

Answer To Persons Defending Animal Research

Nancy Mroczek PhD

©Mroczek/Intelligent Media 1990

*The animal rights movement is not stopping progress;
the animal rights movement is stopping pain.*

The following is against the use of animals for any research and a response to an article written by David Johnson titled “Animal rights and human lives: Time for scientists to right balance” in the July 90 issue of Psychological Science. Dr. Johnson argues that the “philosophical root of the animal rights movements ...begins with the premise that living things are ordered in value by their ability to sense, and most importantly, by their ability to sense pain. By this principle, humans and other animals are equal in value”, Dr Johnson states. **By this principle, ability to sense pain is equal.** Further, ordering, as in hierarchal ascription, is neither pertinent nor of interest and “equal value” as per Dr. Johnson is the very value which arouses the use of animals for research as animals appear common and similar to human life. Suffering matters. Again, “research has been the first target only because scientists have been the easiest mark.” Research has been the first target because experimental research manipulation, - not sudden and swift death or murder -, is gruesome and inhumane. Scientists are a privileged, organized, heavily private commercially and public funded body and as such are not an easy mark. (Animal research ongoings are fanatically and powerfully guarded against the light of day). “To those in the movement, animal research is murder”, says Dr Johnson. Animal research is torture, not murder or sudden, swift death - the infamy of murder here being the inescapable and thankless reward for having been exploited. Apropos animals which have neither been bred nor used for research because of animal right activists, Dr. Johnson says “their deaths will benefit no one.” (!!)

We err away from the sanctity of life in general when paramount attributions to usury and utilitarian death, and death which is not ours to claim, as well as value-ness of life, are measured in “value” to some life other than the life which is exploited or dead. Sooner than the acceptance of death in the natural order of things and an event each must face alone essentially and in fact, we corrupt life by usurping deferential respect, with life instead made into an object for use.

“So don’t measure the success of the movement by animal lives saved”, says Dr. Johnson. “Measure it instead by the human lives lost and the human sufferings that go unrelieved because the research was not done that would have save the lives or erased the pain.” **Measure it instead by animal lives lived as horrific animal sufferings.** Further, do not measure what could be, human health, with what is, animal pain. Put aside questions of medicine and behavior at this point. Begin at the actual life flesh of

animal suffering and pain. Do not pass go; do not quantum leap research animal suffering to principles *beyond* the laboratory.

Animal feel pain. Yes - they do. They are not pencil sharpeners. They are not objects inanimate. They bleed and cry and swell and defecate as you or I. Inattentive oversight and cruel remiss. These are very real horrible phenomena at the hands of human experiment. We are not on the question of medicine or psychology. We are on concrete, absolute, given similarity to humans that makes animals much more suitable research tools. Animals feel, Animals suffer, Animals have nervous systems.

Animal research scientists care about research advances, cures for children with deleterious patterns. They do not consider the animals they use, - whether they try to minimize pain and suffering or not -, in their wholeness and life integrity. They do not consider the living life that is so identical in biology and behavior that it is used to find cures for human beings. Were research scientists animals, a different scream would protrude. Compassion. Knowledge. Understanding. Right at the very source. Right at the life one holds at any moment in one's hand. Right at the wholeness and sanctity. Right at the line of desecratory invasion and physiological infinity-ness separating forest from tree.

Imagine depriving an animal of food in one's home. Imagine electric shocking animals just because. Imagine infecting an animal by design. Imagine growing tumors in an animal and watching it suffer. Imagine keeping an animal in a garage in a cage and poisoning it with pesticides on regular basis. Everyday persons would report such abuse, if discovered, as cruelty to animals. The confines of laboratory practice do not make it different. Research goals do not make it different. There are and have been good reasons for many bad things. One must track sound logic as indigenous to science itself. One cannot go to reason, rationale, cure, help, progress, inflicted on hapless legislatively unprotected animals in pain for being locked in laboratory cage, manipulated under entrapment, and being denied , while living , contingencies pertinent to animal biological drive. Slow and torturous process at the hands of a goal directed entity is completely dissimilar from sudden, quick, and unexpected death. When animal research is presented, the phenomenological reality of the animal should be presented - sores, bleeding, crying, failure to thrive, ulcers, fear, hostility, and a maimed and exhausted life. These facts are as veritable as are social and medical problems.

This article has put at abeyance the questions of psychology, medicine, and health. The research community is eager to resonate about research using animals for such need. But questions in psychology, medicine, and health is a topic completely separate and distinct from animal suffering and those are not *moral* questions. The moral question is defenseless animal pain and doing unto others as one would not have done to oneself. Science, logic and necessary truth adheres to impeccable moral ground.

Being exact and arduous to ourselves is how we want to how we get TRUTH. Sacrifice cannot be made of that which is not ours. Sacrifice can only be made of one's own skin.

The animal rights movement is not stopping progress; the animal rights movement is stopping pain. Technology, including production adverse to human psychological physical health, is commercial gain, an economic megalithic structure. Money is the price and the cost. Morality seeks to know what is good, right and just. In a just world, no feeling system suffers because its morphology, habits, and communication are conveniently used to advantage something separate from itself. The greatest onus on human achievement is to become better human beings, more civilized, less barbaric, more compassionate, kind, loving, and ipso facto, AWARE. For science, for pure science, we must stop - without further reluctance and willful obeisance to conglomerate privilege - the carcinogenic and behavioral life circumstances which lead, e.g., to cancer and stress. Profit, AND health and science in its purity are poor bedfellows indeed. To one who is astute, empirical and intricately detailed, the *world* is the laboratory. Pressure must be spent on quality of life and human social engineering. For everyone. Immediately. Why wait on chloroflourocarbons? Pesticides? PCB's? Radioactive waste? Promotion of senseless and harmful commodities? Why not education par excellence, available and affordable? Why care so much about never ending bio-behavioral invasions, in a mad dash to control life, when pragmatic, glaring inconsistencies exist unperturbed by scientific thrust and the greater moral GOOD. The scientist, in objectivity and logic, is faced with the didactic of a sociopolitical task.