Home

The Ohio State University ▶ Research News

On Research...

Blogging about research issues at Ohio State University









Target: Students...

About us

Posted on March 29th, 2011 by earleholland

Research institutions that use animals in their studies know a simple truth:

Research Communications Staff

Opponents to this work will use any and all means - including violence - to halt such science. Rather than seeing animal use in research as a current necessity to advance human and animal health, the animal rights community sees it as genocide, an equivalent to the Holocaust of World War II.

In recent years, activists have picketed researchers' homes, vandalized and burned their cars, threatened spouses and children and even resorted to using bombs against these scientists. And as seriously criminal these acts are, there always seemed to be a line that wasn't crossed even in their zealousness.



That boundary is no more.

This week, a well-known animal rights activist announced a new strategy. Opponents to animal use should now target university students, pressuring them to renounce their science studies and even perhaps their career plans, if animal use was involved.

"Students are far more malleable and easily manipulated," she said, adding that they are "far more susceptible to applied persuasion tactics."

The activist, Camille Marino, is widely known to be confrontational. Her website - Negotiation Is Over - makes no excuses for advising violence and destruction against any who support animal research.

In her latest diatribe, she argues that, "Every time a vivisector's car or home - and eventually, the abuser him/herself - blows up, flames of liberation light up the night." She suggests that researchers are ready targets with their "homes, adorned with windows that can be opened and doors with locks that can be picked."

Subtlety is not part of Camille's vocabulary.

Her latest screed was titled, "Bringing the War to the Student Body - The Soft-Bellied Target of the Vivisection Complex." She, as do other counterparts, know the power of words. "Vivisection" and "torture" elicit strong negative emotions while "animal research" does not, especially when coupled with the mandated protections by law that govern such studies.

Her recipe for scaring students is blunt:

"Students also need to understand that making the wrong choice will result

NAVIGATION

- Home
- About us
- **Research Communications** Staff

RECENT POSTS

- * A graphic misrepresentation
- Of ghoulies and ghosties and long-leggedy beasties .
- A cascade of lemmings . . .
- Not what Ben meant . . .
- Of science, baseball, and cricket

SOCIAL MEDIA

- * OSU Research News on the Web
- Research News on Facebook
- Research News on YouTube
- StumbleUpon

WHAT WE READ

- Dot Earth Andrew Revkin/New York Times
- Framing Science
- Health News Review
- Knight Science Journalism Tracker
- Real Climate
- Science News
- Speaking of Research
- The Great Beyond
- The Panda's Thumb
- The Plainspoken Scientist
- TierneyLab
- WiredScience

N RSS

CATEGORIES

- Climate change
- Environment
- **Physics**
- Researchers
- Science Communication
- Science policy
- Space
- Uncategorized

ARCHIVES

- February 2012
- January 2012
- October 2011
- September 2011
- August 2011
- July 2011
- May 2011
- April 2011
- March 2011
- December 2010
- October 2010
- September 2010
- August 2010
- # July 2010
- June 2010
- May 2010
- April 2010
- March 2010
- February 2010
- January 2010
- December 2009
- November 2009
- October 2009
- September 2009
- August 2009
- July 2009
- June 2009
- May 2009

in a lifetime of grief . . . Students need to realize that any personal risk they are willing to assume will also be visited upon their parents, children, and nearest & dearest loved ones."

She says students are "infinitely more susceptible to negative and inflammatory publicity," that "when education fails, smear campaigns can be highly effective." She adds, "Abusers [meaning science students involved in animal research] have forfeited all rights to privacy and peace of mind."

This new campaign apparently is rooted in an interaction she had with an undergraduate science major a week or so earlier. Reading between the lines of the information Camille offered, it's clear that the student originally had strong supportive beliefs in the use of animals in research, a commitment solid enough to set her sights on a research career at one of the nation's premier research facilities.

But within 24 hours, she had reversed her opinion on the issue – a righteous victory, Camille argues.

But consider a comment the student wrote (provided by Camille's post) that suggests something different: "Please stop saying such horrible, untrue things about me. It's hurtful."

Clearly she quickly became the target of a vehement hate campaign by activists, one harsh enough to drive her from



research. Overwhelmed by it all, it appears she fled.

And who can blame her? Anyone who's been a target of such attacks – and I have been, including one before by Camille – knows the vindictiveness and bile contained in such messages. Undergraduate students – or even graduate students – have scant experience facing such anger.

And that is specifically why Camille, and perhaps others, sees students as ready targets.

And that is why the idea of such a thing is so loathsome.

In recent years, universities have been moving away from a historic role of "in loco parentis," where the institution served in lieu of parents far away. Students, as well as administrators, are more comfortable now with the notion that students are young adults.

But if Camille or others think that universities will stand idly by while animal rights activists abuse and harass their students, they are sorely mistaken. The fact that institutions have been reserved on this issue in the past isn't evidence that they will allow acts against students.

Camille's miscalculation may well awaken sleeping giants.__Earle Holland

- April 2009
- March 2009
- February 2009
- January 2009
- December 2008
- November 2008
- Cotober 2008
- September 2008
- August 2008
- # July 2008
- June 2008
- **May 2008**

META

- Log in
- Entries RSS
- Comments RSS
- WordPress.org

RESEARCH NEWS WEBSITE





Powered by Bookmarkify™

Tags: Researchers, Science policy //

4 Comments »

4 Responses to "Target: Students . . . "

NIO keep digging in their moral hole « Speaking of Research // Apr 3, 2011 at 12:35 pm

[...] a domestic and laboratory goddess) made a three point plan to defend scientists; and Earle Holland (On Research blog) reflected on Marino's harassment of an FAU student. There were further posts from Orac [...]

Mirna Dittman // Apr 16, 2011 at 6:58 pm

Wow, that is absolutely appauling! What a hypocrite. I care about animals as much as the next person, but this is disgusting. Who is she to mess with these kids' dreams if they want to work in this or that field? This really irritates me.

Slow Türk Dinle // May 19, 2011 at 5:55 pm

thanks for information blog

regalos // Sep 17, 2011 at 1:58 am

is true that the end justifies the means, maybe, but there is a difference between using them for medical and research and quite another terrible treatment they receive and inhuman, I think there is where much of the problem

Discussion Area - Leave a Comment

Name (required)

Mail (will not be

published) (required)

Website

« We're back . . . Skating on . . . »

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY | WWW.0SU.EDU

© 2006, The Ohio State University | Enarson Hall 154 W 12th Avenue | Columbus, Ohio 43210 | 614-292-OHIO This page is maintained by: University Relations. About this site.

Contact

On Research... » Target: Students . . .

If you have trouble accessing this page and need to request an alternate format, contact webmaster@osu.edu.