

that we cannot discern an adequate motive for them. We have no surety that we know all the facts, and if all the facts were as well known to us as to the actors in these dramas, the probability is that the number of "motiveless" acts would be sensibly diminished. Every one of us has an outer life, known to all our associates, and an inner life, the whole of which is known to ourselves alone, though glimpses of it may be imparted to intimate confidential friends. To those who know our outer life only, many of our acts may, nay must, appear "motiveless," although they may have been done after mature deliberation and consultation with our confidants; and if the whole of the inner life were known, it is probable that the residuum of "motiveless" acts would be very small.

Our excellent contemporary, the *Spectator*, founded upon the case of Miss Hickman a plea for the value of confession; not by any means necessarily to an ecclesiastic, but the relief of the overburdened mind by communication of its woes to a sympathetic hearer. Our experience of the working of the human mind, both in order and in disorder, leads us to agree fully with the suggestion.

"Give sorrow words; the grief that does not speak,
Whispers the o'er-fraught heart and bids it break."

If the unfortunate lady, whose fate kept the whole country in anxiety, had had access in the hour of her tribulation to some true and confidential friend, into whose sympathetic ear she could have poured her woes, whatever they were, she would probably be alive now, a healthy, happy, useful member of society. The moral that her unhappy end teaches to us her survivors may be expressed in two words:—Cultivate friendships! We may never need to be extricated from such dire misery as she must have suffered, but who is there that would not be the better, at some time or other, for the services of a good Samaritan who should pour the oil of sympathy into the wounds of fortune?

C. M.

Anti-vivisection.

The case of *Bayliss v. Coleridge* draws attention to the existence in our midst of a considerable class of persons who,

while often estimable and intelligent in the general relations of life, exhibit striking obliquity of mental vision in some special direction.

With those members of the Anti-vivisection Society who merely wish that vivisection should be carefully guarded from abuse, all right-minded persons must agree, but it is a matter for regret that this Society is dominated by a section that desires to entirely prevent physiological research.

These ultra-anti-vivisectionists afford a psychological study of great interest, and the proceedings of the Society yield an invaluable field of research in the pathology of this form of mental variation.

Inconsistency is a prominent characteristic of the ultra-anti-vivisectionist. For example, a prominent member of the Society is, or was, in the habit of holding bird battues, at which, for his personal enjoyment, more animal suffering has been inflicted in one day than could be caused under existing conditions by all the licensed vivisectionists of England in a year.

Nearly every anti-vivisectionist daily partakes of animals killed by a painful wound, inflicted without anæsthetics, and accompanied in the case of pigs by outcries louder than the most imaginative anti-vivisectionist could invent. Hundreds of thousands of animals are thus put in pain, but as the anti-vivisectionist profits by it he raises no protest.

Anti-vivisectionists not uncommonly reduce their pets by injudicious over-feeding to a state of disease, which renders the lives of the unfortunate animals a prolonged torture. Yet the anti-vivisectionist regards their sufferings with sympathetic complacency. It is only when his imagination is hurt by verbal or pictorial exaggerations of vivisection that his indignation is roused; and, as the above illustrations have shown that the existence of real sympathy with animal suffering is very doubtful, the probable motive is a desire to save this imaginative self-feeling.

The effect on the moral character resulting from indulgence in this morbid selfishness may be found in the reports of the Anti-vivisection Society, and is well brought out in the evidence at the recent trial. Perception is so blunted that the most obvious things are not seen, and the matters perceived are perverted by their preconceptions; the statement of facts is often unreliable,⁽¹⁾ but it would be beyond the scope of a brief

note to trace the moral deterioration to the degree in which there is manifested, against those who differ from them, malice, hatred, and all uncharitableness, coupled with an apparent suspension of all sense of honour, fair play, or justice.

In this stage the ultra-anti-vivisectors appear to become reckless. Without knowledge or experience of the value of scientific research, and in face of overwhelming testimony of its usefulness, they are willing to deprive untold myriads of animals and human beings of relief from pain and suffering.

Their anti-social characteristics are shown by their malevolence in trying to injure the hospitals, thereby directly inflicting much suffering on the sick poor. They accuse physicians of the highest character of the vilest motives, one canon of the Church, in his anti-vivisection furor, speaking of persons who even differed in opinion from him as "inhuman devils." The reckless disregard of inflicting personal injury has been well exemplified in the recent trial.

This class of persons is all the more dangerous from its assumption of superior morality, its active verbosity, and its love of notoriety.

The abnormal emotionalism of the ultra-anti-vivisector, which thus overrides reason and the higher moral feelings, is developed by habitual indulgence in emotional excitement, and is communicated by the contagion of sympathy with fellow-sufferers. In this last respect it has some analogy with the emotional epidemics of the Middle Ages.

The suffering and horrors in the illustrated anti-vivisection leaflets are the "dram" of the intemperate emotionalist, while the meetings and lectures, at which "the flesh is made to creep" by histrionic and pictorial displays, are the equivalent of the debauch in more sensual indulgence.

The predisposition to this abnormal emotionalism, like that of the mediæval emotional epidemics, is the deprivation of the normal outlets for feeling. There exist in our midst a large number of unmarried and childless persons whose unsatisfied instincts are vicariously gratified on animal pets, or by the signing of cheques for the relief of suffering with which they have only an abstract acquaintance.

The remedy is that these persons should be brought into direct contact with dependent and suffering humanity; should adopt children in place of animal pets; and should personally

come in contact with the suffering they wish to alleviate, but with which, from over-sensitiveness, they at present spurn all personal contact. If they could be brought face to face, as the physician is, with irremediable suffering, which they earnestly wished to relieve, their point of view would be changed. Helping the inmates of cancer wards or homes for incurables would be most desirable experience for them.

This ultra-anti-vivisectionist class, with its congeners, constitutes a serious danger to society. There can be no reasonable doubt, for example, that the anti-vaccinationists are morally responsible for the deaths of many thousands of helpless children ; while tens of thousands of deaths may be fairly ascribed to the anti-contagious diseases movement ; and if the anti-vivisector were successful, the victims would be still more numerous.

The emotional classes of modern society, however anti-social in the result of their actions, are not really criminal, since they act with a good intent and "mean well."

In spite, therefore, of the anti-vivisector's utter uncharitableness and irritating unverity, pity and sympathy with all human infirmity should actuate scientists to remove their want of knowledge, and to guide their good intentions into channels of real useful activity for suffering humanity.

Scientists are to blame for having stood aloof from these movements, leaving them to fall into the hands of the ultra-cranks, of the notoriety hunters, and of persons actuated even by less worthy motives. A little leaven of real knowledge would have kept them within the bounds in which they should be restricted, and within which they have been useful ; it is even yet not too late to effect this.

(¹) See in this respect a letter to the *Times* of December 11th, 1903, from Mr. Stephen Coleridge, in which he speaks of a leaflet, issued by the National Canine Defence League (a rival anti-vivisection society), as containing "a series of grossly false and misleading statements."

Drug Therapeutics in Asylums.

Clinical observation on the action of medicines, both new and old, is probably one of the most valuable fields for that extension of clinical work so much to be desired in hospitals for the insane.