

Anti-Vivisection: The Pro-Health Solution

By Dr. Les Stewart, 1989

Originally published in [The Animals Voice Magazine](#), December 1989

The anti-vivisection movement is concerned with human and animal well-being alike. We are anti-vivisection health advocates, capable of determining the merit of medical research and we support scientific inquiry when legitimately conducted in an ethical, intelligent and pertinent manner. Such is not the case with vivisection.

Those that condone vivisection have defended their privileged domain and exploitation of animals as a necessary requirement in the resolution of conditions of human disease. We challenge that premise as unintelligent, immoral, unscientific and fiscally unsound.

Well-known institutions such as the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) and Cedars-Sinai Hospital in Los Angeles have constructed the most horrifying prisons on earth from which there is no escape. Behind locked laboratory doors, animals are brutalized while breeding farms and public pounds provide an endless supply of innocent victims. The frightened involuntary animal subject suffers immensely. One primary reason is that clauses in animal protection laws allow vivisectionists to reduce or withhold anesthetics if incompatible with the purpose of an experiment. How is this possible, particularly at a respected institution? The unfortunate transformation from the questioning student to compliant, desensitized "investigator" is complete and rarely reversible through the indoctrination process in which acts of violence are professionally condoned and socially sanctioned. And so it is that curiosity replaces decency and common sense.

No amounts of animal experimentation will ever reveal the secrets to human disease or more importantly the necessary requirements for a healthy existence. Human disease occurs within the complex structure of the human body when a number of variables interact to cause the resultant human disorder. These variables include unfavorable genetic and environmental influences, negative lifestyle habits and attitudes, and physical or emotional trauma or stress. These well-known causes are primarily self-induced, cumulative, of varying impact, and nontransferable to an animal. A true scientist recognizes and acknowledges that these factors—as they affect humans—cannot possibly be recreated in an experimental animal. Human diseases cannot be duplicated in animals simply as a result of transmitting toxins or cells from one species to the next or by exposure to irritating or stressful stimuli. Animals look different from humans because they *are* different—biomechanically, biochemically and emotionally. Examples of these differences are endless and include:

- penicillin can be life-saving in humans and kills guinea pigs
- proportionately, a rat has a liver three times the size of a human liver
- nonhuman mammals are quadrupeds whereas humans are bipeds, factors which contribute enormously to structural as well as functional differences
- aspirin is fatal to cats, useful in humans
- humans have gall bladders, rats do not
- rats can synthesize their own Vitamin C, humans cannot

The outcome is that the information collected from animal experimentation is consistently misleading and potentially harmful if applied to humans.

The majority of vivisectionists have never practiced on a human patient and confuse cause and effect. What vivisectionists attempt to do is recreate human disease or injuries in a healthy animal through deliberate, violent artificial means. However, what they actually do is elicit similar symptoms in the animal to those found in sick humans and not the actual disease and/or trauma. The focus of current medical practice with its foundation of vivisection is centered around symptoms—those that the patient presents and those created by the experimenter in the laboratory animal. The development and application of treatment are aimed at eradicating or controlling those symptoms, usually with drugs or surgery. This approach lends support to the false notion that doctors can control and are responsible for our health.

Common sense tells us that symptoms are only an overt sign of a problem, not the underlying cause. One does not have to look far to see the outcome from this symptomatic approach to research, diagnosis and treatment:

Anti-Vivisection: The Pro-Health Solution

Page 2 of 3

- our infant mortality ranks 15th in the world
- birth defects, miscarriages and infertility are on the rise
- more people die of diabetes now than before the discovery of insulin in 1922—from the number 12 killer in 1900, diabetes now ranks number three as a cause of death in the U.S. with heart disease and cancer in the number one and two positions
- incidence of cancer is climbing with deaths rising 8.7% since 1962
- we are now confronted with the devastating effects of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)
- our nursing homes are filled with people who are incapacitated and riddled with disease

In humans, when only symptoms are treated, the roots of the disease remain. This results in increased susceptibility to future health problems in the absence of substantially improving the organism. In this manner the modern day medical system justifies the production of new and more powerful drugs to be aggressively marketed and conveniently dispensed as through a vending machine into the practice of medicine. All of these drugs are irrelevantly and uselessly tested beforehand on animals. This is done primarily as a legal safeguard for the biomedical/pharmaceutical alliance against adverse reactions and catastrophic side effects in humans.

Vivisection is big business. What it lacks in substance it makes up for in profit. This highly lucrative industry, masquerading as an essential benevolent enterprise, enjoys strong public and media support. However, this monstrous medical lottery is self-indulgent and has an insatiable appetite for the research dollar—both tax monies and private contributions. In truth there will never be a payoff for the overtaxed and overly generous donors. In experimental cancer research alone, approximately \$15 billion has been expended since the beginning of the official "War On Cancer" in 1973 in the United States, while in 1989 it is estimated that one out of every three people will develop cancer in their lifetime.

Vivisectionists are fond of saying that all of the advances in medicine have come from animal research. This is not so. Discoveries that have truly benefitted our health care have come from astute clinical observation and intelligent deductive reasoning. A few examples are:

- invention of the microscope
- use of limes (Vitamin C) to prevent scurvy
- discovery of digitalis (an important heart medication)
- diagnostic method of percussion (tapping of the surface of the body) and auscultation (listening to body sounds—now with a stethoscope)
- development of anesthetics (allowing pain control for surgery)
- hygienic principles for infection control
- inventions of X-ray, blood pressure cuff, hypodermic syringe, thermometer, ophthalmoscope, blood typing, technique of blood transfusion, CAT scan
- acupuncture

Only humans are appropriate subjects for effectively achieving valid research data through careful clinical observation and application of preventive measures. This is accomplished by first providing essential emergency care as needed and then measuring the patient's response to treatment of suspected or known causes. Positive behavioral changes in the areas of nutrition, exercise, rest and recreation, safety and spiritual well-being are recommended, initiated and evaluated. Society as a whole must clean up the environment to support healthy habitation. It is only in this manner that a more permanent resolution of human disorders is attained.

In addition, other research methodologies exist and are being developed to help us in our search for answers to human health problems—human tissue cultures, quantum pharmacology, computer models, post-mortem investigation and more—all of these provide support for clinical research and prevention.

Anti-Vivisection: The Pro-Health Solution

Page 3 of 3

Animals don't smoke, drink alcohol, take drugs and pollute the environment—yet they suffer and die because of our self-abusive and environmentally-damaging behavior. We must no longer use animals as scapegoats, avoiding our responsibilities for our own health.

Animal rights is not the only issue, but in addition, the extent to which human wrongs have resulted in the escalation of disease and the fraudulent use of animals in vivisection. By not addressing and correcting our errors in living, we provided the pathway over which the lost tribes of biomedical research wander aimlessly through the vast wastelands of pharmacomania—the opportunistic outgrowth and expansion of vivisection having evolved from this madness.

Human lives are at risk. Real progress in determining cause, effect and meaningful solutions to our health problems is impeded by false promises of "miracle cures" through animal experimentation. Human disease comes about as a result of human failure—failure to comply with the natural laws of hygiene and living. Our immediate task is to educate all people as to the false premise and deceptive nature of vivisection. Once duly informed that the concept of animals as models for humans is undeniably suspect, we need an authoritative public and professional outcry for responsible research and to stop forever the insanity of vivisection.

Vivisection is, at best, an appalling waste and diversion of resources and, at worst, the cause and continuation of much human and animal suffering and death. We will no longer accept the unacceptable. There is too much at stake.

Dr. Les Stewart was a practicing dentist in Calabasas, CA, and a member of Last Chance for Animals - a direct action, anti-vivisection organization. Les died in April of 2009.

Please also read: [Les Stewart, DDS - Activist Extraordinaire, April 2009](#)