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 beneficent 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 hu-
man lives”].

The War Council was advised from the ablest
sources available that an immediate appropri-
ation 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 num-
er 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 in-
fected wounds—and practically all wounds
are of this kind—never met with in civil
surgery; to the treatment of “trench
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