inflicted on the animals than the law-makers realize. Giving chloroform during the operation does not prevent the subsequent pains from wounds caused by the knife, and it is not able to do so."

Dr. F. E. Vernede, M.R.C.S.: "I am pleased to inform you that a steadily growing number of members of the medical profession are entirely of the opinion that vivisection experiments on animals have not only led to mistakes in medical practice, but are absolutely misleading in their results."

Dr. C. Muthu, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.: "Artificial experiments on animals under artificial conditions cannot possibly reproduce what happens to an animal in natural conditions. Even if it were possible to perform experiments on animals under natural conditions, how can one reasonably deduce that the results obtained could also be applied to human beings?"

Dr. F. J. F. Rooke, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., etc.: "I believe that very few doctors know what goes on under the name of research, otherwise we would hear more protests."

Dr. J. H. Deane, L.R.C.P., L.R.C.S., Edin.: "After close observation over the past 30 years I believe that vivisection has done nothing to advance the healing of disease. But it has done damage by diverting the doctors away from the observation of disease. I do not believe that it has in any way prolonged life or reduced the suffering of mankind."

Dr. Francis Arnold, Bachelor of Medicine, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, etc.: "I believe that medicine and surgery have gained nothing through vivisection. There is not one single 'triumph of vivisection' - such as the serum treatment of diphtheria, the Pasteur vaccination against anthrax and rabies, and so forth - the usefulness of which has not been energetically disputed even by eminent doctors and surgeons who are themselves advocates of vivisection."

Dr. Med. Max Bachem, Frankfurt am Main: "The fight against vivisection is a matter of what is right and of moral evolution, an ethical requirement, and as such a question for the entire people."

Dr. Med. Hoist, Denmark: "The claim that vivisection is a necessary means of training for the doctor and surgeon I must certainly deny from my thirty years of practice as a doctor. "

Dr. F. H. Tedd, Cleveland, Ohio: "I am anxiously concerned to help put an end to the useless, ghastly animal cruelties and tortures carried out in medical faculties and large hospitals. My experience over 40 long years of study, observation and medical practice teaches me that nothing of any practical worth that prolongs life or avoids suffering has been discovered by animal experiments. Carrying them out has, rather, hardened certain doctors into risking fresh experiments on humans in order to satisfy their morbid curiosity."

Dr. R. N. Forster, Chicago: "In assuming the office of President of this Society (Illinois Anti-Vivisection Society), I consider it important at the outset to have a clear understanding with my members. It seems to be generally believed that doctors unanimously approve of and defend vivisection, which is no straightforward barbarity, but a reversal of scientific understanding..."

Letters to the "Internationaler Verein zur Bekaempfung der wissenschaftlichen Tierfolter" (International Association against Scientific Animal Torture), Dresden:

Dr. med. Richard Wolf, Breslau: "Anyone who has stood a lot at the sick-bed and tried to observe his patients humanely and at the same time scientifically, knows what value he can attach to the physiological experiments and their results. It is simply pathetic how everything that we have learned in the laboratory lets us down. It would be like carrying coals to Newcastle if I were to waste another word on the 'value' of animal experiments..."

Dr. med. Boehm, Friedrichroda in Th.: "...on top of this there is the fact that vivisection is perfectly unnecessary; for all the results that we obtain via this cruel means are available to us through surgery with its great forward strides: when operating, we see all the organs functioning, and not just in the body of an animal, but in the living human being himself."

Dr. med. H. v.d. Woemitz: "The vivisector...whose madness has been the fashion in 'infallible' science for decades past (and who knows for how much longer), operates within his field as a dangerous character, dangerous not only for the poor animals but also for our entire human race. The proof is there, and is generally known. In future times vivisection will be a subject only for the historian, and many a future lawyer and doctor will then be able to prepare his doctoral thesis on the subject: 'Witch-burning, flagellation, inquisition and vivisection seen as mass psychoses'. May that time come soon!"

Replies to a questionnaire from the "International Anti-Vivisection League", 90 rue Augustin Delporte, Brussels:

Dr. Vandebossche, physician, Charleroi: "I am opposed to vivisection, it should be totally prohibited, because it is of no use and immoral..."

Dr. De Broeux, physician, Brussels: "In my opinion vivisection should be discarded, for it is useless and cruel. The use of any animal of any species as an object for experimentation is indefensible."

Dr. Hirard, physician, Antwerp: "I reject vivisection, which is pointless and often serves stupid purposes. We should declare a ruthless war against vivisection."

Dr. E. Honnez, physician, Binche: "I totally disapprove of vivisection as an experimental method. It should be abolished, because other methods are available."

Dr. Lecomte, senior physician, Ham s. Heure: "I reject vivisection because it is a useless piece of cruelty and achieves nothing for science."

Dr. Duvivier, Mons, Head of Department at the Civil Hospital, professor at the Maternity Hospital: "I am a resolute opponent for the advancement of medicine, and also because it is immoral due to its undisputed cruelty."

Dr. de Lange, physician, Brussels: "I reject and condemn vivisection, because it is useless to the advancement of medicine and offends morality."

Professor Albert Covin: "What have we learned (from animal experiments)? As far as I am concerned, I have never vivisected, but I can assure you that my therapeutical studies are none the worse for that fact."

Dr. Deswatine, physician, Paris: "Vivisection should be prohibited among all civilised peoples and those who practice it should be severely punished. It is a barbaric practice, cruel, irrational and unnecessary, from whatever standpoint one looks at it, from the physiological, the practical, the medical or the surgical, as well as from the therapeutical and toxicological. One cannot protest strongly enough against these dreadful and disgusting experiments...The vivisectors bring dishonour on us, and bring shame on Science."

Dr. A. M. D. Andreux, Paris, public health engineer, health superintendent, Pon St. Vincent: "As far as my opinion of vivisection is concerned, I have no wish to conceal the fact from you that I am a convinced opponent of it. I find it crude, and the doctors who call themselves intelligent, degrading. One will never achieve anything with experiments. It is shameful that our government and our times allow such things to continue."

Dr. Foveau de Courmelles, Paris, President of the International Society for External Medicine, medical adviser to the Education Department of the Legion of Honour, honoured by the French Academy of Medicine: "Both feeling and reason condemn vivisection. The only way to study physiology has already often been shown by both the doctors and the surgeons: it is by studying Man. But the terrible custom is to continue resorting to vivisection, this ancient procedure which has never produced a single success in 20 centuries. Valuable time which could have been used profitably for science in other ways has thereby been wasted. The evil, out-moored, archaic and malevolent vivisectionist thinking must be fought"

Dr. M. Petit, Brussels: "Vivisection should be done away with due to its immorality and futility. It is difficult to believe that the circulation and breathing in an injured organism, whether anaesthetised or not, as well as the nervous reactions and so forth, are really functioning in their normal way."

Dr. Hiard, physician, Chenee (Belgium): "The cruel demonstration experiments on animals that are carried out in front of students are useless. They learn nothing from them, and stand guilty and bewildered before the bound and groaning animals. The greatest discoveries in medicine and surgery owe nothing to vivisection, which for many teachers and students has become a cruel sport rather than a necessity..."

Dr. Gillion, physician, Brussels: "I am a total opponent of vivisection. It must be abandoned,

because it is of no use for advancing medicine...The animal experiments carried out before students are totally unnecessary. We don't need to make the journey to America in order to be sure that such a country exists"

Dr. Ots, Brussels, surgeon and gynaecologist: "I expressly declare the torments inflicted on the horses at veterinary colleges to be unworthy of civilised mankind. That is no longer science, but sadism."

Dr. E. Villers, Brussels: "I am not a supporter of vivisection. The study of medicines and their effects on the organism produces results which are at variance with each other according to whether one studies on humans or on animals. The experiments carried out before students are pointless and barbaric demonstrations which only lead to wretched results. "

Dr. Albert Salivas, physician, Avon, France: "My opinion of vivisection? Here it is, in a nutshell: it is already repulsive in itself, but has it - viewed from the medical standpoint - ever performed the service of producing even one single piece of genuine and useful information? - No, a hundred times no! And precisely for that reason I am and remain relentlessly opposed to it."

Dr. Roche, member of the Paris Academy: "Don't you see every day that vivisection's 'sure results' of the previous year are proved wrong by the next year's 'undisputable results'? These experiments lead to false conclusions, fill heads with doubts, litter the field of Science with contradictions and wreckage, and these alone are not in the position to produce anything whatever."

Dr. de Burignae de Formel, physician, Limoges: "I have great pleasure in placing my name alongside those who protest against the inhuman and unnecessary atrocity and cruelty of vivisection..."

Dr. Henry Boueher, physician, Paris: "The reduction of vivisection is worthless and is nothing but a trap. Only its total abolition can satisfy the demands of morality, science and humanity. Vivisection is useless for Science, and dangerous for Mankind. "

Dr. Mauriee Laurent, physician, Paris: "I support the total abolition of vivisection with my entire heart and mind."

Dr. Daniel Makree, physician, Leuz, France, former senior physician at the Women's Hospital: "I am...an advocate of the unconditional abolition of vivisection. I find it loathsome, unworthy of our modern civilisation and useless for the advancement of science."

Dr. Lecomte, physician, Ham s. Seure: "I disapprove of vivisection, because it is an unnecessary cruelty and achieves nothing for science."

#### SWISS DOCTORS AGAINST VIVISECTION

Prof. Ignatz Hoppe, Professor Extraordinary of pharmacology, dietetics and general therapy at the University of Basle: "These dreadful facts are an expression of brutality and

arrogance...and triumph disdain for the enquiring as well as knowledgeable sections of the public...The shameful facts point to: ignorance on the part of the supervisory authorities, rashness on the part of the teaching profession, inadequate maturity in the teachers and lack of planning in science..." (From a letter to Ernst von Weber)

Dr. med. E. Constantin, Senior Consultant at the Rothschild Hospital in Geneva: "Vivisection seems to us an expression of parasitism, i.e. the tendency to live at the expense of other creatures and even to cruelly torment them. It is the opposite of the ideal aspired to by the human spirit; vivisection is therefore inhuman and deserves to be condemned." (From the leaflet *Appeal to the people's conscience*)

Dr. med. D. Simonin, Lausanne: "I am for the abolition of vivisection because it is unnecessary for progress in medicine. Why do we have these animal experiments performed before students, when the conclusions drawn from them have long since been known and proven?"

Dr. E. Grysanowski, Doctor of Medicine and of Philosophy: "...If the physiologists really imagine, and the doctors repeat it after them, that all the 'successes' of medicine are due to physiological experimentation, then they do not know what time of the day it is. For as far as the successes of medicine are concerned, it is virtually an open secret that the public is beginning to grow tired of these 'successes' and is, in its scepticism and desperation, threatening to cast itself into the arms of the natural and public practitioners." (From his book *Gesammelte antivivisektionistische Schriften*, Münster)

Prof. Dr. Strausse. Diirkbeim, famous anatomist (quoted in *Uitsprakenover de Vivisectie* by Koloman Kaiser): "Students gain absolutely no benefit from the dreadful vivisection method. All the functions of the organs of the animals held in this terrible condition are functioning so abnormally that one can learn nothing from them. But fanaticism is a contagious disease that is spreading; vivisection is turning up everywhere. The torture is done purely out of curiosity, out of force of habit, out of addiction."

Dr. R. H. Perks: "...The attempt to obtain knowledge about physiological and pathological processes in man by vivisectioning animals is completely unscientific. All such experiments have led to extremely confused, contradictory and consequently worthless results, in other words they have done far more to obscure knowledge than to illuminate it. That section of the public that has so far treated this matter with selfish apathy would do well to take cognizance of the fact of vivisection on animals..." (From the work *Why I condemn vivisection*)

Dr. Frederisk D. Dyster: "I am of the opinion that neither science nor the human race would suffer if the law were to step in and strongly forbid the endless repetition of merciless cruelties, for these merely perform the purpose of demonstrating truths which are already known and recognised." (*British Medical Journal*, No. 734, page 126)

Dr. Geo Macilwain, M.R.C.S.: "Vivisection is a deceptive method of research in medicine and should be abolished." (*The R.S.P.C.A. and the Royal Commission of Enquiry on Vivisection*,

Smith, Elder & co., page 165)

"In my opinion, as a result of vivisection, the highest aims to which a scientific mind can aspire, are desecrated by the most wretched and worthless experimental methods."  
(*Vivisection*, page 139, Hatchards, London)

G. Fleming, veterinary surgeon: "The vivisector can very well be compared with an inquisitor, who seeks to unlock the secrets of Nature by means of the most horrifying and prolonged torture of his victims, whereas the executioner and the butcher feel obliged to bring about as quick a death as possible...It is an undeniable fact that thousands of dogs, cats, horses and other animals have had to succumb to inhuman cruelties which only human ingenuity can dream up, without the results having been of any use to suffering mankind or improved or increased our knowledge; on the contrary, they have shattered the moral nature of mankind, and arrested or misled human knowledge...Vivisection is not necessary to the training of a veterinary surgeon." (From *Vivisection, is it necessary?* page 31 ff.)

Dr. med. E. G. Hammer: "We can point out the manner in which the ignorance and gullibility of the lay public is exploited. The surgeon chloroforms his patient. The operation is short; when the patient regains consciousness the surgical operation is over...The physiologist also anaesthetises his animal, but only in order to make it defenceless. Once it has been tied up and fixed in the apparatus, so that it is held immobile, the chloroform bottle is put to one side, firstly because the anaesthesia is now no longer necessary, secondly because in most cases the nature of the exercise determines full consciousness to be necessary, and thirdly because there can be absolutely no question of keeping the animal anaesthetised for hours or days on end. But if the apparatus is not sufficient to ensure the total immobility of the animal (and unfortunately this is often the case), the animal is immobilised with curare (arrow poison), although the lungs, which are also immobilised, are kept active by means of artificial respiration, i.e. by pumping in air. These two complementary operations (administration of curare and artificial breathing) naturally make the use of chloroform totally dispensable."  
(Extract from his paper *Die Verteidiger des Vivisektion und das Laienpublikum*)

"... But the public is fed with bait so that it will bow tamely and passively before the High Priests of Science...It is self-evident that one can paralyse, poison and wound an animal, but this does not provide one with any typical patterns of illness..."

Dr. med. Jatros: "...Physiological experimentation is unreliable and fallacious, like all physiology. It lacks the necessary conclusiveness possessed by experimentation in physics...When one considers that vivisection is becoming commoner every day, that hundreds of the cruelest experiments are carried out, both secretly and publicly, by students and by professors day by day; that these experiments often last for hours and even days; that the animals which survive the experiment do not receive a merciful death but are kept for new experiments, and that the intrinsic uncertainty of the results spurs the researchers with their belief in the almightiness of Science, to think up ever newer and ever more abominable experimental procedures...one feels that one is dealing here with a moral monstrosity the

existence of which can only fail to be noticed by those who no longer, or not yet, distinguish between what is monstrous and what is normal..." (From his tract *Die Vivisektion, ihr wissenschaftlicher Wert und ihre ethische Berechtigung*)

Dr. med. Nagel: "The parasites are harmless to anyone who builds up his body with pure nutrients and protects it from impure foreign substances, for it is only when a foul soil has previously been prepared in the human body that parasites afterwards take up lodging as the avenging enforcers of Nature's laws. Small children, when they bump into the edge of a table, push the blame from themselves onto the table, - and grown-up children are no cleverer when it comes to the teaching about epidemics. It is certain that the cheese must first be stale before the maggots find it tasty, and it is certain that the human body must have already got into a foul condition before the parasites move into it while it is still alive...The only ones to gain from such theories are those doctors who remain slyly silent about their patients' bad living habits, or even gloss over them, and like to persuade their patients that the illnesses have descended on them from above like secret monsters which only the doctors know how to get rid of." (In his tract: *Die Vivisektion, heillose Irrwege der Wissenschaft*)

Dr. med. Heusinger: "I gladly confirm the judgement of Prof. Dr. Clams: vivisection, painful operations and mutilations carried out on living animals, for the most part give just as dubious results in scientific research as does torture in the legal field." (*Encyclopaedia of Medicine*, page 228)

Dr. Malev-Kessels of the G. Brugman Sanatorium, Alseberg (Belgium): "The useless and immoral practice of vivisection must be abolished. I wouldn't tolerate it under the control of a commission."

Dr. J. Pawels, Strombeek (Belgium): "The vivisections performed before students are useless and harmful. I have noticed that vivisection gave pleasure to certain students in whom the sadistic instinct had been slumbering."

Dr. med. J. Hellmann: "The vivisectors are professional torturers, whose hands are smeared with the blood of countless innocent creatures, slowly murdered in unspeakable torment...May the animal protection societies be on guard, and not let elements join their ranks who only come in order to divide, and not to unify, wolves in sheep's clothing...Listen, whoever has ears to hear!" (From the tract *Ein Memento jar den Berner und alle in seinen Fusstapfen wandelnden Tierschutzvereine*. Dedicated by the authoress to the Society against Medical Animal Torture, Berne)

Dr. R. Bertbon, London: "When an instrument produces false or dubious results, one stops using it. But this is not the case where vivisection is concerned, even though it has led the physiologists to make grave errors, and led both physicians and surgeons into a false conception of disease which has always been the cause of an erroneous therapy (treatment). How many investigations were carried out concerning the secretion of the gall-bladder, and how many animals were forced to endure unspeakable suffering in the process? And all the resulting theories were incorrect. Legallois performed countless unsuccessful experiments in

order to study the influence of the nervous system on the circulation of the blood, and drew the following conclusion: 'After many fruitless attempts to throw light on this dark question I had to give them up, not without regret at having sacrificed such a large number of animals and wasted so much time.'" (*Die Gesundheit*, Vienna, No. 4, 5th Year - "Why I fight Vivisection")

Warren Freeman, M.D.: "As it seems so very doubtful whether vivisection has lessened human suffering or not, I can only go in for a complete forbidding of the practice."

Dr. George M. Gould: Editor of American Magazine, late Editor of the Medical News: "The practices carried on by conceited jackanapes to prove over and over again already ascertained results, to minister to egotism, for didactic purposes, are not necessary and must be forbidden."

Dr. William Held, internationally famous Chicago physician: "Practice on dogs probably does make a good veterinarian, if that's the kind of practitioner you want for your family. Vivisection has done little for cancer, which in animals is not the same malignant condition found in man."

Prof. James E. Garretson, MD: "I am without words to express my horror of vivisection, though I have been a teacher of anatomy and surgery for 30 years. It serves no purpose that is not better served in other ways."

Gordon Latta, MB, Ch.B.: "I consider that vivisection is unscientific. The man or woman who carries out such cruel experimentation exhibits a mind that is out of touch with the great realities. May the day hasten when vivisection will be looked upon as a great tragedy enacted principally by an un-illuminated medical profession." (From Rochester League, p. 100)

Bertrand P. Allinson, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.: "... Orthodox medicine condones ill-conduct and seeks to restore health without rectifying it. True health cannot be attained in this manner. Vivisection has no philosophy, no ethics, and no width of vision. It will, therefore, disappear in the course of time. "

R. T. Bowden, M.D., M.R.C.S., L.S.A.: "What guarantee have we that by trying to protect ourselves from one disease we are not lessening our power to resist attacks from other diseases? That this danger really exists is proved by vaccination, which was extensively employed for nearly a hundred years before it was discovered that vaccination was a frequent cause of fatal encephalitis."

Sir Alexander Cannon, M.D., D.P.M., M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.A., etc.: "In regard to my opinion of experiments on living animals, I entirely concur with the views expressed by my old friend, Lord Moynihan, in one of his speeches, as follows: 'The material of the human body is neither the same, nor subject to the same influences, as that of animals nearest to man; similar functions are not wholly discharged by precisely similar mechanisms; the pressure of environments is not comparable in the two cases; and above all, the mind of man is infinitely complex in comparison with that of the most intelligent animals.'"



R. Fielding-Gould, M.A., M.D., M.R.C.P.: "... Is vivisection cruel? We have ample evidence without giving instances here, that vivisection experiments involve the most intense and prolonged suffering for countless animals every year. This suffering has been admitted by the Medical Research Council, and is evidenced by the publications of the vivisectionists themselves...In spite of the power of mass opinion in the medical profession "to quell independence of mind," there have been, and are, no few medical men of distinction who have had the courage to publicly condemn the practice of vivisection, as not only unnecessary and useless but, more often than not, actually misleading."

Richard H. K. Hope, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.: "My views are simplicity itself - Man's duty is to redeem, not to exploit the creature. Therefore, even if vivisection were necessary - which I profoundly doubt - it is of all sins the most cowardly, fraudulent, subhuman and un-Christian."

Hector W. Jordan, M.B., B.S.: "In my opinion vivisection is both unnecessary and cruel. It is unnecessary because by now there is sufficient knowledge of the causes of disease and ill-health for us, if this were put into operation, to stamp out something like 80 per cent. of disease. It has already been shown in communities like that of the Hunzas of N.W. India that correct feeding and living, combined with a sound agriculture, produces in the race of people a sound and healthy physique. The commoner diseases of civilisation are completely unknown in this tribe. In my opinion vivisection is also cruel because there is absolutely no justification for it."

H. P. Kilsby, L.L.M., L.R.C.P.J., L.R.C.S.I.: "It was the spiritual determination and courage of the gallant few who finally obtained the end of child-slavery, bear-baiting, cock-fighting and other abominations. Very few, if anybody, today would attempt to question the right of such legislation; yet at the time almost all, including the Church, were part of the opposition. So it is with the antivivisection movement. Its success is not to be measured by numbers of members or current achievements, however important these may be, but because it is the leaven in the heavy, so very stupid, but not really wicked, public conscience and understanding, which it will one day transform to spiritual sanity."

Gordon Latta, M.B., Ch.B.: "I consider that vivisection is unscientific...May the day hasten when vivisection will be looked upon as a great tragedy enacted principally by an unilluminated medical profession upon whose shoulders such great responsibilities and sacred privileges rest."

Edward Moore, M.B., B.Ch., B.A.O.: "The practice of vivisection tends to the acceptance of the thesis that disease is something natural and unavoidable, and seeks to absolve man from a sense of personal responsibility towards himself through the production of animal antidotes, sera, antibiotics, and the use of suppressant drugs, thereby encouraging escapism. Therefore it is not only degrading to man, but distinctly detrimental to his progress towards advancement. It is not only cruel to animals sacrificed to vivisectional research, but ultimately cruel to man himself. On this account it is highly immoral, and should be suppressed by law."

Cyril V. Pink, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.: "Quite apart from ethics and cruelty, there is another reason

for condemning vivisection. I am not at all impressed by the claims of the vivisectors. In relation to time, money and brains put into their work, the return has been very poor indeed. I hold that, had the same amount of attention been given to the study of personal hygiene and the way of life of the patient, as a cause of disease, medicine would have advanced much farther."

L. C. Rowans-Robinson, M.B., Ch.B. (Edin.), Surg. Comdr., R.N. (retired.): "...It is therefore a relic of a barbarous age - the age of cock-fighting and bear-baiting - to say that animals have no rights. Various forms of cruelty to animals still continue and vivisection is still unchecked. The small creatures are sensitive and suffer much through these experiments, which are often of a revolting character..."

Dorothy Shepherd, M.B., Ch.B. (Edin.): "Vaccines, serums, and immunisation are extremely crude methods of prevention of disease; they are based on the wrong conception that germs are the cause of disease, while the truth is that germs are but the result of disordered states in the body. It is only by correcting the soil that you can remove the predisposition to any disease; and this can only be done by natural methods on nature cure lines assisted by homeopathy. The modern methods of injecting huge doses of germs and their products into the human body are disastrous and long lasting in their effects."

G. N. W. Thomas, M.B., Dh.B., D.P.M., Barrister-at-Law: As one who has had a long and wide experience and specialised in more than one branch of medical science and in association with its leading men, I feel it my bounden duty to protest, with many other doctors (supported as we are by the considered judgment of various leaders of our profession), against the cruelties to the dumb creatures which are being perpetrated not only in this country but throughout the world in the name of medical science."

H. Fergie Woods, M.D.(Brux.), M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.: "I have studied the question of vivisection for thirty-five years and am convinced that experiments on living animals are leading medicine further and further from the real cure of the patient. I know of no instance of animal experiment that has been necessary for the advance of medical science, still less do I know of any animal experiment that could conceivably be necessary to save human life."

Dr. John Elliotson: "I cannot refrain from expressing my horror at the amount of torture which Dr. Brachet inflicted...A course of experimental physiology, in which brutes are agonized to exhibit facts already established, is a disgrace to the country which permits it."

Arnold, M.B., B.CH., M.R.C.S.: Sir Charles Bell, discoverer of the distinct function of the nerves, said: 'Experiments have never been the means of discovery.' George Granville Bantock, the noted gynecologist and obstetrician, stated that he had never seen an experiment; Prof. Lawson Tait, the foremost surgeon of his day, said that vivisection had often led him astray; it had not helped a bit. Sir Frederick Treves found his experiments on dogs unfitted him to deal with the human intestine - such was the difference between the human and the canine bowel.

"I believe that medicine and surgery have gained nothing by vivisection, that it is, considered as a method of research, utterly barren and misleading and bound in the nature of things always to be so. I am, however, not putting forward an opinion, but stating a fact, when I say that there is not one of the 'triumphs of vivisection' such as the antitoxin of diphtheria, Pasteurian inoculation for anthrax, hydrophobia, etc., whose utility is not strenuously denied by eminent physicians and surgeons, who are themselves supporters of vivisection. Vivisection has produced absolutely nothing whose utility to 'suffering humanity' is unanimously affirmed, even by the vivisection fraternity itself."

Frederick M. Collins, M.D.A.M.: (Dean First National University of Naturopathy): "Vivisection is a disgrace to modern civilization. It is horrible to the extreme, the suffering the animals go through for the benefit of so-called Science. With all of the vivisection and experiments on dogs, scientists have not yet discovered one iota of proof where it has been of any benefit to relieve the suffering human race of its ills. There are over 9,000 medical hospitals in the United States, containing over 1,857,000 beds, and 153,000 physicians and surgeons, and yet there is a daily sick population of over two million. Where has vivisection been of any service to the multitude?"

Robert Bell, M.D., M.B., F.R.C.S.: Vice-President International Cancer Research Society: "...It is impossible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion in regard to cancer in man by experimenting on animals...The vivisection of dogs never has, and cannot possibly in any degree prove of the remotest value to those investigating the nature and treatment of cancer. The only method of research that has yielded satisfactory results has been associated with clinical observation, and I am convinced that experiments upon animals have been the means of barring the way to progress."

E.H. Hawkes, M.D.: "I believe that vivisection blunts the moral sense to such a degree as to become a strong force in the production of criminals."

Robert H. Perks, M.D., F.R.C.S.: "Only in a very small proportion of these operations is consciousness abolished by the use of efficient anaesthetics, such as chloroform and ether; and even when used the convenience of the operator and not the victim is mostly considered, and the anaesthesia is often only partial in character; or the victim is "quieted" by the administration of drugs, such as morphia, chloral, curare and others - in no sense true anaesthetics - by which it is rendered more or less muscularly inert, but with sensibility still more or less intact. In a large number of cases prolonged and often terrible suffering has to be borne by the victims without possibility of relief from anaesthetics, viz those in which, although the initial operation has been performed under anaesthesia, the animal is, after surgical mutilation or with exposed vital organs, reserved for further observation for days, weeks or even months, during which period it may suffer acutely; and also in all cases of inoculation of disease in which the subsequent sufferings are often equally great."

Prof. Schiff: "It is nothing but hypocrisy to wish to impose on oneself and others the belief that the curarised animal does not feel pain."

Prof. Virchow: "I do not for a moment suggest that vivisection does not cause pain and suffering. "

Dr. Borel: "I have vivisected birds, horses, frogs, rabbits and above all, dogs, and I can affirm that it is almost entirely impossible to employ anaesthetics upon animals so as to render them insensible."

Dr. Francois Dejardin, former chief surgeon of the hospitals of Liege, Belgium, wrote these revealing words: "Every sane person trembles at the sight and smell of blood, and resents the sacrilegious shudder that in these individuals is a sign of delight I have seen horrible looks in their eyes, exultant and proud of the spilled blood, and in which one could read the satisfaction for the advantages obtained: pecuniary advantages, or of renown."

Hamilton Fisk Biggar: (Late Physician to Mr. John D. Rockefeller): "The statements that are going out from time to time by vivisectors, that cruelties are not inflicted, are not regarded as truthful, for there are hundreds of instances where cruelties of the most atrocious kinds have been inflicted..."

"Complete and conscientious anaesthesia is seldom ever attempted. The testimony before the Royal Commission was that it is the greatest delusion to suppose that while an animal lived and was being experimented on it was insensible from anaesthetics or narcotics.

"When anaesthetics interfere with due results, which is the case about half the time, no anaesthetics are given. That it is manifest that the practice of vivisection is wrong, far-reaching in its degeneracy, may be found in persons of very high position such as physiologists. It is because these savageries are committed by men who are respected and admired that they are so utterly dangerous to our national morality. It is evident that this hardening of the sympathetic nature of the physician is liable to react upon the sick under his charge in careless and unfeeling treatment. The same mental temperament and condition that delights in experiments on subhuman animals would prompt the practitioner to experiment on a patient"

## CONCLUSION

A perusal of the multitude of medical opinions - merely samples of a much larger collection - presented in this book might seem encouraging to anti-vivisectionists, insofar as it shows them that the number of experts who consider animal experimentation not merely useless but dangerously misleading, and therefore to be abolished, is much greater than they expected; on the other hand it could also be discouraging, because it shows that whatever is being said today had been said before, all the dire predictions that were made by the really competent, honest and courageous doctors, such as Hadwen of Gloucester, over the last century have meanwhile come tragically true, whereas all the extravagant promises made by the laboratory barkers, the venial "science" magazines and the accredited "medical correspondents" have proved to be nothing but flatulent boasts. And yet there has been no abolition, nor even reduction, of the misleading animal experiments, there hasn't been the slightest improvement,

nor even reappraisal, on an official level. There have only been new tricks devised to keep the public anesthetized and misinformed through the industry beholden health authorities and mass media; tricks not designed to halt the proliferation of ever new, profitable drugs and maladies, but to increase them.

Particularly damaging to the abolitionist cause are the "animal rights" organisations - lately ballyhooed by the press - who are either headed by incompetent people, however honest they be, or have been taken over by the industrial interests, or else have been founded by them outright. They deliberately restrict any discussion about vivisection to philosophy, thereby concealing the mass of medical evidence that cries out for a quick demise of vivisection. Only scientific arguments can effect changes on a political, i.e. practical level.

Thus the problem that not only the anti-vivisectionists but all of humanity face, if it is to survive, is how the invisible wall of censorship built up by the evil forces that rule us, can be broken. A way has to be found.

The problem does not lie so much with the evil forces as with humanity itself, whose majority traditionally lack the mental faculties to recognize the truth until it is too late. As Albert Einstein put it in a letter he wrote on April 10, 1938 from Princeton to a Rumanian friend, Maurice Solovine: "A fashion rules each age, without most people being able to see the tyrants that rule them."

In this book CIVIS has tried to show some of the tyrants Einstein was referring to.

## BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Sir Charles Bell (1774-1824)

Scottish physician, surgeon, anatomist, and physiologist, to whom medical science owes "Bell's law" on motor and sensory nerves, which is of fundamental importance to medical science and practice. At the time the aberration of vivisection began taking root in its modern form, he declared that it could only be practiced and propagated by thoroughly calloused individuals, who couldn't be expected to understand the complexities of biology, because such individuals, he maintained, suffered from a severely limited intelligence - sensibility being a component, and certainly not the least, of human intelligence. "I don't think that men capable of such cruelties have the faculties to penetrate the mysteries of nature," was the way he put it, establishing a new "Bell's law" which has proved as right as his more celebrated one. He was among the many antivivisectionists of his time who distinguished themselves for services to humanity, as when he traveled to Europe expressly to tend to the wounded of the battle of Waterloo. His controversy with Frenchman Magendie, who performed a long series of incredibly cruel, sadistic experiments on animals just to "demonstrate" the rightness of the physiological law that Bell had already arrived at by the sheer exercise of intelligent observation and his unadulterated intellect stand described in *Slaughter of the Innocent*.

Irwin D. J. Bross

Dr. Bross writes as a scientist with more than 30 years experience in public health. In 1954, as head of research design and analysis at Sloan-Kettering, the world's biggest cancer research institute, he initiated and designed the controlled clinical trials that led to what was believed to be the first cures of childhood leukemia. During the same period, Dr. Bross pioneered the first statistical studies of highway special accidents investigations which led to the use of seat belts and was also a major force behind the reduction in the tar and nicotine levels of cigarettes. In 1959, Dr. Bross was invited by the Director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute of Cancer research in Buffalo, New York, to head its department of biostatistics. Bross' first project was to set up the first major controlled clinical trial of breast cancer chemorotherapy. Using modern sophisticated statistical techniques, Bross has elucidated the actual hazards of such controversial technologies as medical x-rays and toxic waste sites. He is now President of Biomedical Metatechnology Inc. Dr. Bross is author or co-author of over 300 published articles and reports as well as three books, including his *Scientific Strategies to Save Your Life*, a statistical monograph published by Marcel Dekker, Inc. in 1980.

Vernon Coleman

A former family doctor and former editor of the British Clinical Journal, he is acknowledged as Britain's leading medical author and journalist. A Fellow of the Royal Society of Medicine, he has written over 30 books which have sold over 1,000,000 copies and been translated into 11 languages. He has written over 4,000 published articles and regularly contributes to Britain's leading newspapers, magazines, and medical journals. He has also been a broadcaster for nearly 20 years, and his programs have sold in 26 countries. In recent times, he has become known for his anti-vivisectionist views.

As his immense popularity demonstrates, Dr. Coleman has mastered better than any of his colleagues the fine art of denouncing the unbelievable cruelty inherent in all vivisectionist practice without revealing its negative aspects for human health, which are responsible for turning modern medicine into the main cause of disease today. Had he also conveyed that to his public, all main vehicles of information would instantly have been foreclosed to him.

Pietro Croce

Prof. P. Croce, M.D., is a luminary of medical science. Born in Dalmatia in 1920, he graduated at the University of Pisa, Italy. His international curriculum includes: Fulbright Scholarship, Research Department of the National Jewish Hospital of Colorado University in Denver, Research Department of Toledo, Ohio, Scholarship Ciudad Sanatorial of Tarrasa in Barcelona, Spain. Between 1952 and 1982, head of the laboratory of microbiological-pathological anatomy and chemo-clinical analyses at the Hospital L. Sacco of Milan, Italy. He is a member of the College of American Pathologists and author of many medical books, papers and articles. Currently he is active in a laboratory at Vicenza, Northern Italy, doing medical analyses.

Like so many other physicians and medical researchers before him, Professor Croce one day

also came to realize that the much-vaunted animal experimentation he had been conducting for years was not only valueless but damaging to medical science and practice. Unlike most of his colleagues - defying pressure from above, the risk of professional retaliation, and the necessity of having to retract publicly everything he had for a long time taught and believed in - he one day abruptly decided to forswear all work on animals and started conducting a courageous, outspoken war against this senseless old practice, by writing articles, publishing books and participating in conferences and debates in Italy and all over Europe on the subject.

Bruno Fedi

Professor Fedi qualified as doctor of medicine and surgery at Florence University in 1960. After obtaining the highest marks at the end of a specialist study of urology, he was appointed as Professor at that University in 1968. He went on specialising in the field of anatomical pathology, then in gynecology, then also in oncology (cancer treatment). To expand further his medical knowledge, he attended specialization courses in Paris and Barcelona.

Prof. Fedi was awarded a prize by the World Health Organisation for his work. He lectured at the Universities of Florence and Rome from 1961 to 1970. Since 1970 he has been a Senior Consultant for Pathological Anatomy at the City Hospital of Terni, Italy. He has directed medical courses at the Universities of Perugia and Rome, and has published over a hundred scientific papers. He testified on medicine and animal experimentation at the hearings of the European Parliament in Strasbourg in December 1982.

Walter R. Hadwen (1854-1932)

Also known as "Dr. Hadwen of Gloucester", is regarded as one of the most remarkable individuals and brilliant physicians of our century. Born in Woolwich, he showed unusual intelligence already in childhood, being able to read Latin fluently by the age of seven. He was articled to a chemist as a teenager, and achieved his pharmaceutical qualifications when he was 22. In 1878 he and his wife moved to Somerset to run his own pharmacy business, but he soon realized that health cannot be bought in pharmacies. Having meantime become a vegetarian, he decided to study medicine. He became First Prizeman in Physiology, Operative Surgery, Pathology, Forensic Medicine, and won the Clark Scholarship in 1891, awarded to the most distinguished medical student of the year. Having practiced vivisection in the course of his early studies, he soon recognized that practice as a medical aberration, no less dangerous than the practice of vaccination. He became famous nationwide when he delivered Gloucester of an epidemic of smallpox in a shorter time than any other British city, by ruling out all vaccination and introducing strict measures of hygiene and isolation of the infected instead; which of course won him the hatred and the abuse of the profit-oriented medical establishment. In 1910 he accepted the Presidency of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV), which under his competent and flamboyant leadership quickly grew to be, up to his death in 1932, the largest and most authoritative anti-vivisection society in the world.

Robert S. Mendelsohn (1927-1988)

Dr. Mendelsohn had practiced and taught medicine for 30 years. As a family physician and pediatrician, he was Professor of Preventive Medicine at the University of Illinois (Chicago), Chairman of the Medical Licensing Board for the State of Illinois, National Director of Project Head Start's Medical Consultation Service, consultant to the Illinois Departments of Public Aid and Mental Health, to the Council of Aging, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and the Maternal and Child Health Association, and a recipient of numerous awards for excellence in medicine and medical instruction. He was also a syndicated medical columnist, author of *The People's Doctor* Newsletter and author of the best selling medical books, *Confessions of a Medical Heretic*, *Male Practice: How Doctors Manipulate Women*, and *How to Bear a Healthy Child in Spite of Your Doctor*.

Robert Lawson Tait (1845-1899)

The gynecologist from Birmingham who performed more than 2,000 laparotomies at a time when this operation was still rare, looms larger than any other in the period that is considered the age of giants in surgical progress. He is celebrated as the most successful and innovative surgeon, and many of surgery's present-day techniques originate from him. He performed his first ovariectomy in 1868, when he was only 21, and by 1872 his name had gone into medical history with what became known in England and America as "Tait's operation" the removal of the uterine appendages for chronic ovaritis. In 1877 he began to remove diseased Fallopian tubes, and in 1878 he described a new method of treating chronic inversion of the uterus. All this, before he reached the age of 35. He performed the first chole-cystotomy, a gall-bladder operation, in 1879. In 1880 he was the first to successfully remove the vermiform appendix for the relief of appendicitis (in Germany credit for this "first" in surgery is usually given to Swiss surgeon Rudolf Ulrich Kronlein, who first performed it some 5 years later). In 1883, Tait performed the first successful operation in case of ruptured tubal pregnancy. He was also a firm advocate of today's aseptic surgery, challenging Lister's method of damaging antisepsis. In 1887 he was elected President of the newly formed British Gynaecological Society. He won the Cullen Prize "for the great benefits brought to practical medicine by surgical means", and the Lister Prize for the whole 1888-1890 period. So if anyone who ever spoke about surgery knew what he was saying, it was Lawson Tail. And everything he said and wrote about vivisection, which he had practiced in the early years of his medical studies, was a merciless indictment against it, for he considered it deleterious not only for medical practice in general but also for the medical mind. His courage and brilliance caused him to support a number of unpopular innovations like the introduction of absolute cleanliness in hospitals and asepsis rather than antisepsis in surgery, and advocating equal status for women who wanted to enter the medical profession. (More notes on Lawson Tait in Slaughter of the Innocent.)

#### ABBREVIATIONS USED IN BRITAIN

B. Ch., B. Chir. - Bachelor of Surgery

B.M. - Bachelor of Medicine



B.S. - Bachelor of Surgery

B.Sc. - Bachelor of Science

C.B. - Companion Order of the Bath

C.B.E - Commander Order of British Empire

Ch.B - Bachelor of Surgery

Ch.M. - Master of Surgery

C.M. - Master of Surgery

C.M.G. - Companion Order St. Michael and St. George Diploma in Anaesthetics

D.A – Diploma in Anaesthetics

D.C.H. - Diploma in Child Health

D.C.P - Diploma in Clinical Pathology

D.M. - Doctor of Medicine

D.P.H. - Diploma in Public Health

D.P.M. - Diploma in Psychological Medicine

D.Sc. - Doctor of Science

D.S.O. - Companion Distinguished Service Order

D.T.H. - Diploma in Tropical Hygiene

D.T.M. - Diploma in Tropical Medicine

D.V.Sc. - Doctor of Veterinary Science

F.A.C.D. - Fellow American College of Dentists

F.C.O.G. - Fellow College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists

F.I.C. - Fellow Institute of Chemistry

FRC.I. - Fellow Royal Colonial Institute

F.R.C.O.G. - Fellow Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists

FRC.P. - Fellow Royal College of Physicians

FRC.P.E. - Fellow Royal College of Physicians Edinburgh

FRC.P.S. - Fellow Royal College Physicians and Surgeons  
FRC.S. - Fellow Royal College of Surgeons  
F.R.C.V.S. - Fellow Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons  
F.R.F.P.S. - Fellow Royal Faculty Physicians and Surgeons  
F.R.F.P.S.G. - Fellow Royal Faculty Physicians and Surgeons Glasgow  
F.R.I.C. - Fellow Royal Institute of Chemistry  
FRS. - Fellow of the Royal Society  
F.R.S.E. - Fellow of the Royal Society Edinburgh  
K.B. - Knight Bachelor  
K.B.E. - Knight Commander of British Empire  
K.C.I.E. - Knight Commander of Indian Empire  
K.C.V.O - Knight Commander of Royal Victorian Order  
L.D.S. - Licentiate in Dental Surgery  
L.L.B. - Bachelor of Laws  
L.L.D. - Doctor of Laws  
L.M.S.S.A. - Licentiate in Medicine and Surgery, Society of Apothecaries  
L.R.C.P. - Licentiate Royal College of Physicians  
L.R.C.P.S. - Licentiate Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons  
L.R.F.P.S. - Licentiate Royal Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons Master of Arts  
M.A. – Master of Arts  
M.B. - Bachelor of Medicine  
M.C. - Military Cross  
M. Ch. - Master of Surgery  
M.C.O.G. - Member College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists  
M.D. - Doctor of Medicine  
M.D.N.U.I. - Doctor of Medicine National University of Ireland

M.P. - Member of Parliament

M.R.A.C.P - Member of Royal Australian College of Physicians

M.RC.O.G. - Member Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists

M.R.C.P. - Member Royal College of Physicians

M.R.C.S. - Member Royal College of Surgeons

M.R.C.V.S. - Member Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons

M.S. - Master of Surgery

M.Sc. - Master of Science

M.V.O. - Member of Royal Victorian Order

O.B.E. - Officer Order of British Empire

O.M. - Order of Merit

Ph. C - Pharmaceutical Chemist

Ph. D. - Doctor of Philosophy

R.A.M.C. - Royal Army Medical Corps

Sc. D. - Doctor of Science

Sc. M. - Master of Science

T.D. - Territorial Decoration

V.D. - Volunteer (Officers) Decoration