

Theology on the *Web*.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

—
VOL. XII.
—

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

old stands out the Abrahamic promise. The fulfilment is working out to-day through the multifold channels of modern opportunity, and under the force of the regenerate affections of living souls directed at this moment upon a living, personal Object, dearer to them than life.

This is the finger of God. Is it fanaticism or enthusiasm to say so? Is it not the verdict of historic reason? Have we not here provably the supernatural? This solid fact of actual missionary enterprise, placed beside the equally solid fact of an anticipation embedded in the oldest literature in the world, is it not as direct a moral evidence of a totally superhuman purpose and energy as our minds are capable of receiving? Let us take once more our Bibles, and turn once more from them to the Missionary Report and the Missionary Atlas, and it will be a means to lift us many degrees above doubt and discouragement into a purer air than the stifling mists of "modern thought;" for in these facts, which lie close beside us, are to be seen the immediate traces of the finger of God.

Facts take precedence of theories; and the great ruling facts of history, of which we have been reviewing one, are on the side of the hope of the soul. Who will may speculate; God works. Deep across a hundred systems of criticism and culture lie traced, if we will only look, the visible footprints of His purposes.

May thoughts in this direction sometimes reanimate, from the mental side, the aims and efforts of friends of Missions at home, and of the honoured messengers among the heathen of the Lord's Name and truth. They are moving along the high road of the main purposes of the plan of God, while they walk and work by the side, and in the strength and life, of Him Who is the world's one hope, and Who is for ever the Son of David, the Son of Abraham.

H. C. G. MOULE.



ART. II.—MAN'S DOMINION OVER THE LOWER ANIMALS NOT UNLIMITED.

IN years now happily long past, a terrible spectacle was sometimes witnessed in England. Bound with cords to a frame of wood, the figure of a living man might be seen extended on his back. Presently the cords were tightened and the limbs of the wretched sufferer were nearly torn asunder. This was

the process known as the rack. The object was to extort from the victim a confession of some crime with which he was charged, or the names of his supposed accomplices, which it was assumed he was concealing, but of which very often he had no more knowledge than his judicial torturers possessed. He told them nothing, for he had nothing to tell.

An abominably cruel proceeding, you will say, and as stupid as it was cruel! Yet not a whit more cruel or stupid than scenes which are occurring continually in the England of to-day. Strapped to a table, a living dog or other animal is subjected, by men professing to be students of science, to tortures more frightful than even the anguish of the inhuman rack; and the professed object is to extort from the quivering muscles, brains, or other organs of the agonized victim some scientific discovery which it is assumed his analogy to the human frame will supply. But, like the human sufferer, he makes no response—he discloses no secret; for his nature has none to tell to that of man. In the language of the eminent Dr. Hoggan before the Royal Commission on Vivisection, “The only point on which these people agree, after all their cruel experiments, is, that what is applicable to the dog is *not* applicable to man.” And so Mr. George Macilwain, F.R.C.S., speaking of those who practise vivisection, says: “They almost universally differ more or less in the conclusions at which they arrive; so on the most ordinarily recognised principles of evidence, we can only accept those on which they agree. Thus reduced, the results are so meagre, and for all practical purposes so useless, that whether we regard the time and labour expended on them—and which, in a certain sense, engage our sympathy and respect—or the almost inconceivable amount of suffering which their mistaken labours have inflicted—at which it is impossible to suppress our regret—we are alike struck by the impossibility of applying them to any useful purpose whatever.”

Thus we are driven to the conclusion stated by Dr. Haughton in his evidence before the Royal Commission: “I believe that a large proportion of the experiments now performed upon animals in England, Scotland, and Ireland are unnecessary and clumsy repetitions of well-known results.” And we have the testimony of such eminent surgeons as Sir William Ferguson and Sir Charles Bell that no gains to science have resulted from vivisection.

Well, then, may we ask: “To what purpose are all these living, sensitive creatures sacrificed? Judging from the evidence of the vivisectors themselves, there is no higher object in the multiplication of these experiments, as where one lecturer had consumed fourteen thousand dogs, than merely to

notice the action of the animals under intense agony. We have all read of the painter of a former age who, in order to depict with greater fidelity the agonies of Christ on the Cross, had a slave crucified in his studio, and calmly watched the changing expressions of anguish depicted on his countenance, in order that he might faithfully reproduce them on his canvas. We look on this as a dreadful crime; but wherein does it differ from the crimes of the vivisectors? "Fiat experimentum in corpore vili," say the modern investigators; and the painter said the same, for in his day a slave occupied no higher place in the estimation of men than a horse or a hound—perhaps not so high, if the hound were a favourite. The vivisectors profess that their object is to elevate science; the painter's aim was to elevate art. It would be difficult to apportion the morality of their acts between the performers under these circumstances.

Indeed, if the principle laid down by the advocates of vivisection be sound—if, irrespective of the suffering which may result, men are justified in adopting any course which they may think proper for the attainment of knowledge of any kind—what is to prevent this world from becoming a Pandemonium, or to limit the field of research to the lower animals? We have already a significant intimation that man may be included within the domain of scientific laws and scientific operators in the doctrine of euthanasia advocated by some medical men in France. If it be lawful to hasten death by some drug, when the physician takes it upon himself to decide that an otherwise painful end is inevitable, what security have we that human life will be held sacred in all other cases?

It is, unhappily, an indisputable fact that the habitual practice of vivisection hardens and demoralizes the heart. "I would shrink with horror," says Dr. Haughton, in the course of his evidence before the Commission, "from accustoming large classes of young men to the sight of animals under vivisection. I believe that many of them would become cruel and hardened, and would go away and repeat those experiments recklessly. Science would gain nothing, and the world would have let loose upon it *a set of young devils*."

Nor can it be said that this branch of study *emolliit mores*, if we may judge by the conduct of the undergraduates at the recent meeting at Oxford, when they received the Bishop of Oxford and Canon Liddon with a storm of yells and shouts, because they presumed to advocate the cause of God's humble and helpless creatures.

It is not, then, a mere morbid imagination or a groundless fear that the practice of vivisection may lead to the most un-

foreseen and terrible consequences. It utterly destroys the God-given sentiment of pity in the human breast. I do not remember ever to have seen so saddening a picture of a human heart steeled into an appalling indifference to the sufferings of God's creatures as the evidence of Dr. Klein given before the Royal Commission affords. In answer to the question, "When you say that you only use them (anaesthetics) for convenience-sake, do you mean that you have no regard at all to the sufferings of the animals?" he replied, "No regard at all." To the further question, "You are prepared to establish that as a principle which you approve?" he replied, "I think that, with regard to an experimenter—a man who conducts special research—he has no time, so to speak, for thinking what will the animal feel or suffer. His only purpose is to perform the experiment, to learn from it as much as possible, and to do it as quickly as possible." And again—"Then for your own purposes you disregard entirely the question of the suffering of the animal in performing a painful experiment?" And to this also he replies, "I do."¹

Let it not be supposed, however, that this witness is singular. No one can read the evidence given before the Royal Commission without seeing with sorrow and some indignation that many men of eminence in the medical profession are actuated, to a greater or less degree, by the same views. None of them, it is true, avowed such revolting sentiments in language equally plain, yet approval is intimated in the various shades of palliation, extenuation, excuse, up to complete justification of the practice of vivisection.

It is no exaggeration to say that the practices thus justified in the name of science include horrors too revolting to describe; all the tortures of the inquisition pale before them. The ingenuity of Mantegazza, the celebrated Italian vivisectionist, which led him to the construction of a terrible machine, enabling him to grip any part of an animal "so as to produce pain in every possible way," can only be described as fiendish.

Once more let us ask for what purpose all this hideous cruelty is inflicted? "I have thought over it again and again," says Sir William Fergusson, "and have not been able to come to a conclusion in my own mind that there is any single operation in surgery which has been initiated by the performance of something like it on the lower animals." "I cannot," he says, "myself understand these experiments as a surgeon. I do not see what value they can be of at all."

¹ I should mention that these questions and answers are taken from the short-hand notes of the Secretary of the Royal Commission, published by their authority.

There is, however, one appalling result of the practice of vivisection which will surely follow. God inculcates kindness to His creatures. Vivisectors "have no time to consider what an animal in their hands will feel or suffer." Thus they substitute a law of their own for God's law. As surely as effect follows cause, they will proceed to set aside God Himself. Is this the language of groundless fear—the offspring of unreasoning apprehension? Let the American Professor, N. K. Davis, in the *North American Review* for March, reply. With a full consciousness of the multiplied torments to which animals are subjected by vivisectors, which he describes, he comes to the conclusion that "before such stupendous advantages to the human race (as vivisection is supposed to bring), the right of the brute to exemption from inflicted pain becomes null. Hence, vivisection is not a trespass, and is not cruel or wrong." I have quoted these words for the purpose of showing that Professor Davis is, without any reservation, an advocate of vivisection. His testimony, therefore, is not that of "a frantic opponent" of the practice. As to the ultimate aim of the vivisectors, he furnishes the following testimony in a passage from the address of a Professor in the Paris School of Medicine, of which, however, even he does not approve; although neither he nor any other physiologist can stem the torrent nor stay its progress when it overflows the limits within which he would confine it:

The true ground (says the French Professor) of our vindication is, that if once we permit moralists and clerics to dictate limitations to science, we yield our fortress into their hands. By-and-by, when the rest of the world has risen to the intellectual level of France, and true views of the nature of existence are held by the bulk of mankind, now under clerical direction, the present crude and vulgar notions regarding morality, religion, Divine providence, Deity, the soul, and so forth, will be swept entirely away, and the dicta of science will remain the sole guides for sane and educated men. We ought therefore to repel most zealously and energetically all attempts to interfere with the absolute right of Science to pursue her own ends in her own way, uninterrupted by Churchmen and moral philosophers, forasmuch as these represent the old and dying world, and we, the men of science, represent the new.

Should we err if we described this as "a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies"?

This is the goal towards which the physiological investigations of the day are inevitably tending. Will not the clergy raise their voices against such teaching at Oxford? They may yet do much to rescue the young men at the University from such baleful doctrines. Mr. Ruskin has set a noble example in resigning the Slade Professorship of Fine Art in consequence of his strong objection to vivisection, and of the recent vote in the Convocation which endowed it. Mr.

Ruskin, in a letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, most distinctly states that his resignation was not on account of his advancing years, to which it had erroneously been attributed, but was placed in the Vice-Chancellor's hands on the Monday following the vote endowing vivisection in the University, solely in consequence of that vote." Here is the spectacle, too seldom witnessed, of an eminent man throwing up a distinguished position for conscience-sake, and for that alone. Mr. Ruskin stood high in the estimation of his fellow-countrymen before. His noble self-sacrifice, on the lofty ground of principle, will raise him still higher, and will doubtless help largely to swell the stream, now happily increasing in volume daily, against the horrors of vivisection.

There are two or three stock cases which are constantly called on to do duty, as evidences of the benefits derived from vivisection, which on examination afford no evidence whatever of that nature. One of these is Hunter's discovery for the relief of aneurism, which is said to have been arrived at by experiments on living animals. Now, that assertion is, to quote the evidence of Mr. Macilwain before the Royal Commission, entirely untrue. Hunter did suggest a method of tying a diseased artery which has been "a very desirable and excellent improvement in the practice of surgery;" but, to quote again the language of Mr. Macilwain, "there was not a single thing in regard to it that he could have discovered in a living animal." And "as animals do not have aneurisms, but only the human subject, it is quite clear that there is not a shadow of a shade of evidence that his discovery was the result of experiments on animals." This testimony is the more valuable as it is that of a medical man of high standing who distinctly states that he does not give it as an opponent of cruelty to animals, but on the ground that vivisection is a fallacy in medical investigation.

A still more untenable claim has been advanced, even in Parliament, to the discovery of galvanism by experiments on living frogs. Dr. Lyon Playfair informed the House that "when Galvani put a copper hook through the spine of living frogs and hung them on the iron rails of his balcony at Bologna, no one could have predicted that this experiment was to establish the science of galvanism and lead to the discovery of electric telegraphs, the electric light, and all the important advantages of motive and curative electricity."

It appears that on a marble slab let into the front of a house in Bologna, is an inscription to the following effect :

In this house, then his temporary dwelling-place, at the beginning of September, 1786, Galvani discovered animal electricity in the dead frog. Fountain of wonders for all ages !

It is not likely that we shall hear much in future of this instance of the vast results of vivisection.

When hard pressed for some better evidence of practical good resulting from vivisection, its advocates have been very fond of quoting Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood as a result of the practice by that celebrated man. We shall not probably hear so much of this instance in the future, since it has been demonstrated that Harvey owed his great discovery not to vivisection, but to anatomical investigations on dead human bodies. Still less shall we probably hear of the recent case of the man from whose head a tumour was removed, the diagnosis which fixed upon its seat and the operation which removed it being both claimed as triumphant results of vivisection. The medical journals, and even the *Times*, sang pæans, over this opportune discomfiture of the narrow-minded anti-vivisectionists—that is for two or three days; when a cruel blow deprived them of their victory—the man died; and worse still, it turned out that for many years the same system of diagnosis had been known and followed, wholly irrespective of any alleged discoveries by vivisectors. Nothing now remained for the prematurely exultant journals but to let themselves down as gently as possible; a disagreeable process, but unavoidable under the circumstances.

The truth is, that the horrors of vivisection are unspeakably great, and the results infinitesimally small. But even if those results were of great intrinsic value, being purchased at the price of so much suffering to the lower animals, it would be necessary to show the mandate of some undisputed paramount authority to warrant the acquisition of knowledge by such means. Who is the paramount authority over all created beings but their Creator? Has He ever delegated to man the right to inflict protracted anguish on His creatures, or on any portion of them—I do not say for the advancement of science, but for any purpose?

It is remarkable that the grant made at the creation, of dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth, did not extend to the permission to kill them for food. Every herb bearing seed, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed, was given to man for meat, but no animal food was included in the grant. For the long period which ensued from that day until the Flood, it is quite clear that man had no permission to kill the lower animals for food. The language of the grant of animal food to Noah is very remarkable. It appears distinctly to recognise the prohibition of animal food by its reference to the previous grant of vegetable food: "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you;

even as the green herb have I given you all things”—that is, the second grant was to be co-extensive with the first; that which was known was to be the measure of the new and unknown permission. And what was the measure? What limit was set to man's dominion? Happily this is settled for us by the very terms of the grant. No controversy can arise as to the object of the grant of herbs and fruits; they could be for one purpose only—for food. And the grant of the animals was for the same purpose—for food only—that is, so far as taking life was involved. This restriction, however, would in no way interfere with the right to use the domestic animals as beasts of burden. It is remarkable that the Septuagint employs the same word in both cases to define the object of the permission: to Adam fruits and vegetables were given for “eating” (*εἰς βρῶσιν*); and to Noah, animals were given for “eating” (*εἰς βρῶσιν*) also. The permission was neither broader nor narrower in one case than in the other. It was strictly tied down to food.

Apart from this necessary use of the lower animals, the whole Scriptures breathe a spirit of tenderness towards them. Why was man forbidden to muzzle the ox as he trod out the corn? Because the merciful Creator would not suffer the animal to be tortured as if by a cup of Tantalus, which ever eluded its grasp and mocked its desires, while treading its weary round of labour.

Nothing could be more sacred than the Sabbath; its observance was enjoined under the most solemn sanctions and the severest penalties. It was the sacred sign of the covenant between God and His people. And yet so tender was His care for even the lowly ox or ass, that if one of these should fall into a ditch on the Sabbath day, the law of the Sabbath was set aside, and the awful sanctions by which its observance was guarded were relaxed, in order that the owner of the animal might rescue it from danger.

If it be said that the use of the lower animals was not confined to food only, inasmuch as great numbers of them were slain in sacrifice, it may be replied that even this required a special permission from God, for we read that He declared in distinct terms, in reference to the blood, which is the life, “I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls.” He who made the law alone could make exceptions to its obligatory force.

It certainly cannot be pleaded that He has made any exception in Scripture in favour of vivisection. Its advocates must therefore look to some other source for their authority. None is left but that of man. And it cannot be denied that they have this. The Act which was passed after the Royal Com-

mission closed its labours might well be entitled an Act for Legalizing and Encouraging Vivisection. It does not profess to prohibit the practice ; its professed aim is to restrain and regulate it. There is no evading the conclusion that by this mode of dealing with the subject a legal status and authority are given to the unspeakable horrors of vivisection, while the half-hearted provisions for regulating its practice and mitigating the sufferings of its wretched victims are only "a mockery, a delusion, and a snare."

The directions of the Act for submitting the animals operated on to anaesthetics are simply complied with or not, as suits the convenience or the whim of the operator. We have the testimony of some of the highest medical authorities that experiments performed while the animal is in a state of anaesthesia are of no value ; to be of any value they must be performed while the animal is in its normal condition. The inspection provided by the Act is a mere farce. Does anyone believe that, under these circumstances, animals are narcotized and *kept* narcotized, especially by medical men who "have no time to think of what the animal may feel or suffer," and who look on sympathy for God's helpless creatures as a narrow-minded and contemptible weakness ? Let anyone read the evidence of vivisectors themselves, given before the Royal Commission, and he must have strong faith indeed to believe it.

The Creator has given no sanction for the infliction of these tortures on His creatures. The Act which gives a human sanction to them should be swept off the statute-book. Nothing less than its absolute repeal should satisfy those who believe that God never gave man permission to wrench life from the lower animals by long-protracted and hideous tortures. Every Christian should lift up his voice against the continuance of such a blot on the fair fame of the land ; and especially should clergymen and ministers of all denominations be earnest in their efforts to help on the God-like work of protecting the dumb brutes who cannot protect themselves.

The extension of knowledge is a most laudable object ; but that extension, even if it were more real and beneficial than the imaginary gains of vivisection, if purchased by trampling on the laws of God, can only end in bringing down a judgment on the land. God is not deaf to the cries of the humblest of His creatures ; we may rest assured that man cannot trample on them with impunity.

P. CARTERET HILL.

