THE RED CROSS AND THE ANTI-VIVISECTIONISTS:

AN APPEAL TO THE FAMILIES AND FRIENDS OF OUR HEROIC TROOPS AND TO THE COMMON SENSE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

First of all let me make two facts clear.

1. This paper has been written entirely on my own responsibility and not at the suggestion directly or indirectly of the Red Cross. I have been moved to write it solely in the interest of our brave soldiers, and especially because their sufferings and lives are involved in the suit against the Red Cross by the antivivisectionists to prevent the use of $100,000 of the Red Cross funds in such beneficial life-saving researches.

2. The Red Cross as an organization is neither an opponent, nor an advocate, nor a defender, of vivisection. It states officially that the supreme aim of the Red Cross is to relieve human suffering [and it might well have added “and to save thousands of human lives”].

The War Council was advised from the ablest sources available that an immediate appropriation for medical research would contribute to that end. The War Council could not disregard such advice.

They then refer to the many unsolved medical and surgical problems that have arisen from wholly new conditions and methods of warfare. Letters from a number of my own surgical friends in France emphasize and the medical journals teem with papers on these new problems. They relate to the treatment of the horribly infected wounds—and practically all wounds are of this kind—never met with in civil surgery; to the treatment of “trench