

The Reality of human vivisection : a review of a letter by William W. Keen, M.D., LL.D., late president of the American Medical Association.

Contributors

Keen, William W. 1837-1932.
Augustus Long Health Sciences Library

Publication/Creation

Boston : [publisher not identified], 1901.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/yff937cw>

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by the Augustus C. Long Health Sciences Library at Columbia University and Columbia University Libraries/Information Services, through the Medical Heritage Library. The original may be consulted at the the Augustus C. Long Health Sciences Library at Columbia University and Columbia University. where the originals may be consulted.

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

COLUMBIA LIBRARIES OFFSITE
HEALTH SCIENCES STANDARD



QP45 .Am33

HX64099059

The Reality of human

RECAP

The Reality of Human Vivisection

A REVIEW

OF A LETTER BY WILLIAM W. KEEN, M.D., LL.D.

LATE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

*"Homo sum ; humani
nihil a me alienum puto."*

BOSTON


1901.

QP45


AM33

Columbia University
in the City of New York
College of Physicians and Surgeons
Library





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Open Knowledge Commons (for the Medical Heritage Library project)



The Reality of Human Vivisection

A REVIEW

OF A LETTER BY WILLIAM W. KEEN, M.D., LL.D.

LATE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

*"Homo sum ; humani
nihil a me alienum puto."*

BOSTON

1901.

QP45

Am33

INTRODUCTION.

The following letter was sent by Hon. James M. Brown, President of the *American Humane Association*, to Dr. William W. Keen, of Philadelphia. It explains itself.

THE AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION :

SOCIETIES OF THE UNITED STATES ORGANIZED FOR THE
PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS AND CHILDREN.

TOLEDO, OHIO, Oct. 4, 1900.

PROF. WILLIAM W. KEEN, M. D., late President of the AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia.

Dear Sir:—My attention has just been called to a passage in the published "Report of the Hearings" before the Senate committee, held at Washington last February, on the bill for regulation of vivisection. In this volume the following conversation between Senator Gallinger and yourself is recorded :

SENATOR GALLINGER—What knowledge have you of the advances made by vivisectionists that have led them to progress from the brute creation to the human creation in making these so-called vivisection experiments?

DR. KEEN—I presume you refer to a pamphlet issued by the American Humane Society. I have only to say in reference to it that there were a number of experiments which I would utterly condemn. Of the experiments narrated in that pamphlet, I have looked up every one that I could. Only two are alleged to have been done in America. Many of them are so vague and indefinite that I could not look them up, but as to those that I could, some are garbled and inaccurate; not all of them, observe.

A statement of this character, based upon such authority, it is impossible to ignore. Proceeding from one less eminent than yourself in that profession which you represent and adorn, it might pass without notice, but coming from you, sir, such a charge must be investigated and probed to the fullest extent. Its importance is evident, and in testing its accuracy you will give me, I trust, every assistance within your power.

First: Regarding the cases of experimentation upon human beings recorded in our pamphlet, "Human Vivisection," you informed the Senate committee that "*Many of them are so vague and indefinite that I could not look them up.*" We challenge the accuracy of that statement, and ask for proof. Of the various series of experiments upon human beings, made for the most part upon women and children in hospitals and infirmaries, the authorities given in this pamphlet are as follows :

Introduction.

1. *Bulletin of the Johns Hopkins Hospital* for July, 1897.
2. *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* for Aug. 6 and 13, 1896 ;
The Philadelphia Polyclinic for Sept. 5, 1896.
3. *New York Medical Record* for Sept. 10, 1892.
4. *The British Medical Journal* for July 3, 1897 ; the *New England Medical Monthly* for March, 1898.
5. *The Medical Press* for December 5, 1888 ; the *British Medical Journal* for Aug. 29, 1891 ; the *London Times* for June 27, 1891, (and other journals).
6. *The Medical Brief* for June, 1899.
7. *Ringer's Therapeutics*, pp. 585, 588, 590, 591, 498, 503 ; the *London Lancet* for Nov. 3, 1893.
8. *The Newcastle Daily Chronicle* for Sept. 21, 1888.
9. *The Medical Press and Circular* for March 29, 1899 ; *The London Lancet* for May 6, 1899, p. 1261.
10. *The Allg. Wiener med. Zeitung*, Nos. 50 and 51.
11. *Deutsche med. Wochenschrift*, Nos. 46 and 48 of year 1894.
12. *Deutsche med. Wochenschrift*, of Feb. 19, 1891.
13. Lecture before Medical Society of Stockholm, Sweden, May 12, 1891.
14. *The British Medical Journal* for Oct. 15, 1881 ; *Medical Reprints* for May 16, 1893 ; the *Nineteenth Century* for Dec., 1895.

For one series of experiments in the above list, those made by Dr. Jansen upon children of the "Foundlings' Home"—with the "kind permission" of the head physician, Professor Medin—because, as he said, "calves were so expensive," it appears that the only authority given was a reference to his lecture delivered before a Swedish medical society upon a certain date. Although, so far as known, the facts there stated have never been denied, yet the reference may, perhaps, be called indefinite. But *one* case is not "many." To what other of the references above given did you refer when you informed the Senate committee that "*many of them were so vague and indefinite that I could not look them up?*" Had you stated that your library—ample as it is—did not contain, and could not be expected to contain, all of the foreign authorities to which reference was made there would have been nothing to criticize. I must assume, sir, that you have not put forth an aspersion of another's reliability merely to have acknowledgment of the inadequacy of your sources of reference ; that the proofs of your statement, covering "*many*" cases, are available, and, in the interest of accuracy, I ask you to produce them.

Second : There is yet another point to which I ask your attention. You made the statement before the Senate committee that in regard to our published account of cases of human vivisection, "*many of them are so vague and indefinite that I could not look them up; but, as to those that I could, some are garbled and inaccurate; not all of them, observe.*"

This, sir, is a most serious charge. You distinctly declared that of the cases personally investigated by yourself, as quoted in the pamphlet on "Human Vivisection," some are "garbled and inaccurate." We deny the charge, and again challenge production of evidence upon which it is made.

A "garbled" quotation is one which, by reason of omission and perversions, is essentially unfair. Sometimes it is a statement from which parts are omitted or transposed for the purpose of conveying a false impression. To omit quotation of parts not directly bearing upon the question for the sake of brevity—this is not

"garbling," for all quotation would then be impossible. We assert that in quoting accounts of the cases of human vivisection no omissions of essential facts have been made sufficient to impair the accuracy or fairness of the quotation. Let us put the matter to the test. Point out, if you can, the "some cases" which you found "garbled and inaccurate," and in proof of the charge *quote the omitted sentences or words which, had they been inserted, would cause you and the general public to justify and approve the experiments on human beings which we have so severely condemned.*

Third: You stated, sir, before the Senate Committee that only two experiments upon human beings "are alleged to have been done in America." I question, sir, whether that remark is quite in accord with the highest ideals of truth; it is the language of doubt; it seems to signify and imply that even you are aware of no other experiments upon human beings than two cases which are thus "alleged." I am very confident, sir, that you will not venture formally to assert—what you have seemed to imply—that you know of but two experiments upon human beings made in this country and recorded in the medical literature of the United States. There is indeed need of further enlightenment, if the medical profession of this country, so worthily represented by yourself, is ignorant of what has been done by men without pity and without conscience.

Trusting to have response from you at an early date, I am,

Yours most truly,

JAMES M. BROWN,
President.

After nearly four months delay, Dr. Keen made a long and rambling reply, containing innumerable errors and misstatements of every kind, which he has caused to be printed in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and in the *Philadelphia Medical Journal* in their issue of February 23, 1901, and in pamphlet form for general circulation. No sufficient rejoinder to his letter would be admitted to the columns of these medical periodicals. But such gross errors should not be permitted to pass unchallenged; and some partial exposure of its misstatements follows herewith.

THE REALITY OF HUMAN VIVISECTION:

A REVIEW OF DR. KEEN'S LETTER.

At last we have from the pen of a physician and surgeon, widely known throughout the United States what is practically an apology for the practice of Human Vivisection. Purporting merely to criticise a pamphlet exposing the atrocity in question, he spares no argument that might tend to exonerate those charged with this offense, or that would cast odium upon those who have unveiled to the public eye the horrors of hospital experimentation upon the helpless and the poor. The appearance of this defense,—we can give it no other name,—is of peculiar and painful significance, and fully justifies the apprehensions which have long been felt.

Its evolution is of interest. At the "Hearing" before a Senate Committee in Washington, February 21, 1900, Senator Gallinger called attention of Dr. William W. Keen, then under examination, to certain phases of scientific experimentation upon human beings. "I presume," said Dr. Keen in reply, "you refer to a pamphlet issued by the American Humane Association. I have only to say in reference to it that there were a number of experiments which I would utterly condemn. Of the experiments narrated in that pamphlet I have looked up every one that I could. Only two are alleged to have been done in America. Many of them are so vague and indefinite that I could not look them up, but as to those that I could, some are garbled and inaccurate, not all of them, observe."* How skilfully is vague reprehension,—without one single specification,—mixed with insinuation of unreliability and literary fraud! The president of the American Humane Association in a letter printed herewith, challenged Dr. Keen

* Hearing before the Senate Committee (on Vivisection) February 21, 1900, page 30.

to make good his words; and after some months' delay, he has published his reply in the "*Journal of the American Medical Association*" of February 23, 1901, and printed it for distribution in pamphlet form.

It is a document which it is difficult to characterize. By minutest criticism of words, by disparagement and detraction in all conceivable ways, or by actual misstatements of fact, he has endeavored to convey the impression that the charges of experimentation upon human beings, are on the whole, incredible and absurd; that legitimate methods of medical and surgical treatment have been viciously or ignorantly exaggerated into "experiments,"—when there was no experiment;—and that no cause exists for denouncing the men who have been charged with these horrible deeds. Of one series of experiments only, (the unspeakably vile and atrocious investigations of Menge,) does Dr. Keen affirm his condemnation; but the intensity of his disapproval he at once permits us to measure by the statement that "to misrepresent these experiments is scarcely less culpable than to perform them!" Here, at any rate, we feel sure that Dr. Keen speaks his mind; and that these inoculations of new-born babes,—wrapped at their birth in sterile towels and conveyed from the bedside to the laboratory for experimentation ('*sofort nach der Geburt in sterile Tücher gehüllt, und im Laboratorium zu den Versuchen verwendet,*')* stand in *his* judgment on a moral equality with a translator's exaggeration, or the blunders of a copyist!

The impression of a careful reader of Dr. Keen's letter may be that in these apologetic references to human vivisectioners he has gone a little too far. But should we not remember that he is writing in defense of others? To what extent an advocate in discharging his duty may be allowed to overstep those bounds of fairness or of veracity which ordinarily govern the conduct of honorable men, is a question upon which the highest authorities are not agreed; but it is certain that he may go very far. Lord Brougham, before he became the Lord Chancellor of England, in one of the greatest of his speeches delivered before the House of Lords, laid down the law by which he was governed in the following terms:

* *Deutsche Med. Wochenschrift*, November 29, 1894, p. 907.

"An advocate, by the sacred duty which he owes his client, knows in the discharge of that office but one person in the world,—THAT CLIENT AND NONE OTHER. To save that client *by all means and expedients*, to protect that client at all hazards and costs to all others,—and among others, to himself, is the highest and most unquestioned of his duties; and he must not regard the alarm—the suffering—the torment,—the destruction which he may bring upon any other. Nay, separating the duties of a patriot from those of an advocate and casting them, if need be, to the wind, he must go on, reckless of consequence, if his fate it should unhappily be to involve his country in confusion for his client's protection."*

Human vivisection may be said to be on trial before Public Opinion. It has been impeached as opposed to the spirit of Christianity, on account of its cruelty and for its absolute disregard of human rights; and Dr. Keen, let us say, appears for the defense. Now, in the criticisms we propose to make of Dr. Keen's paper, certain clear distinctions should be kept in mind. For Professor Keen, the skillful surgeon, the prominent member of a leading Christian denomination, we have great respect. For Dr. Keen, the specious apologist of human vivisection, and for his methods of advocacy—"by all means and expedients,"—we shall not be sparing in exposure or criticism. If we show that for the sake of human vivisection he has hesitated at no trick of defensive palliation in behalf of unspeakable outrages upon the weak and defenseless, let it be understood that we are denouncing merely the advocate and not the man. If such advocacy has imposed silence where we had hoped for outspoken condemnation; if he has abundant epithets of scorn and vituperation for the errors of a translator, but no words of mildest censure for the vilest crimes against Humanity,—the inoculation of innocent children with foul disease, the grafting of cancers into the healthy breasts of unconscious women by men of his profession, or the inoculation of hospital patients with yellow fever; if unbounded zeal has carried him even beyond the borders of truth, and caused him sometimes to rely upon petty tricks of duplicity and equivocation, we shall assume that it is due to that mistaken advocacy which he so unwisely undertook. Of that unwisdom we have no doubt. The vileness of the practice, which he attempted to defend by interposition of his pro-

* Speeches of Henry Lord Brougham upon Questions relating to Public Rights, Duties and Interests. Edin. Vol. I., p. 105. There are various readings in the original report of this speech; some phrases run as given here.

fessional repute, no words can express. For his endeavors to mitigate or turn aside the execration sure to overtake it when the facts are fully known, we believe that Dr. Keen will one day experience the bitterest regret.

For plainness of speech or emphasis of denunciation we shall offer no apology; the subject requires it. Again and again, as a method of defense, Dr. Keen has insinuated against the American Humane Association, charges of literary dishonesty, the utter falsity of some of which—as we shall demonstrate,—he must have known. Such methods of criticism demand plain speech. We shall utter no words that have not truth for their basis; we shall demonstrate, rather than assert; we shall be fair and just, but there shall be no cause on the part of human vivisectors or their apologists to complain that our meaning is vague or obscure.

We desire to do Dr. Keen no injustice in the criticisms we propose to make. He will doubtless protest loudly that he sufficiently voiced his condemnation of the practice in that reply to Senator Gallinger, which we have just quoted. But such words of vague reprehension unaccompanied as they were, by one word of specific reproof,—resemble precisely the denunciations of that prudent Puritan, who preached most vigorously against “the exceeding sinfulness of Sin.” Such condemnation touches the sensibilities of no offender. One by one, in careful examination of details Dr. Keen has weighed some of the worst conceivable experiments upon women and children, related in the pamphlet *Human Vivisection*; but which experimenter of them all has he dared to denounce? Not one has he named, or even referred to, in any such way as would tend to hinder the man from grasping his hand in gratitude and tacit appreciation. No reader of Dr. Keen’s paper can doubt for a moment where his sympathies lie. No “condemnation” of his, which mingles one word of mild disapprobation with a thousand of strenuous defense, is of the slightest weight. No “condemnation” has value which refers to crime with apology, and mentions criminals with respect.

In attempting to nullify the disclosures regarding Hospital experimentation made by the American Humane Association in the pamphlet on *Human Vivisection*, Dr. Keen has directed

his attack along various lines. We propose to follow him and to consider these points:

- I. THE QUESTION OF VAGUE AND INDEFINITE QUOTATION. *Were many of the experiments narrated in the pamphlet so vague and indefinite that Dr. Keen could not verify them?*
- II. THE QUESTION OF GARBLED QUOTATIONS. *Brevity of quotation is often absolutely necessary. Were omissions made by the pamphlet of vital importance for determining the morality of the acts condemned, or were they, on the contrary, non-essential to any such judgment?*
- III. THE QUESTION OF CONTROVERSIAL ETHICS. *Has Human Vivisection been defended or palliated by resort to false suggestion?*

These are practically the points at issue. We shall prove that "many of the experiments narrated in the pamphlet" were not so vague or indefinite that they could not be "looked up;" that although some mistakes were made by translators or copyists, they would not change condemnation into approval; and finally that to palliate the offenses of human vivisectioners, resort has been made to the suggestion of inferences manifestly untrue.

I.

THE QUESTION OF VAGUE QUOTATION.

1. In his reply to Senator Gallinger, before quoted, Dr. Keen declared regarding the experiments narrated in that pamphlet that many "are so vague and indefinite that I could not look them up." In other words, regarding "many of the experiments" he could not find proof that they had been made! That statement was challenged. It was pointed out by the President of the American Humane Association that, with one exception, every phase of experimentation specifically mentioned had some reference to a medical authority. Now, how is this issue met by Dr. Keen?

It is met by evasion. Instead of acknowledging his error, Dr. Keen, arbitrarily, and without permission of anyone changes the issue. "I stated" he says in his reply to President Brown, "that many of the *references* were vague and indefinite." Absolutely untrue; he stated nothing of the kind; we quoted his words at the outset precisely as they stand—revised by himself,—in the Report of the Hearing. Does he claim that they mean the same thing? Then why did he change them? It is easy to see.

Let us take as a first illustration of what Dr. Keen means by vagueness, the horrible "cancer-grafting" cases of certain European surgeons, to which this pamphlet first directed attention on this side of the Atlantic. To a hospital in France a poor woman was brought one day suffering from cancer of the breast. An operation was necessary; she consented, and was put under the influence of chloroform. After the operation, and while the patient was still unconscious from effect of the anaesthetic, the operating surgeon, Dr. Doyen, carefully inserted a bit of the cancer he had just removed into the healthy breast of the victim. The wound healed; nothing at first excited the patient's apprehension or alarm. Then, some weeks after, she found, doubtless to her unspeakable horror and despair, a new cancer in the opposite breast! And the crime was repeated.

Let us give a brief summary of these two scientific experiments in Dr. Cornil's own words: (*italics ours.*)

"L'opérateur, après avoir enlevé cette tumeur, en a sectionné un très petit fragment, et l'a inséré sous la peau du sein du côté opposé *qui était parfaitement normal*. L'opération avait été faite *pendant le sommeil chloroformique* avec les précautions antiseptiques."

The second case was almost exactly the same.

"Après l'ablation du sein malade, *et pendant le sommeil chloroformique*, le chirurgien inséra dans le tissu glandulaire du sein du côté opposé, un petit fragment de la tumeur enlevée. La greffe suivit la même évolution."*

When Prof. Cornil read an account of these human vivisections before the Academy of Medicine in Paris, at the meeting of June 23, 1891, the members,—horried by such

* Bulletin de l'Académie de Médecine, 1891, p. 906. "Sur les greffes et inoculations de cancer."

disclosures,—hastened to record their deepest condemnation. “In the name of French surgery, in the name of morality, I cannot too emphatically protest against this experiment,” exclaimed Dr. Leon Le Fort. “It is surgical immorality,” cried Dr. Larrey. “It is an essentially criminal act,” said Dr. Moutard-Martin. Then in the outcry of abhorrence that arose throughout Europe, it was discovered that exactly similar experiments had not only been made in Germany, but—worst of all,—they had been openly described at meetings of physicians and surgeons, one of which was the 18th Congress of the German Medical Association! The special correspondent of the *British Medical Journal*, wrote thus from Berlin :

“The question whether a surgeon is justified in inoculating a patient with minute particles of cancer is being as much discussed in medical circles in Berlin as it is in Paris. A Dr. Leidig—not a medical man but a lawyer,—has, in the public press accused Professors Hahn and von Bergmann of having inoculated carcinomatous patients with particles of cancer, in places where they were not diseased and of having thus artificially produced new cancerous foci. In proof of his accusation, Dr. Leidig quoted the following passages.”*

One of the proofs brought forward by Dr. Leidig was the following extract from the report given by Dr. Hahn of his own investigation :

“Herr E. Hahn glaubt durch ein Experiment die Uebertragbarkeit des Carcinoms erwiesen zu haben. Er hat einer Patientin die an Carcinome disséminé litt von drei Knötchen mit einer Scheere auf Art der Reverdin'schen Transplantation Thiele entfernt und an ganz entfernten Stellen implantirt. *Alle drei Knötchen sind fortgewachsen und haben sich als Carcinome weiter entwickelt.*”†

The correspondent of the *British Medical Journal* translates the above confession of guilt as follows: “Herr E. Hahn believes that he has proved by experiment that cancer is transferable. He had removed particles of three nodules from a female patient suffering from *carcinome disséminé* with scissors, and had implanted them in different spots of the body. *All three particles increased in size developing in cancer.*”

* *British Medical Journal*, July 25, 1891, p. 214. See also its issue of Aug. 29, 1891, p. 495.

† *Deutsche med. Wochenschrift*, 19 Nov., 1887, p. 987.

It was the surgical scandal of all Europe. The *British Medical Journal* editorially denounced the French surgeon's experiments in cancer-grafting as "an outrage, not only upon the unhappy persons referred to, but upon the whole medical profession." * The daily press discussed these abominable investigations with various expressions of popular abhorrence and condemnation. And certainly if any question affects the welfare of everyone, it is this. What wife, mother or sister undergoing a surgical operation, will be safe, if, while unconscious, such "experiments" may be made, and the crime afterward condoned and tacitly justified on the part of American surgeons, by all failure to condemn the perpetrators?

To this phase of human vivisection the pamphlet devoted more space than to any other. Of the occurrence of these infamous deeds, Dr. Keen, as an educated surgeon, could have had no more doubt than he has of the late outbreak in China, regarding which, we dare say, his only source of information is that daily press, which he holds so greatly in contempt. Granted that the charge is true, how can he ward it off? Does he denounce these criminals? Does he join the leading surgeons of France in stigmatizing these acts as "surgical immorality," and as "essentially immoral?" No. *Not one word of censure escapes him.* But looking closely, he discovers that certain quotations from editorials in German newspapers referring to this scandal of the day are without exact dates; he finds, too, that Dr. Leidig's accusation has no date, (although it was referred to by the *British Medical Journal* in a passage just quoted, equally without such specification), and forthwith Dr. Keen holds up these trifles in such way as to convey the impression *that the whole charge rests upon anonymous newspapers!* Of five "references" which Dr. Keen declares were impossible of consultation, four were nothing but editorial expressions of opinion upon occurrences which were vouched for by medical references, which were of notoriety throughout Europe, and of the occurrence of which he had no more doubt than he has of the battle of Bunker Hill! And yet these

* *British Medical Journal*, July 4, 1891, p. 23. A reference to these human vivisections was also printed in the *Medical Press* of London, Dec. 5, 1888 (p. 583)

comments, these expressions of public opinion upon events that were the universal scandal of the time,—comments that did not purport to be proofs,—Dr. Keen has the face to bring forward in support of his charge that “many (experiments) *were so vague and indefinite that I could not look them up!*” What are we to think of a writer who regards such a trick as justifiable, or believes in such methods of advocacy? In failing to condemn the men guilty of these crimes,—eminent surgeons though they may be,—any American surgeon makes a terrible mistake. Possibly there may be in this country half a dozen persons,—certainly not more,—who dream that American women needing a surgeon’s aid, would prefer to trust themselves to the skill of an operator who has no words of condemnation for the perpetrators of the foulest crimes upon unconscious womanhood.

2. Take another illustration of Dr. Keen’s proof that many experiments were so vague and indefinite he could not look them up. The pamphlet on Human Vivisection gives a quotation from Tertullian, who lived nearly seventeen hundred years ago. The quotation certainly had nothing to do with the practices of to-day; it was merely of historical interest. Dr. Keen looks for it, and then, referring to the volume to which it was credited, boldly asserts, that “no such quotation exists on pages 430–433. Now, let us suppose, that some reader who does not care to take Dr. Keen’s word as infallibly correct, concludes to test this assertion. He opens the volume referred to at page 430; finishes the sentence at foot of the page,—*and there is the very quotation* on the second line of page 431, where he cannot possibly help seeing it if he reads the page to which it was ascribed!* No reader who takes the trouble to consult the volume can doubt that Dr. Keen saw it. The temptation, however, to make a printer’s error (430, 433, instead of 430–433) do service as an imputation of literary dis-

* Tertullian, *De Anima*, Edinburgh Edition. Tran. by Holmes. Vol. II, pp. 430–433.

“There is that Herophilus, the well-known surgeon, or (as I may rather call him) butcher, who cut up no end of persons in order to investigate the secrets of Nature, who ruthlessly handled human creatures to discover their form and make.” The pamphlet, it is true, used the word “*physician*” in place of “*surgeon*,” but we presume this is hardly an error which would lead Dr. Keen to deny existence of the paragraph.

honesty was too strong for him to resist, especially since he knew that not one reader in a thousand would ever take the trouble to test the veracity of his statements. But how hard pressed must be the cause that in defense, resorts to tricks like this!

3. Regarding Finger's abominable experiments upon women who had just passed through the pangs of child-birth, the reference in the pamphlet gave the name of the periodical and the number, but in some way omitted the year. "*No such paper by Finger is published in that journal, at least from 1890 to the present time,*" cries Dr. Keen,—wisely modifying his emphatic statement by a saving clause. The account of these experiments, as stated in *Human Vivisection* are to be found in the volume for 1885 of the periodical named.

We shall again refer to this charge of "vague and indefinite" experiments when we come to speak of a more serious matter.

II.

THE QUESTION OF GARBLED QUOTATIONS.

Before touching this question of inaccurate quotation to which Dr. Keen has devoted so much research and argument, let us ask what the compilers of *Human Vivisection* manifestly aimed to do? Assuredly they did not attempt to write a treatise. The extracts were brief, and yet brevity was unavoidable. To have printed in full, the papers from which these excerpts were taken would have required a large volume; the full translation of Menge's articles alone would occupy thirty pages the size of this. What the compilers evidently sought to do was simply this: to demonstrate by a few brief and condensed statements,—taken almost without exception from medical sources,—*the fact that experimentation upon human beings is not a myth, but an awful reality*, and that both the practice, and the men guilty of it should be emphatically and impartially condemned. When Dr. Keen, attempting to create doubt and confuse judgment, told Senator Gallinger that some experiments were "garbled and inaccurate," he was challenged to point out any such suppression of facts as would cause him to give approval to the deeds. Every-

thing that could possibly tend to mitigate condemnation of the perpetrators or throw doubt upon the reality of the deed itself, he has suggested or implied in his letter; but that open sanction he was invited to give, he has prudently withheld. The vilest experimenters he has failed to rebuke, but *he dared not openly commend them.*

In the title given to his contribution—“*Misstatements on Antivivisection*”—and in various allusions which are scattered through it, there is apparently the suggestion that all this opposition to hospital experiments upon the ignorant and poor, proceeds from antivivisectionists. It is true that the opponents of animal experimentation have been strongest in their opposition to human vivisection, but there are hundreds who are not antivivisectionists, who would most decidedly condemn the vivisection of Man. Is it wise, is it expedient, is it accurate to give the former all the credit of opposition to the vile-ness of human vivisection? Can Dr. Keen for a moment fancy that the medical profession are united in tacit approval of such deeds? There will be a vast increase in the number of “antivivisectionists” if all who oppose this atrocity must be included in their ranks.

1. We shall not deny that in his microscopic examination of the pamphlet, Dr. Keen has discovered some few errors of translators or transcribers, which of course will be corrected in any future editions of *Human Vivisection*. These German translations were made by European writers, and considering their source, there was every reason for belief in their verbal accuracy. For none of them was the American Humane Association responsible in any way whatever. But the point we insist upon is this: that such errors of translation as exist,—such liberties with the text involving too liberal translations, such abbreviations or inaccuracies,—pertain to but few cases, and *do not in the slightest degree change or mitigate the immorality of the experiments themselves.*

2. In one point only has Dr. Keen been able to indicate a serious error in the pamphlet criticised. This mistake concerns certain experiments made by Dr. Sanarelli upon hospital patients under his care, by inoculating them with the poison of yellow fever. At the end of a long list of symptoms pro-

duced by the poison in the unfortunate victims, Dr. Sanarelli appends the Latin word in italics—“*collapsus*.”* Impressed with its emphasis, and its place at the end, the translator, doubtless with no objectionable intent—wrote “*final collapse*,” where the adjective should have been omitted. It was a serious mistake, for it led to a statement by the writer who first gave it publicity that it was “understood that some, if not all of the persons inoculated died of the disease.” The translation of this sentence, and the deduction to which it led were both given to the public over his own name by Mr. Rene Bache of Washington, D. C., a well-known writer on scientific subjects, who has no connection whatever with the *American Humane Association*.† Whoever made this translation, he included one sentence, actually in the original Italian, but which was carefully omitted—or “garbled”—in every other translation into English which we have been able to find in the medical press. Reference will be made again to this very singular circumstance.

3. Dr. Keen's imputation of “garbled quotation” is utterly baseless except on the ground that the parts omitted in the pamphlet, were essential to any fair judgment of the morality of the experimenter's acts. On this question, we join issue with him without hesitation. He insists that the accounts of certain human vivisections contained in the pamphlet, are “garbled,” because the result of the experiment—so far as the victim is concerned—was not always stated; and he refers to this omission so often, as to imply that he regards non-injury to the victims a substantial excuse for the deeds. Sanarelli with his yellow fever venom (“*veleno*”) makes cruel tests upon five hospital patients entrusted to his professional care; “*none of them died*,” protests Dr. Keen. Fitch of San Francisco, while at Hawaii, inoculates some twenty little girls with the virus of foulest disease, under circumstances which if Dr. W. W. Keen dared to print and publicly to sanction and repeat in Philadelphia to-day, it would cause him to be hissed and hooted from the city in which he lives. “*None of those inoculated took the disease*,” he pleads in

* We give the exact words of Dr. Sanarelli on page 29 of this pamphlet.

† See the *Boston Transcript*, September 24, 1897.

apparent extenuation of the vileness which he dared not otherwise endorse. Wentworth makes experiments upon sick and dying children in an "Infants' Hospital;" and Dr. Keen hastens to mitigate criticism by showing that the death of the little ones was due to other causes—all unconscious that his excuse is one of the most infamous circumstances of the deed,—it was *dying* children in the last throes of death that were sometimes used as "material" for these human vivisections. Berkley makes experiments which he calls "*poisoning* with preparations of the thyroid gland;" it was, he says, "directly for the purpose of ascertaining the toxicity" (or poisonous qualities) "of one of the best known varieties of the thyroid gland, that the following series of *experiments* were undertaken;" they were made upon "eight patients of the City asylum;" two patients became "frenzied" and of these, one died; and Dr. Keen is loud in proclaiming that she died of "galloping consumption,"—as if now and by this excuse he had cleared the experimenter from every stain of guilt! Schreiber experiments upon forty new-born babes; and Dr. Keen is quick to explain, that—*according to the experimenter*,—no evil results were experienced by the victims. Neisser makes a series of experiments involving inoculations of so infernal a character that their publication has stirred all Germany into indignant protest; the *London Times* recently reports that Neisser has been made the subject of judicial investigation, and that for merely giving publicity to his diabolical work he has been officially censured and heavily fined.* Does Dr. Keen find occasion to add his censure? Does he condemn Neisser in any way? Does he utter a single word of reprobation? On the contrary he rushes forward to defend him by assailing

* *London Times*, Saturday, January 5, 1901. To show how the Prussian Government regards these Neisser experiments, the special correspondent of the *London Times*, writing from Berlin, January 4, 1901, makes the following statement, which we commend to the careful attention of Dr. Keen.

"In obvious connexion with this (Neisser) case, is an order which has just been promulgated by the Prussian Minister of Public Instruction. The order says:

'I hereby call the attention of those who have the management of clinical and Polyclinical Hospitals and similar institutions to the fact that *medical operations for any purposes save those of the diagnosis, cure and prevention of disease are forbidden*, even when otherwise permissible from the legal and moral point of view,—(1) in the case of a person who is a minor, or (who) for other reasons is not

those who had brought his wickedness to light in this country, and by assuring us—*on the word of Neisser!*—that of the girl victims (one was but ten years old), some were of irregular life! *Now what have all these excuses to do with the essential immorality of the experiments or the utter condemnation their perpetrators deserve?* Does Dr. Keen for one moment believe that if he should repeat the investigations of Fitch or Neisser by inoculating Philadelphia children with the foulest of diseases, he could escape universal execration in that city by placing his hand upon his heart and affirming—on his word of honor,—that by good fortune they escaped injury, or else that some of the girl-victims were of doubtful repute? He knows better. He knows that he would not dare to repeat their experiments, and ever hope for pardon from the American people by the promulgation of such a plea. Then why does he bring it up? Why does he attack the American Humane Association for omissions in regard to these experiments of his friends, which could not in the slightest degree mitigate the vileness of their crimes?

For ourselves, we consider utterly valueless all statements concerning the fate of the victims of human vivisection which rest upon the unsupported word of the experimenter himself. Dr. Keen tells us, for instance, that none of the patients experimented upon by Dr. X. died as a result of the experiments, but from other causes. Well, how do you know? From the evidence. Whose evidence? *The word of Dr. X.!* Is he then, likely to confess the truth whenever that truth would make him liable to a criminal investigation? When an insane patient is choked or kicked to death in Bellevue Hospi-

entirely responsible; (2) in cases where the person in question has not explicitly given permission for the operation; (3) in cases where this permission *has not been preceded by a proper statement of the injurious consequences* which might possibly result from the operation.

I likewise order that operations of this nature shall be undertaken only by a Director of the Institution himself or by his special authorization. Whenever such an operation is performed, the register of the case must contain a statement that the above conditions have been fulfilled and must also give a detailed account of the circumstances. The existing regulations affecting medical operations for the purposes of diagnosis, cure or prevention of disease are not affected by these instructions."—(*London Times*. January 5, 1901).

tal by his "nurses," does any one expect them to come forward and tell how the "unavoidable accident" really occurred? Will not the bruises be ascribed to "a fall," and the broken bones to a peculiar osseous friability? And when a man sinks to the moral condition of an experimenter upon human flesh and blood, upon little children confided to his care by love and solicitude, *his* report on the after-condition of his victims may have some special and peculiar value in the eyes of Dr. Keen, but we can assure him, it possesses very little for the world at large. We believe that criminals like these "count the hits and not the misses," as Lord Bacon says; and that whenever there is good reason to fear consequences, the silence of the grave hides forever their crimes. We never know, for a certainty, the result of a human vivisection, when an adverse report is only to be made by the men guilty of the deed, Even when the victims actually and in truth escape the possible contingency to which they were subjected, (we repeat it emphatically for Dr. Keen's elementary instruction in morals), such result does not in the slightest degree mitigate the essential wickedness of the experiment, or the criminality of that physician or surgeon who can stoop to the commission of such infamous acts.

III.

HAS HUMAN VIVISECTION BEEN PALLIATED BY SUGGESTION OF CONCLUSIONS CONTRARY TO FACT?

We come at last to the most serious criticism we have to make of Dr. Keen's letter. In defense of such experimentation or in palliation of its atrocity, has Dr. Keen repeatedly suggested as true, conclusions which were not only without basis of fact, but the falsity of which,—if he had stopped to reflect,—he must assuredly have known? Consciously or unconsciously has he again and again sacrificed veracity to expediency, in anxiety to clear his friends? We are not imputing to him the dishonor of deliberate falsehood. Should he declare with uplifted hands that every word he has ever written on points hereafter criticised is literally true, we shall not argue the matter. We believe, however, that we can indicate so many instances of false suggestion, as to prove—from a scientific

standpoint—the utter unreliability of everything he has written regarding human vivisection. Some of these instances, alone by themselves, might be regarded as of slight significance. Taken collectively, they are so many as to denote an inherent tendency to inaccuracy in his mental operations, which cannot be gainsaid, however it may be explained. We shall refer to more than a dozen instances of this “*suggestion of the false.*”

1. The first instance is less in the very statement made before the Senate Committee. “Of experiments narrated in that pamphlet,” said Dr. Keen, I have looked up *every one I could. Only two are alleged to have been done in America.*” Only “two experiments?” Why Dr. Wentworth made some forty-five experiments on infants and children, some of them in a dying condition; Dr. Berkley tells us that he used “eight human subjects;” we call that fifty-three experiments, not “two.” He affects indignation at “the imputation of untruthfulness,” and asks President Brown to point out “a third instance of experiments done in America,” and mentioned in the pamphlet. We point to fifty more experiments mentioned in the pamphlet than those he asks for, and we say that the impression conveyed by his language is contrary to facts.

The truth is, the American Humane Association did not wish to make any more exposure of the evil than would probably suffice to prove its existence and tend to secure condemnation and reform. It never dreamed that an educated and reputable medical man would attempt to minimize such facts, or give an impression of his personal ignorance regarding so notorious an evil. Why, if the American Humane Association were merely to quote the accounts of experiments made upon charity patients in American hospitals, and on record in medical literature, it would give publicity to researches, some of which, in deliberate diabolism of invention, equal in certain respects the vilest human vivisections of Europe! Will Dr. Keen challenge this statement and assume responsibility for the exposures that will then ensue?

As a suggestive indication of the value of Dr. Keen's assumption of ignorance, let us cite here a single fact. At the Fifty-first annual meeting of the American Medical Association, held at Atlantic City, N. J., in June, 1900, a Dr.

Bernheim, of Philadelphia, presented to one of the Sections an account of some twelve experiments he had made upon human beings,—six upon a mulatto and six on a “woman patient.” These researches were not of the worst character; but still they were expressions of tendency toward that disregard of human rights which underlies all such experiments on the ignorant and poor.* Who was president of the American Medical Association at this time? Dr. William W. Keen.

2. Another false suggestion is the use of the word “alleged;” certain human vivisections are, he tells us, “alleged to have been done.” Why did he use a word that implies uncertainty where no possible doubt really existed in his mind? We do not say the sun is “alleged” to shine; an allegation, says Dr. Murray in his great dictionary, is “an assertion without proof, a mere assertion.” Now Dr. Keen had not the slightest doubt of the Wentworth-Berkley experiments, for he had read the original accounts in the medical journals containing them. To speak of their occurrence as “alleged” could only have been done in order to suggest a doubt where he knew none to exist.

3. In his letter to the President of the Humane Association Dr. Keen, says: “You depend for the accuracy of your statements upon newspapers as follows:” and he prints a long list of journals to many of which merely passing reference had been made,—*entirely suppressing all mention* of the medical books or journals upon whose evidence the compilers of the pamphlet relied. He knew perfectly well that these newspapers were *not* the basis upon which the charges of experimentation rested, but he knew, too, that nine out of ten readers would never take the trouble to test his statement, and would believe—on his word,—that the proofs of such experimentation rested on vague newspaper report. The cancer-grafting experiments to which we have before alluded, were instances of this trickery. Was it honorable to convey impressions so void of truth?

**Journal of the American Medical Association*, February 16, 1901, p. 429. In the same issue of this periodical is an account of certain experiments made regarding yellow fever, upon men who were hired to submit to the investigations. See pp. 431, 447, 461.

4. Upon a small pamphlet, or tract, (printed, Dr. Keen tells us in Washington, D. C.) he expends a certain measure of criticism. Having never seen it, we do not know whether his imputations concerning it are well-founded or not. But whatever its defects, what have they to do with the publication of the Humane Association? Nothing whatever. And yet Dr. Keen joins both pamphlets in one criticism,—even numbering his paragraphs as if both publications proceeded from the same source! He knew better. Why was it done? Simply to lengthen his letter, and somehow to give to the public an idea of responsibility for errors where he knew there was none. Was it honest? Was it anything else but a “suggestion of the false?”

5. Still another instance is found in Dr. Keen’s enumeration of his “evidences.” After giving names of fourteen newspapers and journals, he remarks: “I now add *six other* ‘vague and indefinite references’ not to newspapers;” and he begins by referring to Tertullian (upon which we have already commented) numbering this paragraph “15,” and so on up to “20.” His meaning is clear; he desires his readers to believe that he has named fourteen instances of “vague and indefinite” authorities,—and that he then added “*six other* vague and indefinite references” making twenty in all. Not one reader in ten would perceive that this conclusion was wholly false. He has *not* named 14 “vague and indefinite” references, and he does not add “six more.” Of the fourteen journals referred to, *every one* conveying a statement of fact—save one,—had its name and date of publication plainly given; we read them in Dr. Keen’s own list; one for example was the *London Times* of June 27, 1891. To call such references “vague and indefinite” is to state what is absurdly untrue. Of the “six other vague and indefinite references,” which Dr. Keen then claims to add to his list, two were taken from the Washington publication which Dr. Keen knew perfectly well had nothing to do with the pamphlet he was pretending to review. What kind of principles are they which sanction trickery like this? If done by some “newspaper writer,”—for whom he has so profound a contempt,—would Dr. Keen call it anything but downright literary dishonesty?

6. Referring to Dr. Berkley's well-known experiments on insane patients, Dr. Keen approaches as nearly to positive approval of them as language could well imply. One passage in his letter is as follows :

"Moreover, the pamphlet states, that 'there is no intimation that the administration of the poisonous substance was given for any beneficial purpose to the patients, for he took care to select patients that were probably incurable.' *On the contrary*, Berkley's original paper *expressly states* that instead of being incurable ones (Case No. 1) was cured, and another (No. 3) was improved." (Italics ours).

Did Berkley select patients that were probably incurable? Dr. Keen says, "on the contrary,"—suggesting that Berkley did nothing of the kind. Let us see just what Berkley himself said in his original article.

"The first part of the *investigation* was made upon eight patients at the City Asylum, who, with one exception (No. 1), *had either passed, or were about to pass, the limit of the time in which the recovery could be confidently expected.*" (Italics ours).

If language like this means anything, it means that the patients "with one exception" were not likely to recover. Does Dr. Keen's "on the contrary" suggest this?

7. Dr. Keen asserts that "as a result of the administration of the thyroid tablets to these eight patients, . . . two of these alleged 'incurables' were cured—25 per cent."

This is a suggestion of false conclusions of the most palpable kind. In his original paper, Berkley made no pretense of "curing" Case No. 3. He states that this patient at the outset was "good tempered," and weighed "at beginning of the thyroid administration 125 pounds." After fifteen days of the drug "he was so quarrelsome it was necessary to restrain him," and this was accompanied by other unpleasant symptoms. "The administration of the extract *being now discontinued*, he regained weight, became more quiet, and after the lapse of several weeks he was sent to his friends *somewhat improved.*" In other words, his course was downward until the drug was discontinued, and only after the lapse of weeks was he "somewhat improved!" When Dr. Keen included this case as one that was cured "as a result of the administration of the thyroid tablets" did he suggest the truth?

This is the way Dr. Berkley himself speaks of these "cures," and the "treatment" generally :

" *The above experiment upon eight human subjects points out conclusively that the administration of even the very best and purest of the commercial dessicated thyroid tablets is not unattended by danger to the health and life of the patient.*" (Italics ours).

We commend this wise conclusion to the consideration of those patients of Dr. Keen to whom, he tells us, he has given such tablets "for weeks together in larger doses than Dr. Berkley used." Did they know that their treatment was "not *unattended by danger to the health and life of the patient?*"

8. Still another instance may be found in an "ADDENDUM" to Dr. Keen's letter, wherein he compares the case of a cretin child, treated by the thyroid extract in a perfectly proper way, with Berkley's experiments upon the Insane. Dr. Keen knows quite well that the two cases are entirely distinct; the purpose of one was the cure of the patient; the admitted purpose of the other was to test the toxicity of a drug; but he couples them together as if they were alike in all respects. He says distinctly: "*If Dr. Berkley's use of the thyroid extract, which cured two out of eight patients was an experiment, and its administration by Dr. Nicholson also was an experiment, the more of such happy 'experiments' we could have the better.*" (Italics ours).

Here, within the compass of less than forty words we have three false suggestions. He intimates that the perfectly proper use of the thyroid extract by Dr. Nicholson has been called an 'experiment,' which is untrue; he asserts the "cure" of two of Berkley's patients, and he ridicules the idea that any experimentation took place. We have tested the veracity of one suggestion; let us see what degree of truth is in another.

Was Berkley's administration of the thyroid extract in the nature of regular medical treatment, or was it experimental in character, having for its "purpose," the testing of the "toxicity" of a dangerous drug? The answer to this inquiry is not to be gained by quotations from Berkley's recent defense, but by noting his expressions of "purpose" in the original article, when he had no expectation of any criticism.

In the first paragraph of his essay, Dr. Berkley shows his scepticism regarding the drug as a "medicament." He says:

"The favorable side of the administration of the thyroid extracts is shown in the very numerous articles in current medical literature published both in this country and in Europe. . . . It is quite safe to say after a review of some of them that the results would have been as brilliant *had no medicament been administered.*

It is nevertheless true that the extract, *when administered to either man or the lower animals*, will occasion very grave symptoms of a toxemic (poisonous) nature; symptoms that involve the cerebral, the vasomotor, and digestive functions; and perhaps, also, the normal action of those ductless glands that throw into the circulation a potent, though unknown, substance; and when this administration is pushed to even a moderate degree, *death is almost the invariable result.* . . . A medicament having these qualities cannot, therefore, be administered with impunity to every sane or insane patient; and it was therefore *directly for the purpose* of ascertaining the toxicity (poisonous qualities) of one of the best known varieties of the thyroid extract *that the following series of experiments was undertaken.* *The first portion of the investigation was made upon eight patients at the City Asylum, who, with one exception (No. 1), had passed or were about to pass the limit of time in which a recovery could be confidently expected.*"* (Italics ours).

"*If this was an experiment!*" "The *more* of such happy experiments the better!" We wonder whether Dr. Keen's patients share his enthusiasm for this sort of happy experiments upon themselves?

9. But there are phases of defense of far more serious import. It is not easy to imagine a physician whose conscience is so touched with atrophy that he can consent to palliate Human Vivisection even by accurate statements of what he may consider its scientific utility. When, however, we find one not merely excusing the infamy, but suggesting excuses, the untruth of which he is certainly aware, then, indeed we feel that the limitations of permissible advocacy have been more than reached.

Take the case of Schreiber's victim, as related in the pamphlet,—the little boy whose mother was ill with consumption but who, himself was apparently sound and healthy. At first the parents refused to permit their child to be inoculated as an experiment ("anfangs wolten die Eltern die injection nicht zulassen,") but at last, after what persuasions we

* Bulletin of John Hopkins Hospital, July, 1897. POISONING with preparations of the Thyroid Gland," by Henry J. Berkley, M.D.

can never know, they were induced to grant it as a punishment for some trifling offense, and it produced the reaction looked for. Concerning this experiment Dr. Keen, of course, has a good word:

"I do not know what could have been more fortunate for this boy than the recognition in its incipency of a disease previously unsuspected, and which, recognized thus early, should in all probability be cured by proper treatment. This tuberculin test is constantly employed to prevent the spread of tuberculosis in our cattle. In our children, it enables us to discover the same disease in an early, curable stage. Shall we care for our cattle better than our children?"

As an example of the art of false suggestion, this paragraph is a masterpiece. In the most dextrous manner possible the reader is invited to believe that what Schreiber intended as an experiment was very proper treatment; that tuberculin, as a test for incipient consumption is as suitable for children as it is for cattle; that it is so regarded and so employed by the medical profession in their general practice; that to decline using it to discover consumption "in an early, curable stage," is to "care for our cattle better than our children." And yet every one of these deductions would be false. Dr. Keen knows perfectly well, in the first place, that phthisis, however early discovered, is not "*in all probability*," a curable ailment. He knows that the tuberculin test, so often used upon apparently sound and healthy cattle, is *not* sanctioned by the medical profession for use upon apparently sound and healthy children. He neglects to tell us, as a matter of no account, that of the three experiments made by Anders, one of the victims died six weeks afterwards. He knows that experiments like those of Schreiber, made upon apparently healthy children of poor consumptive mothers, he would not venture to repeat openly upon the apparently sound and healthy children of a consumptive mother in any family of wealth and influence in the city of Philadelphia; and that if such a test were made at all, it would be—as Schreiber made it—where persuasion counts, and ignorance veils results. And yet knowing all this, he has the supreme audacity to put a question implying the recognized use of tuberculin upon children who seem perfectly sound and well:—"Shall we care for our cattle better than for our children?"

10. For Schreiber's experiments upon 40 new-born babes by injecting tuberculin in increasing doses, we know in advance that Dr. Keen will try to discover some palliating excuse. In this case, however, none is apparent, and he therefore impudently intimates that the justification existed but that the pamphlet suppressed it. "It would be too much to expect your Society to have indicated on what grounds Professor Schreiber was led to the employment of such large doses," deftly suggesting—without any positive affirmation—that Schreiber knew in advance that his experiments would be harmless. Now Dr. Keen knew perfectly well that in this suggestion there was not a word of truth, and we shall prove it by Schreiber himself. So far from being confident that his experiments were harmless, Schreiber after beginning them *could not sleep for thinking of what he had done*, and its possible consequences to these new-born babes. "I spent," he says, "an almost sleepless night. *Before me I seemed to see the poor babes with crimson cheeks and violently-increasing temperature; their wailings I seemed to hear.*"* It is true that,—taking Schreiber's word for it,—these forebodings were unrealized, and he went on to repeat the inoculations with constantly increasing doses. Dr. Keen has no word of censure; apparently he would have us infer it was all right. Would he be willing to have thus experimented upon at the hour of its birth, one of his own children? Does he fancy that in the sight of the Creator, a hospital-babe is less sacred than his own favored offspring? Because it is poor and friendless, has it no rights? What, we wonder, does Dr. Keen think would have been the judgment, upon these experiments, of Him whose birthplace was only a manger, and who sometimes had not where to lay His head?

11. This perverse instinct of inveracity crops out everywhere: it infects even a simple statement of fact. For instance, in referring to Sanarelli's inoculations of hospital patients with the toxin of yellow fever Dr. Keen sees a chance

* "Die erste Nacht danach habe ich fast schlaflos zugebracht; ich sah im voraus die armen Kinder schon mit hochrothen Wangen und gewaltiger Temperatursteigerung vor mich; ich glaubte sie wimmern zu hören, u. s. w. von alledem war nichts."—*Deut. Med. Wochenschrift*, Feb. 19, 1891.

to confuse the impression, and straightway informs his readers—as if it were of the utmost importance,—that the pamphlet omitted to state that

“Not the *germs* of the disease, but the carefully filtered and sterilized *germ-free* fluid was used.”

Really? Is it not perfectly evident what inference Dr. Keen wishes here to suggest? Could any reader unfamiliar with the subject imagine that this “carefully-filtered and sterilized *germ-free* fluid” was as a matter of fact one of the most virulent of poisons? Sanarelli tells us that certain experiments on animals led him to suspect “the existence of a *very active specific poison*. This poison is obtained by simply filtering the broth-culture of *bacillus icteroides*, 24 days old.”* But Dr. Keen tells it that it is not only “germ-free,” but “*sterilized* ;” why is that done? Because, Sanarelli tells us, “if cultures *sterilized* with ether are employed, the toxic (*poisoning*) power is much more active.” How thankful we should be to Dr. Keen for his little contributions to popular science! How great is the art that can pervert the judgment by the statement of a fact!

12. We come now to one of the most serious charges we have to make. In its reference to Sanarelli's experiments, the pamphlet on HUMAN VIVISECTION gave as authority for the fact that such experiments had been made, the *British Medical Journal*, quoting also a single sentence from the *New England Medical Monthly*. Although there is nothing of the kind mentioned in the pamphlet, Dr. Keen will have it that “the extracts marked with quotation marks are from the *New England Medical Monthly*,” and having evolved this from his inner consciousness, he goes on, as a matter of course, to complain that in certain respects the quoted matter does not verbally agree with the source to which he has arbitrarily ascribed it. The truth is, that the pamphlet nowhere ascribes the quotation he criticises to the *New England Medical Monthly*; it distinctly prefixes to this citation the words, “Sanarelli himself says:” and the translation which follows was from other sources.

*British Medical Journal, July 3, 1897.

But worse is to come. Dr. Keen says :

"Moreover, the end of the quotation is as follows :—' I have seen [the symptoms of yellow fever] unrolled before my eyes, thanks to the potent influence of the yellow fever poison made in my laboratory.' *This entire sentence does not occur either in the British Medical Journal or in the New England Medical Monthly.* Whether it is quoted from some other source not indicated, or has been *deliberately added*, I leave you . . . to explain."

We propose to speak with great plainness in regard to this paragraph, and the disgraceful imputation which Dr. Keen has therein put forth.

In the first place, this most cold-blooded sentence, (referring to the "yellow fever poison made in my laboratory," and the long list of symptoms "unrolled before my eyes)," which Dr. Keen cannot find in the medical journals named, *was in Sanarelli's own words.* We give them in the original Italian, transcribed from the volume to which Dr. Keen himself refers us.*

"La febbre, le congestioni, le emorragie, il vomito, la steatosi del fegato, la cefalalgia, la rachialgia, la nefrite, l'anuria, l'uremia, l'ittero, il delirio, il *collapsus*—infine, tutto quel complesso di elementi sintomatici ed anatomici, che nel loro apprezzamento combinato costituiscono la base indivisibile della diagnosi di febbre gialla, noi l'abbiamo visto svolgersi ai nostri occhi,—dovuto alla potente influenza del veleno amarilligeno fabricato nelle nostri culture artificiali."

There are the words, translated and given to the world by the pamphlet on *Human Vivisection*, but garbled and suppressed by every medical publication in England or America! True indeed it is, that when men attempt to defend an infamy, "either the moral sense is blunted, or the truth-telling faculty is in abeyance."†

But we have not finished with Dr. Keen. When he made the imputation that because these words were not in certain

* Annali d' Igiene Sperimentale, 1897. Vol. VII., p. 470.

† This garbling of Sanarelli's words was probably made by some one connected with the *British Medical Journal*, for the first appearance of the mutilated sentence was in this periodical, July 3, 1897. It read thus :

"The fever, the congestions, . . . delirium, collapse ; in short, all that complex of symptomatic and anatomical elements which in their combination, constitute the indivisible basis of the diagnosis of yellow fever."

Any educated reader must see at once that this sentence is imperfect and incomplete ; *where is the verb ?* Did it not occur to Dr. Keen, that only as printed in the pamphlet *Human Vivisection*, could the sentence be said to be grammatically correct ? The reason for this garbling is of course evident : it was too plain a confession of human vivisection.

medical journals, they were perhaps "*deliberately added*" by his opponents, *was he not perfectly aware that Sanarelli himself wrote them?* Dr. Keen refers us to the very article of Sanarelli, from which we have just quoted them; he consulted its many pages most carefully in order to ascertain the alleged fate of the five patients upon which the experiments were made. Did he not see this sentence there? With the volume in his hands, the original article open before his eyes, would he have us believe that he did not take the trouble to compare and verify the only quotation from it which appears in the pamphlet? He did not see it? *Credat Judæus Apella!* There are limitations to credulity. But how queer must be that sense of honor which would permit a man to make a disgraceful imputation, knowing all the while that every word of it was false!


We have by no means touched upon all that is worthy of criticism in this remarkable letter. We have sufficiently demonstrated its innate unreliability, its unfairness, its frequent paltering with truth. It is astonishing that one occupying Dr. Keen's position in the medical profession should so completely fail to comprehend the intensity of protest and indignation sure one day to be evoked regarding all who either practice or defend these atrocious and execrable experiments upon their fellow-men. But the most significant point of all, seems to us that entire absence of any sympathy for the victims which marks his communication. Everything is set forth that could help in any way to turn aside criticism regarding the experimenters; could not Dr. Keen have spared as well, a few words of pity for those who were the victims of so-called "research?" He is inclined to make merry over "scientific assassination that did not assassinate, and murder of those who were so disobliging as still to live!" It strikes us that this tone of levity is decidedly out of place. How does Dr. Keen know that the victims of Sanarelli are still alive? These experiments on hospital patients,—for which Dr. Keen has here no word of censure,—may not have lacked in the end, the death of the victim to complete the tragedy. Reading Sanarelli's own account of the agonies endured by his victims, the "*violenta cefalalgia*," the "*dolori*


lancinanti," the "*tenismo spasmodica*," the "*vomito incoercibile*," the "*viva lamentazioni*," we are quite sure that the Hospital of San Sebastian was no place for mirth. Nor was the final result of these experiments so innocent as their apologist would have us believe. If a child of Dr. Keen were thus unconsciously inoculated with "the carefully filtered and sterilized *germ-free*" toxin of yellow fever, and made to suffer day after day all the torments that Sanarelli has so vividly described; and if, after the fever had abated, a few "explorative punctures" were made in his liver and kidneys, "*(varie punture esplorative dal fegato e dai reni)*") revealing a profound fatty degeneration of the one and granular degeneration in the other, we are inclined to think that such endowment of his offspring with the beginnings of organic disease and the probabilities of shortened life would be regarded as "scientific assassination" even by the man who now scoffs at the phrase.* No, Dr. Keen; by the side of these wan and wasted victims, there is no occasion for your sarcasm, no place for your taunts. Rather were it fitting that in sackcloth and ashes, in humiliation and remorse, you laid hands on your lips and your forehead in the dust, remembering with shame that when the infamies of human vivisectors were unveiled, and men called in the name of Humanity for their condemnation, *your* voice was silent, and *your* lips at last opened only for vague and glittering generalities of reproof, for ridicule of charges you knew were substantially true, for defense even of the vivisectors of children, in palliation of the vilest crimes.


Yet we are not hopeless of the future. Centuries ago, to one who had stood by dying men, "consenting unto their death," there came at last a voice that he could not but heed, and a light that "suddenly shining round about him," smote him, blinded, to the earth. Perchance to others may yet come some journey to Damascus, the light of rebuke and warning, the lesson of penitence and expiation. *O Divine Justice! Thou that tarrying long, yet sleepest not nor slumberest, Power not ourselves that makes for Righteousness,—hear our prayer! For the sake of infants yet unborn, for whom*


* "Una profonda degenerazione grassa di tutte le cellule epatiche," etc. "*Annali d Igiene Sperimentale*," vol. vii., p. 445.


some Menge or Schreiber in his laboratory, waits,—for the sake of innocent girlhood and sacred motherhood, not yet stretched upon the altar of a God-less science,—for the sake of our poor, outraged, common humanity,—grant that all who practice or uphold these deeds of shame, all who encourage and defend these criminals, may soon be touched with sincerest repentance, or meet some just and redeeming retribution,—even though it come with keen, and bitter, and life-long remorse.











DATE DUE

[illegible]

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

QP45

Am33

American humane association.

The reality of human vivisection.

