

# SCIENTIFIC SADISM

by Jim Bollinger

In a report released recently by United Action for Animals, Inc., a non-profit organization dedicated to insuring the humane treatment of laboratory animals, it was revealed that zoos across the nation are being used as compounds for research, and many of the animals in the exhibits are being used as laboratory animals by behavioral scientists, and others. In the report, it was pointed out that many organizations for animal protection, such as the Humane Society, have done little, if anything, to try to protect these helpless animals.

The report cited a meeting of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums (AAZPA) in October 1973, which was attended by a number of animal-protection agencies, several government lab-animal procuring agencies, M.D.'s from Baylor, California, and Chicago, and the vivisection arm of the National Academy of Sciences. The purpose of the meeting, the report said, was to discuss the possibility of "(breeding) zoo animals and (promoting) the use of zoo animals in biological and biomedical research."

Many readers will be shocked to learn of the sadistic tortures contrived by behavioral and other "scientists" which pass for scientific experiments, and many of them subsidized by the U.S. government, by our tax money. Here are a few examples cited from the report:

Two standard methods (of nutritional research) are employed: overdosing with toxic amounts of vitamins or other nutrients, and deprivation of vitamins or other substances. In the latter, the animals are 1) deprived to death, or 2) killed at an advanced stage of deprivation.

In the experimental psychology laboratories, "presentation of special stimuli" often means electric shock, food/water presentation after depriving animals of food/water, air blasts in the face, presenting cats with mice or rats to kill, etc.

Mouth rot was artificially produced "repeatedly" in the king snakes... It might be said that these experiments were "for the good of snakes," but if mouth rot is a problem in zoos it seems strange that veterinarians can't identify the infecting organism in the naturally-occurring disease and treat it WITHOUT artificially infecting other, healthy snakes.

The published literature abounds with accounts of how psychologists "present live prey" - mice or rats - to cats to watch the cats "aggression" as they kill the rodents. We even have numerous pictures of these experiments. They're standard laboratory exercises, subsidized largely by Congress with money out of the pockets of the unsuspecting public. They're "necessary" only to pay the rent and put food on the table of the experimenters by use of public funds.

The report quoted some speakers at an informal discussion session concerning the killing of animals in zoos for their "experiments." One speaker emphasized the delicacy of the subject: "Studies of predatory behavior involve killing. This is disagreeable to the public... I would agree, don't do it when there are people there to watch it... But you can certainly do it after hours."

This entire subject, as handled by these sadists masquerading as scientists reeks of something out of the mind of Edgar Allan Poe. Perhaps these learned "gentlemen" have watched one too many Frankenstein flicks. At any rate, their preference to perform their ghoulish acts in relative secrecy cannot be called anything less than cowardly and immoral.

The report also described some very grisly methods used to prevent zoo birds from escaping from their aviaries via flight. What it boils down to is that "all bones corresponding to the wrist, palm, and fingers in humans are removed and discarded" in a very complicated process which also requires some extensive makeshift plastic surgery to make the birds appear normal, although it may fail at this: "(it) produces an unsightly appearance when these birds display with wings outstretched." For the clincher, this entire obviously-painful technique is normally done WITHOUT THE USE OF ANESTHESIA!

These are only a few of the many instances of scientific torture performed by scientists of all biological persuasions (and this includes some veterinarians, too) on the many defenseless living creatures who inhabit this planet with us. Please refer to the related article on scientific torture on dogs for more information. And perhaps the greatest transgression is that much of this torture goes on behind the public's back while using the public's money.

The report goes on to state that animal experimentation, besides being barbaric, is also practically obsolete, and the methods currently being followed are those "favored 100 years ago by Claude Bernard. Bernard told his students: 'Experiment first, think afterwards.'"

Government action, one would think, is required. However, the pro-vivisectionist lobby is suprisingly strong and consists of many varied special interest groups who have a grave stake in these affairs and who carry much weight in Washington. To top it all off, organizations such as the American Humane Society have done very little to stop these monstrous proceedings. The report tells of a number of instances where humane society "investigation(s) that turned out to be a non-investigation(s)."

To wind up this tale of debauchery and sadism, I have reprinted the Conclusion from the UAA report!

Based on our investigation, the evidence is that zoo animals are under siege by many self-interests whose aim is to profit from the exploitation of them. Zoo animals are doomed to be used as "animal models of human disease" in the standard biological and biomedical laboratory experiments. They are destined to become victims of brain ablation and other "behavior modification" used allegedly on humans to make them normal, but used on animals to make them abnormal. Zoo animals are fated to be altered physically and psychologically in the name of "animal behavior," just as laboratory animals are altered, tormented and terrorized. The big difference between vivisection and "animal behavior" is that in vivisection the animals have some hope of dying. In "animal behavior," the animals are tormented, tortured and terrorized throughout their entire lives.

Zoo animals have been abandoned - betrayed - by the very ones purporting to be their protectors and benefactors - humane societies, wildlife groups, conservationists, environmentalists, etc. While some of these groups have issued various reports concerning zoo animals, these have concerned "humane care and treatment" or "improved conditions" which mean nothing more than animal husbandry. Some have called for "accreditation" of zoos, as some laboratories are accredited. But "accreditation" as defined by those who coined the word, the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science, also

means what is essentially animal husbandry along with "unfettered freedom" for researchers to do what they please to the animals.

Since starting our investigation of zoos and issuing subsequent reports, we have discovered that there is a great deal of opposition in this country to capturing and impounding wildlife in cages or compounds. It was also interesting to find that some zoo experimenters agree that there is no justification for keeping zoo animals captive except to experiment on them.

We thus conclude that zoos should be phased out by not replacing the creatures that die. Efforts should be directed, rather, to providing maximum protection to all wildlife in its native habitat - to allow the other creatures on this earth with us to live in their own way without interference or manipulation.

\*\*\*\*



This monkey is sealing his own death warrant. His cage like those in many zoos, is painted with lead-based paint. This type of paint was discontinued for human use in the

1940's, yet zoo animals have been dying agonizing deaths from lead poisoning all along because zoos have refused to switch to a non-toxic paint.

## Replacement needed but Congressmen get plaques

### A U.A.A. Inc. Progress report

As our members know, UAA is pioneering in laboratory animal welfare work, using every possible approach in the hope of finding the one that may be the most effective. Now it appears that our disclosures on "Higher Education U.S.A., or Animal Models of Terror and Pain" is the most effective work we have done so far. We have shown that students at institutions all across the country are being educated and trained to maim, kill, torment and torture animals - that they can earn their PhD's and other academic titles by abusing animals. This information has come as a bombshell to students at every level. Letters are pouring in even from elementary school children who tell us, in the scrawled handwriting of the very young, that they are angry and determined to do something to stop cruelty to animals in education. We feel certain their parents and teachers are hearing the views of these young people.

A great many university students have requested our material, some expressing outrage at what is being done to laboratory animals in the

college teachers have requested material, without comment. A number of student-run newspapers are speaking out about cruelty to animals in research and education. Often as a result of an article in a student newspaper, we are inundated with mail from the students at the institution requesting the details. We have had to hire two new people on our staff just to

keep up with our outgrowing flow of information. We do not seek contributions from students. All of this work on education is a public service which we are able to conduct only because of the generosity of our dues-paying members.

There can be little doubt that our work on cruelty to animals in education is having an impact on the research Establishment, which never before seemed too upset about our disclosures of cruelty to laboratory animals. For example, in its February 1974 Bulletin, the National Society for Medical Research, which exists to promote the procurement and use of laboratory animals, published a statement by its executive director, a veterinarian, as follows:

"The anti-science groups apply subtle but effective pressure with grisly advertisements in newspapers and by trying to mislead the public into believing that animals experimentation is not needed."

We're delighted that the NSMR's veterinarian rates our work as "effective". But why does he call us "anti-science" when the very reason UAA was founded was to work for the use of modern, sophisticated, more economical and humane research methods to replace the centuries-old, obsolete method of animal experimentation? Of course the NSMR hasn't especially singled out UAA for name-calling, it even calls medical schools "anti-science" if their students don't do enough "basic research", that is, animal

experimentation. The NSMR was founded to promote animal experimentation, just as UAA was founded to promote alternatives, so it is not surprising that the NSMR and UAA are at opposite ends of the pole. But what about Congress?

In the coming fiscal year the National Institutes of Health will receive an estimated \$2.6 Billion research subsidy for Congress, most of which will be used for animal experimentation, just as NSMR wants. A long string of other federal agencies - The USDA, the VA, the military Establishment, etc. - will receive similar research subsidies, which will also be used for animal experimentation. The total Congressional research subsidy for all agencies may reach \$20 - \$25 billion in the coming year. But Congress has remained deaf to the appeals of a great many people that modern, sophisticated, more economical and humane research methods replace outdated, outworn, and unspeakably cruel animal experimentation. As an example of Congressional bias, On October 13, 1969, Rep. Paul Rogers spoke before the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science, a self-interest organization that exists to promote the procurement, breeding, husbandry and use of laboratory animals. Rep. Rogers assured the AALAS: "It would be folly to think that we can eliminate animals as subjects for research. And I would not champion such a cause." It is hard to understand how Mr. Rogers became such a close and devoted friend of the AALAS, which is made up of research veterinarians and other animal experimenters, laboratory animal breeders, dealers and importers, cage and equipment manufacturers, laboratory animal feed producers and others whose very bread depends on the expanding use and consumption of laboratory animals.

### CONGRESSMEN PLEAD IGNORANCE GET PLAQUES

How can anyone convince powerful lawmakers - those key Congressmen most responsible for the ever-increasing federal research subsidies - of the need for replacement when they (1) plead ignorance of what is being done to laboratory animals with public funds, and (2) accept "plaques" from a registered lobby in recognition of the billions of tax dollars they vote for animal experimentation? For example, in a letter to a constituent dated August 2, 1973, Senator Warren Magnuson stated:

"There is not yet a sufficient amount of information to legislate further in regard to test animals in laboratories beyond the prohibition in the Animal Welfare Act."

Senator Magnuson has been a key figure in helping pushing the Congressional research subsidy to its present staggering proportions. He is also Chairman of the powerful Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations. How does it happen that he pleads ignorance of how the public funds he appropriates are REALLY used?

The American Veterinary Medical Association, a registered lobby, maintains a Washington office to keep an eye on Congress. In 1972, the AVMA told the House Appropriations Subcommittee on health (Chairman, Rep. Daniel J. Flood) that public funds were needed for "laboratory animal resources" - that is, more laboratory animal holding facilities - because "An entire new industry has been developed... with several of the larger companies having obtained international status with stock traded regularly on the major exchanges of this country." What

continued on page 7