

attitude the calmness of conscious moral strength ; but arrogant and ignorant opponents, who became puffed up and insolent.

The fearless challenge to these persons and the exposure of their methods produced a great effect upon the Congress as a whole, and even produced something like a panic among the antivivisectionists themselves. Those of them who are unaccustomed to the restraints of good manners, who are aware of no obligations in respect of truthfulness, and who feel themselves at liberty to indulge their tempers by reckless aspersions upon others, have been dismayed, not by the revelation of their own hollowness—of this, unfortunately, they cannot judge—but by the discovery that they are not always to be treated with contempt, but at due times with chastisement. Of these people we hope nothing and fear nothing ; we look entirely to that great body of men who happily preserve an equitable mind ; and we note with as much pleasure as surprise that among these a marked re-action has taken place ; the current quips at the expense of physiologists have ceased, and an impression is abroad that the case of the physiologists is stronger and that of the abolitionists far weaker than they had supposed.

For such readers—readers open to moral and rational conviction—Dr. Ruffer's paper is well fitted. On the whole it is as dispassionate as it claims to be, but we think such phrases as the "unscrupulousness of professional agitators and so forth," are better henceforth avoided ; many thoughtful and scrupulous men are opposed to us in this matter ; if there were not the agitators would soon disappear.

Dr. Ruffer sets forth the well known arguments with care and point. He repeats that if therapeutics are to advance, and advance must be (1) by experiment upon man, or (2) by experiment upon animals ; and that new methods and agents are not to be tried on man until we gain upon animals some knowledge of their working. "In the end," he says, "the experiment must be made on man, but when this is done let us have all the trumps in our hands." The author deals next, and deals ably, with the very proper objection, that we cannot argue from the lower animals to man. Dr. Ruffer seems to us to answer this objection sufficiently ; some of his freshest sentences are those in which he shows, amid the many superficial differences of pathological processes in living creatures of various classes, that "at bottom, life, both in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, is influenced in the same way by the same reagents." This proposition Dr. Ruffer illustrates by effective instances. Dr. Ruffer also enforces the tremendous truth that "a year's delay in any advance of medicine really means the sacrifice of thousands of lives." That experiments upon living animals do aid us largely in interpreting the laws of life and

death, Dr. Ruffer of course re-asserts, but we believe this point is no longer contested ; the antivivisectionists—we mean our thoughtful and considerate opponents—now stand on the plain issue that, granting any success of the method, the means are not justifiable. This, if we mistake not, is the position of the *Spectator*. To us there can be but one reply to such a proposition.

Dr. Ruffer could not overlook the repartees about the butchers and the sportsmen ; perhaps his paper would have been incomplete without them, well worn as they are. Yet we must admit these retorts do not touch the heart of the matter, being of the nature of mere *tu quoques*, that is, effective in a polemical and not in a philosophic sense. The meditative man may effectively reply that butchers and sportsmen are survivals of barbarism whom he does not defend, or whom he will leave for the present out of the question ; that shooting and hunting are becoming every year more difficult of attainment, and are being largely supplanted by athletic sports ; or, again, that vivisection revolts his conscience, while hunting and shooting do not ; his conscience being, so far as he is aware, in a healthy state.

It is some answer to this objector to contend that use and wont are largely concerned both in the direction of public opinion and in the formation of the private conscience, and that aversion from vivisection will diminish when the public are as used to it as they are to the infinitely greater liberties of the sportsman. Still, this answer is not sufficient ; an aversion is felt by reasonable people, which is stronger than mere unwontedness can account for ; and how comes this state of feeling ? The explanation is no doubt this : that ordinary men take short views of things, and even imaginative men, like Tennyson, for instance, take short views of things of which they know nothing. This may not lie in lack of imagination, but in that their ideas are, in certain directions, unformed.

A bishop wants a strong voice ; animal food produces a strong voice ; then, says the bishop's wife, let a sufficient number of proper animals be killed for the bishop at once. A country man has a wholesome passion for fresh air, exercise, and adventure, and he is a lover of Nature ; to hunt a fox satisfies these passions, so the fox is hunted accordingly. "Sensible men" especially take short views of life, and "sensible men" see at once that the end attained is well worth the sacrifice. On the other hand, the physiologist does not by the sacrifice of an animal bring direct aid there and then to a certain person ; he may sacrifice the animal and other animals month after month, and year after year, with no immediately obvious service ; the physiologist takes a far longer view of his part of life than the ordinary man does or can do. His imagination is fixed upon great