Remarks on the use of vivisection as a means of scientific research : in a letter addressed to the Earl of Caernarvon, President of the Society for Preventing Cruelty to Animals / by Richard Jameson.

REMARKS

ON THE USE OF

VIVISECTION

AS A MEANS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH;

IN A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

THE EARL OF CAERNARVON,

PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY FOR PREVENTING CRUELTY TO ANIMALS,

BY

RICHARD JAMESON.

"RESPICE FINEM."

LONDON:

HIPPOLYTE BAILLIÈRE, PUBLISHER,

219, REGENT STREET.

1844.

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND JOHN E. TAYLOR,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

My Lord,

The position you occupy as President of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals induces me to address the following remarks to you, more especially as you have recently, at the annual meeting of that Society, thought fit to mark with the strongest terms of censure those members of the medical profession who, in the prosecution of their studies, have resorted to experiments on living animals.

He who devotes himself to any of the more arduous departments of Science must not hope for sympathy from the vulgar: unable to discern the end which he has in view, *they* restrict their observations to the means he employs for its attainment. But when persons of your Lordship's character and station in society join their voices to the clamours of the multitude, it becomes the duty of the accused to defend

his conduct, lest silence should be considered a confession of guilt.

And yet it is a bold undertaking for any man to attempt the defence of that which popular clamour has condemned. The crusade against Vivisection is one in which it is most easy to enlist the passions of the multitude: natural feelings of humanity, unwillingness to inflict pain, disgust at the sight of blood, the vague fear which the aspect of death always inspires, all these are arguments more powerful than the laboured efforts of the orator, or the pathetic fervour of the enthusiast. The unconditional denouncer of Vivisection is sure of meeting with a sympathizing audience; whilst those only who have devoted themselves to the study of Physiology, and have experienced its difficulties, can truly appreciate the obstacles which every instant rise up in the path of the inquirer, and force him to employ means for their removal which Necessity alone can justify.

I cannot therefore but regard the Addresses of the Society over which your Lordship presides as most injudicious. They appeal to the passions of the ignorant rather than to the understanding of the educated, and raise a prejudice against those great men who have devoted their time, their health, their lives to the service of mankind. They encourage the timid and the indolent among the medical profession in a superstitious reverence for great names, which, if once fully established, would put a stop to all farther inquiry, and take us back to the times when physicians used

to study the volumes of Galen instead of the book of Nature, and laboured only how they might best annotate and comment upon the writings of their great Idol, instead of using their own eyes and hands and examining for themselves.

In the following pages I shall endeavour to show,—

First, that the *number* of experiments practised upon living animals is grossly exaggerated by the writers employed by your Society :

Secondly, that the *pain* caused by these experiments is also in many cases exaggerated :

Thirdly, admitting that in many instances much pain is the result, Vivisection* is notwithstanding *necessary*, as a means of acquiring and of imparting useful knowledge ; and

Lastly, that whilst necessity alone compels *us* to take away the lives of animals, *our accusers* are daily accessory to their wholesale destruction and torture for the mere gratification of luxury, or as an amusement to while away the passing hour.

I. Foremost in the list of exaggerators I must place the Rev. John Styles, D.D.† He is the author of an Essay which gained a prize of £100 as being *the best out of thirty-four* papers sent in to the Committee of your Society, and may therefore fairly be regarded as

* I use this term for convenience and to avoid circumlocution, as implying not only the actual *cutting of living creatures*, but all experimenting upon them which involves either pain or death.

† The Animal Creation : its claims on our humanity stated and enforced. 8vo, London, 1839.

the chosen champion of its cause ; I shall bestow as much space as the limits of this letter will allow in exposing some of his most glaring misrepresentations. But few words are necessary to do this, for the statements refute themselves by their very absurdity.

He informs the public " that every surgeon's apprentice thinks himself entitled to find his way into the arcana of nature by scalping cats and rabbits to see where their brains lie." " The transactions," he adds, " of the college of the medical craft in this sense would convict them before a convocation of Ashantees." Very likely—and why ? Because the Ashantees, like Dr. Styles himself, are unable, from ignorance of Physiology, to appreciate the end for which Vivisections are employed. Supposing that the Ashantees *would* be shocked at experiments on living animals, how much more horrible would they think a surgical operation performed on one of themselves ! What needless cruelty to wrench a fine, firm tooth out of a poor child's jaw ; or stab him in the arm with a poisoned weapon ; or make a gash in the thigh of a man who has only a little swelling behind his knee ; or, when a person has been stunned by a fall, what wanton barbarity to cut his scalp and saw off a piece of his skull ! " How could such cruel experiments answer any good end ? " would be the wise remark of some Ashantee Doctor of Divinity.

Where Dr. Styles collected his information about the " surgeon's apprentices " I know not, but it looks exceedingly like a hoax practised on his credulity by

some waggish student, who thought to satisfy the Doctor's love of the marvellous by telling him horrible stories of "what they did at the Hospital." I will give one or two proofs how excessive his credulity is. He gravely asserts that "oxen are compelled to travel *for many days* without food, *their hoofs worn off, and on bleeding stumps.*" He might just as well have said at once, "with their *heads* worn off." The only instance at all parallel to this of the *hoofs*, is to be found in the 'Surprising Life and Adventures of Baron Munchausen.' He had a famous greyhound that ran till he wore his legs away, but was not useless even then; for being a stanch dog, says the Baron, he made a capital pointer.

Again at page 128, we are told that "the hippopotamus or river-horse, which, when overcharged with too great a quantity of blood, strikes himself against the point of a sharp reed until he has bled sufficiently, and then rolls into a particular kind of mud until the bleeding is stanched, supplied the ancients with the original idea of Phlebotomy." An animal whose hide is proof against a bullet, bleeding itself with the point of a reed!!

But not content with single absurdities of this kind, the Doctor groups into one sentence a whole cluster of them. Speaking of the small amount of pain inflicted by prædacious animals upon others, he says,— "they obey an instinct which destroys the life of their victims at the least possible expense of pain. It is usually in the night-time and in the hour of sleep

that they sink under the fangs of their destroyers; twenty strokes sent home in one instant to the sources of life afford no time to reflect that they are about to lose it." If Dr. Styles had studied the Animal Creation before writing about it, or if he had kept his eyes employed as he walked in the fields, or even if he had only sat by the fireside and watched his cat, he would never have written such nonsense as this. Do hawks and kites kill sleeping birds, or foxes sleeping rabbits, or swallows sleeping insects, or do spiders subsist upon somnambulant flies? Had the Doctor's cat depended for her sustenance upon sleeping mice, who while in that state are always in their holes, she would have fared but poorly. And when she does catch a mouse, is its life destroyed "at the least possible expense of pain"?

But one of the Doctor's greatest exaggerations, and one which most appropriately belongs to this the first division of my subject, relates to the *number* of animals experimented upon. Not only does "every surgeon's apprentice" think himself entitled to destroy them, but "in this country many thousands of animals of all descriptions, from the worn-out horses and asses regularly bought for the purpose, to the most minute insect, are dissected alive." This is a very vague way of talking: it is easy to say—"many thousands;" but I do not believe that *one* thousand animals, large and small, are used for Vivisection in the course of the year throughout Great Britain. But as the Doctor is so fond of great numbers, I will just

remind him that King Solomon, his pattern of humanity, killed *in one day* twenty-two thousand oxen, and as many sheep. These animals, it will be said, were killed to the glory of God. And, I ask, do not the discoveries of Physiology advance his glory? Are not the facts which that science reveals to us brought forward every day as so many proofs of a designing Providence?—*ἱερὸν λόγον ἐγὼ τοῦ δημιουργήσαντος ἡμᾶς ὕμνον ἀληθινὸν συντίθημι, καὶ νομίζω τοῦτ' εἶναι τὴν ὄντως εὐσέβειαν, οὐχὶ εἰ ταύρων ἑκατόμβας αὐτοῦ παμπόλλας καταθύσαιμι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μυρία μῦρα θυμιάσαιμι καὶ κασίας, ἀλλ' εἰ γνοίην μὲν αὐτὸς πρῶτος, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐξηγησαίμην οἷος μὲν ἐστὶ τὴν σοφίαν, οἷος δὲ τὴν δύναμιν, ὁποῖος δὲ τὴν χρηστότητα**.

In the 'Animal Creation' we more than once meet with the proverb about a good man regarding the life of his beast: upon which I may just observe, that it affords a fresh instance how much easier it is to say fine things about humanity than to practise it. If Solomon regarded the life of his beast, he certainly disregarded that of his brother. This reminds one of what was said of Sterne; that he could neglect a living mother to weep over a dead ass. To be sure, it was before he wrote the passage I have referred to that Solomon killed Adonijah, but it was long afterwards that he became a votary of Moloch, the chief part of whose worship consisted, as is well known, in offering human sacrifices.

Wm. H. Drummond (also a D.D.) follows closely

* Galen.

on Dr. Styles, but, with less confidence of assertion than that gentleman, puts his accusation into the form of a question: "Wherefore," he asks, "are boys, who have just commenced the study of anatomy, to make upon living creatures their incipient efforts in this difficult art?" If Dr. Drummond had taken pains to inform himself on the subject of Medical Education in Great Britain, he would have learned that the "incipient efforts of boys" are directed towards acquiring the elements of human anatomy by attendance at Lectures, where the bones of the skeleton are exhibited and explained to them, and afterwards in their due order the muscles, vessels, &c. In their second year of study they usually commence their dissection of the human body, in which they encounter quite difficulties enough to deter them, even if they were so inclined, from entering upon a course of experiments on living animals. Indeed the notion of learning "a difficult art" by commencing with the most difficult portion of it is perfectly ludicrous. Did the Doctor begin his clerical education by preaching sermons?

It would however be unjust towards Dr. Drummond to place him on the same level with Dr. Styles: 'The Rights of Animals' contains much that does honour both to the author's head and heart. He is evidently well acquainted with his subject, and he thus avoids all those zoological blunders and monstrous exaggerations which are so plentiful in Dr. Styles's strange Essay.

Mr. James Macaulay's little volume* is likewise to be commended for its fair and dispassionate spirit. Instead of loading with abuse and calumny those members of the medical profession who have made experiments upon animals, he freely confesses how much mankind are indebted to their investigations, and he only recommends such precautions in making them as every humane and truly scientific physiologist would endeavour to practise. The objection to Mr. Macaulay's work is, that there is a want of argument and aptness of illustration. He thinks he has done enough when he has strung together a mass of texts, selected from different writers in the Bible, which allude (some only in the most distant manner) to the duty of humanity to brutes. While extolling the merciful enactments of the Mosaic law, he seems to have overlooked the painful death which it inflicted on an ox that might happen to gore a person. In such a case the animal was to be killed *by pelting it with stones.* He forgets, too, that by the command of Moses, tens of thousands of domestic animals were destroyed by the Israelites in Canaan : and if their death was necessary to prevent the conquerors being overstocked with cattle, it does not make the treatment of the horses less cruel, when, instead of being killed outright, they were lamed by having their sinews cut !

I mention these facts, not as in any way affecting the question whether humanity to brutes be a duty or

* Essay on Cruelty to Animals, by James Macaulay, M.A. Edinburgh, 1839.

not, but merely to show how dangerous it is to use double-edged arguments which cut both ways. If Moses says (as quoted by Mr. Macaulay), "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn," he says equally, "If an ox gore a man or a woman that they die, then the ox shall surely be *stoned.*"

It is remarkable that among the numerous passages which Mr. Macaulay cites from the writings of King David, there is not *a single precept** which enjoins humanity to brutes! all the quotations from the Psalms are descriptive either of God's power over the animal creation, or of the cruelty of men towards each other.

Having thus noticed some of the more active opponents and denouncers of Vivisection, I proceed to the consideration of my second proposition:

II. *That the pain resulting from experiments on Animals is exaggerated.*

We are so much the creatures of habit, and the words of the great masters of our language are so inwoven, as it were with our very being, that we insensibly take our notions of history and morals from them, and on their authority receive as truths, state-

* The *practice* of this monarch was notoriously the very reverse of humane. When he conquered the Syrians, he "houghed all the chariot horses." (2 Sam. viii. 4.) Nor was he less cruel to his human captives: "Whosoever getteth up to the gutter and smiteth the Jebusites, and the *lame* and the *blind,* that are hated of David's soul, he shall be chief and captain." (2 Sam. v. 8.) "And he brought out the people that were in it (Rabbah) and *cut them with saws, and with harrows of iron, and with axes.*" (1 Chron. xx. 3.)

ments which we should listen to coldly and doubtingly, if submitted to us by the philosopher or the sober historian.

What Englishman would hesitate to bring forward as an argument Shakspeare's assertion, that

> .... "the poor beetle, which we tread upon,
> In corporal sufferance feels a pang as great
> As when a giant dies!"

and yet nothing can be farther from the truth.

Compare the various insects when the subjects of wounds or injury, with quadrupeds or man under similar circumstances. See a child catch a "daddy-long-legs:" the insect escapes by leaving a leg or two behind him in his pursuer's grasp; and an instant after observe the mutilated animal feeding as quietly as if nothing had taken place. The Ichneumon fly deposits her eggs in the body of a living caterpillar; the young are hatched there, and the caterpillar continues to feed uninterruptedly while the intruders are actually devouring its living tissues. Trembley* cut a living polype in two, and each half became a perfect animal: nay, he even turned some of these creatures completely inside out, and they soon took food and digested it as well as in their original state. The head of a common house-fly is cut off, and what happens? Instant death, as would be the case with a quadruped? or writhings of agony? Nothing of the kind: it walks, it

* Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Polypes: à Leide, 1744.

flutters, it cleans its legs and wings. The silk-worm moth has been seen to copulate after decapitation: would Shakspeare's giant have done so?

Suppose for a moment that the poet was right. What a horrible scene of suffering would this earth constantly present! Every moment thousands, nay millions, of living creatures are being killed or, what is worse, maimed. The bird catches a slug, or a worm, or an insect; eats a part, some tit-bit, and then leaves it. How horrible if this creature were to feel the agony of a human being similarly mangled! The world would be one scene of incessant suffering.

Sensation is given to the lower animals to warn them of danger, to afford them opportunities of escape; to have bestowed more than this necessary amount of sensation upon them, and at the same time to have made escape impossible, would imply a scheme of creation very difficult to be reconciled with the idea of a benevolent Deity.

To ascend from insects to animals whose nervous system is more completely developed,—to birds and quadrupeds. Here, no doubt, as they are subject to fewer casualties, and are furnished with more perfect means of escape, we find an increased susceptibility of pain. But how absurd to pretend, even in these creatures, that the pain resulting from surgical operations is as great as in man! How trifling comparatively is the mere physical pain of an amputation to that caused by the anticipation of it, or by the consideration of its results! Contrast the situation of an

idiot who has lost a hand, with that of a surgeon or an artist similarly mutilated. Would Raffaelle or Michael Angelo, or any other great painter, have grieved over the mere severing of so many inches of bone and sinew ; or would not the feeling that from henceforth all his glorious conceptions—all the visions of grandeur and beauty on which he had mused for years—must fade away for want of the power to embody them, have caused a pang infinitely more severe than any bodily torture ? What would have been the state of mind of John Hunter, brooding over a vast system of Physiology, and trusting to his industry and manual skill to work out and prove all his theories, if compelled to lose his right hand ? The idiot and the brute no doubt suffer from wounds, or from the various causes which may bring about their death, but, as Dr. Styles observes (and for once he is right),“ that fatal moment is not embittered to them by any of the feelings which render it so painful to most of the human race, regret for the past and solicitude about futurity. They feel the pang of Nature but not of mind*.”

The writers for your Society exhibit the same ignorance of the structure and functions of the higher quadrupeds and man, as of the lower classes of ani-

* Since writing the foregoing observations, I have discovered that the whole of the paragraph in Dr. Styles's Essay,—from “it is usually in the night-time” to “solicitude about futurity,”—has been copied by him, *word for word*, from Hunter's translation of St. Pierre's Studies of Nature ! (vol. i. p. 265.)

mals. When describing the experiments of Vivisectors, they usually reserve for a climax of horror some account of those performed on the brain, and harrow up the feelings of their readers by relating how "the monster" actually opened the skull of an animal and cut away a portion of its brain! Now much of their sympathy on such occasions is thrown away, for the simple reason that the brain is *insensible.* This has been frequently proved in persons who have received extensive injuries to the skull: one case I may allude to which is mentioned by the late Sir Charles Bell, where a pistol-ball had passed through a man's head. "I have had," says he, "my fingers deep in the anterior lobes of the brain, when the patient, being at the same time acutely sensible and capable of expressing himself, complained only of the integument *."

A paper-war on the subject of Vivisection has, I perceive, been carried on for some time in the pages of the London Medical Gazette. Among the most violent of the Anti-vivisectors is a Dr. Hull, who deals about his blows with the blind fury of a raw recruit, rather than the steady skill of an old soldier. He calls those who make physiological experiments by some very hard names; they are "diabolical," "savage," "infernal," "damnable:" and he quotes as a great authority a Mr. Mac something, "a surgeon of operative and literary fame, who has been long im-

* Anatomy of the Human Body, vol. ii. p. 350.

pressed with the inutility of Vivisections." Neither the fame of Dr. Hull nor of his friend has yet reached the city where I am now writing, and I must be excused for the present if I prefer to either of these gentlemen's opinions, those of Harvey, Haller, Hunter, Bell, Dupuytren, Cooper, Orfila, and Hope, who have all declared (and proved) that Vivisection was absolutely necessary to enable them to attain the important objects of their research. Another writer in the Medical Gazette recently quoted a number of the Idler against Vivisection, as if the opinion of Dr. Johnson could be of the smallest weight on a subject of which he was utterly ignorant. The following are some of the passages quoted :—

"Among the inferior professors of medical knowledge is a race of wretches, whose lives are only varied by varieties of cruelty, whose favorite amusement is to nail dogs to tables and open them alive ; to try how long life may be continued in various degrees of mutilation, or with the excision or laceration of vital parts ; to examine whether burning irons are felt more acutely by the bone or tendon ; and whether the more lasting agonies are produced by poison forced into the mouth or injected by the veins" * * * * "he that burned an animal with irons yesterday, will be willing to amuse himself by burning another tomorrow."

Here we observe the common fallacy of unscientfic writers on the subject of Vivisection,—that those who practise it do so "for amusement!" Of course any persons who could derive the slightest gratification

from inflicting pain, either on their fellow-men or on the lower animals, would be most justly stigmatized as "wretches:" but where are such monsters of absurdity to be found amongst medical men? At the very time that Johnson, like a "good hater" as he was, composed the 17th. No. of the Idler, Haller (at least as good, as conscientious, and as pious a man as Johnson himself, and certainly not one of "the inferior professors of medical knowledge") was engaged in a series of experiments on living animals, perhaps the most extensive that has ever been performed; and was laying the foundation of that system of patient investigation and impartial research which has produced such important results, and has raised medicine from rude guess-work to the rank of Philosophy.

I revere the memory of Dr. Johnson, but I do not love his faults; nor can all my admiration of his independent character, his noble self-reliance, his unflinching integrity, and honest warmth of heart, make me forget that he was of all bigots the most prejudiced, of all controversialists the most obstinate and virulent.

Truth is still truth, be her disciples ever so few and humble, and persecution ever so fierce against them. On the other hand, adultery, incest, and offences even more shocking, because unnatural, might be defended, if kings, and patriarchs, and philosophers were to be blindly followed as our patterns; "Nihil tam absurdè dici potest quod non dicatur ab aliquo philosophorum:" but still, as the members of your Society are constantly appealing to the authority

of eminent men, who (either from natural tenderness of disposition, or not fully appreciating the important ends to be achieved) have stigmatized as cruel those who make experiments on living animals, I will cite a few instances of men, not only above all cavil as to their talents and moral worth, but eminent for piety, who have largely employed Vivisection as a means of studying Physiology.

At the head of these I place Haller. It would be impertinent in a letter like the present to go into detail on the subject of this great man's physiological studies; but a glance at the mere titles of his works will show how laboriously he followed out those studies, while his 'Letters to his Daughter,' and several of his poems, no less than the uniform testimony of his contemporaries, declare him to have been a sincere and pious Christian. For our countryman Robert Boyle, I need do little else than allude to the bequest in his will, whereby he instituted those Lectures which have given occasion to so many eminent divines to defend the principles of the Christian Religion. The Rev. Stephen Hales, and Dr Derham, though less familiar to the general reader, present sufficiently well-known instances of Christians (and even Christian *clergymen*) who have made experiments on animals for the sake of Science: and the famous Boerhaave, also a Vivisector, was not only benevolent and kind in his disposition, but likewise a firm believer in the revelations of Christianity.

To come yet nearer to our own times, I will add to

my list the name of the late Dr. Hope, not less remarkable for his talents as a physician than for his fervent piety as a Christian. He experimented largely on living animals, and in his Memoirs, recently published by his widow, many of these experiments are alluded to almost in the same chapter with passages full of the most enthusiastic effusions of devotion.

I could adduce other instances of religious Vivisectors, but the illustrious names already quoted are more than sufficient to prove my assertion.

I wish as much as your Lordship or any member of your Society that there were no such thing as pain in the world: but we must take the world as we find it; with its good and its evil, its pain and its pleasure, its joy and its sorrow, endlessly mingled and alternating. A golden age such as Dr. Styles describes, in which beasts of prey and the weaker animals lived together in harmony, could no more have had an actual existence than those "impenetrable scales" with which his liberal imagination has encased the whale*.

We judge of God's will by his works. What we see done we conclude he willed to be done. Now if

* What the *carnivora* would find to live upon in such a golden age it would puzzle the Doctor to explain. But all theorizing on the subject is superfluous when we have the plainest facts to guide us. The fossil remains of the gigantic Ichthyosauri exhibit in the interior of their bodies various fragments of fishes, which they had swallowed during life. The stratum in which these fossils are discovered (the *lias*) belongs to a period *long anterior to the creation of Mammalia or of Man*. [See Dr. Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise, London, 1837, and Agassiz, 'Recherches sur les Poissons Fossiles,' Neûchatel, 1833—38.]

we contemplate his works in Nature, we see a never-ending process of destruction and reproduction of life going on, the former frequently attended by *pain*. Whether we regard the great destroyer Man, incessantly taking away the life of other creatures to support his own, or the beasts of prey roaming the desert and the forest, or the countless tribes of fishes devouring those weaker than themselves; or when, as the insect tribes escape our search by their minuteness, we aid our sight with the microscope, and see that the very film that floats on the stagnant pool is one scene of slaughter and devastation; whichever way in short we turn our eyes, we must be convinced that the amount of pain in the world is great beyond calculation.

What is it that reconciles us to all this but a conviction that it is necessary? and that this seemingly wanton waste of life is in reality a most wonderful provision for preserving organic matter within the limits of the Animal Kingdom, and thereby economizing, as it were, Nature's strength and resources? This is well stated by Professor Owen in his recently published Lectures on Comparative Anatomy, where he speaks of the important office which the Infusoria perform "in preventing the gradual diminution of the present amount of organized matter upon the earth. For when this matter is dissolved or suspended in water, in that state of decay which immediately precedes its final decomposition into its elementary gases, and its consequent return from the organic into the in-

organic world, these wakeful members of nature's invisible police are everywhere ready to arrest the fugitive organized particles, and turn them back into the ascending stream of animal life. Having converted the dead and decomposing particles into their own living tissues they themselves become the food of larger Infusoria, as the Rotifera, and of numerous other small animals, as fishes; and thus a pabulum, fit for the nourishment of the highest organized beings, is brought back by a short route from the extremity of the realms of organized matter."

III. *Admitting that in many instances much pain is the result, Vivisection is notwithstanding necessary as a means of acquiring and of imparting useful knowledge.*

One of the main objections of those who condemn Vivisection as a crime is this—that the advantages derived from it have been few and inconsiderable in their practical results. "Could it indeed be proved," says Dr. Styles, "that any suffering of the inferior animals may be made essentially to contribute to the benefit of man, we should be obliged to allow its infliction." If then I can show that such suffering *has* been made to contribute largely to man's benefit, I shall (at least in your Champion's opinion) have gained my point. In doing this I will confine myself entirely to *practical* results, and will begin with two instances in which experiments were made by men universally acknowledged to have been most eminent in their profession—John Hunter, and Sir Astley Cooper.

Before the time of Hunter, the operation for the cure of Aneurism was so severe and hazardous, that it was never attempted but as a last resort; and the cases of recovery from it were so few, that patients might almost be said to have been reduced to the alternative of dying of the disease or by the knife of the surgeon. After much reflection, it occurred to Hunter that if, instead of cutting into the tumor formed by the dilated artery and attempting to secure the two openings of the vessel, a ligature were placed upon the latter at a distance from the seat of disease, the flow of blood might be diverted from its course, and be made to take a circuitous route, thus allowing the blood in the aneurismal sac to coagulate and be absorbed.

Before attempting so novel an operation on the human subject, Hunter performed a number of experiments on dogs and other animals, for the purpose of ascertaining precisely what took place in a living body when a ligature was placed around an artery; by what means the latter became obliterated, and how, under such circumstances, the circulation of the limb would be kept up and its vitality preserved. After satisfying himself completely on these points, he performed his new operation for the first time in December, 1785: the man recovered. The operation was repeated, and with the same happy result; and at the present day (except the disease be too far advanced, or the vessel affected be out of the surgeon's reach), there is every reason to expect that the ope-

ration will succeed, and the patient again become a useful member of society.

In the year 1817, Sir Astley Cooper, encouraged by the favorable result which had attended his operations on the larger arteries, conceived the bold design of placing a ligature around the Aorta itself, at the point where it is passing through the abdomen in front of the spine. He first attempted the operation on dogs, several of whom recovered; and although the same result did not attend its performance on the human subject, Sir Astley was fully justified in so desperate a case in resorting to a desperate remedy; whereas he would have been shamefully tampering with the life of a fellow-creature, had he not previously tried the operation on the lower animals with success.

Equally important with the ligature of the Aorta (and far more so if we look to the result), were the experiments which the same indefatigable surgeon instituted, to discover the mode by which fractured bones are united, and the causes which principally retard, or altogether prevent such union. The non-medical reader who might peruse the details of these experiments would be shocked at their apparent cruelty. But let him consider the *end* for which they were instituted,—to enable surgeons to cure broken limbs: to prevent much suffering and confinement to the patient, and very frequently to avoid the necessity for amputation: to restore to usefulness the right arm on which the very existence of the

workman's family depends ; the skilful hand of the artist or mechanic ; to enable the child to grow up an active and useful member of society, instead of lingering out his days a helpless cripple, dependent on the charity of others.

I have yet to notice another illustrious example of talent and industry, who has employed Vivisection to a greater extent than perhaps any of his contemporaries : I mean Professor Orfila. The objects which he, and others who laboured in the same field, had in view were these :

1st. By carefully and repeatedly observing the effects of poisons on living bodies, to ascertain with precision what organ or set of organs were specially affected by certain substances :

2ndly. To determine what antidotes would best counteract such poisons, and how these antidotes could be most efficiently administered :

3rdly. To apply the knowledge thus obtained to cases where death might occur under suspicious circumstances ; and to ascertain, by *post mortem* examinations and the use of chemical tests, whether poison had been administered, and if so what the nature of the poison had been : points of the utmost possible importance in a legal inquiry, as involving the life of a fellow-creature who may have been falsely accused of murder.

I bring forward experiments of this kind the more readily, as they determine at once the question of the

lawfulness of Vivisection, by proving that the end for which they were instituted was a great and important good and attainable by no other means. These experiments were nearly all painful, many acutely so, and lingering in their operation: if wantonly employed, therefore, for mere curiosity or for amusement, they would have been frightfully cruel. But what has been their result? I refer in answer to the treatment of persons poisoned, as it existed even at the commencement of the 19th century, contrasted with that of the present day. With what happy promptitude in one case is the stomach-pump applied, instead of time being wasted and the patient at last sacrificed by relying upon supposed antidotes; and how certainly, in another case, does the physician employ the means with which chemistry has furnished him to neutralize the deadly drug! To experiments on animals carefully conducted, and repeated over and over again, and to nothing else, can we attribute the happy change from the fruitless trifling of the old herbalist to the energetic practice of the modern physician.

In a late number of the 'Quarterly Review,' the illustrious writer whose experiments I have alluded to is mentioned in a note, as having "sacrificed the lives of 10,000 animals in the course of his researches into the action of poisons," and he is accordingly classed with what the Reviewer is pleased to call "the Frenchified, butcherly school of anatomical experimenters." I should like to know how many thou-

sand lives have been sacrificed with no other object than *mere amusement*, by those hard-riding gentlemen whose exploits the Reviewer elsewhere takes such pains to celebrate*. The man who devotes years of study to learn how he may best alleviate the pain or save the lives of his fellow-creatures, is called a "butcher." If he had quitted his study for the field, had dressed himself like a mountebank, and had ridden his horse to death, or had killed ten times ten thousand hares and rabbits, the Reviewer would have seen nothing wrong in his conduct, and instead of a "butcher" would have styled him "a gallant sportsman."

The whole question of the lawfulness of the experiments of Orfila and others is well stated by Sir David Barry, who devoted much time and labor to an inquiry into the actions of poisons on living animals, with a view to improve the treatment of poisoned wounds. "Others," he says, "talk of needless cruelty. If any useful knowledge is to be obtained

* "———Two horses are seen loose in the distance: a report is flying about that one of the field is badly hurt, and something is heard of a collar-bone being broken, others say it is a leg; but the *pace* is too good to inquire."

——"'Who is that under the horse in the brook?' 'Only Dick Christian.' 'But he'll be drowned,' exclaims Lord ———. 'I shouldn't wonder,' observes Mr. ———, 'but the *pace* is too good to inquire.'" Quart. Rev. xciii. 237, 239.

In making these extracts I refrain from transcribing the names of the noblemen and gentlemen to whom the Reviewer, in his description of a Leicestershire fox-chase, attributes (I hope falsely) such unfeeling remarks.

by an experiment, none of the means necessary to arrive at that knowledge can be useless, and none else can be adopted without defeating the purpose aimed at; therefore, in useful experiments, there never is needless cruelty, or, in other words, unnecessary pain inflicted."

Having shown the vast importance of Vivisection, as enabling the surgeon to investigate Pathology and thereby to devise the most important means of cure, I will, in the next place, consider it as a means of teaching Physiology, the only sure basis of medical science.

There are many functions of the living body the knowledge of which is indispensable to the Physiologist and yet cannot possibly be taught in a satisfactory manner except by actual demonstration: such are the vermicular or peristaltic movement of the intestines, the ciliary motion on certain surfaces, and the peculiar action of the heart. With the latter especially the physician must be familiar, and fortunately all these vital actions can be seen after an animal has been deprived of sensation, but of course to do this the infliction of momentary pain is required. The common objection to such a mode of demonstration is, that the experiments, having once been made by competent persons, need not be repeated. As well might a watchmaker content himself with examining the works of a watch at rest and with reading an account of what others had seen after winding it up and setting it in motion. Five minutes

of actual inspection would teach both the physiologist and the mechanic more than hours of reading could convey to them, if indeed by any amount of such study they could master their subjects. But further,—our knowledge of the minute and intimate structure of the body has been immensely increased of late years by the aid of fine injections of the blood-vessels of the lower animals. Parts so prepared, and examined by the powerful and accurate microscopes which are now constructed, reveal to us the whole mechanism by which textures are supplied with blood and their nutrition maintained. Now it must be obvious to anyone who considers the subject with attention, that to fill accurately the veins, arteries, and ducts of an animal with any fluid, the blood and other secretions which they naturally contain must be got rid of. If we wait for the death of the animal, or kill it by pithing or by strangulation, we do not attain this object: some kind of Vivisection must be resorted to. I will illustrate what I mean by referring to the researches of a distinguished anatomist on the structure of the liver. He found that it was impossible to inject the ducts of this organ after the natural death of an animal, in consequence of their being always more or less filled with bile. He therefore was obliged to resort to the following expedient. He tied the blood-vessels going to the liver in a living dog, after feeding it, and thus prevented any fresh bile from being formed; while that which was already existing in the organ passed out of it to mix with the food. Some

hours afterwards he killed the animal, and was thus enabled to fill both the blood-vessels and ducts with different coloured injections, so as to trace the whole distribution of the blood to this most important organ.

It would be needless to multiply cases of this kind, where results have been obtained by Vivisection which could have been arrived at in no other way. "But," cry the laity, "experiments such as this, having once been made by competent persons, need not be repeated." This is a fallacy: who is to determine the question of competency? Galen was a *competent* person, and his authority unquestioned, until Paracelsus (with more zeal perhaps than his experience warranted) pronounced him to be in error. Hundreds of writers were considered competent authorities in anatomy, until Harvey showed them that they did not even know how the blood in their own bodies was circulating. Every day's experience tends to shake our faith in great names, and shows us how much we have yet to learn.

But we are not now considering the importance of Vivisection merely as leading to new discoveries, but as a means of teaching already ascertained facts. The objection that experiments on the bodies of living animals have been already made, might with the same justice be urged against Dissection. Thousands of dead bodies have been dissected, and there are anatomical works without end which contain the results of such dissections, and yet each student has to

go through the same processes to impress things on his memory. So if there be anything seen on opening a living animal which is important to be seen and to be remembered, each must use his own eyes, and not content himself, any more than in questions of Human Anatomy, with the written reports of others.

One word more with respect to Vivisection considered as a part of *Surgical teaching*.

The first step necessary for the student to take who intends to practise Operative Surgery is to make himself a thorough anatomist, and especially to become familiar with those regions of the body which are most frequently the seat of diseases requiring operation. We will suppose the student to have done so, and to have practised frequently on the dead subject the tying of arteries. He finds little difficulty in this: he knows precisely where to make his incision; what structures to divide and what to avoid; the parts are always bloodless and motionless, and he wonders how Mr. —— could have spent more than two or three minutes in tying the Carotid artery. At last his own turn comes to operate for Aneurism of this vessel. He makes his first incision as he has been accustomed to do: there is a little bleeding: this is annoying, for it conceals those parts which, in the dead body, he used to expose so neatly. After some little difficulty he finds the artery, but close to it is a great vein full of blood which overlaps the vessel he wants to get hold of: he was

not prepared for this, and begins to feel embarrassed: the patient, too, is restless; and each uneasy movement makes the troublesome vein swell more and more. At last all difficulties are overcome and the operation completed, and our surgeon then finds that, instead of having done it quicker than Mr. ——, he has been just five times as long about it. Now if, before operating on his fellow-creature, he had practised tying the artery in a living dog, he would have been prepared for all those deviations from the dead subject which so embarrassed him. He would have accustomed himself to the peculiar appearance which living tissues present, and would have gone through his operation with more ease to himself, and with greater safety to his patient.

No doubt Vivisection has been frequently abused. What good thing has not? Operative Surgery is a source of the greatest blessings to mankind. How many thousands has it not rescued from wretchedness and pain and restored to comfort and activity! But operative skill has been abused: love of display and the ambition of being thought dexterous, have been the cause of many an operation which a solemn feeling of responsibility, and a conscientious regard for the patient's good, would have prevented. But are surgical operations therefore to cease?

Dr. Drummond quotes, on the authority of a friend who witnessed them, some experiments made in Edinburgh by the late Mr. Fyfe. In one of these the windpipe of a living pig was opened, to illustrate some of

the phænomena of voice, and the animal's body was then cut into and the intestines displayed to show their peristaltic action. Now here was an abuse of Vivisection. The vermicular movements of the intestines could have been equally well seen after the pig had been "pithed," and thus deprived of all feeling. On the other hand, the operation of opening the trachæa produces but slight suffering: an incision of about an inch or so through the skin is almost the only painful part of it. It is frequently performed on patients attacked with inflammation, and those who have undergone it describe the pain as trifling. The third experiment mentioned by Dr. Drummond seems to have had a definite object, and not to have been wantonly undertaken. The facts it exhibits have a practical bearing upon accidents which occur to human beings, and may call for the interference of the surgeon. If unnecessary violence was employed in this instance in securing the animal, the cruelty was not a whit the greater because the sufferer happened to be "a beautiful spaniel dog with ivory teeth." The ugliest, mangiest cur that ever mumbled carrion, would have felt just as much pain, which is the only thing to be considered in the case. The narrator's humanity here degenerates into sentimentalism; "he pities the plumage, but forgets the dying bird."

In a passage which Dr. Styles quotes from Dr. Millengen's Curiosities of Medical Experience*, the

* Dr. Styles is as unfortunate in citing the opinions of others as

author says that Vivisection should not be made "a public exhibition or a student's pastime." This remark is most just. Among the precautions to be observed by the Vivisector, none is more essential than *the avoidance of display*. When an important end is to be gained (as was the case in the experiments I have previously noticed, by Orfila, Dupuytren, Sir A. Cooper, Bell, and others,) the means indispensable to

in developing his own : he makes Dr. Millengen argue that the assumed cruelty of the French professors arises from their having, at an early age, witnessed the bloody scenes of the Reign of Terror. On referring to the original work of Dr. Millengen, I do not find that the passage quoted bears any such interpretation, but on the contrary the author alludes to *himself* as having witnessed the "bloody scenes" described. His words are,—"At any rate professors alone should be allowed the *indulgence* (of Vivisection), but in no case should such pseudo-scientific practices become a public exhibition or a student's pastime. Brought up in early life among the complicated horrors of a Revolution, *I have* been sadly convinced that the contagion of cruelty is much more doubtless and active than that of pestilence."

The plain and obvious meaning of this passage is as I have stated, and not, as Dr. Styles has interpreted it to be, an attack on the French Revolution as the cause of the cruelty of physiologists. Indeed this theory is overturned by the fact, that most of the French physiologists of the present day are too young to have seen anything of the Reign of Terror, and the older ones had little to learn after having experienced the tyranny and cruelties of the old monarchy. They had seen criminals tortured and broken on the wheel, and innocent citizens dragged from their homes, without even the form of a trial, to be buried in the dungeons of the Bastille. They were no Revolutionists, but the dutiful servants of the *Most Christian King*, who endeavoured to drag the wretched Damien limb from limb, and, when the efforts of four horses failed to dismember him, hacked and severed his joints as a butcher would have cut up a sheep. That was a Royal Vivisection indeed!

that end do not constitute cruelty. In employing these means the experimenter is justified by stern necessity, and, if duly impressed with the importance of his researches, can no more feel an inclination towards display than a conscientious surgeon would during a critical operation.

Those who consider all infliction of pain on the lower animals unjustifiable may charge me with carrying the principle of expediency too far. To such I would reply, by asking on what ground but the supposed necessity to an end is the punishment of death tolerated in the present day? The feeling of revenge, which originally prompted it, is out of the question in a civilized community. It is inflicted on offenders to deter others: "On ne corrige pas," says Montaigne, celuy qu'on pend; on corrige les aultres par luy." Whether the proposed end be really attained is doubted by many enlightened persons: no doubt can exist, however, that the means are shocking, infinitely more so than any Vivisection of brutes. In killing the latter mere pain is the result; take the most agonizing process by which a creature's life can possibly be extinguished, still it is so much bodily suffering: we destroy a creature without moral sense, and incapable therefore of doing right or wrong; we prevent no virtue in this life, we hasten no punishment in another.

How different is the case of a criminal! Who can say if his life were spared that he would not repent? It is not likely perhaps, but it is possible. He may

have been seduced by evil example, the strongest temptation may have assailed him, he may never have had (how often is this the case !) the benefits of education. If that education and moral training were begun even now, his whole nature might be changed, he might yet become a good and happy man : by killing him you prevent all his possible virtues, you make him *die wicked*. And if we take the more solemn view of the question ; if we believe that his future fate *through all eternity* depends upon his life *here*, what a responsibility do we take upon ourselves ! By making a change of life impossible, we seal his everlasting doom.

I have yet to notice what at first appears to be a powerful argument against Vivisection, because it is one that requires no laboured effort of the understanding, but comes home at once to the heart of every man ; I mean—the *natural repugnance* which a humane and rightly constituted person must feel against inflicting pain on the lower animals. This appeal to the conscience is powerful and striking, but a very little examination will prove it to be fallacious. We feel a still greater repugnance to inflict pain on our fellow-men, and yet if we were to indulge this feeling beyond its proper limits there would be no such things as medicine and surgery in the world. The whole course of a surgeon's education is directed towards enabling him to overcome his natural weakness : not by rendering him callous to the sufferings of others,— God forbid ! that would be but to make

him a skilful assassin,—but by teaching him steadfastly to contemplate the end to be achieved, and to distinguish it from the painful means necessary to its attainment. This steady contemplation of the important end to be gained reconciles him to the loathsome details of the dissecting-room, makes him disregard the danger of infection as he pursues his daily round among the squalid abodes of the poor, and nerves his hand to perform the most severe operations on his fellow-creatures, and to cause sufferings which the most savage barbarity would shrink from inflicting without such an object. I will instance a case, of not unfrequent occurrence, in which the "natural repugnance" to cause pain is as strong as possible, but if yielded to would deprive the sufferer of his only chance of life.

In children of tender age we sometimes meet with a disease of the eye which advances with fearful rapidity, speedily destroys the sight of the organ, and, if left to itself, certainly kills the patient. Medicine in these cases is unfortunately powerless: the total extirpation of the eye affords the only chance (and it is but a chance) of cure. What can be more horrible, or more naturally repugnant to one's feelings, than to scoop out the eye of a poor little creature whose helplessness appeals so eloquently to our sympathy? No one who was not firmly and fully persuaded that the operation was necessary could, unless he were the merest savage, be induced to perform it; but the surgeon, let him be ever so feeling and humane, sub-

mits to the necessity of the case, subdues his natural repugnance, and calmly and rapidly completes his bloody work. If he were to indulge his unwillingness to inflict pain, he would shrink with horror from such an operation; his feelings would be spared, nature would triumph, but—the child would die!

I come now to the last of the four propositions with which I commenced this letter;

IV. *That while necessity alone compels us to take away the lives of animals, our accusers are daily accessory to their wholesale destruction for the mere gratification of luxury, or as an amusement to while away the passing hour.*

Before I enter upon the consideration of this the concluding portion of my subject, I wish it to be understood, that in bringing charges of injustice, partiality, and cruelty against many of the members of your Society, I utterly disclaim any intention of imputing bad *motives* to them. I am too deeply impressed with the truth of Paley's observation,—that "man is a bundle of habits,"—to forget that it is possible, nay most natural, for us to overlook faults in ourselves to which we have been long accustomed, whilst we vigorously condemn and combat them in others: and as the Patrons and Directors of your Society are, for the most part, persons of exalted rank and ample fortune, so do they form precisely that class most likely to be dazzled by the deceptive brilliancy and false

glitter which fashion throws around her favourite amusements; leaving all their vice, but hiding all their grossness.

I would ask how you, my Lord, and the other members of your Society, justify the painful killing of animals for food? There can be no doubt that mankind were originally vegetable feeders. Living in those warm climates which produce spontaneously an ample supply of fruits and herbs, but as yet destitute of means for mastering and ensnaring animals, they were so on compulsion. As population increased, and men wandered to less fertile regions, or were driven thither by war, they were forced by hunger to become ingenious, and to make nets, and traps, and bows and arrows, to capture living prey, until, in process of time, scattered bands, penetrating into barren and frozen tracts almost destitute of vegetables, were compelled to seek their food among the waters, and to become fish-eaters like the Esquimaux and Greenlanders.

Civilization has to a great degree overcome the natural disadvantages of our soil and climate, and an almost endless variety of wholesome vegetables may now be obtained, so that *necessity* can no longer be pleaded by us as an excuse for killing animals for food. In the East, whole nations, as is well known, live entirely on vegetables; abstaining in many instances even from those animal substances, milk and eggs, which may be procured without the slightest injury to any living creature. But besides the pain

which in Europe is hourly being inflicted by the actual slaughtering of cattle, however quickly performed, they undergo much preparatory torture by fatigue and thirst, the brutal conduct of drovers, and the worrying of dogs. Some animals are mutilated for the sake of improving their flavour or for other reasons: bulls and rams are gelded, sows spayed, cocks converted into capons: thus, besides the pain of the operations, they are deprived for ever of one great source of pleasure, perhaps the greatest which their merely animal natures are capable of enjoying. And if we were to enumerate all the ingenious atrocities of gastronomy, what a picture would be presented to us! Geese confined to one spot close to a fire, and stuffed with food, until a disease of the liver takes place which converts that organ into fat for "*pâtés de Strasbourg*:" turkies crammed by main force: fish taken out of their natural element and left to die of exhaustion. I say nothing of lobsters, shrimps, and prawns boiled alive, and oysters eaten alive; for perhaps no quicker mode of death for these creatures could be devised. Our quills are annually plucked from the wings and our feathers from the breasts of living geese; and with such a quill can Dr. Styles pathetically record the horrors of a dissecting-room, and then calmly repose his head upon the well-stuffed pillow, without bestowing a thought on the wretched birds who have bled and suffered for his luxury. Busied too as he is with the delinquencies of the doctors, he has not time to reflect, that the very counterpane beneath which he

is so snugly reposing is one of the fruits of human slavery, and was raised by the stimulus of the cart-whip applied to the bare backs of his fellow-men!

"Cruelty," says Dr. Styles, "whether it be for gain or amusement, for the gratification of appetite, the promotion of science, or the sustenance of human life, is the *unnecessary* infliction of pain."

This is but a vague definition; for the questions instantly suggest themselves—What determines the necessity? Is it absolute, or relative? If the infliction of pain be unlawful except when *absolutely* necessary, then not only is Vivisection a crime, but also the enslaving of beasts for draught, and the killing of them for food: for why should we not live entirely on eggs, milk, and vegetables; walk instead of ride; and in short treat animals in all respects as having equal rights with ourselves? Why should we even inflict pain on our fellow-*men* for what we call a good end, that of removing disease?—there is no absolute and irresistible necessity for a physician to cure a man of a fever, or for a surgeon to cut him for the stone. How, again, could Dr. Styles justify as absolutely necessary the Jewish custom (continued daily for thousands of years) of slaughtering beasts for sacrifice? If he replies, that such slaughtering was necessary because it formed a part of religious worship, he has admitted all that I want to prove; namely, that the necessity was not absolute but relative; indispensable only *to attain a certain end.*

The most ardent defender of Vivisection contends

for no more than this :—that to gain an important and beneficial result it is essential that animals should suffer, and by the importance of the object he justifies the proceedings necessary to attain it. On the ground of *relative necessity*, then ; for the sake of attaining an important and beneficial result, do we Europeans kill animals for food, enslave them for convenience, and make experiments upon them to advance medical science.

But what sound defence can be made for those who, like the Royal and Noble Patrons of your Society, kill and torture animals simply for their *amusement* ? Are such persons fit to judge others ? Are they so free from sin as to be made " ex officio " casters of stones ? Let us examine a little into the details of your Society's benevolent exertions.

Your Committee, in their Report for the past year, congratulate the Society, I perceive, on their having succeeded in putting down *Bull*-baiting at Wheatley in Oxfordshire : but my Lord, where have they even attempted to put down *Stag*-baiting ? There is, no doubt, a great difference between the two amusements : one is as decidedly vulgar as the other is fashionable. But did the poor bull's suffering arise from the social position of his persecutors ? Or do you suppose the stag feels less agony because his tormentors are lords and gentlemen ? Prince Albert's hounds bite as sharply as the butcher's bull-dog ; and your stag is a republican of nature's own making, who cares not for distinctions between ranks

and classes. How can it be expected that the poor man should yield a cheerful obedience to laws so partial and unjust, or pay without grumbling taxes that are to pamper the Royal buck-hounds, while he is forbidden, by severe penalties, to amuse himself with *his* field-sports of cock-fighting and badger-drawing?

The following paragraph appeared in the *Standard* newspaper of October 23, 1843:—

"The Queen's Beagles.—Since Her Majesty* has possessed her pack of beagles, which are kept in the new kennel in the Home Park, Windsor, under the superintendence of the huntsman, Mr. Maynard, Her Majesty, from domestic causes of an interesting nature, has been prevented from hunting with her Liliputian pack, during great portions of the regular season. This year, however, Her Majesty has signified her gracious intention to hunt with the Royal beagles occasionally in the Great Park. Mr. Maynard having received his Royal Mistress's commands to this effect, the little pack has had several beautiful trial-runs within the past ten days, and is now in a first-rate condition. When Her Majesty takes the field, *bagged hares will always be at hand*, in order to insure *sport* in the event of not being successful in an early find. The Queen, it is well known, is an excellent horsewoman; indeed, Her Majesty upon her favourite hunter takes a ditch and double fence in most beautiful style."

Your Committee congratulate the public on the success of their endeavours to put down the practice of dog-fighting and badger-baiting at the Westminster Pit, and state that they "prosecuted and convicted John King the keeper of it." No doubt they did well in getting rid of such a nuisance and abolishing such cruelty. Now let us imagine John

* Patron of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals!

King taking a trip down to Windsor, and, during a solitary stroll in the Park, reflecting on the past scenes of the Pit, his trial, and his punishment. He hears the familiar yelp of dogs, and sees a Lady on horseback with a train of fine gentlemen sweep past him. What must be his surprise when he learns that his Queen (the Patron of the Society which prosecuted him) and her Court are amusing themselves with *baiting a hare*! How the conviction flashes into his mind, that if, instead of bears and badgers, he had but baited weaker and more defenceless animals, he might still have reigned supreme in Westminster; praised as a "keen sportsman" instead of being execrated as a ruffian!

"There's a difference, I ween,
Twixt a beggar and a queen."

But your chief Patron is by no means singular in inconsistency: the Duke of Cambridge seconds with his gun the eagerness of his Royal niece's beagles. The *Times* newspaper of the 13th of January informed its readers that "His Royal Highness, accompanied by the Earl of Brownlow, Viscount Alford, and a party, went out shooting in the Park on Tuesday. The result of the day's sport was satisfactory, a great number of pheasants being killed. *The Duke killed with his own gun above sixty head.*" The third name on the list of your Patrons is the *Duke of Devonshire*, who, the newspapers told us on the 17th of August 1843, "left Devonshire House that morning for grouse-shooting." The following is copied

from the *Times* of the 1st of December 1843:— "Prince Albert * * * * *, attended by Mr. Anson and the Earl of Jersey, accompanied by the *Duke of Buccleugh* and Sir Robert Peel, went out to shoot. The former first went in a boat on the water, duck-shooting, and shot two ducks. He then went to cover-shooting and killed 60 pheasants, 25 hares, 8 rabbits, and 1 woodcock. About two hundred head of game were killed by the whole party:"—one of this party being a Patron of the Society to which your Lordship belongs!

Take another extract from the *Times* of Dec. 30th: "On Friday last, the 15th instant, all the agents and clerks engaged in that very extensive establishment, the Bridgewater trust, were conveyed in barges prepared for the occasion to Worsley, whither they were invited by their respectable and honourable employer, *Lord Francis Egerton*, to have a day's coursing upon the beautiful estate attached to the princely mansion which his Lordship has lately erected there. At 11 o'clock the party assembled to the number of seventy, and proceeded to the sport. A fine body of dogs was provided, and the running was splendid; so much so, that by 3 o'clock *twenty-two hares were killed.* About 4 o'clock they sat down to a most sumptuous dinner at the Grapes Inn."

If I had more frequent opportunities of examining the English newspapers I could probably add the names of several other members of your Society to the list of sportsmen, but I am unwilling to make charges which are unsupported by evidence. The

paragraphs which one sees in the public journals soon after the 12th of August and 1st of September, with their long accounts of "battues," seldom lack the name of some titled member of the legislature. We read of Lord * * * and the Duke of * * * bagging in the course of the day so many hundred head of game; but in none of these accounts do we ever see a word about the *wounded*! If the partridge had a choice, do you suppose it would prefer having its wing crushed in a turnip-field rather than in a dissecting-room? Or that more pain is caused by the physiologist when he breaks the leg of a rabbit, than by the sportsman who does the same thing with the addition of leaving a few shots to fester in the wound?

The cruelty of hare-hunting, with its ludicrous contrast between means and end, has been repeatedly urged, and is well stated by Dr. Styles in the Essay I have so often quoted; but hare-hunting sinks into insignificance when compared with stag-hunting as nowadays practised. In the former, the wretched little creature either escapes, or, if caught, is put to death in an instant; while, by a refinement of modern cruelty, the stag is rescued from the hounds and led back to his paddock, to be chased and terrified a dozen times in the course of the season.

Take as an instance the following account from the *Morning Post* of December 13th, 1843:—

"*Tremendous run with* the Queen's *Buck Hounds into Hampshire.*

"One of the longest and severest runs this season with the *Royal* Stag Hounds took place on Monday last, *the fixture* having been

appointed at Winkfield-row, about three or four miles from the kennel, at Ascot. The field consisted of about one hundred, including Lord William Beresford and several of the officers of the First Life Guards, Captain Wyre, Messrs. Worley, Staniforth, &c. The deer Sulky, a gallant animal, *which had afforded some splendid runs during the past two seasons,* was turned out near Winkfield Church and went away in beautiful style through Miss Farrand's park, shaping his course to Winkfield-row, on to the Kennel-piece, to the cross roads at Ascot; * * * * * and then bore away by the Fleet Pond for Elvetham, near Hartford bridge in Hampshire, into Dogmersfield Park (three miles below Harley-row), the seat of Lady Mildmay, where *the gallant stag, after going over between thirty and forty miles of heavy country, at a tremendous pace, was literally dead beat, and died* before the pack and the *select few whose horses managed to continue the chase* had got up. Only fifteen (including Mr. C. Davis, the huntsman, and the whips) were up at the finish. *The run occupied a little more than three hours*: the distance from point to point, 'as the crow flies,' was upwards of twenty miles, but, from the doublings, headings and divergings, the distance gone over, first and last, could not have been much less than forty miles. The run, after leaving Rapely, was at a racing pace, up to the finish. At that point (Rapely) a gradual tailing-off took place, and the field, upon approaching the borders of Hants, had become exceedingly select. None but first-rate cattle had the least chance of living with the Royal pack. The hounds from the kennel to the meet, during the run, and back from Dogmersfield Park to the kennel at Ascot, went over upwards of sixty miles of country, a great portion of which was of an extremely heavy character. The pack arrived at the kennel between five and six o'clock *the same evening.*"

Nor is it by a merely official use of the Royal name that the chief Patron of your Society encourages these amusements. I see by the following paragraph in the *Times* (Dec. 22nd, 1843), that Her Majesty's personal attendance at a stag-bait may be brought forward as a defence of the barbarous sport.

"The Royal Stag Hounds.—Her Majesty and his Royal Highness Prince Albert left the Castle on Thursday morning, in a close travelling carriage and four, shortly before 10 o'clock, for Hillingdon house, the seat of Mr. R. A. Cox, between Hillingdon and Uxbridge, where a private meet of the Royal stag hounds had been arranged to take place between 11 and 12 o'clock, and at which it was very privately notified that the Queen and the Prince Consort would be present. The Marchioness of Douro (Lady in Waiting on the Queen) rode in the carriage with Her Majesty and His Royal Highness. Major-General Wemyss, Colonel Bouverie, and Mr. G. E. Anson followed in another of the Royal carriages and four. Her Majesty and the Prince, upon arriving at Hillingdon house (where they alighted), were received by Mr. and Mrs. Cox, and ushered into the drawing-room, where a splendid *déjeûner* had been prepared for their Royal and illustrious guests. The Prince having mounted his favourite hunter, proceeded, attended by Colonel Bouverie and Mr. G. Anson, on horseback, and also by Mr. Cox and his sons, to Pole-hill, where the uncarting of the deer had been arranged to take place. Her Majesty also proceeded to Pole-hill, attended by the Lady in Waiting and Major-General Wemyss, in the Royal carriage and four. In consequence of the secresy which had been observed relative to the hunt today, there were not more than forty or fifty at the place of meeting, including the Earl of Rosslyn, Captain Vyse, Captain Seymour, Messrs. Worley, Warde, &c. Her Majesty was placed in a favourable situation for having an excellent view of the uncarting of the stag, and the laying on of the hounds. The stag went away in beautiful style for the feeder on to West-end, where it doubled back to Yatton, leaving the village to the left, on to Hayes, by Colonel Grant's park, to Pole-hill, and thence to Ruislip, and was run into and secured, after a beautiful run of about an hour and a half at a racing pace throughout, without a single check. Her Majesty left Hillingdon-house, on her return to Windsor, between 12 and 1 o'clock; and just as Her Majesty reached the Adam and Eve, near Hayes, the deer and hounds crossed the road nearly in front of the Queen's carriage, affording Her Majesty a long and uninterrupted view of the chase. The Queen arrived at the Castle at 2 o'clock to luncheon."

You can punish the poor man who fights his dog or baits a bull; why not go down to Ascot and declaim against hunting? See the noble horse forced beyond his strength till he staggers and falls dead in the ditch! Ask how the dogs have been brought to such a state of discipline as to forget their natural appetites, and only move at the command of the huntsman! Ask by what means this discipline is maintained; or look for answer at yonder poor hound, crouching at the feet of a liveried ruffian who lashes him till life is almost gone, because, being hungry, he ran after a hare!

Now, my Lord, suppose all the pain and distress which was inflicted upon the horses at Ascot and Dogmersfield had been caused by over-*driving* instead of over-*riding* them: and let the scene be changed from the picturesque fields of Hampshire to the dull pavement of Cheapside; the actors being attired in dirty drab coats instead of spruce scarlet ones,—poor hackney-coachmen instead of lords and "officers of the First Life Guards." With what righteous anger would the constables of your Society have taken the cruel fellows into custody! how the by-standers would have pitied the poor over-driven horses! how would the indignant magistrate have lectured the offenders, only regretting that he could not punish them more severely!

My Lord, is it just,—is it honest to draw these distinctions? Does Christianity, whose mild precepts are so often quoted by your orators and preach-

ers,—does Christianity, I ask, recognise this respect of persons? Did the Founder of that Religion single out the poor and ignorant for his reproof and censure? "Woe unto you, ye rich!" was his cry; "Woe unto you, who strain at a gnat and swallow a camel!" "Woe unto you, ye lawyers,"—"ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers:" "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!"

When I see your agents selecting Melton Mowbray as the field of their labours, as well as Westminster and Wheatley; when the educated and accomplished members of your Society cease to amuse themselves with the slaughter of hares and partridges, while punishing with heavy fines or imprisonment the killers of badgers and dogs; when they no longer enact laws to protect one animal with hair, and wantonly destroy another that happens to be covered with fur; when they treat with equal humanity a cock-pheasant and a game-cock; then, and not till then, shall I consider them entitled to style themselves "Preventers of Cruelty;" then may they hope to escape the charge of injustice, in punishing the poor and friendless for the very faults which they overlook or applaud in the rich and powerful. Let their motto be,

"Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos."

Before I bring my letter to a close, allow me once more distinctly to repeat my declaration, that in charging your Patrons with the grossest inconsistency

and injustice, I do not mean to accuse them of *wilful* oppression and tyranny. I have no doubt that the hunters and shooters of Windsor and Chatsworth think they are simply advancing the cause of humanity in punishing the baiters of Westminster and cock-fighters of Hillingdon. The persecutors do not see the wrongfulness of their own pursuits, simply because it has never been fairly pointed out to them. The sportsman shoots and hunts because his father and his friends hunted and shot before him: the possibility of his amusements being cruel has never once occurred to him. Just so it was in Great Britain a century ago with respect to slavery. Englishmen had been accustomed to buy and sell Negroes just as they did pigs or poultry; and yet those Englishmen were not perhaps worse people than their grandsons. Whitefield (a sincerely pious Christian, if ever there was one) bought Negroes and worked them, and at his death bequeathed them to—"that elect Lady, that Mother in Israel, that mirror of true and undefiled religion, the Right Honourable Selina, Countess Dowager of Huntingdon." In his will the Negroes stand just midway between his "lands" and his "books and furniture"! But one by one, and little by little, men began to see that the slave-trade was wrong: Sterne said something, and Granville Sharp, and Clarkson, and Wilberforce, said more, and at last most Englishmen were ashamed of what they and their fathers had done as a matter of course; and now every child will tell you that slave-dealing is a

sin. When the thing was pointed out to the people they saw it, but not before: having once clearly seen it, they can never lose sight of it again.

If the Society over which your Lordship presides be really anxious to act up to its title, let it throw aside all that reverence for rank which at present checks its efforts or renders them ridiculous. If cruelty is to be punished, let it be condemned *for its own sake*, not because its effects are sometimes painful to the beholder who happens to have weak nerves: and let it be punished alike in all. In the mean time, let the Society make a better use of its funds than to give away a hundred pounds for an 'Essay on the Animal Creation,' by one who is ignorant of the commonest facts connected with it. Above all, let it beware how it attempts, by well-meant but ignorant interference, to check the progress of a science, whose noble aim it is by mitigating disease to prolong the lives, increase the happiness, and promote the social welfare of mankind.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your obedient Servant,

RICHARD JAMESON.

Leyden,
January 1844.

Printed by R. and J. E. Taylor, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, London.