

effectively contributed by deeds and words would lead to vivisectionist experiments upon tens of thousands of human beings that were as helpless as the animals in his squalid laboratory—the political prisoners in the Nazi camps of extermination. And not at the hands of SS guards, but of Claude Bernard's scientific heirs, all titled physicians, trained in the vivisectional schooling of which he had been the loudest apostle.

* * *

In the light of his continuous failures, the memory of his heated controversies with the "vitalist" doctors and scientists clearly rankled in Claude Bernard. They included many a famous name, like the great naturalist Cuvier, and Pasteur himself. Claude Bernard had derided every adversary of organic mechanism in his *Introduction*. And now those words stood in print, indelible, published, undeniable.

But the High Priest of vivisection could not disown the false deity that he had foisted upon a credulous world. At stake was the honor of France, the prestige of Science, but most of all the vanity of a man who at the expense of other creatures' sufferances had been acclaimed as the founder of a new epoch, and had been heaped with honors.

Only in a letter to Madame Raffalovich, his friend and confidante who later on will donate to the Academy of Sciences their private correspondence, did Claude Bernard confess toward the end of his days:

"In the autumn of life the illusions fall from the soul one after the other, like leaves falling from the trees in the autumn of the year."

Words that could sound very touching indeed if we didn't know how bloody the hand was that wrote them, what ravages had been necessary to cause those illusions to fall from a vain and cruel mind. And the illusions continue falling, like so many autumn leaves, until the tree is entirely bare; and on his deathbed, without any member of his family being present, but only surrounded by other vivisectionists—including d'Arsonval, his preparator—Claude Bernard confesses

at last: "Our hands are empty, and only our mouths are full of promises."

Perhaps for all vivisectionists the hour of truth comes only in the face of death? Too late, ladies and gentlemen.

Claude Bernard was the first French scientist to be given a state funeral, and his biographers tell us that the day he died "all of France wept." But this is an exaggeration. There were at least three people in France who didn't weep that day: his wife and his daughters.

POSTSCRIPT TO CLAUDE BERNARD, DIABETES AND THE LIVER

Up to date the major encyclopedias and textbooks in the western world continue calling Claude Bernard a "genius" and indicate as his major claim to fame his alleged "discovery" of the role of the pancreas and of the "glycogenic power" of the liver.

But the thousands of dogs he had mutilated didn't reveal anything that had not been described previously, and with much more adherence to the truth, by the U.S. Army doctor, William Beaumont, in a book that in 1833 became part of the history of medicine. (Sigerist mentions it in *Grosse Aerzte*, p. 364.) In fact William Beaumont had discovered more about digestion than all the world's vivisectionists put together, by clinically observing a single human patient who was accidentally afflicted by a gastric fistula—an opening in the stomach that enabled the doctor to observe the digestive process over a period of years; without propagating the vivisectionists' innumerable fatal errors.

Claude Bernard had not understood—any more than today's vivisectionists—that by extirpating a dog's pancreas, which means inflicting one of the most brutal injuries possible, the experimenter does not duplicate the condition of a diseased pancreas, but puts the thus mutilated organism in a completely different condition; that through the severity of the injury and the pain he inflicts, he causes organic reactions that are entirely different in nature from those caused by a

pancreas that has gradually become defective through alimentary errors or excesses.

In fact today, as in Hippocrates' day, diabetes is preventable through appropriate diet. Although a ruined pancreas cannot always be restored to full efficiency, the only effective treatment, if the damage is not too far gone, consists in a simple diet—which is of no advantage to anyone, except to the patient.

Diabetes is a very serious disease. It can lead to acidosis and hence definitive, irreversible lesions of the arteries. It can lead to gangrene, uremia, angina pectoris, blindness, and the most serious infections, including pulmonary TB. The cause of diabetes is clear, well known to all those that haven't clouded the issues with animal experiments. The highest incidence of diabetes is in the United States, where the mortality from it is rising and has recently reached 27.8 per 100,000 inhabitants; the lowest in Japan, where mortality is only 2.4 per 100,000. And the Japanese diet contains on average 5 percent animal fats and meat, the American 35 percent. When Japanese take on American eating habits, they develop the same diabetic trouble. So the cause is not racial but nutritional. In one and the same country, like India, mortality from diabetes is very high among the rich, who consume large quantities of meat and animal fats, very low among the poor, whose staple diet is rice and vegetables. So statistics confirm the conclusions reached by the Hippocratic doctors through sheer intellectual activity, whereas animal experimentation keeps obscuring or misleading our sure knowledge, in all fields.

Facts and statistics have clearly shown that a pancreas can be ruined and chronic, incurable diabetes can be established by improper nourishment—heavy and rich. Hence we know how it can be prevented and treated. Already nearly half a century ago doubts were expressed about the usefulness of insulin, as in this statement by Dr. J. E. R. McDonagh, a distinguished surgeon, in *The Nature of Disease Journal* (Vol. I, 1932, p. 1): "Diabetes is a symptom, not a disease, and insulin does no more than palliate this

symptom. The drug throws no light upon the cause, it does not act in the manner described, and, had the cause been found and eradicated as it can be, there would have been no need to use it." The treatment with insulin and other drugs since developed has the effect to efface the symptoms and thus contributes to masking the cause of the malady. Insulin treatment has done more damage than it has brought benefits, has killed more people, especially among the old, through insulinic shock, than it has saved, has shortened more lives than it has lengthened.

In fact deaths by diabetes have not diminished but have increased since the discovery of insulin. In 1900, 22 years before its discovery, deaths from diabetes in the United States were 11 for each 100,000; in 1954 they were 15.6; in 1963, 17.2; ten years later, 27.8. And the rate keeps rising. Some success . . .

This caused French Academician Jean Rostand, one of Europe's best-known biologists and himself a vivisector, to write that "medicine cultivates disease. The health situation is worsening . . . Therapeutics is a purveyor of ills, it creates individuals that will have to take recourse to it . . . An impressive example is hereditary diabetes. Since the discovery of insulin, this disease has markedly increased." (From *Le Droit d'être Naturaliste*, éd. Stock, Paris, 1963).

Wrote Brian Inglis in *Drugs, Doctors and Diseases* (1965): "Further study has shown that diabetes is more complex than it appeared to be and that intrinsic diseases of the pancreas may not, in most cases, be the primary cause after all . . . The cause, or more probably causes, still elude researchers." (p. 70)

And to quote a vivisectionist journalist, Ulrico de Aichelburg, writing in the authoritative Italian magazine *Epoca* (Sept. 21, 1974): "The more we study diabetes, the more we discover the contradictory aspects of this malady. Fifty years ago, when insulin was discovered, we thought that the mystery of diabetes had been resolved. But now the mystery keeps getting more mysterious." Aichelburg failed to add: "But only to us vivisectionists."

And so now the whole subject is up again for re-

view. Not since Banting and Best were presumed to have solved the problem has there been so much milling around.

Of course, there is no money in it for research if everybody followed the proper, well-known diet. But money can be asked for working on dogs to "solve" the diabetic mystery once more—and never mind that the dogs' alimentary habits and organic reactions differ radically from ours, and that the very diet which being the wrong diet, *causes* diabetes in man (lots of meat and fat) is the *proper* diet for dogs—the favorite animals of the experimenters on diabetes.

I know personally diabetics who have been living very well for years without taking insulin or any other "anti-diabetic" drug—just following the proper, Hippocratic diet. One of them is Ursula von Wiese, aged 72, who just finished translating this book into German.

But never underestimate the enterprising spirit of died-in-the-wool experimenters. So, the Jan., 1971, issue of *Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics* had a report by Drs. L. Beaty Pemberton and William C. Manax, who in their attempt to solve what to them seemed the "mystery" of diabetes, subjected still another 74 dogs to complicated transection of the body of the pancreas, transplantations, and grafts, where-after irritant drugs were administered. Four dogs were lucky enough to die comparatively soon from pancreatitis and peritonitis. Sixteen died from abnormally high concentration of sugar in the blood. Eight died from thrombosis, one of kidney failure and another of lung congestion. It isn't clear what the end of the other dogs was. Much less what was the practical result of the experiment. Perhaps it was to bolster the feeling of self-importance, produce the usual entertainment value or pecuniary advantages for the pseudoscientists involved.

And a 14-page report in the April, 1975, issue of that same *Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics*, indicated that three doctors from London and three from Denver, Colorado, were at it again, with 123 dogs all told, and the usual result: *nil*.

But meanwhile, to confuse still further the scien-

tists' ideas concerning diabetes, an editorial in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* questioned even the notions that had been considered definitely acquired, like the long-accepted theory about insulin and blood sugar. *According to the editorial, more insulin does not always mean less sugar, nor less insulin more sugar.*

A splendid reason for starting to research diabetes all over again, as if Claude Bernard had never extirpated a dog's pancreas.

* * *

The other major achievement attributed to Claude Bernard is the alleged "discovery" of the "glycogenic" function of the liver—based on his mistaken experiment reported earlier, which made Claude Bernard believe that the liver fabricates sugar out of nothing, since he ruled out the existence of sugar in the vein leading to the liver. According to more recent theories, the liver is a filter for impurities and has anti-toxic functions, which Claude Bernard had never suspected. Many physiologists assume that the liver—through some processes that they define "very complex," because they haven't clarified them—has the power to "store" sugar and "liberate" it again when needed. Or at least this was the "official" belief a few decades ago. For presently all these notions have become doubtful again, as the Italian medical encyclopedia (*Edizioni Scientifiche Sansoni, 1952*) indicates on page 928:

"Numerous and recent investigations have cast serious doubts on everything that had been 'discovered' up to now about the function of the liver."

And the Encyclopedia Britannica puts it this way: "The construction of the liver is extremely simple, yet almost nothing was known about its microscopic structure prior to 1949 and almost nothing was known of its gross anatomy before 1952. The numerous functions of the liver are all carried out by the Kupffer cells (so called after their discoverer), but it appears that the more details are learned, the less is understood about their astonishing variety of function."

And we thought that the great Claude Bernard had solved it all with the help of thousands of dogs ages ago!

THE RED CANKER OF BERNARDISM

Great Britain was the first nation that promised to restrict vivisection by law, with the Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876. It established that for each experiment authorization had to be obtained beforehand from a special board, which would grant it only if the absolute necessity of the experiment was proved. It further established that the animals had to be spared unnecessary suffering, and that the number of experiments had to be made public. The promise has not been kept—neither in Great Britain nor elsewhere.

The year before this act went into effect, about 800 experiments had been performed in Great Britain. Since then, the number of experiments the British vivisectors have managed to have acknowledged as indispensable to the welfare of mankind has kept rising relentlessly, with slight fluctuations. It reached in 1973, at the hands of 16,759 licensed researchers, in 607 licensed laboratories, a total of 5,363,641 during that one year alone. Over 4.5 million experiments or 85 percent were performed without any anesthesia, and fewer than 4 percent of the anesthetized animals were destroyed before waking up again to suffer to the bitter end.

And yet these figures are modest compared with American and Japanese figures. Since the number of vivisections is directly related to the possibility of gains and to the subsidies for so-called scientific research, it is inevitable that the U.S. should be in first position. In Russia, where there is no money in subsidies and drugs, vivisection is today almost nonexistent, in spite of some widely advertised experiments of the recent past, as when a Prof. Demichov implanted a small dog's head into the neck of a large German shepherd; both heads were shown drinking water the next day, but finally the man-made freak

had to be destroyed, because the pain-crazed smaller head kept biting furiously the host animal.

Said Owen B. Hunt, director of the American Anti-Vivisection Society, whom I interviewed in Geneva in 1976: "In our country the prime reason for the growth of vivisection is money. Take the money out of vivisection and 90 percent of its projects would collapse overnight. Awhile back, somebody sold the government on the idea that you could buy anything with money, including health. All you had to do was spend enough money. This was great news for the researchers, especially for the biological scientists. President Johnson was our most recent high official to fall for it, though every president since the last war must share the blame. Johnson made extravagant promises that in a few years we would conquer cancer, heart disease and what have you. He has seen his promises along with billions of dollars of groaning taxpayers' money go down the drain. He has also experienced hardening of the arteries and angina pectoris at the comparatively early age of 61. All those dead experimental animals have done him no good. Nor have the squandered tax dollars done anybody any good—except the venal vivisectors and their sycophants in the National Institute of Health, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and other governmental bodies dedicated to the proposition that the American citizen is a sucker to be taken."

According to Rutgers University, New Jersey, in 1971 the various U.S. laboratories sacrificed 85,283 primates, 46,624 pigs, 22,961 goats, and approximately 190,000 turtles, 200,000 cats, 500,000 dogs, 700,000 rabbits, 15-20 million frogs, 45 million mice and rats. However staggering, these figures probably stand below reality, since just one American breeder boasted the next year to have sold 220 million mice to laboratories in a twelve-month period. And in spite of the new alternative methods that are constantly being developed because they prove superior to animal tests, the number of animals annually sacrificed to the profits of industry and to the experimental folly of a comparatively small number of individual experi-

menters keeps growing on a worldwide scale of about 5 percent annually.

These are the figures. Now let us see what could lead mankind to such aberration.

* * *

During the last century, the western hemisphere had gone into raptures of enthusiasm over the great discoveries and inventions that were changing the face of the earth—for the better, it was still being hoped. At that time the faith that the majority was placing in the Bernardian dogmas was understandable, even though many scientists were ridiculing them. Today, the absurdity of Claude Bernard's doctrine is being demonstrated daily. But meanwhile the vivisectionists have modified their argumentations, like Claude Bernard kept modifying his, in order to mask his continual failures.

Today's "researchers" admit that one can't experiment on organic life equally as on inert matter, and that animals don't react like man; but blithely ignoring logic, they argue that this calls for an intensification of vivisection rather than for abolition. So the aberration of Bernardism is as firmly entrenched in our current social structure as the aberrations of Galenism were during the long medieval night.

There are two major explanations—the one material, the other psychological—why official medicine won't admit that it has taken the wrong road. The first is the financial profit of the drug industry and its willing agents—the practicing physicians. The psychological explanation was furnished by Claude Bernard himself when he wrote that "man is always inclined to accept as absolute truth what he has been taught." (*Médecine*, p. 214)

In the U.S., in the name of liberty and democracy, no less, the vivisectionists have imposed the principle of "complete freedom of vivisection," as if it were the equivalent of freedom of thought or the rights of man. Vivisection is glorified in the States; its rare outspoken adversaries risk the ostracism of

the community, are accused of being antisocial and inhuman, much like those who would have opposed the witch hunts of the past, but did not dare to, lest they join the victims at the stake.

Continual efforts are made today to indoctrinate the children with the new religion. Its phony priests dedicate much study to the matter. The New Jersey Science Teachers Association, for example, conducts an annual essay contest in which money prizes are awarded to children from the 6th to 12th grades. Among the topics in 1974: "How Medical Research Using Animals Saves Millions of Lives" and "The Need for Continued Progress in Medical and Scientific Research Using Animals."

As a result of this early brainwashing of American children, although there are severe laws against the maltreatment of animals in the U.S., the so-called "Science" is free from any inhibitory laws.

In the U.S. a man who whips a horse faces a stiff penalty. But if he wants to find out, under the pretext of scientific research, how many blows are needed to kill a horse, he can club to death a hundred horses and reap admiration from his equals for doing it, for this is "Science."