CHAPTER IX

ANTI-VIVISECTION

The anti-vivisectionist movement opposing the use of animals in medical experimentation, owes its beginning in this country, like the animal and child protective movements, to Mr. Henry Bergh. The first attack upon this practice was made by him and opposed by the New York State Medical Society in 1867. In that year Mr. Bergh introduced and obtained the passage of an anti-cruelty act by the New York legislature. The annual convention of the Medical Society of the State of New York was being held at the time when the act came up before the legislature for discussion. Through the influence of the convention, a provision permitting animal experimentation was included, despite the very vigorous opposition and much to the disappointment of Mr. Bergh. This provision was incorporated in the final clause of the act and read: “nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit or interfere with any properly conducted scientific experiments or investigations, which experiments shall be performed under the authority of the faculty of some regularly incorporated medical college or university of the State of New York.”

During the next few years Mr. Bergh’s time and attention were taken up with the work of organizing the American S. P. C. A. and nursing its early development. In 1874, however, he reopened the campaign against vivisection. seek-

1 N. Y. Sess. Laws, 1867, sec. 95.
2 New York Evening Post, Sept. 4, 1874.
ing to bring the American S. P. C. A. with its growing influence to the support of his new project. He carried on an educational propaganda during the next six years, and on January 21, 1880, he introduced into the New York legislature, the first American anti-vivisection bill. It read:

Sec. 1. Every person who shall perform, or cause to be performed, or assist in performing, in or upon any living animal, an act of vivisection, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Sec. 2. The term "vivisection" used in this Act shall include every investigation, experiment, or demonstration, producing, or of a nature to produce, pain or disease in any living animal, including the cutting, wounding, or poisoning thereof, except when the same is for the purpose of curing or alleviating some physical suffering or disease in such living animal, or in order to deprive it of life when incurable.

The medical organizations, not only of New York state, but also of the other states, protested and sent memorials to the New York legislature. The bill was adversely reported in the assembly committee and never came to a vote.

As may be noted in the bill introduced by Mr. Bergh, the term "vivisection", originally implying merely the cutting of a living animal by way of experiment, had come by 1880 to include all scientific investigations upon animals whatsoever, even when such researches or demonstrations involved no surgery of any kind. Since then, the term has acquired a still wider connotation, and the definition of "vivisection" given by one of its recent and most scholarly opponents is "the exploitation of living animals for experiments concerning the phenomena of life".¹

¹ Medical Record, January 31, 1880.
² Ibid., March 31, 1880.
The most natural objection to the practice of vivisection is the pain thereby caused to the animals which are the subjects of experiment. The extreme anti-vivisectionists have long accused medical practitioners of taking a more or less fiendish delight in the sufferings of the animals in their power, and have asserted that their familiarity with the instruments and routine of surgery has obliterated all feelings of sympathy. Moderate opponents of vivisection, passing over such charges as these, point out that there is a necessary minimum of suffering that must be borne by the animals, and which all too often is increased by carelessness and thoughtlessness, rather than viciousness.

Against this necessary and doubtless irreducible animal suffering, defenders of vivisection have placed the benefits accruing to mankind in the perfecting of surgical practice and the greater knowledge of the nature and cures of various diseases. The anti-vivisectionists' retort to this defense has been two-fold. Some question outright whether human beings have the moral right to gain health and freedom from certain physical ailments at the cost of any suffering to animals, no matter how slight the extent of such suffering.\(^1\) This "ethical problem" has been stated: "Is it right to do an evil and abominable thing, fouling our best nature, and degrading us below the level of the beasts of the jungle, 'red in tooth and claw', that we may save our skins for a while?"\(^2\)

In the second place, anti-vivisectionists deny that benefits have accrued to medical science through animal experimentation. In support of this assertion, they quote various

\(^1\) *Vide* testimony of Dr. Hadwin before the subcommittee of the U. S. Senate Judiciary Committee (1921), 62nd Congress, 1st Session, *Hearings on S. 758*, p. 4, et seq.

medical authorities during the past two centuries.\textsuperscript{1} Special protest is made against the practice of vivisection in demonstrations in medical colleges in connection with teaching.

There are not a few anti-vivisectionists who base their denial of the benefits of vivisection on a repudiation of the germ theory of disease. To the doctors' claim that animal experimentation has enabled them to isolate the germs of several diseases and to discover their cures, these opponents reply that the entire germ theory is false and therefore all the animals used in the experimentation had to suffer for a medical delusion.\textsuperscript{2} The president of one of the most important anti-vivisection societies quotes with approval the following excerpt from the speech of an anti-vivisectionist medical practitioner: "The germ theory, which has been worked out by the most refined and long-drawn-out cruelty to sentient animals that has ever disgraced the name of science, is opposed to all of Nature's laws and teachings. It is but a fashion of thinking—first among theorists, and now among the millions of ignorant and misled."\textsuperscript{3}

Anti-vivisectionists are likewise opposed to the use of anti-toxins and serums obtained from animals. They point to the Undoubted pain that the processes for obtaining some serums must cause the animals used. In addition, those who deny the germ theory insist that this pain is suffered for a delusory cause and some make the additional charge that the whole doctrine of inoculation and vaccination is propagated by commercial organizations interested in producing these serums for financial gain. Henry Bergh was the first American anti-vivisection protagonist of the anti-

\textsuperscript{1}Cf. Medical Opinions Against Vivisection, pamphlet issued by the N. Y. Anti-Vivisection Society.

\textsuperscript{2}Vide testimony of Dr. Hadwin, cit. supra, p. 20.

vaccination movement. A recent pamphlet of the Maryland Anti-Vivisection Society states that eminent authorities warn us that all serums and vaccines are a danger to health and not infrequently to life itself. The persistent continuance of this revolting practice can only be explained by the rank commercialism associated therewith and it is beyond dispute that but for commercialism and the superstition of the uninformed, the whole system of inoculating diseased animal matter into the human organism would collapse. The gross selfishness that tempts believers to gain supposed profit for themselves either as a prevention of or cure of disease at the cost of such intense suffering to a sentient being, gagged, bound down, and helpless—indicates the moral depravity inherent among us.

The president of the New York Anti-Vivisection Society said at the London Anti-Vivisection Congress in 1909:

What is the way of salvation? It seems to me that the only real way to freedom, not only for the sub-human but for the human as well, lies in getting away from the unfortunate and mistaken idea of the germ theory of disease, with its filthy inoculations of poison into healthy blood and tissue. Fundamentally, our work and our battle are there. The insanity of serum therapy is increasing so rapidly that soon no one will be safe from the infection of any and every kind of disease; the blood of the children will be impure from the hour of their birth, and the certain sure retrogression of the race is bound to follow, since all these results from serum therapy are cumulative, and we have reached the natural but inevitable result of blood pollution by serum therapy, i. e., a degenerated race.

Just as the attacks upon animal experimentation range from moderate accusations to most radical charges, so do the solutions of the controversy proposed by anti-vivisec-

1 Vide his interesting letter to the New York Tribune, December 18, 1881.
2 New York Herald, July 8, 1909.
tionists. On the one hand is the conservative program suggested by Dr. Leffingwell: "First of all, public opinion should be aroused, not so much to condemn all experimentation upon animals, as to know with certainty the facts about them . . . then a campaign should be waged to register all laboratories and experimenters and to provide that all animals used and experiments made be duly reported on". On the other hand, several anti-vivisection societies desire the total prohibition of animal experimentation and the discontinuance of vaccination under heavy penalties.

The first society opposed to animal experimentation—the American Anti-Vivisection Society—was founded at Philadelphia in 1883. Its object was "the restriction of the practice of vivisection within proper limits, and the prevention of the injudicious and needless infliction of sufferings upon animals under the pretense of medical or scientific research". In 1887 it announced its purpose as the total elimination of all forms of animal experimentation.

The American Society for the Regulation of Vivisection was formed in 1896, and devoted itself to the distribution of anti-vivisection literature. In 1903 this society was merged with the Vivisection Reform Society of Chicago, then incorporated. This compound organization likewise devoted itself almost exclusively to propaganda. At a later period it was merged with the National Society for the Humane Regulation of Vivisection. It stated in its program:

To critics we answer that we realize that vivisection cannot be prohibited at this time. We believe the day will come when science will find a way to do all that is now accomplished by this means, and to do it without recourse to cruelty. In the

1Leffingwell, op. cit., p. 203.
2Leffingwell, op. cit., p. 216.
meantime, we do believe that it is possible to overwhelmingly reduce the number of victims sacrificed by very unscientific experimentors and to insist on the use of such anaesthetics as shall prevent suffering, and that, having served its purpose, the subject shall be put to death painlessly, instead of being allowed to drag out a wretched existence.\(^1\)

In 1898 the Anti-Vivisection Society of Maryland was formed. Its charter was amended in June 1911 and it was reentitled the Maryland Anti-Vivisection Society. Its purpose was now stated as “the protection of animals and human beings from vivisection, inoculation, and cruel and unnecessary experiments for scientific research or for any other reason, and to ascertain the relation of vivisection and experiments upon animals and human beings to science and also its effect upon the character and morals of those who experiment in such ways, and the known deleterious as against the claimed good effects of such practice generally”.

In 1907 the Society for the Prevention of Abuse in Animal Experimentation was organized in Brooklyn.\(^2\) During its existence, this society, together with the New York Anti-Vivisection Society, waged a steady fight to have an anti-vivisection bill passed by the New York legislature. The first of this series of bills was the Francis Bill introduced in 1907 “to prevent cruelty by regulation of experiments on living animals”. Its requirements were: first, institutions conducting experiments must be licensed by the State Board of Health, must be open for inspection, and issue semi-annual reports; secondly, that such experiments must not be for demonstration of fact, must be conducted under general anaesthetic, and the animal must be killed immediately after. In 1908 two similar bills were introduced into the New York assembly. The opposition

\(^1\) *Mercy and Truth*, vol. i, no. 14.

to these bills was most bitter. The medical associations under the leadership of the Medical Society of the State of New York combated all three bills. The newspapers took up the fight, the New York Herald supporting the anti-vivisectionists, and most of the other papers ranged against them.

The next few years saw a vigorous growth of the anti-vivisection movement and likewise the beginning of organization on the part of the medical fraternity to oppose it. The Washington Anti-Vivisection Society was organized in 1908, and began a campaign for anti-vivisection laws in Washington, D.C. The California Anti-Vivisection Society was organized in Los Angeles in the same year. The New York Anti-Vivisection Society and the International Anti-Vivisection Union had amalgamated for better cooperation a few months earlier.

At the annual meeting of the American Medical Association, held in Chicago in June 1908, the subject of attempted restriction was discussed, and a committee of seven was appointed for the defense of freedom in experimentation. ¹ During the next few years, under the auspices of this committee a series of "Defense of Medical Research" pamphlets was issued, thirty in all. By far the larger number of these were devoted to showing the benefits accruing from experimentation in certain fields of medicine and the prevention of disease. A few of them were direct attacks upon the methods and charges of certain anti-vivisection organizations. The Medical Society of the State of New York appointed a committee on Experimental Medicine which likewise issued a series of controversial pamphlets. In defense of their position, the doctors asserted that if there was an ethical problem involved, it was not that humans had no right to benefit from the sufferings of animals, but that

¹McCrea, op. cit., p. 123.
I. Scientific men are under definite obligation to experiment upon animals so far as that is the alternative to random and possibly harmful experimentation upon human beings, and so far as such experimentation is a means of saving human life, and of increasing human vigor and efficiency. II. The community at large is under definite obligation to see to it that physicians and scientific men are not needlessly hampered in carrying on the inquiries necessary for an adequate performance of their important social office of sustaining human life and vigor.¹

Direct attacks were made upon the programs and controversial methods of the anti-vivisection societies themselves. They were accused of "exaggerated statements, repetition of allegations of cruelty which have never been proved or even examined, use of sporadic cases of cruelty to animals in Europe a generation or two ago as if they were typical of the practice in the United States today, refusal to accept the testimony of reputable scientific men regarding either their own procedure, or the benefits that have accrued to humanity and to the brute kingdom itself from animal experimentation, uncharitable judgment varying from vague insinuation to downright aspersion".² It was claimed that a study of the medical authorities quoted by the anti-vivisectionists showed few of them to be established practicing physicians or surgeons, nor fully competent to set themselves up as authorities, and that many of the authorities they quoted had been dead for periods ranging from a few years to a century. More serious were the charges that statements used were misquoted and that when their authors called the attention of the anti-vivisection organizations to this, no change was made, nor were the statements


²Ibid.
withdrawn from circulation. Also it was charged that qualifying statements in the description of experiments (such as the fact that an anaesthetic was used) were suppressed. The antivivisectionists were challenged for appealing to the emotions instead of to the intellect.

The doctors made direct statement of their own position:

In the first place, the investigators object to any step tending to check the use of animals for medical research. They maintain that such interference is not justified by the present treatment of the experimental animal. They declare that the imagined horrors of medical research do not exist. The insane lust for blood, the callousness to the infliction of pain, which are attributed to the experimentors, they resent as most absurd and unjust accusations. Only the moral degenerate is capable of inflicting the torment that the antivivisectionists imagine. No one who is acquainted with the leaders in medical research, who are responsible for the work done in the laboratories, can believe for a moment that they are moral degenerates. The medical investigators further maintain that judgment should be based on knowledge, not ignorance. They rightly insist that their critics are ignorant—ignorant of the conditions of medical research and ignorant of the complex relations of the medical sciences to medical and surgical practice, and they contend that these critics in their ignorance are endeavoring to stop that experimental study of physiology and pathology.¹

In reply to the demand that experimental laboratories be opened to investigation, direct refusal was made, the doctors insisting that inspection of laboratories would not satisfy the antivivisectionists, who looked upon this as the first step towards complete prohibition of the practice. The representatives of antivivisection societies who conducted such inspection would be untrained, and would feel it their

duty to find "horror" where such did not exist. As proof of good will, however, and to defend the medical profession against the charges of the antivivisectionists, the Committee on Protection of Medical Research of the American Medical Association formulated a code of laboratory procedure which was formally adopted by medical schools, research institutes and health laboratories and posted so as to be visible to all workers in the laboratories.\footnote{1}{Dr. W. B. Cannon in \textit{Defense of Medical Research} pamphlet no. xvi (1909).} \footnote{2}{"I. Vagrant dogs and cats brought to this laboratory and purchased here shall be held at least as long as at the city pound, and shall be returned to their owners if claimed and identified. II. Animals in the Laboratory shall receive every consideration for their bodily comfort; they shall be kindly treated, properly fed, and their surroundings kept in the best possible sanitary condition. III. No operations on animals shall be made except with the sanction of the Director of the Laboratory, who holds himself responsible for the importance of the problems studied and for the propriety of the procedures used in the solution of these problems. IV. In any operation likely to cause greater discomfort than that attending anaesthetization, the animal shall first be rendered incapable of perceiving pain and shall be maintained in that condition until the operation is ended. Exceptions to this rule will be made by the Director alone and then only when anaesthesia would defeat the object of the experiment. In such cases an anaesthetic shall be used so far as possible and may be discontinued only so long as is absolutely essential for the necessary observations. V. At the conclusion of the experiment the animal shall be killed painlessly. Exceptions to this rule will be made only when continuance of the animal's life is necessary to determine the result of the experiment. In that case, the same aseptic precautions shall be observed during the operation and so far as possible the same care shall be taken to minimize discomforts during the convalescence as in a hospital for human beings."}

The deans and directors of the laboratories also consented at the same time to admit at all times officials of humane societies in order that the latter might acquaint themselves with the actual conditions under which animal experimentation is being conducted. (The antivivisectionists claim that the spirit of this agreement has not been lived up to.) \textit{Cf. The First Public Declaration of the Open Door in Laboratories for Animal Experimentation} (1922) published by the Blue Cross Society of Springfield, Mass. C\textit{f}. also editorial in \textit{Journal of the American Medical Association}, June 10, 1922.
In some cases active steps were taken to combat the propaganda of the anti-vivisection societies. In New York in February 1914, the anti-vivisection booth was excluded from the Women's Industrial Exhibition in the Grand Central Palace upon the protest of several medical organizations, although it had been permitted in former years. Similar exclusions were made at other exhibits.

This opposition added to the ardor of the anti-vivisectionists. Under the influence of Mr. Stephen Coleridge, an English anti-vivisectionist who visited this country in 1910, American opponents of animal experimentation swung from the advocacy of regulation to abolition. In the winter of 1909 the New York Herald published a series of revelations of former employees of the Rockefeller Institute relative to horrors which they asserted were perpetrated there. On the crest of this wave of excitement, the New York Anti-Vivisection Society announced its 1910 bill to be introduced into the New York legislature.

The year before, the Murray-Brough Bill had introduced an innovation by providing for a board of inspection whose members should be chosen by anti-vivisection societies and appointed by the State Board of Regents. This was the bill reintroduced in 1910 by the New York Anti-Vivisection Society. At the same session, the Goodspeed-Bayne bill was introduced, providing also for an inspection commission, whose membership in this case specifically included two scientists, two anti-vivisectionists, two lawyers and one member at large, all to serve without compensation. Both bills were actively opposed by the state medical association and were defeated.

In 1911 both of the 1910 bills were reintroduced. To these a third was added, the Griffin Bill, which provided for an amendment to Section 185 of the Penal Code (pun-

1New York Herald, February 6, 1914.
ishing cruelty to animals) to read: “In all cases where animals are subjected to operation, mutilation, experimentation, treatment or tests involving pain, which, were the operation, experiment, or test performed on human beings, anaesthetics would be administered, the animal shall first be properly and fully anaesthetized, and if, when the operation is completed, its further existence would entail pain and suffering, it shall forthwith be put to death.” All three bills failed to pass.

From 1911 to 1923, one or more of these three bills has been introduced into each session of the New York legislature. Some of these have contained slight variations from the types noted: the McClellan Bill of 1913, similar in other respects to the Goodspeed-Bayne measure, provided for a commission of only five members; the Herrick Bill of 1914 provided that a commission of seven should investigate experimentation upon children as well as upon animals; the Boylan Bill of 1920, modeled upon the already-mentioned Griffen Act, prohibited experiments upon living dogs. During the last three years, the Boylan Bill has been introduced into each session. A bill introduced by Senator Cotillo in 1923 modeled on the Boylan Bill prohibited experiments on children. All of these bills were defeated in committee, except one or two of the earlier ones which were killed by legislative vote.

In 1909 the first anti-vivisection exhibit was held in July at Atlantic City. The exhibit consisted of stuffed animals represented as undergoing various types of torture under the surgeon’s knife, and pain-producing apparatus reputed to be used in the course of experiments. The exhibition was repeated in New York in November of the same year under the auspices of the New York Anti-Vivisection Society. In 1910 it was held in Baltimore; in 1911 in Boston, Philadelphia and Los Angeles; and since then it has been repeated in many of the large cities.
In 1910 anti-vivisection became an issue in the American S. P. C. A. In that year the board of managers declared it the duty of the Society to draw public attention to vivisection, to cause state authorities to investigate, "and hereafter, to try to secure the passage of legislation which, while not prohibiting entirely such animal experimentation, will penalize all acts which are properly characterized as cruel"; and to limit the practice and to place it under the supervision and control of the State. The Society supported the Murray-Brough and the Goodspeed-Bayne bills of 1910, 1911 and 1912. Since then, however, the American S. P. C. A. has confined itself to enforcing the statute against unauthorized animal experimentation (not under the supervision of some medical college or foundation), feeling that any campaign for further restriction can best be left to anti-vivisection societies specifically incorporated for that purpose.

In 1911 there occurred an epidemic of charges by the antivivisection societies that colleges were stealing animal pets or paying for stolen animals to be used in their laboratories. Accusations were made against Harvard, Wellesley, Vassar and Barnard among others. Several newspapers and magazines now actively championed the cause of anti-vivisection. The New York Herald stood foremost among the daily papers which gave wide publicity to these charges. The Boston Post and the New York Globe were very sympathetic. Life and Vogue among the magazines were favorably inclined.

In 1912 the Vivisection Investigation League made public a report which accused doctors of the Rockefeller Institute.

1This announcement, published in all the New York papers, was not included in the 45th Annual Report (1910) of the Society.

2What Vivisection Inevitably Leads To, pamphlet published by the Vivisection Investigation League, New York.
of infecting one hundred and forty-six persons of pure blood, "many of them children between the ages of two and eighteen years", with the virus of syphilis. This charge was too serious to go uninvestigated and President John D. Lindsay of the New York S. P. C. C. called it to the attention of District Attorney Charles Whitman of New York City. After consultation with the doctors of the Institute and an investigation into the nature of the experiment, the District Attorney's office issued a statement that the inoculations for the purpose of testing for the presence of the disease were "rendered absolutely innocuous by treatment", and that it was certain that no person had been harmed by them.

This controversy raised the whole question of "human vivisection", which until then had received little attention from either the public or the anti-vivisectionists. In the term "human vivisection" the anti-vivisectionists included "every experiment upon a living human being for any other purpose than his individual benefit, unless such experiment is positively known to be free from discomfort, distress, pain or danger to health or life; or unless it is made with the full and intelligent consent of the person experimented upon".

Four groups of cases are included in the anti-vivisectionists' charges of human vivisection. The most important are those against the Rockefeller institute mentioned above. Reference is also made to two sets of experiments made in 1908 and 1910 in the use of tuberculin tests for the pre-

3 The report of District Attorney Whitman has never been accepted by the anti-vivisectionists, and the Vivisection Investigation League still publishes the original account of the Rockefeller Institute experiments which it issued in 1912.
sence of tuberculosis. Lumbar-puncture tests made in 1896 which determine the efficacy of the anti-menigitis serum are also used as illustrations, and finally, the “Rafferty case” —a series of experiments made in 1874 upon the brain of an Irish servant girl—is pointed to.1

Discussion of these charges of human vivisection gave impetus to the formation of the Interstate Conference for the Investigation of Vivisection, created in 1912 to give the anti-vivisection movement a national character. The groups that organized it were the Society for the Humane Regulation of Vivisection (Washington, D.C.), the American Anti-Vivisection Society (Philadelphia), the New England Anti-Vivisection Society (Boston), the Society for the Prevention of Abuse in Animal Experimentation (Brooklyn), the New York Theosophical Anti-Vivisection Society (New York) and the Vivisection Investigation League (New York). Shortly after, the Convention was joined by the New Jersey Vivisection Investigation Society (Newark) and the Maryland Anti-Vivisection Society (Baltimore). The federation was composed of “societies, either opposed to vivisection or any cruelty in the practice thereof, which shall meet triennially, or at such other intervals as may prove desirable, for the purpose of discussing methods and results, or to take such action as is deemed advisable.” The Interstate Conference has grown in adherents during the past decade and now is supported by thirty-two societies, and also by a limited individual membership of its own. It follows an opportunist program for the amelioration of animal experimental conditions, studies the reports of hospitals and medical examinations, and sends excerpts of these to different anti-vivisection and animal protective societies.

1 Full accounts of these cases appear in the Human Vivisection series of pamphlets published by the Vivisection Investigation League (New York).
In 1913 a bill came up in the Pennsylvania legislature providing that any official of a dog pound refusing to sell unclaimed animals to medical schools or institutions, should be guilty of a misdemeanor. The Pennsylvania humane societies opposed the bill, the state federation making a special issue of it. It was killed by amendment. On the strength of this, the American Anti-Vivisection Society the next day introduced a house bill to prohibit animal vivisection and a senate bill to prevent "human vivisection". Both bills were killed in committee.

Following this failure, the Pennsylvania anti-vivisectionists brought charges of cruelty against members of the medical staff of the University of Pennsylvania, and obtained indictments against five. The trial was concluded in April 1914, the jury disagreeing. Thereupon the anti-vivisection societies of the country made plans to bring cruelty charges against all prominent surgeons who engaged in experimentation. This program was never carried through. Until this period the Pennsylvania anti-cruelty societies and the American Anti-Vivisection Society had worked in cooperation. The trial of the University of Pennsylvania surgeons brought about a split between them which has never been healed.

In 1914 the New Jersey Vivisection Investigation Society succeeded in preventing the establishment of a Rockefeller Foundation research institute in that state. The next year a bill authorizing the establishment of the institution was passed over the protest of the anti-vivisectionists.

In 1915 the California Anti-Vivisection Society obtained the passage of a bill to prohibit experimentation in schools below a certain grade and to provide for the right of search and inspection of experimental laboratories. The attorney-general and a committee of lawyers assured the governor that it would be unconstitutional and he killed it with a pocket veto.
In 1916 a bill was introduced into the national congress directing the Secretary of Agriculture to "examine into the extent and conditions of the practice of experimentation on living animals in laboratories for research and in hospitals and other establishments, and in the commercial production of serums and vaccines for sale, for the purpose of ascertaining whether such experiments and practices are attended with unnecessary and preventable suffering arising from useless repetitions of experiments, want of proper skill in the experimenters, non-use of anaesthetics, and the absence of proper care of the animals upon which such experiments or operations are conducted"; the bill perished in committee. This was not the first anti-vivisectionist measure to be introduced into the National Congress. In 1900, hearings were held before the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia on a bill to prohibit animal experimentation in the District; no action was taken. In 1920 still another such bill was introduced "to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia or in any of the Territorial or insular possessions of the United States and providing a penalty for the violation thereof"; this bill likewise died in committee.

With the entry of the United States into the World war and the concentration of troops in the training camps, the anti-vivisection societies protested against the compulsory inoculation of the soldiers, alleging that the training-camp mortality was due to this cause. In February 1918 the New York Anti-Vivisection Society submitted a request to Secretary of War Baker "that the present medical rule of compulsory inoculation be rescinded, and that it be left to the free will of each soldier as to whether his health and life shall be endangered by an operation, which, in actual
experience, has resulted in deplorably affecting the strength and availability of our national army, and occasioned unnecessary loss to thousands of American families, who have bravely offered their young manhood to our beloved country.”

In the winter of 1917 the National Red Cross announced that it had been requested by the U. S. War Department to make investigations into the nature and prevention of trench fever. For this purpose it proposed to set aside $100,000 of its general fund. As this investigation would avowedly necessitate experiments on animals, the anti-vivisection societies, with the Christian Science Monitor as their most active organ, protested. A special fund was contributed by interested persons to make the necessary investigations, and thus the need to draw upon the general funds of the organization was obviated.

Since the War the anti-vivisection movement has gained strength in the West. The Minnesota Anti-Vivisection League was organized in November 1918. The next year the California Federation of Anti-Vivisection Societies was formed, composed of the California Anti-Vivisection Society of Los Angeles, the San Francisco Anti-Vivisection Society and the Alameda County Anti-Vivisection Society. They introduced an anti-vivisection bill as a referendum measure in the elections of 1920. It failed as did a similar measure in 1922.

In 1921 the Washington Humane Education and Anti-Vivisection Society was organized; in its by-laws it stated that a part of its purpose was “to study the practice of vivisection, its relation to science, and its effect upon those who practice it and upon society; to expose and oppose secret or painful experiments upon living animals, inmates of charity hospitals, foundling institutions, asylums.”

1 Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 17, 1918.
Referendum measures similar to those of California failed in Colorado and Louisiana in 1921.

Recently there has been strong opposition in some quarters to the activities of the anti-vivisection organizations. The Blue Cross Society of Springfield, Mass., while campaigning for the "Open Door" in laboratories, has been far more severe in its criticism of anti-vivisectionist tactics than of the practices of animal experimentors. Its publication, The First Public Declaration of the Open Door in Laboratories for Animal Experimentation (1922), containing letters from directors of the medical schools and experimental foundations assuring their adherence to the policy of the Open Door, amounts to a refutation of many of the accusations of more radical anti-vivisection organizations.

In the July 1921 number of the Woman's Home Companion, there appeared an article entitled "The Truth About Vivisection" by Ernest Harrold Baynes criticizing the anti-vivisection literature and defending the work of animal experimentors. Later in the year, after an address by Mr. Baynes in Boston which was highly critical of antivivisectionist activities, an organization for the defence of animal experimentation was formed. This remained in a rudimentary form until 1923 when it incorporated in Massachusetts as "The Society of Friends of Medical Progress". It gave as its purposes:

(1) To encourage and aid all research and humane experimentation for the advancement of medical science; (2) To inform the public of the truth concerning the value of scientific medicine to humanity and to animals; (3) To resist the efforts of the ignorant or fanatical persons or societies constantly urging legislation dangerous to the health and well-being of the American people.\(^1\)

\(^1\)The Society of Friends of Medical Progress, Why It Was Founded (1923).
The organization proposes to issue pamphlets and literature to confute anti-vivisectionist claims, and to oppose the efforts of anti-vivisection societies to obtain legislation restricting animal experimentation.

The vehemence with which the anti-vivisection organizations have directed their charges against animal experimentors, and the bitterness of the retorts of the latter, have given the controversy the appearance of greater importance than it deserves; there can be no question of the sincerity of the anti-vivisectionists, though intemperance of language and acts must often be deplored. Nevertheless they have not accomplished the objects they originally aimed at—not even during the past decade when their activity has been at its highest—although they must be credited with having aroused great interest in a subject previously ignored by laymen.

The anti-vivisection controversy, by bringing forward the ethical issue in animal experimentation, has aroused a not inconsiderable minority against the practice. But this anti-vivisectionist support has not proved sufficient to cause the passage of legislation specifically to limit the practice. State legislatures have consistently refused to take any steps to this end, and in the few cases where the issue has come up for popular decision, the verdict has each time been against the anti-vivisectionists.

Against these negative accomplishments of the anti-vivisectionist campaign must be set the fact that not only have medical organizations been goaded to retaliatory efforts, but non-professional organizations have joined with them in combating the propaganda of anti-vivisection. Some of the larger life-insurance companies have contributed both money and efforts to defeat anti-vivisection measures before various legislatures and in the national Congress. Finally, the new organization, the "Society of the Friends of Medical Progress", represents a growing disapproval, if not of the aims, then of the methods of anti-vivisectionism.