

Why Fraudulent Animal Research Continues:

An expose of Animal Rights/Welfare groups & their alliance with the Pharmaceutical-Vivisection Industry.

Introduction

This article exposes the fraud committed by many animal welfare and animal rights organisations in regards to the subjects of vivisection and medicine. These groups covertly promote animal research on behalf of the pharmaceutical industry. These groups help to conceal the truth about modern medicine from the public. By way of demonstration, I will focus on the particular example of the Humane Society of the US (HSUS). They are considered a fraud because they appear to be the *opposition* to animal research. To the contrary, and as shown below, they have invested heavily in companies that do animal research. Further, they promote incorrect and deceptive pro-vivisection statements to the public. They also suppress the views of the real opposition to vivisection: the doctors, ex-animal researchers and medical historians who oppose unscientific methods like animal research. It is the learned opinion of this real opposition that the results of animal research are misleading and lead to human injuries and fatalities. Groups like the HSUS serve drug company interests to cover up this fact when they distort the public debate from "Science or Vivisection" into one of "Animal Welfare/Rights or Vivisection".

Many animal welfare groups invest in companies that do animal research.

For example, according to a 1984 report by investigative reporter Richard Morgan, the:

“Humane Society of the US (HSUS) has substantial holdings in the following companies which do toxicology testing and/or experiments on animals: DuPont, Eastman Kodak, Exxon, General Motors, IBM, Mobil, Occidental Petroleum, Proctor & Gamble, Standard Oil of California, Standard Oil of Indiana and Union Carbide” (1)

I will return shortly to a discussion of how and why the HSUS promotes animal research. Firstly, I will highlight some basic facts about medicine and animal research which groups like the HSUS suppress on behalf of the pharmaceutical industry.

Doctors explain the true purposes of animal research - it provides the illusion of drug & chemical safety.

Consider the opinions of numerous doctors, former-animal researchers and other scientists who state that drug companies rely on animal research to provide the illusion, *the faÁade*, that their products are “safe” for humans.

Dr. Herbert Gundersheimer, 1988:

“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.” (2)

Dr. Herbert Stiller and Dr Margot Stiller, 1976:

"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." (3)

Dr James Gallagher, 1964, Director of Medical Research, Lederle Laboratories, 1964:

"Animal studies are done for legal reasons and not for scientific reasons." (4)

Dr Irwin Bross, 1982, former Director of the largest cancer research institute in the world, the Sloan-Kettering Institute, then Director of Biostatistics, Roswell Park Memorial Institute, Buffalo, New York:

"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..." (5)

Dr Robert Sharpe, 1988:

"Toxicologists are...pursuing an illusion of safety using animals to fulfill political and legal obligations. As if to confirm our suspicions, some drugs are marketed and clinical procedures undertaken despite 'failing' animal tests!... But if animal tests are sometimes ignored, they can also be used to imply certain advantages of a company's new product over existing drugs....

On the other hand, the fact that animal tests are misleading can form the basis of a company's defence against claims about one of its products... So, if animal experiments are misleading, they are at least flexible: they can be deemed inapplicable when necessary, ignored when convenient and used to imply important advantages over competing products." (6)

In other words, when people are damaged by unsafe products (such as pharmaceutical drugs, chemicals, cosmetics ...etc.) and attempt to take legal action, manufacturers can claim to have adhered to “safety” tests and are thus absolved of having consciously marketed a harmful product. For instance, this is what happened in the case of Thalidomide. (7)

Another main purpose of animal research is to advance academic careers:

Dr. Andrew Salm, former animal researcher,1985:

"Most research today is just repetitious protocol, done to write papers, to complete educational requirements, and to obtain federal grant money.... for the sake of research is an end itself." (8)

In the words of animal researcher Dr. Harry Harlow, 1974:

"The only thing I care about is whether the monkeys will turn out a property that I can publish." (9)

Dr. Heide Evers, 1982:

"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". (10)

Medically-induced illnesses and fatalities.

Meanwhile, the number of people killed and injured by drugs and chemicals declared “safe” through unscientific animal-tests skyrockets. For instance, a 1994 study in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) revealed that each year, in just the USA, there are 180,000 deaths attributable to modern medicine (11). Most of these are due to pharmaceutical drugs. A 1998 study in the JAMA stated that in 1994, in the USA, “2,216,000 hospitalized patients had serious Adverse Drug Reactions and 106,000 had fatal Adverse Drug Reactions, making these reactions between the fourth and sixth leading cause of death.” (12) That is, modern medicine is considered to be a leading cause of death. The 1994 figure of over 2 million medical-drug-caused injuries is a significant increase over past years. For instance, according to the United States’ Food and Drug Administration, 1.5 million Americans were hospitalised in 1978 as a consequence of pharmaceutical drugs administered to treat them. (13)

Of course, there are a variety of factors that contribute to this large amount of pharmaceutical-caused human damage. As parts of this article show, many medical experts consider a major factor to be the unscientific reliance on animal research. (14) Because animal tests and many clinical tests are unscientific, the real guinea-pigs are the humans who take a new drug during the first several years of it being on the market. Moreover, many scholars consider these figures to be conservative estimates; the real figures could be significantly higher. This is because adverse reactions to medicine are often overlooked or misdiagnosed.

The small role of medicine in advancing health.

Moreover, consider the widely accepted findings of academics John & Sonya McKinlay that medical intervention only accounted for between one and three-and-a-half (1 to 3.5) per cent of the increase in the average lifespan in the United States since 1900. (15) Similarly, academics unanimously agree, with the findings of Professor Thomas McKeown, that the decline of infectious disease and the increase in human life expectancy was due to improvements in water supplies, nutrition, hygiene, housing and general living conditions. (16, 17) In other words, the increase in human life expectancy was not due to the commercial products of drug companies and was due to social reforms.

Medical advances were not due to animal research.

Numerous medical historians such as Hans Ruesch and Dr Robert Sharpe have shown that the true advances in medicine were derived through methods other than animal research. Moreover, that animal research has regularly retarded medical progress. (18, 19) If you are like me, you will need to study the works of these scholars before you will fully comprehend the grand deception and fraud that animal research is. People who have not read these exposes are not in a position to have an educated opinion about medical history. They only have one side of the story - that of the drug and vivisection industry.

Animal testing leads to environmental pollution.

Lastly, consider that the entire planet is being polluted with harmful chemicals that are marketed after being declared "safe" through flexible animal tests. This is explained by Professor Gianni Tamino (1987), biologist at Padua University and former Congressman in the Italian Parliament:

"Let's take the case of pesticides. These dangerous products, used in agriculture, are classified according to their acute toxicity, graduated with the Lethal Dose 50% tests on animals. 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 harmless, but are in reality very harmful in the long run, even if taken in 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 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, which are cheaper and quicker than animal tests; in vitro tests on cell cultures, 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." (20)

In her booklet "**Animal Experimentation: the hidden cause of Environmental Pollution? Absolutely!**" Hoorik Davoudian explains how companies use flexible animal tests to make their toxic chemicals appear "safe" for marketing. (21)

I will now return to the subject of fraudulent animal welfare/rights groups, their financial wealth and how they serve the drug companies to suppress the above knowledge about medicine and vivisection.

The Humane Society is very wealthy.

To return to discussion of the Humane Society, Richard Morgan's report also revealed:

The "Humane Society of the United States - perhaps the most currently successful business among all animal organisations, HSUS owns a multi-story office building in a prime location in downtown Washington D.C., has rapidly increasing assets (\$3 million in 1976, \$11 million in 1983, an average increase in assets of \$1 million per year), the highest executive salaries (among animal groups) at every level, and **the largest portfolio of securities in animal-abusing companies** of any organisation for which details were available." (22)

Further, the then President of the HSUS, John Hoyt, received an annual salary of \$100,965 U.S. (23) And that was back in 1984. In today's money that would be up around \$500,000 Australian or more!

The HSUS wastes their member's donations?

Where does the HSUS get much of this money? From well-meaning people who believe the HSUS and groups like it are the real opposition to animal research. Why do people believe that? Because the mass-media, owned by people who profit from drug companies (through

stocks, ownership or advertising revenue), promotes groups like HSUS as the opposition to animal research. Meanwhile, the voices of scientists who oppose animal research, because it doesn't advance human healthcare and actually retards it, remain unheard by the public.

The general animal welfare/rights movement acts as a smokescreen to hide the truth about medical damages to humans.

The HSUS is just one of many animal organisations who are financially in bed with their apparent opposition - the pharmaceutical-vivisection industry. In the 1980s and early 1990s, the Swiss organisation CIVIS exposed in great detail how almost the entire animal welfare/rights movement is orchestrated by the pharmaceutical industry; in order to suppress the truth about modern medicine and vivisection. (24)

In "CIVIS Foundation Report #5", published in 1989, they outlined how the animal rights movement then sat on around one billion US dollars (\$1,000,000,000). This huge sum of money could have been used to quickly stop animal research if used to publicise the views of many scientists and doctors who denounce animal experiments. (25) Instead, the animal rights groups largely suppress the scientists and promote fraudulent ethicists such as Peter Singer. Peter Singer claims to argue against animal research, but he regularly makes scientifically and historically incorrect pro-vivisection statements (26). CIVIS has exposed Peter Singer's links to the pharmaceutical industry. For instance, in 1993 Peter Singer admitted in an Italian Court, that he has been funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. (27) The Rockefeller Foundation is an arm of one of the largest industrial empires ever to exist. It includes many pharmaceutical companies along with oil and media interests. (28) The Rockefeller Foundation has also been the largest private source of funding for medical science and education in many Western countries. (29, 30)

The subtle pro-vivisection propaganda of groups like the Humane Society.

It may strike the reader as odd that animal welfare/rights groups like the HSUS invest in companies that do lots of animal research. However, this confusion is resolved when one realises that the HSUS acts on behalf of the pharmaceutical industry to subtly promote belief in animal research.

Although Humane Society (HS) literature contains moral claims against vivisection, it is actually full of subtle pro-vivisection statements. For example, the emotive HS leaflet "Why do people do unspeakable things to me? Is it because I cannot talk?" is full of language which *implies* animal experiments are scientifically useful for human medicine. For instance, the leaflet states the HS will "Campaign to ensure that bans will be placed on experiments that are unnecessarily duplicative, scientifically or medically trivial, dubious, or other wise fail to balance scientific aims and the public's concern for animals..." (31)

With use of words like "unnecessarily duplicative", "medically trivial", and "fail to balance scientific aims and the public's concern for animals" the HS implies - and without providing evidence - that animal research is scientifically useful. Thus, they cleverly trick the unsuspecting person into thinking: "The HS, which is against animal research, says that some of it is necessary and scientific, so it must be, because otherwise they'd say otherwise".

By implying that not all vivisection is unnecessary, the HS implies that some experiments are necessary. And which ones are they? Every animal researcher and peer group review committee claims that theirs are - thus the vivisection juggernaut is perpetuated *ad infinitum*.

In other words, groups like the HS, whilst being paraded as the opposition to animal research, actually promote the propaganda of the pharmaceutical industry. So, what is the real opposition to animal research, and why?

The real opposition to animal research? Scientists and medical historians.

The real opposition to animal research, which scares the hell out of the drug industry, consists of doctors, ex-animal researchers, other scientists, historians, students and laypersons who recognise that vivisection is not a scientific method. Numerous medical historians have shown that the real medical breakthroughs come through methods relevant to the real world human situation, not from the use of flawed "animal models". Further, it has been shown that the animal research industry has stolen the credit for many of these medical advances. (18, 19) Moreover, the above people recognise the real reasons for animal research. One of these is that animal experiments are used to prove or disprove any theory and make chemicals seem safe or unsafe - depending on the species used and the test conditions.

Why vivisection does not work.

The animal research industry exists on the premise that the experimental results of artificially-induced illnesses on one species can be transferred to the naturally-occurring illnesses of another species. However, this premise is flawed. Not only because of the major differences between species, but because even individuals of the same species can react very differently to a substance.

For example, research carried out at the University of Bremen, published in a paper titled "Problems of activity threshold in pharmacology and toxicology" found that:

1. In ionising radiation-- young animals react differently from older ones.
2. In reactions to Tranquillisers--again, young and old animals react differently.
3. In the common method of testing pharmaceuticals and chemicals, the Lethal Dose 50% test, it was found that in the experiments carried out in the evening almost all the rats died: in those carried out in the morning all of them survived. In the tests carried out in winter, survival rates were doubled in contrast to those carried out in summer. In tests carried out on mice overcrowded together in cages, nearly all of them died, while those carried out on mice in normal conditions, all the mice survived.

The authors of this research, animal researchers, concluded:

"If such trifling environmental conditions bring about such widely differing and unforeseeable results, this means that animal experimentation cannot be relied upon in assessing a chemical substance and it is all the more absurd to extrapolate to problems of human health results which are intrinsically wrong."

(32)

The predictive value of vivisection is worthless.

In other words, the predictive value of vivisection research is worthless. Professor Pietro Croce, who conducted animal research for over 30 years, explains:

"In support of animal testing vivisectionists say: "We don't expect final answers from animal experiments, but just hints, indications, which encourage us to continue in a

particular direction.” But what's an indication? An approximate information, merely orientative. And as the compass card shows, an orientation can point in the right direction, of which there is only one, or to one of the many wrong directions. And an animal experiment only very rarely points to the right direction, and when it does, it is due to coincidence, and at any rate verifiable only after the fact. Experimenting on animals to do medical research is like playing roulette." (33)

Prof. Dr. Herbert Hensel, Director of the Institute of Physiology at Marburg University, explains this further:

"...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... If this is not the case, then the prediction is irrational... It cannot be rationally applied. In the opinion of leading biostatisticians, 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, there exists no possibility at all of a scientifically-based prediction. In this respect, the situation is even less favourable than in a game of chance, for in the latter the chances of success are known... one cannot scientifically determine the probable effect, effectiveness or safety of medicaments when administered to human beings by means of animal experiments..." (34)

Lastly, Dr. Werner Hartinger explains it further. He is a surgeon with over thirty years experience and the first President of the International League of Doctors Against Vivisection:

“In each specialised area, the logically thinking scientist can deduce no more than the fact that *the animal used* has *under the conditions applied*, shown a certain reaction or change in function, or has borne this or that surgical procedure well or badly. Any more far-reaching interpretation is speculation, at best a hypotheses with no appraisable validity for humans.

The experiment must always be repeated and checked again on humans. Only when both the results of both the animal and human experiment are available can one recognise any possible comparability and judge the degree of validity. It is therefore totally impossible to reach any conclusion from an animal experiment. . . The results obtained from experimentation on an animal does not enable one to say that a human will react in the same way”. (35)

In summary, only when an experiment is repeated on a second species, or individual, can one say that there is or isn't a correlation between these results and those of the first species or individuals tested. Very often, apparent correlations between a test on one animal and on another cannot be repeated in subsequent tests. As shown above, contradictory results may appear even on the same individual animal in subsequent tests! Vivisectionist experiments on humans are scientifically invalid for the very same reasons. In other words, the predictive value of vivisectionist experimentation is negligible. It is not a scientifically useful method.

Human tests are done anyway, because animal tests are unreliable.

The fact that human clinical trials are performed everyday for new drugs or procedures, and that they are prescribed by law, is, in the words of former animal researcher Dr. Christopher Anderegg, “a very subtle acknowledgement by the legislators, who are advised by the animal experimenters, that animal experimentation is fully unreliable”. (36)

Unfortunately, many of these human clinical trials also suffer from unscientific procedures and deliberate fraud, in attempts to market new drugs and procedures. (37)

Animal welfare/rights groups create ethical smoke-clouds that hide the truth about animal research.

Now to return the discussion to animal welfare groups like the Humane Society (HS). How do they fit into all this? The purpose of these groups and their ethical-moral arguments, is to divert public attention away from the doctors, former animal researchers and other scientists who campaign to abolish vivisection; it has been responsible for untold millions of human casualties due to its unreliable results.

Animal welfare/rights groups - pawns of the vivisection industry.

Animal rights groups are often puppets of the drug, chemical and vivisection industries. These industries are more than happy for animal activists to focus on the cruelty and moral issues surrounding vivisection; just so long as people still believe it “works”. This keeps some people very rich.

Whilst people believe vivisection “works” to help cure disease, then much of the public will:

- continue to remain complacent about the poisoning of the environment with chemicals declared “safe” on laboratory animals;
- continue to NOT take responsibility for preventing illness;
- become ill from preventable illness;
- provide fertile fields for profits to be generated from;
- keep buying the often health-destroying “miracle drugs”. However, as Dr. Henri Pradal explains, “when most people finally discover the cause of their illnesses, the sale of medicaments will abruptly drop”. (38)
- keep on donating billions of dollars to fund institutions of animal-based research. Which, by some strange coincidence, never cures disease. Although, we are constantly assured that the cures are “just around the corner” (provided we donate more money). The vivisection lobby has been making such appeals for the past 150 or so years.

Nevertheless, medical advances do occur, but through the scientific methods relevant to human illness. (18, 19). These methods include Epidemiologic Studies (comparative studies of human populations), Clinical Research, In-Vitro Research (tissue and cell cultures) and computer modeling. (39)

Animal rights groups distort the debate in favor of the vivisection lobby.

By parading the animal rights movement as the opposition, the pro-vivisection lobby more effectively controls public debate than it would otherwise. Without a visible opposition the public could start to suspect something was being hidden from them. But because groups like the HS are presented as the opposition to vivisection, the public thinks that all sides of the issue are being publicly addressed.

The animal rights groups do the dirty work of the pro-vivisection lobby when they distort the public debate from one of "Science Vs Vivisection" into one of "Animal Welfare Vs Apparent Science (ie. Vivisection)". When the subject is debated as "Science Vs Vivisection" the pro-vivisection lobby cannot win. They wish to keep the debate to one of "Animal Welfare Vs Science (ie. Vivisection)". This way they can always sway the vast majority of public opinion with claims like "Animal research cures sick babies".

Ethical, animal rights arguments miss the point.

Vivisection is performed because the pro-vivisection lobby decrees it benefits human medicine. Therefore, vivisection is a human health issue. That is the premise and that is what has to be questioned. Animal rights people who wander of on tangent issues about animal cruelty and welfare fall straight into the trap the pro-vivisectionists set for them. The animal rightists let off intellectual "smoke-clouds" with their ethical/moral debates. This is what the Drug and Chemical industries want them to do. These smoke-clouds distract public attention away from the fact that large numbers of people are being injured and killed each year by a fraudulent and commercial medical system. A system based on unscientific methods, including animal research.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

People who are serious about advancing medicine and human healthcare, as well as the plight of laboratory animals, ought to read the literature of groups like:

- **CIVIS** – The Hans Ruesch centre for information on vivisection and exposés of bogus animal rights groups and gurus: <http://www.VivisectionFraud.com>
- **Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine:** A group of doctors, physicians and health practitioners promoting good health through real science <http://www.pcrm.org>
- **Doctors and Lawyers for Responsible Medicine (DLRM):** <http://www.dlrm.org>
- **The Campaign Against Fraudulent Medical Research:** <http://www.pnc.com.au/~cafmr> (a great archive of information on related subjects).

Learn the scientific argument against vivisection. Learn about the lethal drug-pushing scam that the medical establishment is. Moreover, look after yourself, practice prevention and take control of your own health-care and diet.

www.MedicineKillsMillions.com

In closing:

Lastly, I would like to point out that I do believe many animal welfare/rights groups do work that benefits the welfare of animals. I also recognise that the members of these groups are well-meaning sincere people. It is on the issues of medicine and animal research, however, that many of these animal rights/welfare groups are fraudulent. It only takes one person to take control of an organisation's "scientific advice", to lead all the members astray. These people can then do great damage to public debate, albeit unwittingly. For with their incorrect knowledge about science and medicine, not only do they fail the animals they hope or claim to represent, they also betray the millions of people who have fallen victim or will become victims of a medical system based on an unscientific method: vivisectionist research.

REFERENCES:

Many of the books listed below are available from the organisations recommended above.

- 1 - quoted by Hans Ruesch, in "CIVIS International Foundation Report No. 9" CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1990, p.7 CIVIS - PO Box 152 -Via Motta 51 - CH Massagno-Lugano, Switzerland.
- 2 - Herbert Gundersheimer, quoted in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.29.
- 3 - Herbert Stiller and Margot Stiller, quoted in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.87.
- 4 - James Gallagher, in the "Journal of the American Medical Association", 14 Mar. 1964, cited in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p. 103
- 5 - Irwin Bross, "Animals in cancer research: a multi-billion dollar fraud" in "Fundamental and Applied Toxicology", Nov. 1982, cited in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.70-71
- 6 - Robert Sharpe, "The Cruel Deception", Thorsons Publishing Group, Wellingborough, U.K. 1988, pp.112-14
- 7 - Hans Ruesch, "Slaughter of the Innocent," CIVITAS Publications, Hartsdale NY, 1991, pp. 359-367.
- 8 - Andrew Salm, quoted in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.61.
- 9 - Harry Harlow, quoted in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.92.
- 10 - Heide Evers, quoted in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.69.
- 11 - Lucian Leape, "Error in medicine", Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), 1994, vol. 272, nr 23, p. 1851.
- 12 - Lazarou J, Perneranz B, Corey PN. "Incidence of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients: a meta-analysis of prospective studies," JAMA, 1998, vol. 279, nr 15, pp. 1200-1205.
- 13 - Hans Ruesch, "Naked Empress-the Great Medical Fraud", CIVIS, Massagno/Lugano, Switzerland, 1992, p.12.
- 14 - Hans Ruesch, "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989.
- 15 - John McKinlay, Sonya McKinlay , R Beaglehole, "Trends in Death and Disease and the Contribution of Medical Measures" in "Handbook of Medical Sociology" (H.E. Freeman and S.Levine, Eds), Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1988 p.16
- 16 - Thomas McKeown, "The Role of Medicine: Dream, Mirage or Nemesis?", Oxford: Blackwell, 1979.
- 17 - Robert Taylor, "Medicine out of Control", Sun books, Sydney, 1979 p.9,
- 18 - Hans Ruesch, "Slaughter of the Innocent," CIVITAS Publications, Hartsdale NY.
- 19 - Robert Sharpe, "The Cruel Deception", Thorsons Publishing Group, Wellingborough, U.K. 1988.
- 20 - Gianni Tamino, quoted in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.37.

- 21 – Hoorik Davoudian, "Animal Experimentation: the hidden cause of Environmental Pollution? Absolutely!", Nature of Wellness, Pasadena, 1993, see <http://www.animalresearch.org/pollute.htm> for an online condensed version of this booklet
- 22 - quoted by Hans Ruesch, in "CIVIS International Foundation Report No. 9" CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1990, p.7
- 23 - Hans Ruesch, in "CIVIS International Foundation Report No. 15" CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1993, p.11
- 24 – Hans Ruesch, "CIVIS Bulletin Nr.1", CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1983. Numerous CIVIS Foundation Reports also contain exposes on fraud, corruption and deception within many of the world's best known animal welfare/rights and anti-vivisection organisations. CIVIS - PO Box 152 -Via Motta 51 - CH Massagno-Lugano, Switzerland.
- 25 - Hans Ruesch, in "CIVIS International Foundation Report No. 5" CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989.
- 26 - Peter Singer, "Animal Liberation", 2nd edition, Jonathan Cape, London, 1990, p.91-92.
- 27 - Hans Ruesch, "Now It's Official: Peter Singer's Lecture Tours Sponsored by Rockefeller's Drug Lobby" in "CIVIS International Foundation Report, Fall-Winter 1993", Hans Ruesch (Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno/Lugano, Switzerland.
- 28 - Hans Ruesch, "CIVIS International Foundation Report No. 9" CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1990, p.6.
- 29 - Morris Bealle, "The Super Drug Story ", Columbia Publishing Co., Washington D.C., 1949 p.22-23
- 30 - Hans Ruesch, "Naked Empress-the Great Medical Fraud", CIVIS, Massagno/Lugano, Switzerland, 1992, p.97-119.
- 31 – Humane Society International Inc., "Why do people do unspeakable things to me? Is it because I cannot talk?" leaflet, Avalon, Australia, publication date unknown.
- 32 - Pietro Croce, "Vivisection or Science - a Choice to Make", CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1991 p. 19
- 33 - Pietro Croce, "That's why I am against vivisection" in "CIVIS International Foundation Report: Autumn 1989", Hans Ruesch (Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno/Lugano, Switzerland, 1989, nr 7, p. 1.
- 34 - Herbert Hensel, quoted in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.88.
- 35 - Werner Hartinger, from a letter in "CIVIS Foundation Report No.11", Hans Ruesch (Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno/Lugano, Switzerland, Spring-Summer 1991 Edition, p. 2.
- 36 - Christopher Anderegg, excerpt from a video-recorded speech at the 2nd International Congress of Doctors in Britain Against Animal Experiments (DBAAE), 1992. DBAAE has since expanded and changed name to the Doctors and Lawyers for Responsible Medicine. See <http://www.dlrm.org>
- 37 - John Lesso, "The Pharmaceutical Drug Racket – Part 2", Campaign Against Fraudulent Medical Research, Lawson, 1993, p.1-5. See online version at <http://www.pnc.com.au/~cafmr/online/research/drug2a.html>
- 38 - Henri Pradal, quoted in "1000 Doctors (and Many More) Against Vivisection" (Hans Ruesch, Ed.), CIVIS, Massagno, Switzerland, 1989, p.89.
- 39 - for a description of these scientifically valid research methods, see the articles "Are there valid research methods?" and "New cell tests beat animal tests " at <http://home.mira.net/~antiviv/valid.htm>

www.MedicineKillsMillions.com