

Animal rights: in Hitler's footsteps

The 'animal liberationists' attack on medical research is costing human lives. Part II by Kathleen Klenetsky.

Nothing better proves the contention that the real purpose of the animal rights movement is to kill people, rather than prevent cruelty to animals, than the movement's savage assault on biomedical research.

For the past 10 years, animal liberationists have conducted a war against medical science and scientific researchers, claiming that the use of animals in any kind of research—not just in the cosmetics industry—is fundamentally immoral.

In the 1980s, animal rights terrorists broke into over 90 labs and research centers, smashing equipment, destroying data, stealing research animals, and causing an estimated \$10 million in physical damage.

But the overall cost exacted by these fanatics is far higher. Animal liberationists have been dangerously successful in their efforts to close down medical research. In literally hundreds of cases, they have been able to bring important research projects to a halt, or to put them on indefinite hold.

Author Katie McCabe described several research projects that have been adversely affected by the animal cultists in an article published in the February 1990 *Washingtonian*—an article for which the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) subsequently sued her.

One particularly striking case cited by McCabe concerns Dr. John Orem. Last year, members of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) broke into a lab run by Orem, a researcher at Texas Tech University who is doing groundbreaking work on the cause of sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS). They destroyed his equipment and uncaged animals on which he was conducting his experiments.

The ALF's destruction dealt a tremendous setback to Orem's work. "Every year we lose 8,000 babies to crib death, because we don't fully understand how the brain controls breathing during sleep," he says. "In the last two years, my work had begun to explode, to generate a multitude of questions that could lead us to a drug therapy to prevent SIDS." As a result of the raid, "I can't even analyze the data I do have until we replace the equipment the ALF damaged. That analysis is the basis for the next stage of experimentation. How do you begin to translate all of that into human costs? I don't know."

The cost of fanaticism

The threat of such damage has forced many research centers to spend outrageous sums on upgraded security to

prevent or deter damage or intrusions. "This is money that could have gone for more research, or for upgrading the conditions that lab animals are kept in," a spokesman for the Foundation for Biomedical Research points out.

Officials at the Yerkes Regional Primate Center near Atlanta recently had to allocate hundreds of thousands of dollars on new alarms and other security measures, following two bomb threats and five attempted break-ins.

Worse, many scientists engaged in biomedical research have been subjected to such cruel treatment—ranging from organized hate-mail campaigns to death threats and physical attacks—that researchers are being frightened and harassed into leaving the field.

This is an end openly sought by the animalists. "We're demoralizing the people who think there's a buck to be made in animal research," gloats PETA's medical adviser, Neal Barnard. "And they're starting to get scared, and they're starting to get angry and they're starting to give way."

The animal liberationists have managed to force through a variety of ordinances and regulations governing the treatment of animals in experimental research, which have vastly increased the cost of such research. A case in point are a series of amendments sponsored by Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kan.) that were attached to the 1985 Omnibus Farm Bill. These put stringent requirements on such things as cage size, feeding, and even the animals' psychological environment. Estimates of what it will cost to meet these requirements range from \$1 to \$2 billion.

An end to medicine

Animal rightists insist that the ends sought by animal experimentation can be better accomplished using other techniques, such as computer modeling or work on cells. The disingenuousness and scientific incompetence of this claim has been pointed out by many researchers. "Many of the problems that we seek to address depend on a highly structured organization," Michael Jackson, dean for research at George Washington University, says. "Diabetes, for example, can be regarded at a level of certain cells or parts of cells. But if we want to understand the entire problem we have to look on it as a multi-system disorder that affects tissues and organs like the brain, the liver, the heart, and the kidneys. And there is no way that a computer or an isolated cell system can simulate the organization of a tissue or organ."

Houston heart surgeon Michael DeBakey, chairman of the National Association for Biomedical Research, says: "The fact is that most of the therapies and treatments in use today are the result, to some extent, of animal research. I think it would be a good thing if every prescription pad had the words, 'This drug was developed through the use of animal experimentation.' "

In fact, there is virtually no disease for which a cure or treatment has been found that did not involve animal research. "It's easy to say animals have rights until you have to make a choice," says Dr. Frederick Goodwin, head of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. "If you stop using animals . . . you will slow down and eventually stop medical progress."

"Virtually every major biomedical advance can be traced back to original critical studies using animals," says John A. Krasney, Ph.D., Professor of Physiology at State University of New York at Buffalo. Diabetes, typhus, polio, meningitis, syphilis, hemophilia, and diphtheria would still be killing millions each year had it not been for animal research. Viral research, angiograms, cardiac catheters, radiation therapy, X-rays, artificial joints, surgical techniques, blood transfusions, skin grafts, organ transplants—none of these life-saving advances would have been possible without the use of animals.

Animals, too, have been helped by animal experimentation, the rabies vaccine being just one example. "Most drugs, diagnostic tests, and surgical techniques used in veterinary medicine today come directly from research or from human medical or surgical practice that was originally based on animal research," according to Dr. Franklin M. Loew, dean of Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine.

Animal activists piously claim to be nonviolent, but their actions tell a different story, as the two assassination attempts in Britain in June testify. In the last few years, animal researchers at such key centers as Duke Medical Center, Cornell University, and the National Institutes of Health, have received death threats.

In November 1988, a woman animalist was arrested outside the United States Surgical Corp. in Norwalk, Connecticut, and charged with planting a radio-controlled pipe bomb near the parking place assigned to the company's chairman. According to author Kate McCabe, West Coast activist Chris DeRose, commenting on this apparent murder attempt, predicted that there would be many more in the future. "In every civil rights battle," he said, "eventually you see people taking the law into their own hands. . . . I cannot condone bombings or terrorist activities, but . . . the people who are committing the real atrocities are on the inside [i.e., the researchers]. . . . The time has come when we stop asking for change and demand it—not 100 years from now, but now."

But this simply underscores the bone-deep misanthropy which motivates the animal rights movement, especially at the top. Typically, those who rail against animal research

would prefer to conduct experiments on humans. Gracie Slick, the lead singer of the psychedelic 1960s band, Jefferson Airplane, and now one of the movement's bevy of celebrity supporters, has openly called for using death-row inmates in experiments that now employ animals.

Slick is hardly unique. The anti-vivisectionist movement of the 19th and early 20th centuries—the precursor of today's animal rights movement—proposed much the same thing. U.S. anti-vivisection activist Caroline Earle White led a campaign in the early 1900s to end animal experiments geared toward developing an antivenom for snakebites that were killing many in India. "The best plan would be for the experimenters to go to India where they could find as large a field for investigation as they require in the poor victims [of snakebites] themselves," she said. "Nothing seems to be less defensible than these experiments on the poison of snakebites upon animals, since it is the one case in which they could be observed with so much satisfaction and certainty upon man."

The Theosophical roots

The philosophical and historical roots of animal liberation can be traced to the Theosophy movement of the 19th century, and its offshoots, notably the Fabian Society of H.G. Wells, George Bernard Shaw, et al.

Theosophy is essentially another form of the ancient gnostic heresy, which proclaimed that the God who created the world was evil, and thus his highest creation, man, was the most evil. Annie Besant, a key figure in both Theosophy and the Fabian Society, became a devotee of the anti-vivisection cult through her friend, Anna Kingsford. Kingsford was a British occultist, with ties to MacGregor Mathers of the satanic Order of the Golden Dawn.

Kingsford so hated the power of reason, and its ability to better the condition of man, that she tried to use so-called magical powers to kill leading researchers of the time. Louis Pasteur was one of her first victims. Shortly after she cast a spell upon him, Pasteur fell ill, and Kingsford was convinced that her magic had worked. She directed her venom next against Prof. Paul Bert, who coincidentally died. She wrote in her diary: "Yesterday, November 11th at eleven at night, I knew that my will had smitten another vivisector! . . . The will can and does kill, but not always with the same rapidity. . . . I have killed Paul Bert, as I killed Claude Bernard; as I will kill Louis Pasteur and after him the whole tribe of vivisectors, if I live long enough, Courage: It is a magnificent power to have, and one that transcends all vulgar methods of dealing out justice to tyrants."

This hatred for humanity dominates the animal rights cult. And they are not relying on "magic" to accomplish their goals.

Next: How the animal rights' movement is destroying American agriculture.