Scientific chicanery : does it pay?

Scientific Chicanery:

DOES IT PAY?

PRINTED FOR
THE AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION
1900

Scientific Chicanery: Does it Pay?

To one who has ever cherished belief in the existence of a high standard of truth and honor in the intellectual world, no more saddening disillusion can come, than the realization of the untrustworthy character of certain scientific men. To most of us, such revelation causes that shock of intense surprise and keen disappointment which would be occasioned by the discovered dishonesty of an old acquaintance, the treason of a trusted friend. We have been accustomed to judge workers in every field of science by the ideals and example of the illustrious men preceding them, who would have scorned a lie, even in defense of a scientific method, as the basest infidelity to Science herself. Some of us, perhaps, expect dishonesty to exist in trade, and chicanery to find place in political life. But above that lower world of sham and pretense, was—we have thought—one region of purer and diviner air, where Science and all who served her dwelt; where Truth for its own sake was loved supremely, and where Fraud and Falsehood were alike unknown.

But that vision of serener skies and higher ideals has already become dim, and seems destined soon to fade away. Among that class of scientists whose methods of investigation are alone open to criticism, there are many to whom the habit of paltering with truth has become so easy, that their statements upon matters pertaining to vivisection are to-day, utterly without value. For them, the ethics of controversy have no meaning. Relying on the faith inspired by the integrity of men of science as a class, they do not hesitate to promulgate charges of which, apparently, they have not the slightest proof, to suppress facts, to suggest false conclusions, or to make statements imbued with the most shameless disregard for truth. The literature in favor of unrestrained and unlimited vivisection is filled with petty equivocations, evasions and deceits. One or two instances of this chicanery in behalf of science we propose to give, as an illustration of the evil that exists. Perhaps they may attract the attention of those who have the interests of higher

education most deeply at heart. For there are some signs of decadence and intellectual degeneracy that no true lover of Science can afford longer to ignore.

In a Report issued by the United States Senate in 1896, there appears a sort of manifesto, regarding the practice of animal experimentation, set forth as "the unanimous opinion of the National Academy of Sciences," and signed by the president, Wolcott Gibbs. The object in view was to impress members of Congress against a bill then pending, which provided for a certain degree of Governmental supervision of vivisection in the District of Columbia. To accomplish this end most effectively, it was, by somebody, deemed expedient that this distinguished body should affirm, first, the painless, or comparatively painless character of biological experimentation; and secondly, that in inoculations, the experiment involves less suffering to the animal than would be occasioned by the administration of an anæsthetic. The following extract from this report, shows exactly what they declared:

"The death of an animal in a physiological laboratory is usually attended with less suffering than is associated with so-called natural death. . . . In modern laboratories, anæsthetics are always employed, *except when the operation involves less suffering to the animal than the administration of an anæsthetic, as in the case of inoculations*, or in those instances in which the anæsthetic would interfere with the object of the experiment. The suffering incident to biological investigations *is therefore trifling in amount.*"*

Here are two leading affirmations. First, that "the suffering incident to biological investigations is trifling in amount." Secondly, that an inoculation experiment involves less suffering than would be occasioned by the administration of an anæsthetic. One is a falsehood. The other is an instance of that suppression of truth for the sake of giving a false impression, which is one of the meaner phases of deceit.

I. The proof that the suffering incident to biological investigations (a polite euphemism for "vivisection,") is *not* "trifling in amount" is overwhelming. Suppose we take the evidence of men whose names stand high in the medical profession, and who assuredly knew the truth. What do they tell us of the "trifling suffering" pertaining to animal experimentation?

*54th Congress, 1st Session, Report 1049, p. 128. Italics are ours.

Dr. Theophilus Parvin, LL.D., a professor in Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, delivered the Presidential Address before the annual meeting of the Academy of Medicine, held at Washington, D. C., May 4, 1891. Therein he stated :

"While it is my belief that the majority of vivisectors pursue their work out of ardent love of science, or desire to benefit humanity (and I trust they carefully and conscientiously avoid inflicting needless pain), *there are others who seem, seeking useless knowledge, to be blind to the writhing agony and deaf to the cry of pain of their victims, and who have been guilty of the most damnable cruelties, without the denunciation by the public and the profession that their wickedness deserves and demands.* These criminals are not confined to Germany or France, to England or Italy, but may be found in our own country."

"Damnable cruelties!" Is this a phrase which the president of a great Medical Society would employ concerning the infliction of suffering which is "*trifling in amount?*"

At the meeting of the American Academy of Medicine at Atlanta, Ga., May 2, 1896, an address was delivered by Dr. George M. Gould, a strong advocate of vivisection, one of the foremost medical writers in the country, and the present editor of the *Philadelphia Medical Journal.* Therein, speaking of vivisection, he said :

"At present, the greatest harm is done true science by men who conduct experiments without preliminary knowledge to choose, without judgment to carry out, without true scientific training or method, *and only in the interest of vanity.* It takes a good deal of true science and patience to neutralize with good and to wash out of the memory the *sickening, goading sense of shame* that follows from the knowledge that, in the name of Science a man could . . . . I have adduced this single American experiment, but purposely refrain from even mentioning the horrors of European laboratories . . . Dr. Klein, a physiologist, before the Royal Commission testified that *he had no regard at all for the sufferings of the animals he used, and never used anæsthetics except for didactic purposes, unless necessary for his own convenience,* and that he had "no time" for thinking what the animal would feel or suffer. It may be denied, but *I am certain a few American experimenters feel the same way, and act in accordance with their feelings.* But they are not by any means the majority, and they must not only be silenced, but their useless and unscientific work should be stopped. *They are a disgrace both to science and humanity."**

And yet the National Academy of Sciences had the audacity to assure Congress that "the suffering incident to biological investigations is "*trifling in amount!*"

*Borderland Studies, pp. 30, 33. Italics are ours.

Take still another witness. Nearly a quarter of a century after the discovery of anæsthetics, one of the principal surgeons of America, Dr. Henry J. Bigelow, the professor of surgery in Harvard Medical School, in an address before the Massachusetts Medical Society, referred thus to the suffering inflicted in biological research, which the National Academy of Sciences assures Congress is "trifling in amount."

"How few facts of immediate considerable value to our race have of late years been extorted from the dreadful sufferings of dumb animals, the cold-blooded cruelties now more and more practiced under the authority of science!

The horrors of VIVISECTION have supplanted the solemnity, the thrilling fascination of the old unetherized operation upon the human sufferer. Their recorded phenomena, stored away by the physiological inquisitor on dusty shelves, are mostly of as little present value to man as the knowledge of a new comet, . . . contemptible compared with the price paid for it in agony and torture.

For every inch cut by one of these experimenters in the quivering tissues of the helpless dog or rabbit or Guinea-pig, let him insert a lancet one-eighth of an inch into his own skin, and for every inch more he cuts, let him advance the lancet another eighth of an inch, and whenever he seizes, with ragged forceps, a nerve or spinal marrow, the seat of all that is concentrated and exquisite in agony, or literally tears out nerves by their roots, let him cut only one-eighth of an inch further, and he may have some faint suggestion of the atrocity he is perpetrating when the Guinea-pig shrieks, the poor dog yells, the noble horse groans and strains—the heartless vivisector perhaps resenting the struggle which annoys him. . . . . I have heard it said that "somebody must do this." I say it is needless. Nobody should do it. Watch the students at a vivisection. It is the blood and suffering, not the science, that rivets their breathless attention. If hospital service makes young students less tender of suffering, vivisection deadens their humanity and begets indifference to it."

Is it likely that a surgeon of national reputation, a teacher of surgery in a great medical school, would have referred to "agony and torture," to "dreadful sufferings of dumb animals," and to "cold-blooded cruelties, now more and more practiced under the authority of Science," if, as the National Academy of Sciences and other associations assert, *nothing of the kind takes place?* There is in such denial the audacity of guilt. The writer who phrased that denial stated a falsehood. He did worse; he induced those of his too-trusting associates, whose lines of scientific research lay in other

directions, to endorse without a dissenting voice what *he* knew was untrue.

II. Is it true that an inoculation-experiment is so trivial that the operation "involves less suffering than the administration of an anæsthetic?" The members of the National Academy of Sciences so declare. Is the statement correct?

No. It is a "suppression of the truth with intent to deceive" utterly unworthy of students of science or of honorable men. It is a typical example of that chicanery to which a certain class of scientists do not hesitate to resort, if thereby they may veil their practices from the public eye. More than once its mendacity has been exposed. Let us again give the proof of it, and upon an authority, the eminence of which cannot be questioned.

In his Presidential Address in the Section of State Medicine at the last Annual Meeting of the BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION in August, 1899, Dr. George Wilson, LL.D., probably the leading authority in Great Britain upon Preventive Medicine, made the following indignant exposure of this contemptible evasion:

"I boldly say there should be some pause in these ruthless lines of experimentation. . . . I have not allied myself to the Anti-vivisectionists, but *I accuse my profession of misleading the public as to the cruelties and horrors which are perpetrated on animal life.* When it is stated that the actual pain involved in these experiments is commonly of the most trifling description, *there is a* SUPPRESSION OF THE TRUTH, *of the most palpable kind*, which could only be accounted for at the time by ignorance of the actual facts. I admit that in the mere operation of injecting a virus, whether cultivated or not, there may be little or no pain, but the cruelty does not lie in the operation itself, which is permitted to be performed without anæsthetics, but in the after-effects. *Whether so-called toxins are injected under the skin into the peritoneum, into the cranium, under the dura mater, into the pleural cavity, into the veins, eyes, or other organs—and all these methods are ruthlessly practiced—there is long-drawn-out agony. The animal so innocently operated on may have to live days, weeks, or months, with no anæsthetic to assuage its sufferings, and nothing but death to relieve.*"

So much for the exposure. A more disgraceful instance of intent to deceive by ignoble artifice, is seldom brought to light. If we place the chief guilt on that man—whoever he was—who drew up the memorial for his fellow-members to sign, what shall we say of a great scientific association—a NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES—that could give "unanimous assent" to a statement inspired by fraud? If, with Dr. Wilson,

we suggest the excuse that "ignorance of the actual facts" caused an erroneous judgment, what then are we to think of the simplicity that could be so easily deceived, or of the hypocrisy that, pretending to knowledge it did not possess, could so freely lend its influence to obstruct legislation against cruelty and vice? Was there not a single member of the National Academy of Sciences who dared to say: "I do not know the facts, and I will not sign such a memorial?" Or was the suppression of truth recognized, but regarded as too valuable in its influence to be discarded? Among a certain class of men, a falsehood is judged solely by the advantage that accrues. Even on this low plane, was one, so easily exposed, worth its cost to the NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, in depreciation of honor, in impairment of public confidence, in atrophy of self-respect?*

Whenever an instance of this "suppression of truth" is detected and pointed out, some one interested in the success of the petty deceit will attempt to excuse it by asserting that no real lie has been told. He, however, is a genius in the art of chicanery, who can make this claim, and at the same moment—while adhering verbally to the truth—can phrase yet another suggestion of that which is untrue! When, among other evasions and equivocations, the false insinuation of the painless character of inoculation experiments had been pointed out in a Senate Document,† Surgeon-General Sternberg hastened to make reply. "The pain attending the inoculation is trifling, and does not call for the administration of an anæsthetic." That is quite true.

*As a further illustration of the extravagant and absurd statements which eminent men permit themselves to endorse, it is probable that for impudence and falsity, nothing has exceeded the following extract from a preamble to certain resolutions on vivisection, which were "*unanimously passed* at the meeting of the NEW YORK STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, October 13, 1896." The italics are ours.

"WHEREAS, in the *rare* instances in which *some* pain may be inflicted, *it is moderate and of brief duration*, and is not to be contrasted with *the amount or the degree of suffering constantly inflicted* by the owner of animals in their daily *use* of them, *and even by parents toward their children*, etc."

The vivisections referred to by Gould and Parvin, Bigelow and Wilson, are so trivial that in the opinion of this State society, they are not to be contrasted with "the suffering *constantly inflicted by parents toward* their children!" Certainly bad grammar and falsehood go fitly together.

† Doc. No. 78, Fifty-fifth Congress.

"But no one," he adds, "so far as I know, *has ever denied* that as a result of such inoculation, there may at times be more or less pain." Here at last is confession—confession of what it was hoped might be hidden from the public, by "suppression of truth." And then the Surgeon-General adds the insinuating statement: "To give an anæsthetic to an inoculated animal during the time it is under observation to determine the result of the experiment would entirely neutralize the value of the experiment, and *a law requiring this, would effectually arrest all investigations of this kind.*" . . .

If we may put all ethical considerations aside, such a sentence is a stroke of genius. Every word is true; and yet in the deftest manner possible, there is an insinuation, or suggestion, in the words italicized, that was absolutely false. For at the time this communication was made to Congress, there was before the United States Senate a bill for the regulation and supervision of vivisection in the District of Columbia. Nine out of every ten Senators reading that sentence would naturally take it for granted that Surgeon-General Sternberg was again protesting against some provision in this bill, which, if carried into effect, "would arrest all investigations of the kind." And yet it was a bit of pure chicanery. *No bill with these provisions was before Congress.* The measure against which the Surgeon-General was working, distinctly provided that inoculation experiments should not be affected.

"Sect. 2, *c*. The animal must, during the whole of the experiment be completely under the influence of ether or chloroform sufficiently to prevent the animal from feeling pain, *excepting only, that in so-called inoculation experiments . . . the animal need not be anæsthetized nor killed afterward.*"

Doubtless this apparent reference to a bill which did not exist, helped, here and there, to create that unfavorable impression upon members of Congress for which it was probably written. But does such chicanery pay? Is science ever honored by ignoble methods of defense? Even as a successful trick, was it worthy of the Surgeon-General of the United States Army?

Let us consider another instance of the unreliability of this class of scientific men. In the same Senate Report on Vivisection, to which reference has been made, there appears a "Statement in behalf of Science," signed by some forty

American "investigators" or vivisectors, asking in effect, that the practice of animal experimentation in the District of Columbia be continued free from all Government supervision or control.* To increase the importance of this manifesto, it was introduced to the public by a special letter, signed, among others, by Dr. Charles W. Eliot, the President of Harvard University, vouching for it as a statement which "may be accepted as an authoritative expression of expert opinion." Its opening sentences were as follows:

"So long ago as the autumn of 1866, there were published in New York denunciations of the practice of making upon living animals those scientific observations and experiments which are commonly called vivisections. During the following twenty-nine years there have appeared from time to time similar denunciations, more or less sweeping and violent. Of these, some condemn vivisection altogether, and others in various of its phases. Some call for its total abolition, and others for its material restriction. Some are labored essays, and others are brief "tracts" or "leaflets," intended more easily to arrest the attention. . . . *In these publications, too, there often figure extracts from scientific writings; and in many cases these extracts are so garbled, that only ignorant or reckless animosity could be accepted in excuse for their seeming bad faith.*"†

Among the signatures to this document were the following names:

S. Weir Mitchell, M.D., Philadelphia, Pa., Member of the National Academy of Sciences.

J. G. Curtis, M.D., Professor of Physiology, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia College, New York.

W. H. Howell, M.D., Professor of Physiology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

H. P. Bowditch, M.D., Professor of Physiology, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, Mass.

W. T. Porter, M.D., Assistant Professor of Physiology, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, Mass.

J. W. Warren, M.D., Associate Professor of Physiology, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

R. H. Chittenden, Ph.D., Professor of Physiological Chemistry, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

V. C. Vaughan, M.D., Professor of Hygiene and Physiological Chemistry, Medical Department of Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.

John Marshall, M.D., Assistant Professor of Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

* See Report 1049, p. 57.

† Italics ours.

S. C. Busey, M.D., President of the Medical Society, District of Columbia.

Henry M. Lyman, M.D., Professor of Principles and Practice of Medicine, Rush Medical College, Chicago, Ill.

E. J. Janeway, M.D., late Professor of Principles and Practice of Medicine, Bellevue Hospital Medical College, New York, N. Y.

Ch. Wardell Stiles, Ph.D., Zoologist, Bureau of Animal Industry, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

William Patten, Ph.D., Professor of Biology, Dartmouth College.

William T. Sedgwick, M.D., Professor of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.

H. C. Ernst, M.D., Professor of Bacteriology, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, Mass.

Theobald Smith, M.D., Professor of Applied Zoology, Bussey Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

A. C. Abbott, M.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

J. J. Abel, M.D., Professor of Pharmacology, Johns Hopkins University.

H. C. Wood, M.D., Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harrison Allen, M.D., Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

G. A. Piersol, M.D., Professor of Anatomy, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. S. Minot, S.D., Professor of Histology and Embryology, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, Mass.

Henry F. Osborn, M.D., Professor of Biology, Columbia College, N. Y.

C. O. Whitman, Ph.D., Professor of Zoology, University of Chicago.

William H. Welch, M.D., Professor of Pathology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

T. M. Prudden, M.D., Professor of Histology and Pathology, Columbia College, New York.

R. H. Fitz, M.D., Professor of Theory and Practice of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, Boston, Mass.

George M. Sternberg, M.D., Surgeon-General U. S. Army.

J. Rufus Tryon, M.D., Surgeon-General U. S. Navy, Washington, D. C.

Walter J. Wyman, M.D., Surgeon-General U. S. Marine-Hospital Service, Washington, D. C.

Daniel E. Salmon, D.V.M., Hon. A.R.C.V.S., Chief of Bureau of Animal Industry, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

W. W. Keen, M.D., Professor of Principles of Surgery and Clinical Surgery, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, Pa.

William Osler, M.D., Professor of Clinical Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The signers of this manifesto admit that they could not hope "to make any statement" which would not be denounced

as "false." This is hardly a reputation which men in general desire to proclaim to the world. Doubtless, there were good reasons for that conscious distrust.

Let us clearly understand the matter. The modern controversy over vivisection has been going on for over a third of a century. That no imperfect quotation has ever been made by the opponents of unlimited experimentation, either in Europe or America, would be too much to assert. Nearly ten years since, an English lady compiled a work, under the somewhat suggestive title of "THE NINE CIRCLES," which was intended to illustrate certain phases of vivisection. In describing experiments which lasted for hours or days or months, the compiler did not always mention that in certain cases the initial operation, lasting sometimes but a few minutes, was performed under anæsthetics; and for this and a few like omissions, the work was severely denounced by one of the leading vivisectors of Great Britain, as misleading and unfair. The book thus criticised was immediately withdrawn from circulation. How little its intrinsic reliability was affected is shown by the fact that the omissions were immediately supplied and the book again brought out with an introduction by Dr. Edward Berdoe, a leading London physician. More than a quarter of a century ago, in September, 1874, the late Henry Bergh, writing to the "New York Tribune," quoted from Brown-Sequard the statement that in a certain vivisection, the result of incisions was "all guesswork," omitting to add that after death of the animal, anatomical observations removed the uncertainty of the vivisection. The omission was not very important; still, it was one that would not have occurred under a more careful adherence to verbal accuracy. But neither of these two cases can have had anything to do with the imputations made. One was a book printed in England ten years since; the other a hasty newspaper letter published twenty-five years ago. Neither as "essays," or "leaflets," or "tracts," can they have been referred to by the forty scientists as "*the many cases*" in which extracts from scientific writings are chargeable with intentional inaccuracy.

The important question, therefore, that confronts us is simply this: Did these forty "scientists" tell the truth in the passage that has been cited from their "Statement in

behalf of Science?" The literature of protest against the atrocities and cruelties of vivisection abounds, as they say, with quotations from the writings of scientific men. The vast majority of those who question the morality of the unlimited vivisection now going on in America and the continent of Europe, base their doubts or their convictions upon the accuracy and reliability of this evidence. May it all be dismissed by an accusation like this—put forth without a particle of proof? Is it true, or is it false, that "in many cases" these quotations are so garbled as only to suggest bad faith and reckless animosity? This is a very simple question. It is determinable by evidence. But one conclusion is possible. Each of the men who put his name to that document "in behalf of Science" either possessed evidence of the truth of the assertions he was making, or else he signed it knowing that he was lending his name and influence to a charge *for which he had no proof whatever, and which might be false.* If such evidence was in his possession, we should expect its production immediately its existence was questioned. If he had no such evidence, *then every signer of that charge was guilty of a false statement; of an act of perfidy to scientific truth.* There are gradations in dishonor; there are offenses for which even "reckless animosity" is no excuse.

At the convention of The American Humane Association, held in Washington, D. C., in December, 1898, it was felt that this charge—so injurious even if false—ought not to pass unchallenged. Simply to denounce it as untrue was deemed not enough; every signer of that document should have the matter brought directly to his personal notice, and a request made him for whatever evidence was in his possession. The following resolution was unanimously adopted, December 16, 1898:

"Whereas, In the Senate Report No. 1049, concerning Vivisection, there appears "A Statement in Behalf of Science," bearing, among other well-known signatures, the names of George M. Sternberg, M.D., Surgeon-General U. S. Army; Daniel E. Salmon, Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, U. S. Department of Agriculture; Charles Wardell Stiles, Ph.D., of the same department, and S. C. Busey, M. D., President of the Medical Society, Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas, In its reference to various leaflets and pamphlets issued by some of our constituent societies regarding the practice of vivisection, this manifesto makes a most serious imputation, alleging that

'In these publications, too, there often figure extracts from scientific writings, and in many cases, these extracts are so garbled that only ignorant or reckless animosity could be accepted in excuse for their seeming bad faith;' and

WHEREAS, This charge, absolutely unsupported by any evidence whatever, constitutes a most grave aspersion upon the honor, veracity and good faith of some of our constituent societies; and

WHEREAS, This Association is unwilling to believe that allegations, so dishonoring to their authors, if untrue, can have been heedlessly and maliciously made by scientific men of such eminence, without their having at hand at least some apparent proofs of their charges; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Humane Association hereby respectfully, but emphatically protests against the putting forth of such imputations without production of the evidence upon which they rest; and it therefore requests each and every signer of this 'STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF SCIENCE' (and especially each of the signers above named, who is in Government employ), to furnish the Secretary of this Association with a reference to some few of these 'many' extracts from Scientific writings concerning Vivisection which he claims to have been 'garbled;' accompanying such reference with an exact quotation of the words or phrases which have been so altered or omitted as to have materially changed, or distorted the meaning of the writer thus cited."

To each signer of the "Statement in Behalf of Science" a printed copy of this resolution was sent, together with the following letter from the Secretary of the American Humane Association:

FALL RIVER, MASS.,
21, January, 1899.

Dear Sir:—I have been directed to ask for proof, or for any evidence in your hands, of the charges made by you over your published signature, and referred to in the accompanying Resolution.

An early reply will oblige

Yours very truly,
FRANCIS H. ROWLEY, *Sec'y.*

The responses to this request have been precisely as might have been anticipated where the signers had no proof of the imputations they had made. Charles Wardell Stiles, of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Washington, and calling himself a "Scientific Attaché of the United States Embassy"—whatever that may be—wrote from Berlin, Germany, March 3, 1899, that his private library being in storage, he was unable to comply with the request. He intimated willingness to furnish some evidence of the sort on his return to Washing-

ton, but no further word from him has been received. The private secretary of Dr. S. Weir Mitchell wrote under date of January 23, 1899, that Dr. Mitchell was "in Europe for the winter," and that she was not permitted to send him any notes upon matters of business outside of his profession. No further response from Dr. Mitchell has been received. It is not generally known that Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, whose name is now so well known as a novelist, was, some thirty years ago, one of the leading vivisectors of the United States.

The Surgeon-General of the United States wrote as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
SURGEON-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 26, 1899.

Mr. Francis H. Rowley,
Fall River, Mass.,

Dear Sir:—I am so very much occupied by my official duties that I am unable at present to give any further attention to your communication of January 21st. I hope, however, to be able to do so at some future time.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE M. STERNBERG,
Surgeon-General U. S. Army.

No further communication from General Sternberg has been received. It is highly probable that if the Surgeon-General could have referred to a few facts in support of the charge he had made over his official signature, he would have found the necessary moments of leisure during the year that has elapsed.

Dr. W. W. Keen of Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, wrote as follows:

1729 CHESTNUT ST.,
PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 4, 1899.

My Dear Sir:—In reply to your letter received a few days ago, I beg to say that a suitable reply will be prepared and forwarded to you in due time.

Yours very truly,
W. W. KEEN.

Nine months have gone by since that letter was received, and we still await the "suitable reply."

Prof. R. H. Fitz, M.D., of Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, wrote thus:

18 ARLINGTON STREET.

Francis H. Rowley, Esq., Sec'y,

Dear Sir :—I have referred your letter of the 21st inst. to one of the committee having in charge the preparation of the document referred to.

Yours sincerely,

R. H. FITZ.

BOSTON, 23, Jan., 1899.

In other words, Prof. Fitz of Harvard University, having no evidence whatever of the imputation to which he had affixed his name, fancies that he can now wash his hands of all responsibility for the falsehood, by passing the request over to the men who phrased it—whom he does not name!

Prof. Charles S. Minot, S.D., of Harvard Medical School, Harvard University, writes, without date, the following astounding communication:

Dear Sir :—To cite only one instance: Mr. Peabody, formerly—I have been told—president of the Anti-Vivisection Society of Boston, made before the committee of the Massachusetts Legislature, the most impudent, outrageous and baseless accusations against officers of the Harvard Medical School, in my hearing. When cross-questioned, he had not the faintest, most remote or trifling foundation for any of his accusations, and only demonstrated that he was guilty of deliberate misrepresentation.

CHARLES S. MINOT.

Considering its source, this is a most extraordinary epistle. The writer is a man of science, yet his letter violates almost every rule of scientific precision. Professor Minot had affixed his name to a charge that in the various publications put forth by the critics of vivisection, there were "*in many cases*," garbled quotations from scientific writings. He is respectfully asked for the evidence upon which he had made that accusation. Instead of quoting a line, or giving a single reference to the "many cases," he tells us with child-like simplicity, that he once heard Mr. Peabody make a speech against himself and his associates of the Harvard Medical School, which speech he forthwith proceeds to denounce! Is it possible that Prof. Minot as a scientific man really believed that, in citing from memory a speech of Mr. Peabody, he was giving proof that garbled "extracts from scientific writings" had been made in certain *publications?* Is this the kind of scientific precision which is taught by vivisection in the laboratories of Harvard University?

Here, then, is the result. Of the above-named forty experts in scientific accuracy, who so solemnly affixed their signatures to this calumny, but six made any reply when called upon for proof, and *not one furnished a single line of evidence in support of his statement.* Their charge was false. The man who phrased it doubtless knew it was false. The men who sent it forth to the world, knew that whether true or untrue, *they,* at least, had no proofs of the imputation to which they lent the authority of their names. It is simply another instance of the utter unreliability of scientific men, when, leaving legitimate fields of inquiry, they enter the arena in defense of pursuits and practices, linked to Cruelty and Vice, and impeached today by the moral sentiment of mankind.

At the annual convention of the AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION, held in Columbus, Ohio, September, 1899, the following resolution was adopted without a dissenting voice:

WHEREAS, At the last annual meeting of the AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION, held at Washington, D. C., in December, 1898, attention was called to a Document issued by the United States Senate, containing a "Statement" signed by men eminent as professional men, or as experts in the practice of vivisection, and vouched for by the President of Harvard University and others as "An Authoritative Expression of Expert Opinion;" and

WHEREAS, Referring to the various publications concerning vivisection which from time to time have appeared, this so-called "Statement in behalf of Science," meets argument by the imputation of dishonesty, alleging that:

> "*In these publications there often figure extracts from Scientific writings, and in many cases these extracts are so garbled, that only ignorant or reckless animosity could be accepted in excuse for their seeming bad faith,*" *and*

WHEREAS, This Association, protesting against such injurious imputations without production of a particle of evidence of their truth, directed its Secretary to request from each individual signer of this statement, some reference to the "many" proofs upon which the charge was professedly made; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with this authorization, the Secretary, in January, 1899, asked for such evidence from Surgeon-General Sternberg, U. S. Army; from Daniel E. Salmon and Charles Wardell Stiles (all in the employ of the United States Government), and made the same request by personal letter to each of the other signers of this document, without

obtaining from a single individual, reference to one "garbled" extract from scientific writings; and

WHEREAS, This result proves that most eminent scientists are not above affixing their names to public "Statements in behalf of Science" which they did not promptly substantiate, and of the truth of which, so far as concerns America, apparently they never had the slightest evidence; therefore,

Resolved, I. That the AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION hereby records its emphatic condemnation of this apparent falsehood. It believes that Science rightly understood, means only the simple truth; that just criticism of any method of scientific inquiry is entirely legitimate and right; and that no exposure of the abuses of vivisection—however unwelcome—can ever justify a falsehood in their defense, or make mendacity a scientific privilege.

Resolved, II. That this Association does not assert that in course of this controversy over the abuses of animal experimentation—a controversy extending over a quarter of a century, and involving Europe even more than America—no errors or mistakes have ever been made. It does, however, most confidently affirm that no "garbled" extracts from scientific writings, implying a different sense and purport from that of the authors quoted, can be pointed out in any publication, tract or pamphlet issued by its authority. It believes that not only regarding vivisection, but always and everywhere, the exact truth is of supreme importance; that what we need is not the secrecy of the laboratory, but ever "more light;" and that even from opponents, all criticism should be welcome, when it is based on truth.

Literature Concerning Vivisection.

Medical Opinions concerning Vivisection,	per dozen copies,	$ .06
Is Vivisection Painful? - - - - -	" " "	.08
Scientific Chicanery: Does it Pay? - -	" " "	.35
Confessions of a Vivisector, - - -	" " "	.08
Facts about Vivisection, - - - -	" " "	.08
State Supervision of Vivisection, - -	" " "	.08
Dr. Theophilus Parvin on Vivisection, -	" " "	.08
Physiology in our Public Schools, - -	" " "	.06
A Dangerous Ideal, - - - - - -	" " "	.10
The Brutalization of Childhood, - -	" " "	.05
Shall Science do Murder? - - -	" " "	.12
Opinions concerning Vivisection in Schools,	" " "	.12
Abstract of Report on Vivisection in America,	" " "	.20
Does Science need Secrecy? (15th Thousand),	" " "	.60
Report of American Humane Association on Vivisection in America, - - -	per copy,	.08
Human Vivisection, - - - - - -	" "	.08
Animals' Rights and Vivisection in America, (Fifth Thousand), - - - - - -	" "	.40

These prices include postage. A single copy of all the above pamphlets, etc., will be sent, postage paid, to any address for eighty-five cents.

Address:

HUMANE EDUCATION COMMITTEE,

No. 61 Westminster Street,

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

HUMANE LITERATURE.

The AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION was organized in 1877, for the purpose of promoting unity and concert of action among the American societies, having for their object the prevention of Cruelty to children and animals. For twenty-three years it has endeavored to carry out this purpose, principally through deliberative conventions, held annually in various cities throughout the Union, and in Canada. At the meeting of the Association in Washington, D. C., in December, 1898, it was decided somewhat to enlarge its field of activity, and to make the Association more of an Educational force in awakening public sentiment to the need of various reforms.

The principal method through which the AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION will aim to accomplish this purpose is by the systematic distribution of Humane Literature. So far as funds permit, it proposes to promulgate the ideals of humane conduct in every direction where necessity exists. Among the subjects regarding which it would seek more thoroughly to arouse public sentiment are the abuses connected with the treatment of domestic animals; the transportation of cattle and their slaughter for food; the extermination of birds for the demands of fashion; the cruelties of "sport;" the abuses of vivisection when carried on, as now, without State supervision or control; the cruelties pertaining to child-life, and above all, the great and growing abomination of HUMAN VIVISECTION, in the subjection of children and others to scientific experimentation.

The extent to which this work can be carried out will depend upon the assistance received. All interested are urgently solicited to contribute towards this object. Every dollar so contributed will be devoted wholly to the publication and dissemination of Humane Literature. Should subscribers desire their contributions to be especially devoted to any one of the above lines of this humanitarian work, their preferences will be observed.

FRANCIS H. ROWLEY, D.D.,
Treas. Humane Literature Committee,
No. 163 Winter Street,
Fall River, Mass.

QP45 Am35

American humane association.

Scientific chicanery: does it pay?

QP45 Am35