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TO OUR READERS.

Inquiry as concerns Vaccination has of late made extraordinary progress; and the assiduity wherewith Anti-Vaccinators are admonished by the newspapers, whilst every argument in favour of Vaccination is emphasised and magnified, affords unmistakable evidence of a growing disturbance of public opinion. The advocacy of "pure lymph from the calf," by Sir Thomas Watson and others, as a substitute for arm to arm inoculation, with the frank and even profuse confession of the dangers which attend the existing practice, is conclusive proof that the medical conscience is ill at ease—a phenomenon of alarming significance.

It is felt by many who love liberty, and by others who are likewise convinced that Vaccination is injurious, that the time has come for an energetic and persistent endeavour to amend the law. Some who are not without faith in the efficacy of Vaccination recognise the injustice of enforcing it on those who are persuaded that it is a foul superstition, and who, having surrendered the claim to persecute for theological heresy, are in no wise disposed to compound for toleration on one side by persecution for medical heresy on the other. Again, there is an increasing number of thoughtful people who dispute the validity of Jenner’s claim, who dispute the efficacy of Vaccination as a defence against Small-pox, and who dispute the theories whereby Vaccination is justified, and the accuracy of the statements and statistics whereby it is sustained.

Especially is it desirable to draw the attention of the public to the cruel inequity of the existing Vaccination Law. No child need ever be vaccinated if only the fines for the non-performance of the rite are paid. A rich man pays these fines with ease, but on a poor man their infliction falls with crushing effect: and among the poor are numerous intelligent, conscientious, and inflexible Anti-Vaccinators. Mr. Pease has made a praiseworthy attempt to redress the inequality of the law, and has been supported by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Bright, and Sir Thomas Chambers; but our plutocratic Parliament is indifferent to such wrongs, and it is only by well-directed agitation that a change in the law can be achieved.

The question of Compulsory Vaccination is no trifling matter. It is the initiation of an order of legislation wherein it is asserted the laity have no concern, inasmuch as they can have no proper knowledge; that it is for medical experts to decide what the Government should enforce, and for the people to submit like well-behaved children. Thus we learn from the medical journals that the compulsory vaccination of infants is only partially effective, and must in due season be supplemented by the compulsory periodical re-vaccination of adults. The Contagious Diseases Act (Women), is a logical develop-
ment of the same principle; and in like manner we are calmly informed that the regulations which now prevail over certain garrison towns will presently be extended to the whole country. In short, we have in these measures a foretaste of what medical despotism has in store for us, if only we are sufficiently docile and acquiescent.

A constant difficulty in the advocacy of the abolition of Compulsory Vaccination is the profession of ignorance. Members of Parliament meet argument with asserting, “What you say may be true, but we have not looked into the question. We have had what we considered good professional advice, and have acted upon it. It is possible that we have been mistaken, but it is for you to prove that we have been led astray.”

To supply that proof, and to maintain and enforce it, we have determined to commence the issue monthly of The Vaccination Inquirer. Therein, the physiological, legal, and social aspects of Vaccination will be fully discussed, with the distinct purpose of influencing politicians, physicians, and the press. We do not conceal from ourselves how largely and how ably the task we propose has been already accomplished; but there is ample room for many labourers in the good cause, and we are confident that The Inquirer will stimulate and sustain all kindred efforts and energies.

It is sometimes observed that opponents of Vaccination are extravagant in their statements and utterances; and, if we allow that their rough-handed treatment by the magistracy, and the scorn of educated ignorance, afford reasonable excuse for vehemence, yet nowhere is violence less necessary than in a controversy where truth is palpable to those who will look for it with their own eyes, and where the law is manifestly at variance with that respect for personal conviction and personal rights which is the supreme grace of modern civilization. The spirit of the times is with us, if only we know how to appeal to it and have the courage to trust it; nevertheless we do not deceive ourselves as to the arduous character of the contest before us; for Vaccination, with the majority of people, has become an article of faith which it is profane to question; but to reason, with patience, all things are possible; and with reason and patience we propose to attack that vicious legislation which inflicts a loathsome operation on the willing and the unwilling, until the law is either essentially modified or repealed.

To the pages of The Inquirer some who have made Vaccination the study of years, will contribute; and, it is expected, on the other hand, that not a few who are persuaded of the benefits of Vaccination, will vindicate the practice. Our confidence in our position will enable us to entertain adversaries with composure, and, we trust, to deal with them effectually. “Truth, like a torch, the more it’s shook it shines.”

ATROCITY OF VACCINATION.—To infuse into our children’s blood corrupt matter, in which no physician on earth can know or guess what evil may lurk, is simple infatuation. Tampering with the blood is an abomination. To recommend it is enough to lay low the credit of any medical man. To command it is a gross usurpation in a legislative body. So long as our bodies are healthy, Parliament has no right to command assault upon them under the pretext of public health. To punish parents for struggling to keep their children’s blood inviolate, is a form of tyranny unheard of until modern times, and emphatically disgraceful as it is impious.—F. W. Newman.

CALF LYMPH WORSE THAN HUMAN LYMPH.—Speaking of vaccination direct from animals, Dr. Seaton (Handbook of Vaccination, p. 887,) observes, “The difficulties of applying such a plan to the vaccination of the general population are, I apprehend, quite insuperable.” He goes on to say, “There is no one in England whose opinion on this subject will be received with so much respect as Mr. Ceely’s, because there is no one who has nearly the knowledge that he possesses of the disease in the cow and of its transplantation to the human species. He looks upon this proceeding as not only open to the objections of impracticability, as applied to the general population, and of unsucceess; but he says, also, that so far from being likely to produce fewer ailments and cutaneous eruptions in the predisposed, he knows from his experience that it would, as being more irritating, produce more.”
THE VACCINATION INQUISITOR.

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER I.

COTTON MATHER AND ZABDIEL BOYLSTON.

To the Turks we owe little, and in the little is included the practice of inducing small-pox artificially. The practice was first brought under English attention by Emanuel Timoni in a letter, dated Constantinople, December, 1718, communicated to the Royal Society by Dr. Woodward, and published in the Society's Transactions for 1714.* About the same time, Pylarini, Venetian consul at Smyrna, described the practice in a Latin pamphlet printed at Venice, 1715,† and reprinted in the Philosophical Transactions for 1716. Mr. Kennedy, an English surgeon, who had visited Turkey, also reported the practice under the designation of "Engrafting the Small-pox."‡

Timoni was a Greek physician, who had studied at Oxford and Padua, and then established himself in Constantinople. He described "small-pox by incision" as having been practised in Constantinople for forty years, and that it had been found uniformly successful in warding off small-pox as naturally developed. The various matter was usually taken from healthy boys suffering from the spontaneous disease, and was applied to persons of all ages and temperaments, causing them no more than temporary and trifling inconvenience. The only preparation requisite for incision was abstinence from flesh and broth for twenty or twenty-five days.

It so happened that when Woodward read Timoni's letter to the Royal Society, he at the same time produced a selection from the correspondence of Cotton Mather of Boston, Massachusetts—a curious jumble of facts and fancies. Mather had been elected a Fellow of the Society, and the selections from his correspondence, and Timoni's letter appeared in the same number of the Transactions, No. 398, 1714.

Cotton Mather is one of the marvels of biography—a choice specimen of Puritanism developed without check. He was a man of boundless energy and incessant industry, of intense piety, and unlimited self-confidence; and thus, without hesitation, he set himself to extirpate witchcraft, shrinking from no atrocity, until the frightful Salem tragedy of 1692 shocked the colony into mercy and common-sense.

Mather was just the sort of character to be impressed with Timoni's description of the short and easy way with small-pox; and he who had hanged warlocks and witches with sublime assurance, was not likely to have scruples about inoculating the community when inwardly satisfied it was for the public good. The audacity and tyranny of conscientious conceit are proverbial. He had, however, to exercise patience in awaiting an opportunity to test the Turkish remedy, for there had been no small-pox in Boston for nineteen years—a fact worth noting by those who imagine small-pox was an omnipresent ailment until the advent of Edward Jenner. In 1721 a serious outbreak occurred, the deaths rising in October to 100 a week in a population of 16,000. Mather convoked a meeting of physicians, and laid before them the Mahometan prescription, but they would not listen to it. Dr. Boylston, however, was persuaded, and inoculated two of his slaves, and then his sons, aged five and six; whereon he was summoned before the justices and severely reprimanded. Undeterred by the State, and supported by the Church, he persevered, and by the end of September had inoculated 80, and by the middle of December, 250.

His custom was to make a couple of incisions in the arms into which bits of lint dipped in pox-matter were inserted. At the end of twenty-four hours the lint was withdrawn, and the wounds dressed with warm cabbage leaves. On the seventh day the patient sickened and pustules appeared, sometimes few, sometimes hundreds. Mather and Boylston maintained it was a most wholesome operation, for after it "feeble, crazy, consumptive people, grew hearty, and got rid of their former maladies." To be poxed was to be rejuvenated.

Cotton Mather's own account of the Boston experiment is worth reading. He wrote—

"March 10th, 1724.

"The distemper hath lately visited and ransacked the City of Boston; and in little more than half a year, of more than 6000 persons that have undergone it, near 900 have died. But how many lives might have been saved if our unhappy physicians had not poisoned and bewitched our people with a blind rage that it has appeared very like a Satanic Possession against the method of relief and safety in the way of the small-pox inoculated!


"I have prevailed with one physician (and for it I have had bloody attempts made upon my life by some of our Enemogens) to introduce the practice; and the experiment has been made upon almost 800 Objects in our neighbourhood, young and old (from one year to seventy), weak and strong, male and female, white and black, in midsummer, autumn, and winter, and it succeeds to admiration!

"I cannot learn that one has died of it; though the experiment has been made under various and marvellous disadvantages. Five or six have died upon it, or after it, but from other diseases or accidents; chiefly from having taken infection in the common way by inspiration before it could be given in this way of transplantation.

"Dr. Leigh, in his Natural History of Lancashire, counts it an occurrence worth relating, that there were some cattie known to catch the small-pox, and pass regularly through the state of it, and then to die. We had had among us the very same occurrence.

"It was generally observed and complained that the pigeon-houses of the City continued unfruitful, and the pigeons did not hatch or lay as they used to do all the while that the small-pox was in its epidemical progress: and it is very strongly affirmed that our dung-hill fowl felt much of the like effect upon them.

"We have many among us who have been visited with the Plague in other countries many years ago, who have never been arrested with small-pox after it, though they have been exposed as much as any other people to it; whence the belief now begins to prevail among us, that they who have had the Plague will never have the small-pox after it."

Considering the developed evidence that awaits us as to the character and results of inoculation, it would be superfluous to discuss this singular report, but we may remark the consummate audacity with which Mather assumes and maintains his position. What a masterly touch of the quack have we in these words—

"I cannot learn that one has died of it. Five or six have died upon it, or after it, but from other diseases or accidents; chiefly from having taken infection in the common way by inspiration before it could be given in the way of transplantation."

We can readily understand how the hand that could give so adroit a turn to awkward disasters could in other days frame irresistible indictments for witchcraft.

The precise truth as to the extent of the Boston epidemic is far from easy to ascertain:

it was the temptation of the inoculators to magnify the numbers of the afflicted and of their antagonists to minimise. Thus we read—

"At a meeting by publick authority in the Town House of Boston, before His Majesty's Justices of the Peace and the Select Men; the practitioners of physic and surgery being called before them, concerning Inoculation, agreed to the following conclusion:—

"A Resolve upon a debate held by the physicians of Boston concerning inoculating the Small Pox on the 21st day of July, 1721.

"It appears by numerous instances, that it has proved the death of many persons soon after the operation, and brought distempers upon many others which have in the end proved deadly to 'em.

"That the natural tendency of infusing such malignant filth in the mass of blood is to corrupt and putrify it, and if there be not a sufficient discharge of that malignity by the place of incision, or elsewhere, it lays a foundation for many dangerous diseases.

"That the operation tends to spread and continue the infection in a place longer than it might otherwise be.

"That the continuing the operation among us is likely to prove of most dangerous consequence.

"The number of persons, men, women and children, that have died of Small Pox at Boston from the middle of April last (being brought here then by the Salterthwaite's Fleet) to the 23rd of this instant July (being the hottest and worst season of the year to have any distemper in) are, viz.—2 men, strangers, 3 men, 3 young men, 2 women, 4 children, 1 negro man, and 1 Indian woman, 17 in all; and of those that have had it, some are well recovered, and others in a hopeful and fair way of recovery.

"BY THE SELECT MEN OF
THE TOWN OF BOSTON."

Dr. Flegart of Boston wrote to London that of 70 inoculated, 14 or 15 had died; and that at Roxbury, where there was no small-pox, 5 inoculated had died. *

Conflicting as are the testimonies, we must allow much to the natural aversion from an operation, not only novel, but disgusting; but taking the best that could be claimed for the new practice by an enthusiastic advocate, the benefit was trifling when seriously scrutinised. Dr. Boylston visited London after the Boston epidemic, and finding inoculation in high vogue he published an Account of the Small Pox inoculated in New

* Letter to Dr. Jurin by Isaac Massery, London, 1723.
Viewed thus in his own light—a light most favourable, how vain, not to say impudent, was such boasting as this—

"Now, if there be any one that can find a faithful account or history of any other method or practice that has carried such a number of all ages, sexes, constitutions, and colours, and in the worst seasons of the year, through the small-pox; or indeed through any other acute distemper with better success, then I will alter my opinion of this; and until then, I shall value and esteem this method of inoculating the small-pox as the most beneficial and successful that ever was discovered to, and practised by mankind in this world."

And, gaining courage through his own noise, he went yet farther, and proclaimed that small-pox was tamed and subdued—

"It is, and shall be acknowledged, to the praise and glory of God, that whereas a most wild, cruel, fierce and violent distemper, and which has destroyed millions of lives, is now (by that happy discovery made of its transplantation) become tractable, safe and gentle."

In the knowledge of the utter emptiness of this bounte, it may seem malicious to withdraw it from forgetfulness; but it serves to point the truth that human nature in 1726 was much the same as human nature in 1879, and that the same arts of audacious assertion and rowdy rhetoric were in practice then as now. Indeed, whoever is sufficiently wicked to presume on the natural trustfulness of mankind, and will lie loud enough and long enough, may attain an appalling success—as our story, alas! will prove.

One thing goes to Boylston’s credit: he did not propose to make poxing universal—to poison and sicken everybody, and inflict certain present injury to avert a future and uncertain danger. He proposed to reserve inoculation for emergencies—

"When the small-pox left Boston, inoculation ceased; and when it shall please Providence to send and spread that distemper amongst us again, may inoculation revive, be better received, and continued a blessing in preserving many from misery, corruption and death."

The narratives of Mather and Boylston are of special importance because we have in them the true lineage of inoculation as introduced from the eastern to the western world. Boylston tells us that when small-pox appeared in Boston—

"Dr. Mather, in compassion to the lives of the people, transcribed from the Philosophical
Transactions of the Royal Society the accounts sent them by Dr. Timonius and Pylarinus of inoculating the small-pox in the Levant, and sent them to the practitioners of the town for their consideration thereon."*

For some inescutiable reason the true position of Cotton Mather in the history of inoculation is continually overlooked or mis-stated. For instance, in Mather's biography in the excellent English Cyclopaedia, it is said that he derived his information and impulse from the letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, a statement repeated in the memoir of that lady, and which is perfectly fabulous. As to the true extent of the small-pox epidemic in Boston in 1721-22, and the mortality, I should feel thankful for any trustworthy information, which may be addressed to me—4 Kemplay Road, Hampstead, N.W. WM WHITE.

IMPRISONMENT FOR MEDICAL HERESY.—I regret much to hear of the case of imprisonment to which you refer. It is, indeed, an odious thing that a man can now be put in prison because he cannot accept a particular medical theory.—JACOB BRIGHT, M.P.

SCIENTIFIC QUACKS.—The claims of chemistry and physiology, in the actual state of those branches of inquiry, to regulate our habits in conformity with their fleeting hypotheses, are as ludicrous as anything that Swift imagined in the University of Laputa; and it is high time that the intelligence of mankind should assert itself in opposition to the pretensions of sham science. The tendency of the day is to exalt what is technically called "research," as opposed to ratiocination; and one consequence of this tendency is that a number of otherwise unemployed and unappreciated persons set themselves to work with microscopes and test-tubes, and fancy that they are making discoveries. The laborious trudging of six months is then described as a "research," and the conclusions of the great unknown who makes it are regarded as part of the general stock of knowledge for the six months longer which may possibly elapse before these conclusions are overthrown by somebody else. The ordinary sequence of events is, that the iconoclast sets up his idol in its turn, which in like manner is dragged through the dirt by his successor; and the common people, who are not scientific, are expected to worship at each shrine as long as it endures.—R. BRUDNELL CARTER in Contemporary Review, p. 863, Jan. '79.

* An Historical Account, p. 1.

COMPULSORY VACCINATION.
(Enlarged from a Discourse on Toleration of Opinion.)

By Monture D. Conway, M.A.

Since freedom of thought leads to freedom of practice, it may be asked—Has not society a right to check the expression of opinion which threatens danger to the moral or physical welfare of the community? Is no line to be drawn beyond which individuals, or bands of individuals, must be restrained from giving such practical effect to peculiar opinions as the majority may suppose dangerous to the order or security of society? To this I reply, that it is the right and duty of society to punish crime; but it has no right to punish any conscientious action because a majority may theoretically think it would lead to crime if left free, or tend to evil. Injury to the just rights of others, intended or actual, must be proved before just punishment can follow.

Nor can an enactment be allowed to identify itself as just law, and then treat violations of itself as crime. Jesus was quite legally put to death; but it was the law that was criminal, not he.

A considerable number of good people are just now suffering fines and imprisonments because they will not suffer their children to be vaccinated. Their very excellencies as parents cause them to be dealt with as malefactors. Here, say, are two men: one gives uninquiring assent to what other thoughtless people assent to; he doesn't care much what happens to his child, delegates to usage the duty of thinking for it, gives it up to be baptised, catechised, vaccinated, flogged at school—to anything that is usual, whether right or not. The other man gives no uninquiring assent; he studies carefully that his family may be nourished with truth and maintained by such laws of health as he can discover. Now, of these two the careless parent is favoured by the vaccination law, while the thoughtful, anxious, and devoted parent is punished unless he adopt a prescribed opinion. A law which thus favours parental indifference, and discourages careful thought and conscientious devotion to the child's welfare, reverses the spirit of all just law. Of course it is equally probable that the thinking parent may be able to agree with the majority; but he may not, and in this case he suffers for his inquiry, while the other escapes,—no man being so safe from the results of thought, erroneous or right, as he who never thinks at all.

Extreme cases are conceivable in which it may
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be necessary to overrule practical dissent claiming to be conscientious. A ship may be placed in quarantine,—or a nation or individual—to prevent the spread of infectious or contagious disease; if a captain should regard it as his duty for some large purpose to evade quarantine, it might be right to punish him. In such an instance no principle of individual right is involved, the question not concerning the general rectitude of the law, but its application in a particular case. Then there is the law of compulsory education. Society insists that every child shall have the opportunity of some degree of education on two grounds: first, because it is shown that pauperism and crime flow from ignorance; second, because for a parent to bring up a child in complete ignorance is an injury comparable to putting out that child’s eye or breaking its back. But why has it been found necessary to make education compulsory? Who or what opposes it? Not the reason or conscience of any one. It was parental indolence or selfishness that had to be overruled. Had there been any compulsory religious instruction in the public schools, the scheme would have been an oppression, for good and wise people differ about religion, and a majority has no right to coerce the convictions of a minority. But no one is willing to defend ignorance as a part of his religion. There is no conscience against learning. The government, therefore, having gained reason and conscience on its side, by limiting education to subjects of universally conceded importance, having provided the means for all, has a perfect right to meet the indolence or selfishness of parents and guardians with force. But when against any law a protest arises, made in the same public interest as law itself; when it has no private or selfish purpose, and appeals only to fact and argument; when, though in a small minority, it has sufficient weight of intelligence on its side to confuse the judgment of good citizens; then no law can remain just which meets that protest and argument with brute force.

In the case of vaccination, it may some day be proved right to secure it by compulsion; but before that situation can arrive the government has a number of conditions to fulfil and of duties to perform, in default of which it is now guilty of the worst offence of governments,—framing injustice in law.

1. Vaccination has been seriously challenged by men of learning. The misgivings concerning it have not arisen from ignorance and prejudice, but from men of science and medical men. These arguments have been sufficiently strong to shake the convictions of eminent thinkers and political leaders,—such as Herbert Spencer, Professor F. W. Newman, Dr. Garth Wilkinson, William Ewart Gladstone, W. E. Forster, John Bright,—in the justice of the law, and of some of them in vaccination itself. The arguments which have influenced such men—leaders of large numbers of the people—cannot be met justly except by fact and argument. To answer by mere force is tyranny.

The reasoning objectors have been answered only by fine and imprisonment, which are as genuinely persecutions as if inflicted for the non-baptism of children, on the ground that such children may become foci of heretical infection. To those who dissent from it, vaccination is merely a medical dogma. To coerce parents into its practice rests upon that assumption of medical infallibility which has again and again been proved false,—as in the instance of inoculation, once generally practised, now penal; as in the example of bleeding, that barbarous practice to which Washington and Cavour fell victims while opening new vistas of civilisation. Even were physicians, unanimous in their faith in vaccination, they could not claim infallibility after having so often erred; while, as a matter of fact, there is less unanimity in that profession about vaccination than there was at one time in favour of the now discredited inoculation.

The vaccinators prove that of those who are attacked by small-pox, very few who have been vaccinated die, while the disease is generally fatal to those who have not been vaccinated. On the other hand, the anti-vaccinators contend that a very large number of children die by vaccination, and many suffer terrible diseases transmitted by the arm-to-arm process. Here is an issue that cannot be fairly settled by force. It cannot be settled solely by a profession pecuniarily interested in vaccination and much more constrained by the intolerance of medical orthodoxy. It can only be settled by a commission of disinterested men of science and statist. If these, putting together the deaths through vaccination and those through non-vaccination, were to show a decided preponderance of death due to the non-observance of this precaution; if they were to show that the transmitted taints by vaccine-erisypelas were slight dangers compared with those of non-vaccination; then the law would have fulfilled the first condition of making itself justly compulsory.

2. It has been abundantly proved—so com-
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completely as to have been admitted by the government before which the proof was laid—that very serious perils attend the arm-to-arm inoculation. Horrible diseases, taints of blood, are conveyed by this means, insomuch that Sir Thomas Watson, M.D., in an important article in the Nineteenth Century, justifies the parent who rebels against vaccination unless he can secure pure lymph from the calf. This, then, being an admitted danger, the government which professes to enforce vaccination has another condition to fulfill. It must provide pure lymph. It has no more right to compel a parent to inoculate his child with possibly tainted lymph than to compel the child of a Protestant into a Catholic school. Every precaution admitted against what a parent may think tainted dogmas, is equally within his right against tainted lymph. *

If the government should fulfill these two conditions; if it should bring before the alarmed parents clear facts and evidences, attested by men of science, not resting solely upon the traditions of a profession so lately engaged with equal confidence in poisoning by inoculation and assassinating with the lancet; and if, having gained this unbiased verdict, it should then place within reach of every parent pure vaccine matter (as it offers unsectarian education); then, were any compulsion necessary, as it probably would not be, it might be justified.

Not having procured any fair verdict on the subject, not having secured families against the terrible dangers of taint, which it acknowledges, from the only lymph available to the masses, the government confesses the injustice of its persecutions of non-vaccinating parents by their very pettiness. If these parents are guilty of anything at all, they are guilty of sowing broadcast the seeds of death. They ought not to be tolerated at all. Small fines and imprisonments are not the proper penalties of murder. But if these parents who suffer, rather than subject their children to dangers, are really practicing a care and tenderness of the utmost importance to every home, then the government may well reconsider its position before punishing such parents, even though the majority may regard

* My own family have been vaccinated with pure vaccine matter from the calf, obtained for me by an eminent physician from a distant part of the continent. But how monstrous it would be to punish a parent for liability to avail himself of such an alternative to inoculating his children with a soul substance which may have crept through a thousand diseased veins.

1 I honour the medical profession quite as much as any other; but I know of no profession or vocation which has not its right wing controlled by orthodoxy and tradition much stronger than its left struggling for progress.

them as mistaken. The fair rule would be to punish only the indolence and carelessness which neglect a precaution whose value the offenders admit. Where those who refuse to have their children vaccinated can prove that course not a result of mere neglect or contemp, but of full consideration and conscientious conviction, the government must provide a conscience clause, or a reasoner’s clause. Government is degraded when a magistrate is empowered to afflict an honest man because he has intelligent doubts which the functionary of precedent cannot solve. The man should be accorded an immunity like that which the Quakers have from bearing arms.*

The number of such cases of intelligent dissent from vaccination could never be of such importance—assuming the value of vaccination—to bring on the community such serious evils as the facile oppression of parental rights, and discouragement of the parental sense of responsibility for children. Such oppression can only result in driving parents to evasion of the law. Until the government has itself so completely fulfilled the conditions and duties antecedent to a just coercion of individual opinion and conscience, it can gain no real advantage by such impolicy. The parent whose question is unanswered, whose alarm is met by violence, knows that he is entitled to deceive his human oppressor as much as a tiger. Such deceptions are already very common, and they must steadily increase under the accumulation of unanswered objections and vague misgivings, until at last, after years of fruitless annoyance to household martyrs, the government will be reduced to do what it should do now—exempt from penalty every parent whose refusal to vaccinate rests upon careful thought, inquiry, and conviction; and secure the benefit of vaccination—should it be proved real—by such investigations, related to the points raised by eminent objectors, and such provisions against evil results, as will leave no kind parent willing to deprive his child of such benefit.

* It is a serious mistake to suppose that such exemption of those who can give evidence that their opposition is not frivolous, might endanger such other compulsory measures as education or drainage; if no conceivable case could any man offer reasons in favour of defective drainage or of ignorance. There may be a conscientious preference for the school in which one’s own theology is taught over that from which it is omitted; but to place compulsory education on the same basis with compulsory vaccination, it must be shown that there are parents who believe that it is injurious to learn reading, writing, &c., who are willing to pay fines or even go to prison rather than have their children so taught. No such parents can be found.
A COMMON SENSE VIEW OF VACCINATION.

By a "common sense view" of this important question, is meant the view taken by sensible persons who have no professional bias. It may be objected that such persons are not qualified to have any views of their own about vaccination. Inquiry will show that only common sense is needed to understand this subject.

What is vaccination? The word originally meant "inoculating with cow-pox." In the days of Dr. Jenner, cows kept in dirty dairies got the pox; and the milk-maids sometimes had the disease.

One day Jenner was serving a milk-maid in his shop at Berkeley, Gloucestershire, and cautioned her to beware of that peril to a pretty face, the small-pox, when she said, "I have had the cow-pox;" meaning, that having had a similar disease, she was not liable to small-pox.

There was common sense in this. Jenner pondered the matter, and came to the conclusion that every child ought to be inoculated with cow-pox to prevent the small-pox.

The milk-maid's common sense told her that when the blood is purified by an eruptive disease, the body is invigorated by the removal of morbid matter, and there is consequently less likelihood of the system undergoing another eruptive disease.

Jenner was under a double delusion: he imagined that everybody was liable to have small-pox, and that impregnating the blood with cow-pox virus, in some mysterious way destroyed all susceptibility to small-pox. The words he used in his Inquiry into the Causes and Effects of Cow-Pox (1798) were—"What renders the cow-pox virus so extremely singular is, that the person who has been thus affected is for ever after secure from the infection of the small-pox."

Jenner lived to confess that experience as well as common sense disproved his "for ever" statement. Thousands of vaccinated persons have not only had small-pox, but have died of it.

But everybody does not have small-pox. It is not hereditary. When parents have had this disease, their children are less liable to it. We know the causes of small-pox: Jenner did not. Small-pox is a dirt disease, and it is, therefore, preventable by cleanliness, and not by adding filth to filth.

Some doctors say that small-pox is not a thing of growth, but is always "caught." That is not common sense, but uncommon folly. From whom did the first small-pox patient "catch" the disease? Florence Nightingale, in her Notes on Nursing, ridicules the idea that children "must" have measles, etc. She tells us how small-pox originates. Her words are—"I have seen with my eyes, and smelt with my nose, small-pox growing up in first specimens, either in close rooms or in over-crowded wards, where it could not by any possibility have been "caught," but must have begun."

Common sense tells us that it is wrong and dangerous to implant any disease in the blood, which is "the life." Jenner's milk-maid had the cow-pox naturally, which is very different from being inoculated with it artificially.

Common sense teaches that disease cannot be prevented by causing disease. Such a proceeding is as unreasonable as expecting a child to be truthful by teaching it to lie; or sowing weeds and expecting a crop of wheat.

Common sense says there is danger of imparting other and worse diseases with the so-called "lymph;" because the vaccine matter is not got from healthy cows, but from diseased children. "Diseased?" Yes, every vaccinated child is necessarily diseased: it is called the "vaccine disease."

It is admitted that horrible diseases are too often imparted by vaccination, hence some of its advocates are agitating for "calf-lymph." This original virus having to be produced artificially, only vegetarians will avoid the risk of eating vaccinated veal.

Vaccination is utterly opposed to common sense, whether viewed physiologically or politically. In the name of common sense, as there is a doubt, let there be inquiry, individual and natural. If vaccination were a preventive, and compulsion in medical matters were permissible, it ought to be enforced upon adults as well as children.

As vaccination is admitted not to protect "for ever," there is an outcry for re-vaccination. Our legislators' common sense will not sanction compulsory re-vaccination; and were it attempted, the people would not submit to it. There is a large and increasing number of intelligent parents who decline vaccination for their children, preferring the option of fine or imprisonment; and the law cannot be really enforced, for sending policemen to take infants by violence would cause a "mothers' rebellion."

The common sense conclusion is—leave it optional. If vaccination be a good thing, loving parents will not neglect it; if it be an injurious superstition, the sooner the law is repealed the better.

Manchester. HENRY PITMAN.
ST. PANCRAES PERSECUTORS.

Perhaps no men have done more to discredit local government in the metropolis than St. Pancras Guardians. The parish of St. Pancras is wide and wealthy, but its prosperous folk are too busy to attend to public affairs, and its intellectual folk are too dainty for the vulgarities of corporate existence; and the result is, that the administration of the district is abandoned to the "lower middles"—to men whose native vigour is rarely tempered with culture and social experience.

With this explanation, it will be understood by readers unfamiliar with London, how it happens that St. Pancras has such an ill reputation in many connections, and latterly in the flagrant question of compulsory vaccination. The rough Englishman when he is thwarted storms and vows that he will not submit to defeat; and thus it is that when Mr. Tebb and Mr. Mansfield pay their fines, and yet do not surrender their children to the vaccinator, the bumbling of St. Pancras waxes furious and invokes fresh vengeance from below. At a recent meeting it was resolved to hale the obstinate fellows once more before the judge, notwithstanding the protest of Mr. Byrne, chairman of the Vaccination Committee, that these repeated prosecutions were as useless as they were mischievous; in which opinion Mr. Furniss sustained him. Guardian William Bower, apothecary, of 96 Tottenham Court Road, rebuked Mr. Byrne as a weak brother, and hoped, for the credit of St. Pancras, that it would never go forth that they were ready to compromise. Guardian Thomas Ross, of 70 Hampstead Road, was still more implacable and furious. If fines were accepted in place of obedience, the law, he thought, might as well be repealed altogether. It was nonsense fining such men: they ought to be sent to prison. Guardian Guerrier, cattle salesman, of 177 Camden Road, was equally ferocious, and echoed brother Ross; whereas Mr. Byrne explained that he was no anti-vaccinator, but he did not see the use in picking out a couple of ratepayers and prosecuting them to no purpose. They might go on fining them for ever, but they would never get the children vaccinated.

Just so. The children will not be vaccinated, and hence the absurdity of so much talk. Perhaps even imprisonment might prove ineffective, and would St. Pancras then recommend hanging? It is to be regretted that a gentleman in delicate health like Mr. Tebb should be so persistently and wantonly annoyed; but the opposition to vaccination has received extraordinary impetus and encouragement from his persecution. His pamphlet, stocked with arguments against the existing law, has been circulated over the whole country, and has drawn forth the most gratifying expressions of sympathy and approval. As for Mr. James Mansfield, of 40 Judd Street, Euston Road, Mr. Tebb's companion in affliction, he is one of those heroes who for centuries have been the salt of English life. Satisfied that vaccination is wrong, he has gone up to judgment again and again, and has suffered for righteousness' sake without flinching, maintaining through all a meek and reasonable spirit. It is only after acquaintance with a case like Mansfield's that one realises to the full the exceeding wickedness of compulsory vaccination law. Even an ardent vaccinator, with the heart of a Christian in him, would pause if asked, "Could you advise a man with a solemn, conscientious conviction, like Mansfield, to sacrifice it at the bidding of any power on earth?" The answer could only be an emphatic "No!" unless the Christian is prepared to repudiate the divinest incidents in the records of his own faith. It is the consummate perfection of man to do what he believes to be right, and to refrain from what he believes to be wrong; and, correspondently, to trespass on conscience, or to degrade it, is the worst of offences against humanity. "Better far," said Dr. Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham, "better far that a man should do wrong believing it to be right, than that he should do right believing it to be wrong." Through all, Mansfield cherishes charity toward his persecutors. They know no better: they know not what they do. He is of the temper of John Huss, who, when fastened to the stake, saw an old woman bearing a faggot to assist his burning, and exclaimed, "O! sancta simplicitas!" But in St. Pancras, we fear, there goes little of the epithet to the simplicitas.

IRISH VACCINATION.—Ireland has been the bosoet of vaccinators. Sir Dominic Corrigan, when M.P. for Dublin, asserted in the House of Commons, that vaccination had extirpated small-pox in Ireland; but the vaunt was premature, and the collapse ignominious. Since then there have been frightful outbreaks of small-pox in Dublin, in Belfast, and in Cork. In Dublin during 1871-72 the ratio of mortality was threefold; the worst London epidemic of the century; and in Cork, during the quarter ending June, 1872, it was ten-fold that of London. During the present year, 1879, another specially malignant outbreak has occurred, and Ireland as evidence for the blessings of vaccination is judiciously dropped.
THE PURE LYMPHERS, OR POXERS.

If we could forget how grave are the issues connected with Vaccination, we might treat it as the drollest of hallucinations. The fact is, Vaccination has never been subjected to scientific examination. It has been regarded as something outside science, as a sort of trade secret, and has been abandoned to the profession in whose ranks, as Dr Richardson recently observed, no man of genius, or of vigorous and original mind, ever abides. When the time comes—as come it will, when Vaccination is "looked into" by men who are trained to investigation, and who separate evidence from assumption, the whole fabric will collapse, and the memory thereof will alone remain as a graphic illustration of human folly and credulity.

A few years ago the assertion that Vaccination communicated syphilis and other diseases, latent in the subjects from which lymph was taken, was treated with absolute scorn; and as proof in due official form was not producible, those who saw and knew the truth whereof they affirmed had to find comfort in their own veracity. Now, however, it is officially confessed that syphilis is communicable and communicated by Vaccination, and that infant mortality is magnified by diseases of which Vaccination is the excitant; and consequently there is a rising cry for Vaccination divested of such horrible risks.

Of course the cry has an answer; for, as Cobbett said, quackery is never without a shift and a shuffle; and since Vaccination is detected as objectionable in one form, it is straightway exhibited in another, warranted absolutely innocent, absolutely effective, in short, absolutely whatever the good public is pleased to require—until like other unquestionable specifics it is in turn found out.

The new prescription is termed "pure lymph from the calf"—a sweet name with a savour of Daphne and Chloe that would do credit to Barnum. Nice words, however, often cover nasty realities; and thus it happens that "pure lymph from the calf" is a euphemism for pox taken from a cow at Beausenagy and propagated by inoculation on calves. The matter from the pustules on the calves is the pure lymph extolled by our Poxers for diffusion through the blood of universal English infancy, warranted to do babes no harm and to hold them secure from small-pox—until they catch it, when of course it will be manifest that some accident must have befallen the precious commodity.

It seems Belgium has embarked in pure lymph culture, and that it is no easy enterprise. Dr Warlomont, director of the Institut Vaccinal de l'Etat of Brussels, says, "Calf vaccination is so difficult and anxious a business that I could not desire a better occupation for my dearest enemy." And since, if Vaccination is to be maintained in this country, some alteration in practice is inevitable, Dr Cameron, M.P. for Glasgow, is to move a resolution in the House of Commons as to the expediency of setting up government lymph factories in London, Edinburgh and Dublin, thus making an end of the prevalent and increasing alarm as to the dangers of Vaccination.

Of course Dr. Cameron will not have it all his own way. There are vested interests in other sorts of pox, and their proprietors are certain to show fight. Moreover, "pure lymph from the calf" is no new discovery. It was well known to Jenner, and not only well known, but was pronounced by him "delusive," and "inequal of producing any specific effects on the human constitution."

The Calf Lymphers are fond of dilating on the absence of serious irritation and erysipelas from their inoculation; but, admitting their contention, is it not obvious that they cut the ground from under their own feet? The argument with which Jenner worked was, that he did produce a disease by inoculation of cow-pox virus (conveyed to the cow from "grease" in the horse), which disease was accepted by Nature as an equivalent for small-pox in man. But the Calf Lymphers hope to gull Nature more deeply, and to take her in with chaff—something less than Jenner offered. Nature is patient, but who ever did outwit her?

None the less do we wish success to the Lymphers in Parliament and out of it. May they divide and confound the counsels of the vaccinators! When folly falls out, good sense may come to its own.

"So whether he kill Cassio,
Or Cassio him, or each do kill the other
Every way makes my gain."

Mr George Anderson, who is Dr Cameron's Liberal comrade in the representation of Glasgow, is also a Lymph, and at the same time a supporter of compulsory vaccination. Having a child of his own to render small-pox proof, he sent to Brussels for some of the pure Beausenagy pox; and the good man would fain extend its benefits to the whole community. Even crazy benevolence we are bound to respect.

St. Mungo.
“PORTEUR DE L’EAU À LA RIVIERE.”
Poor Ireland! Those who know and love her best have often to deplore the fatal facility with which she follows England in things evil. At a meeting of Home Rule M.P.’s the other day, it was resolved to support vaccination, and to resist anti-vaccinators—a resolution as grotesque and superfluous as Mrs. Micawber’s, never to desert her husband. Ireland, alas! is one of the most thoroughly and willingly vaccinated countries in Europe, and, like Sweden and Prussia in similar case, has paid the penalty of corruption in a small-pox epidemic of singular intensity and malignity. However, in order to be like England exactly, a Bill has been introduced to Parliament "to amend the laws relating to vaccination in Ireland"—laws already through the people’s credulous docility perfectly efficient, but enabling Irish magistrates to deal with any possible Irish Washington Nye or Joseph Abel as those heroes are dealt with in England—that is to say, fined over and over again, and, if the fines are not forthcoming, to resort to imprisonment. The Bill, too, provides that the fee for vaccination be henceforth 1s. 6d. instead of 1s., and that a medical officer in attendance during vaccination prosecutions have a guineas a day out of the poor rates. As we have said, the Bill happens to be superfluous in so far as it puts more money in the doctors’ pockets; but in the event of the development of anti-vaccination opinion in Ireland, it provides an instrument of oppression, the existence of which in England is a grievance, of which liberal statesmen are ashamed, and will presently pronounce unendurable.

Mr. P. Davis, jun., of Enniscothry, writes: “We have conclusive evidence of the universality of vaccination under the present Acts, and more stringency is needless. The only instance in which the law has been put in motion, and has failed (so far as I have been able to ascertain), is in the case of John Savage, of Kinsale, Co. Cork, who has been fined several times, illegally, for one child. The cause of his resistance is that another child had suffered long and severely from vaccination. He had two beds sold from under him to pay fines. I wish you could bring his case under the notice of our Irish M.P.’s.”

PERSECUTED, BUT UNCONQUERED.
Is Joseph Abel, watchmaker, of Faringdon, Barks, anti-vaccinators everywhere rejoice. He is a chief among their ironides, and his example is inspiration. Twenty-seven times has he been summoned since March, 1876, and has paid £86 19s. in fines! His last appearance was on Saturday, 22nd March, when he made a capital speech, and told the bench that having answered to twenty-six summonses he was not going to surrender to the twenty-seventh, and as long as God gave him health and strength he would protect his dear children. What his merciless persecutors hope to accomplish is difficult to conceive. They fine him, and there is no more that they can do. English gentlemen should be above such petty and toothless malice.

AN AMERICAN EXPERIENCE.
Mr. Ezra H. Heywood, a fellow labourer with W. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Francis Jackson, and Parker Pillsbury, for the abolition of slavery in the United States, has recently suffered imprisonment for the same cause as Mr. Truelove in England, but was liberated by President Hayes. He is turning his prison experiences to account in public lectures, showing how adverse to good are prison influences and regulations. “I have no personal grievances to vent,” he says. “I was in a liberal jail. Judge Clifford allowed me to choose the one to which I should be taken. Prison life implies social, financial, and physical death. When I stepped over the threshold of Dedham jail, I stepped from the civilisation of the nineteenth century into the barbarism of the tenth.”

Among the outrages practised on prisoners is compulsory vaccination. If a convict refuses he is knocked down, handcuffed, and operated upon—a lesson in sweetness and light. Mr. Heywood managed to escape pollution once, but the doctor was too much for him, and insisted on his submission; but, as soon as the doctor had gone, Mr. Heywood energetically rubbed the virus off his arm, and only escaped punishment because there was no rule to apply to the offence.

Consistently with this trust in vaccination, is the indifference displayed towards cleanliness. The prisoners are allowed to bathe but once a week, and then only three minutes are allowed for their ablutions; and when prisoners are unwell they go for weeks without bathing and without change of clothing.
THE VACCINATION INQUISITOR.

VACCINATION OF THE POOR.

Compulsory vaccination assumes its most malignant attitude towards the poor. As Sir Thomas Chambers says, "When a medical man is called to vaccinate a child in Belgravia, he says to the anxious mother, 'Wait.' Why wait? 'Wait till I get a good case.' But the parish doctor vaccinates by the score, with any lymph that is available." To a rational mind possessed with any knowledge of physiology, there is no sight more revolting than a public vaccination station, where, in the name of science, an abominable and pernicious rite is enacted, that seems like a survival from the dark ages. The poor are easily led, and are apt to believe whatever doctors say is right; but when parents see a healthy infant blasted or destroyed from the day it received virus from the vaccinator's lancet, the resolve is naturally begotten, never again to incur the same risk. To escape the risk, and to save a loved child alive, is often a matter of extreme difficulty; and, to baffle the vaccination officer, inconveniences and losses are undergone with a heroism that, were it only for theological ends, would be trumpeted as divine. We heard lately of a carman removing the furniture of a persecuted family to another parish, and being entreated by the mother not to inform. "No," said the good man. "Trust me, I shall not inform. I have reason to hate vaccination as much as you have. My best wishes go with you, and may God keep you!" Thus, unseen and unknown by the general public, there is a constant persecution going forward, which is not denounced as a revived Inquisition, because it happens to be medical. As Mr. Herbert Spencer writes, "I wish I had known that the vaccination persecution had been carried so far as you describe, as I might have made use of the fact. It would have served farther to enforce the parallel between this medical popery which men think so defensible, and the religious popery which they think so indefensible." These remarks will serve to introduce and explain the following document, which is being widely circulated:

[Private and Confidential.]

HOW PARENTS MAY PROTECT THEIR OFFSPRING FROM THE DANGERS AND INJURIES OF VACCINATION.

The question is often asked by anxious parents, who have witnessed the terrible injuries produced by vaccination upon the children of their friends and neighbours, how to protect their own. In answer, we always advise that when there exists the means of paying judicial penalties, the duty of a good citizen is, when summoned to attend before the magistrate in person, to make the best defence practicable, see that a reporter is present to report the proceedings for publication and circulation, and pay the fines and costs. The outlay is insignificant compared to the doctors' bills many parents are called on to meet, after what is called successful vaccination. The response to such advice is frequently, "I am utterly unable to meet such demands; they would ruin me." To such chiefly this confidential advice is tendered. Before your child is born, let the mother go to some friend's house, or take apartments in another county if possible; have the child registered, and before proceedings under the Vaccination Acts can be initiated, let the mother return to her home. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred this will, effectually baffle the local guardians, and prevent the vexatious vaccination prosecutions.

Many parents adopt the plan of not registering the birth of the child; but the law enjoining registration is a beneficial one, with many advantages; and though non-registering, it is believed, is extensively practised in some districts, the writer does not recommend it.

There are, however, thousands of honest, conscientious parents who cannot obtain friendly invitations, and are as completely unable to incur the expense of migrating to another county, as they would be to meet the oft-recurring vaccination penalties, and upon whom the operations of the existing Acts are crushing and ruinous. Parents of this class who are determined to protect their children from the poisoned vaccinator's lancet at all hazards, must make up their minds to submit to inconveniences and hardships of the severest description. They must be always on the alert, and be ready at short notice to move from one house or parish to another. They should have but little furniture, and that only of the most portable description, and should live in lodgings, and provide that a few days' notice to the landlord will suffice to clear them of further liability for rent. The removals should be carefully concealed and made by night, and the carman who removes the furniture be instructed not to disclose their whereabouts to the vaccination informer. When unable to avoid the summons of the vaccination officer, the abode should be changed several times at short intervals, so as to baffle all searchers. We know parents who in this way have succeeded in eluding the vigilance of
vaccination spies for many years. This plan, however, can only be adopted in towns of considerable size, and we confess our inability to advise those who reside in small places or in the country. They must sometimes see their healthy offspring sicken and die through the blood-poisoning of vaccination without the power to rescue them.

It may be said that the remedy here set forth is worse than the risks incurred by vaccination; but such a conclusion would not be arrived at by any parent who has observed the loathsome diseases so frequently following vaccination, or those who will take the trouble to read a digest of the latest Parliamentary Return, entitled, Vaccination Mortality, No. 483, dated 1878, which shows that 25,000 children are slaughtered annually by diseases inoculated into the system by vaccination, while the same official document suggests that a far greater number are injured and maimed for life by the same unwholesome rite.

Other methods of avoiding the injurious effects of vaccination are adopted to a greater or less extent in some districts of the metropolis as well as in other places. Arrangements are made with the vaccination officials to omit the names of parents with unvaccinated children from the list of delinquents brought from time to time before the Board of Guardians. A notable instance of this description was alluded to by an able writer of a communication which appeared in a December number of the Nonconformist, when it was shown how local officials were "squared" to prevent vaccination prosecutions. Medical men are sometimes paid to give certificates of successful vaccination, when the rite has been performed without the use of vaccine virus. It is well known that tartar emetic, which has been largely used by some doctors, produces a vesicle and leaves a cicatrix scarcely distinguishable from those described and illustrated by Jenner in his Inquiry, without risk of syphilis or other contaminations. One medical man, residing in a fashionable metropolitan suburb, has for years given the babies brought to him for vaccination the lymph* as a dose of medicine, and filled up the certificates in the usual way.†

These last named methods of avoiding the risks of vaccination are mere subterfuges and evasions, and, apart from their immorality, their adoption will do nothing towards obtaining the repeal of the cruel and tyrannical enactments.

"GOVERNMENT PROSECUTIONS FOR MEDICAL HERESY."*

This is a most useful pamphlet, and its publication at the present time very opportune. Its style is vigorous and popular, its argument clear, incisive, and temperate; the facts and medical evidence adduced are pertinent and telling. No careful, unprejudiced reader can deny that a strong case against compulsory vaccination is here made out. Wherever a controversy on the subject is carried on, this pamphlet should be freely circulated. It should, especially, be sent to Members of Parliament, Boards of Guardians, Editors of Newspapers, and all who may influence public opinion on this question, and who have to do with the framing of the law and its administration. In a few weeks the annual election of Boards of Guardians will take place throughout the country, and a copy of this pamphlet should be sent to every candidate, who should be freely questioned as to whether, if elected, he will support or resist the continued prosecution of his fellow-parishioners, who may dissent from orthodox medical practice. In the autumn, it is expected that a new Parliament will be elected, and, when candidates appeal to popular suffrage, it will be the duty of electors to interrogate them freely on this, as on other questions. This pamphlet may help them to better information and a sounder judgment, and they should be reminded that the main and primary question is not as to the best medical treatment for the prevention and cure of smallpox, but whether the whole community should be coerced into the adoption of a particular medical theory, however strongly many of them may entertain convictions of its injurious nature; whether, in short, as is implied in the title of this pamphlet, there should be Government Prosecutions for Medical Heresy. Members of Parliament and Boards of Guardians, alike, are always amenable to reason on the eve of a general election.

* Homoeopathically prepared.
† It has been stated that if a little milk of sulphur be given daily to an infant for a few days previous to the vaccination, it will prevent the vaccine taking effect, or destroy its influence; but more information is required on this point. A solution of the sulphite of soda, in the strength of one drachm of the salt to four tablespoonfuls of water, has been recom-mended to be applied on a piece of rag to the punctures made by the vaccinator to destroy the poison of the vaccine virus. (See Vaccination Tracts, No. xii. pp. 21, 22.)

VACCINATION TRACTS.

1. Letters and Opinions of Medical Men.
2. Facts and Figures, showing that Vaccination has failed to
   stamp out, arrest, or mitigate Small-pox.
3. & 4. Opinions of Statesmen, Politicians, Publicists, Statisticians,
   and Sanitarians.
5. Cases of Disease, Suffering, and Death, reported by the
   Vaccine Nations.
6. The Vaccination Laws a Snare to Public Honesty and
   Religion.
7. Vaccination a sign of the Decay of the Political and Medi-
   cal Conscience in the Country.
8. The Propagation of Symbols to Infants and Adults by
   Vaccination and Re-vaccination.
9. Vaccination evil in its Principles, false in its Reasons, and
deadly in its Results.
10. Vaccination subverts Dentition, and is the cause of the
    prevailing Deficiency and Decay of the Teeth.
11. Compulsory Vaccination a Desecration of Law, a Breach of
    Homes, and Persecutor of the Poor.

VACCINATION MORTALITY. A Para-
    mentary Return made by the Registrar-General to the
    House of Commons, Session 1878. Published at Office
    for Sale of Parliamentary Papers, Great Queen Street, Lon-
    don, W.C. Price 5d.

THE PEOPLE OF DUNBURY AND
    VACCINATION. A Letter to William Chamber, Esq., in
    reply to an Article in Chamber's Journal, with notes and an
    appendix by Andrew Leighton, 22 pp., price 3d. Mr. Wray,
    66 Carlton Street, Kentishtown, London, N.W.

BOTH SIDES OF THE VACCINATION
    QUESTION. This Important Debate between George
    Wyld, M.D., and Alexander Wheeler, with the summing-up
    of Sir Thomas Chambers, M.F., Recorder of the City of London,
    reported verbatim by Mr. Henry Pitman, and revised by the
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    Chamber's Speech on Compulsory Vaccination can be had at
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HOW PARENTS MAY PROTECT THEIR
    OFFSPRING FROM THE DANGERS AND IN-
    JURIES OF VACCINATION. Sent free on receipt
    of stamped envelope. Mr. Bone, 102 Pollock Road, Southwark,
    London, S.E.

VINDICTIVE PROSECUTIONS BY THE
    GUARDIANS OF ST. PANCRAS, LONDON. By a
    Lover of Justice, reprinted from the National Intelligencer
    and Nonconformist, 4 pp., price is. 6d. per hundred. Mr.
    Young, 8 Neeld Terrace, Harrow Road, London, W.

PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT. A Series
    of Forms adapted to meet the various grievances
    arising out of the Vaccination Acts, will be sent free on receipt
    of stamped envelope. Mr. Wray, 66 Carlton Street, Kentish-
    town, London, N.W.

THE POLITICAL SIDE OF THE VACC-
    INATION SYSTEM. An Essay by Professor F.
    Newman, 12 pp., price 1d., or 4s. 6d. per hundred, fourth
    edition. Published by the National Anti-Vaccination
    League. Mr. Amos Booth, Secretary, 60 Stanely St.,
    Leicester.

VACCINATION—All persons who are opposed to
    the Adulteration of the Blood of Infants, at the ex-
    pense of the nation, by corrupt matter falsely called pure
    lymph, are requested to join the Halifax and District League,
    and may obtain further information on applying to Samuel
    Knowles, Secretary at the Anti-Vaccination Station, 42 Dow-
    ney Street, Hopwood-lane, Halifax.

RECENT letter by Professor F. W. Newman on
    Magisterial Responsibility in Relation to the Vaccina-
    tion Acts; also a reprint from the Hastings and St. Leonar-
    dian Gazette of a leading article on "Peace, Retreatment, and
    Reform" in connection with Compulsory Vaccination, 3 pp.,
    price 1d. or 3s. 6d. per hundred. Mr. W. Young, 8 Neeld
    Terrace, Harrow Road, London, W.

VACCINE—SYphilis, by James R. Lane,
    F.R.G.S. Price Essay on Vaccination, by Edward
    Ballard, M.D. A pamphlet containing extracts from the above
    can be had on sending stamped envelope to W. M. Wright,
    Silver Street, Stockton-on-Tees.

TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

AN Analysis of the Registrar-General's Return,
    No. 470, Session 1878, entitled "Vaccination Mortal-
    ity," published by authority of Parliament. By a Barrister
    of the Inner Temple. "Children are slaughtered by Vaccina-
    tion in a wholesale way."—J. W. Pease, M.P. "It is a most
    serious matter to find, from this official document, that the
    deaths from the fifteen (incommunicable) diseases have increased
    in England and Wales from 134,709 in 1847, to 217,701 in 1874,
    whilst the population has only increased from 33 millions
    to 35 millions."—Glasgow Herald. With supplementary
    matter, 8 pp., price 1d., or 4s. per hundred. Mr. Wray, 66
    Carlton Street, Kentish-town, London, N.W.

NEW PAMPHLET, PRICE ONE SHILLING.
    Should be read by all Anti-Vivisectionists, and others who
    study the question of the Rights of Man over the Brute
    Creation.

THEORY OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN
    DEFINED: Being a Solution of the Problem of Vivise-
    cion and the Treatment of Animals by an old and almost W.
    Parker's Square, E.C. Manchester, John Heywood, Ridge-
    field, John Dalton Street; Liverpool, The Argus Printing
    and Stationery Company, Limited, 16 Peter's Lane.
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER II.

LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGU.

"As for History," said the Duke of Marlborough, "I know that it is false;" and whoever has occasion to enter minutely into any biographical question will be apt to concur with the Duke. Happening to refer to Walter Bagehot's essay on Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, I found this passage—

"She brought from Turkey the notion of inoculation. Like most improvers, she was roughly spoken to. Medical men were angry because the practice was not in their books, and conservative men were cross at the agony of a new idea. Religious people considered it wicked to have a disease which Providence did not think fit to send you; and simple people 'did not like to make themselves ill of their own accord.' She triumphed, however, over all obstacles; inoculation, being really found to lengthen life and save complications, before long became general."*

Now Bagehot loved accuracy and abhorred credulity; and yet in these lines, delivered with as much confidence as a column of the multiplication table, there are exhibited about as much inaccuracy and credulity as could be packed into the space. Let us see what Lady Mary really did in the matter of inoculation.

Mr Wortley Montagu was appointed ambassador to the Porte, and set out for Constantinople in the autumn of 1716 accompanied by his wife, then in her twenty-seventh year. The Ottoman Empire was in those days powerful and proud, disclaiming to send representatives to Christian Courts, and receiving ambassadors as commercial agents, or as bearers of homage from their respective sovereigns. The English ambassador reached his destination early in 1717, and ere a month had passed, and ere Lady Mary had time to look around and appreciate the strange world into which she had entered, with sprightly audacity she wrote as follows to her friend Miss Sarah Chiswell—

"I am going to tell you a thing that I am sure will make you wish yourself here. The small-pox, so fatal, and so general amongst us, is here entirely harmless by the invention of ingrafting, which is the term they give it. There is a set of old women who make it their business to perform the operation every autumn, in the month of September, when the great heat is abated. People send to one another to know if any of their family has a mind to have the small-pox: they make parties for this purpose, and when they are met (commonly fifteen or sixteen together) the old woman comes with a nut-shell full of the matter of the best sort of small-pox, and asks what veins you please to have opened. She immediately rips open that you offer to her with a large needle (which gives you no more pain than a common scratch), and puts into the vein as much venom as can lie upon the head of her needle, and after binds up the little wound with a hollow bit of shell; and in this manner opens four or five veins. The Grecians have commonly the superstition of opening one in the middle of the forehead, in each arm, and on the breast, to mark the sign of the cross; but this has a very ill effect, all these wounds leaving little scars, and is not done by those that are not superstitions, who choose to have them in the legs, or that part of the arm
That is concealed. The children, or young patients play together all the rest of the day, and are in perfect health to the eighth. Then the fever begins to seize them, and they keep their beds two days, very seldom three. They have very rarely above twenty or thirty [pustules] in their faces, which never mark; and in eight days' time they are as well as before their illness. Where they are wounded, there remain running sores during the distemper, which I don't doubt is a great relief to it. Every year thousands undergo this operation; and the French ambassador says pleasantly that they take the small-pox here by way of diversion, as they take the waters in other countries. There is no example of any one that has died in it; and you may believe I am very well satisfied of the safety of the experiment, since I intend to try it on my dear little son.

"I am patriot enough to take pains to bring this useful invention into fashion in England; and I should not fail to write to some of our doctors very particularly about it, if I knew any one of them that I thought had virtue enough to destroy such a considerable branch of their revenue for the good of mankind. But that distemper is too beneficial to them not to expose to all their resentment the hardy wight that should undertake to put an end to it. Perhaps, if I live to return, I may, however, have courage to war with them. Upon this occasion admire the heroism in the heart of your friend."

In this letter there was material for a small-pox idyl—nothing easier, nothing surer, "small-pox made entirely harmless." But idyls are deceptive; their paradisiacal effects are obtained by the sedulous exclusion of whatever is otherwise. About the time that Lady Mary was romancing so triumphantly to Miss Sarah Chiswell she dispatched this note to her husband—

"Sunday, 23rd March, 1717-18.

"The boy was engraffed last Tuesday, and is at this time singing and playing, and very impatient for his supper. I pray God my next may give as good an account of him... I cannot engrat the girl; her nurse has not had the small-pox."

Why should the engraffing of the infant have been hindered because the nurse had not had small-pox? The answer to the question reveals a peril concealed from Miss Sarah Chiswell. Because the engraffed child would probably have communicated unmitigated small-pox to the nurse. Why not then engrat the nurse and child? Because they would have sickened together, and mother Mary did not care to incur the risk. There was no danger, she said; none whatever, only a pleasant diversion; nevertheless she preferred discretion to her own ample assurance.

In History we have always to suspect the picturesque, for mankind have a fatal preference for handsome error over uncomely facts, and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu as mother of English inoculation, and derivatively of vaccination, is ever so much more graceful than dull Timoni and Pylarini in the Philosophical Transactions. Few condescend to inquire whether Lady Mary, as primary inoculator, was acting independently, or whether she had advisers and prompters. "All of her self and by her self" is the heroic representation—"a woman's wit against the world," and judgment surrenders to fancy, as is the way in myths ancient and modern.

But it so happens that what in itself ought to be incredible—that a young Englishwoman should suddenly adopt the strange practice of a strange people—is demonstrably incredible. Lady Mary did not act alone. She had for counsellor and director, Charles Maitland, the physician to the embassy, who familiar with the fame of inoculation was glad to observe its practice experimentally. Maitland writes—

"In the year 1717, when I had the honour to attend the English ambassador and his family at Constantinople, I had a fair opportunity fully to inform myself of what I had long before heard, namely, the famous practice of transplanting, or raising the small-pox by inoculation."

Here we may note, too, that Maitland was aware that inoculation did not originate in Turkey. He says—

"Whilst universally practised all over Turkey for three-score years past, it has been known in other parts of the East, a hundred, or for aught we know, some hundreds of years before."†

It was Maitland who managed the inoculation of young Montagu, and he thus described the operation—

"About this time, the Ambassador's ingenious lady resolved to submit her only son to it, a very hopeful boy of about six years of age. She first of all ordered me to find out a fit subject to take the matter from, and then sent for an old Greek
woman who had practised this way a great many years. After a good deal of trouble and pains I found a proper subject, and then the good woman went to work; but so awkwardly by the shaking of her hand, and put the child to so much torture with her blunt and rusty needle, that I pitied his cries, who had ever been of such spirit and courage that hardly anything of pain could make him cry before; and, therefore, inoculated the other arm with my own instrument, and with so little pain to him that he did not in the least complain of it. The operation took in both arms, and succeeded perfectly well. . . .

He had about an hundred pox all upon his body. This operation was performed at Pers in the month of March, 1717."

That is to say, almost simultaneously with the Ambassador’s arrival in Turkey.

The embassy returned to England in 1718, after a residence of little over a year in Constantinople. The dates are worth observation; for whilst it appears that the doctor and the lady were in common resolved to recommend the practice of inoculation to their countrymen, the dates prove with what inexperience and levity they assumed the grave responsibility. If quackery be assertion in absence of knowledge or of evidence, then we may accurately stigmatise Maitland and Montagu as a couple of arrant quacks. But so far as concerns Maitland we may go farther, for he expressly tells us—

"I was assured and saw with my eyes that the small-pox is rather more malignant and epidemic in the Turkish dominions than with us; insomuch that, as some have affirmed, one-half, or at least one-third part of the diseased, at certain times, do die of it; and they that escape are terribly disfigured by it."

Yet this same Maitland, who thus testifies of the impotence of inoculation to mitigate and restrain small-pox in Turkey, came to England ready to assert its power to mitigate and restrain! It is difficult to find words of due severity for such crass folly—for such impudent inconsistency. We shall see, however, in the course of this wonderful story, how every rule of evidence may be defied in the matter of small-pox, and how, even at this day, it is possible to shut one’s eyes and prophecies in the name of science, and have noise and hardihood accepted for veracity.

---

\[ Account of Inoculating for Small-pox, p. 3. \]
\[ Ibid. p. 4. \]

HOW WILL YOU HAVE IT, GENTLEMEN?

Sir Cordy Burrows, the well-known physician, sitting as magistrate on the Brighton bench, and dealing with a vaccination case, observed—

"The public seem scarcely to understand what Vaccination means. The vaccine lymph taken from a child is nothing more than what has passed from a small-pox patient through a cow. In 1858 I assisted in the inoculation of seventeen cows with small-pox, three of which produced vaccine lymph, and from these the world has been supplied. I explained the process the other day to a gentleman who objected to Vaccination, and when I had finished he intelligently remarked, ‘Then, according to your account, the cow is a filter, and small-pox poison passed through it loses its virulence and contagious nature.’"

Nothing could be more explicit and candid than this statement of Sir Cordy’s. All mystery is dispensed with, and the public are unreservedly informed that what is known as Vaccination is in reality old-fashioned Inoculation mitigated by the intervention of the cow, “the immortal Jenner,” with his dogma, being quietly and decisively shoved aside.

Let us now leave Brighton for Galway. At a recent meeting of the Galway Guardians it was suggested that a calf should be inoculated in order to obtain a supply of lymph for Vaccination; which suggestion was unanimously approved; but in a day or two the Guardians were compelled to pause by the following missive from head-quarters.

"LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD,
DUBLIN, 10th Feb., 1879.

"The Local Government Board of Ireland acknowledge the receipt of minutes of proceedings of the Board of Guardians of the Galway Union on the 7th inst. from which it appears that a suggestion was made by a member of the Board that a healthy calf should be procured for inoculation, in order that a full supply of lymph be obtained for the Union, and another member having intimated his willingness to give a calf for the purpose, the Guardians passed a resolution accepting this offer, and directing the medical officers to see the animal inoculated. In reference thereto, the Local Government Board desire to observe that it is not clear from this resolution whether the proposal is to inoculate the calf with small-pox virus, or with vaccine lymph obtained from a human subject; but in neither case can the Local Government
Board approve of the resolution adopted by the Guardians. Small-pox virus, taken from a calf, would communicate that disease to a human subject, and be thereby a fertile source of propagating the disease, and would, moreover, render the operator liable to prosecution under the fourth section of the 81 and 82 Vic., cap. 87.

If the proposition were to vaccinate a calf with lymph obtained from a human subject, the Board have to state it has long since been ascertained that the animal lymph for Vaccination purposes must, in the first instance, be obtained from a cow in which the disease has spontaneously arisen, and that Vaccination performed with lymph taken from a cow which had been vaccinated with human lymph is not reliable. The Local Government Board, therefore, lose no time in cautioning the medical officers against either of the practices referred to, as the Guardians, no doubt, acted in ignorance of the consequences when they passed the resolution directing their medical officers to act on the suggestion made.

"By order of the Board,
"B. Banks, Secretary."

Now, we ask any hesitating M.P., How could the existing practice of Vaccination be more thoroughly exposed and condemned? Sir Cordy Burrows described the process whereby matter for Vaccination had been officially procured and distributed over the kingdom; and the Irish Local Government Board stigmatise the procedure as not only a fertile source of small-pox, but absolutely illegal! And yet Anti-Vaccinators are a fanatical and illogical folk

Compulsory Vaccination a Sin and a Crime.
—We admit that the State may assault our bodies in two cases. First—if we are criminal; only the crime must not be a fanciful crime, arbitrarily created by law. Religious persecutors used to pretend that they punished a heretic not for his heresy, but for his disobedience to the law. That is, they voted his opinion to be a crime. Now-a-days, they vote non-vaccination to be criminal. A hundred years ago the physicians would have advised the State to enforce inoculation; but now inoculation is penal! Well may the State forbid infusing a disease! but to command the infusion of disease is sin and crime, whatever men may vote. No such capricious enactments can justify the enactors; crime must be measured by the human conscience and common sense.—Prof. F. W. Newman.

PROFESSOR NEWMAN on MAGISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY.

The following letter was addressed to Mr. Wm. Tebb in relation to his repeated prosecutions for non-vaccination of your daughter. You hardly look for reiteration of my wonder and my indignation that legislators of this country should dishonour themselves and betray the trust committed to them by delegating legislation to medical experts, and should be ignorant that they are committing usurpation by legislating against perfect health. The necessity of disestablishing and disendowing the medical cliche which has fastened itself round the neck of this nation, and afflicted us by foul tyranny under false pretences of averting contagion, is the lesson which, I trust, is everywhere being learnt. But the fact which most presses on me, from reading the language of magistrates and guardians, is the immoral complacency with which they think they can clear their consciences from the guilt of oppression by explaining that 'they do but execute the law, and it is their duty to execute it, without judging if it be right or wrong.' Can they be ignorant that this tyrannical renunciation of the duty of obeying God rather than man has always been the strength of every most wicked tyranny? No man can get rid of personal responsibility before God in this way. Every one of these men would see it, if a case were proposed in another nation and another class of actions. To poison the blood of healthy children is a wickedness which no honourable man ought to justify by saying that the State commands it; nor therefore ought he to compel a parent to do such a deed. No man is obliged to continue in the post of magistrate or guardian. If he is commanded to act oppressively, he can resign his post, and ought to resign it. Nothing is clearer to anyone who will open his eyes, than that what is now called Vaccination has no effect in lessening small-pox, and has frequent and terrible effect in doing mischief. The doctors who urge Vaccination do not believe in it, for they advise re-vaccination. It aims to infuse disease, which no legislator has a right to do, whatever bold theories or falsehoods medical fanatics may advance. To unprejudiced common sense the case is perfectly clear. Neither the Pope, nor the head of the Jesuits,
nor a Catholic director, nor an English Parliament, in commanding tyrannical deeds, can free the under-agents from the responsibilities of wicked action. Each man has to bear his own guilt in compulsory Vaccination as much as in burning heretics or in massacring Jews. Besides, all men in authority ought to know that this pernicious and usurping law was passed without publicity and free debate, and that the Parliament did not know the dangers of various contagions from this false Vaccination, of which the enforcement degrades law and makes Parliament itself odious. A patriot, methinks, would brave the authority of Parliament to save the honour of Parliament. I am sorry for you as an individual, but I do not wish this wickedness to become inveterate by mildness in the enforcement.—I am sincerely yours,

"F. W. NEWMAN.

"Weston-super-Mare, Jan. 28, 1879."

THE ST. PANCRAS PERSECUTION.

Mr. WILLIAM TEBB's 18th summons was heard before Mr. De Rutzen at the Marylebone Police Court, on the 21st of March. Mr. Thomas Baker, barrister, appeared for Mr. Tebb, and the magistrate listened to his arguments with more than the usual courtesy accorded to those who plead for the confessors of unpopular truth. Mr. De Rutzen ultimately adjourned the case for a week on two points; first, that the Vaccination officer should produce the minutes or written instructions of the Guardians authorising the prosecution; and, second, that he, the magistrate, might consider whether the Vaccination officer should be required to prove that Mr. Tebb's child had not been vaccinated. The interest in the decision was however frustrated; since, for some reason, as yet unrevealed, the solicitor for the Guardians intimated to Mr. Tebb their withdrawal from the suit. The St. Pancras newspapers affect considerable indignation over the Guardians' retreat, and denounce the favour shown to the rich over the poor. What would they have? The favour is the creation of Parliament, which concedes exemption from Vaccination to any parent who pays the specified fine. The law is iniquitous, odiously iniquitous, and Mr. Tebb has never ceased to proclaim its iniquity; but let the St. Pancras press give proof of virtue by sustaining the first anti-vaccinator, prosecuted for protesting the purity of his children's blood, and unable to purchase the immunity which the law allows.

THE DOCTORS' DILEMMA.

The people of England are lamentably ignorant of physiology and the laws of health. The imposition of compulsory Vaccination is one of the penalties of this ignorance and neglect. The so-called "educated" classes are the most deluded on the subject of Vaccination. Working people, men and women, use their common sense on the subject of Vaccination, and hate it with a perfect hatred.

We have left this matter to the doctors, and a pretty mess they have made of it! I gather hope, however, from the fact that the doctors are in a dilemma.

Sir Thomas Watson, M.D., who has been a leading London physician for nearly half-a-century, and who is an upholder of Vaccination, admits (Nineteenth Century for June, 1878) that there is an "ugly blot" on Vaccination. He says: "It is certain that one objection, really formidable, does exist—that the operation may impart a harmful and destructive disease (syphilis). I can readily sympathise with and applaud a father who is willing to submit to multiplied penalties rather than expose his child to the risk of an infection so ghastly."

That sounds like common sense; but note what nonsense follows. On the next page, Sir Thomas Watson advises a return to "calf lymph" in order to avoid this "ghastly" risk of infection from arm-to-arm Vaccination. He adds: "Compelled Vaccination should in all cases be from the calf alone." But as cows and calves do not have the pox spontaneously nowadays, it must be produced artificially; and this is the process:

"A healthy and well-nourished calf, about three months old, is hired from a butcher, and vaccinated in the usual way, on its shaved abdomen, in about sixty places. Upon the punctures thus made, vesicles form, and the virus is, about the fifth or sixth day, fit for use from the living animal in direct Vaccination. The calf is returned to the butcher none the worse for what has happened." (!)

I doubt if the annals of medical quackery contain anything more opposed to common sense than this. Well may Dr. Seaton say (Vaccination Inquirer, p. 3), "The difficulties of applying such a plan to the Vaccination of the general population are insuperable;" and that, "so far from producing fewer ailments and cutaneous eruptions, it would, as being more irritating, produce more." So that the remedy is worse than the disease.

It is proverbial that "doctors differ."
Vaccinating-house is "divided against itself," and we knew on the highest authority that such a house "cannot stand."

That men who have received a medical training to qualify them for the "healing art" should support this system of inoculating every healthy child with disease is an outrage upon common sense.

Manchester.

HENRY PITMAN.

WHAT HAPPENS UNDER THE ACT.—I have before me a copy of the Echo, of July 2nd, in which, not an anonymous correspondent, but the editor himself, gives a case of a healthy child who was vaccinated when three months old, and was thereby infected with serious disease, and the result was that the child died. The editor of the paper says—"So important was the case considered, that all the physicians in attendance at the hospital on that day, being six in number, left their patients to examine the child, and they one and all concurred that it was a Vaccination case." The editor goes on to say—"It is all very well to have a Compulsory Vaccination law; there ought at the same time to be a Government scrutiny as to the quality of the Vaccination material used. The case we have recorded shows that no child is safe under present circumstances." I have here a copy of the Boston Guardian of September 20th, in which there is a case of a child who was vaccinated by Dr. Maxwell, the Vaccination officer, and who died a week after the Vaccination. The attention of the Local Government Board was called to the matter. Dr. Maxwell said he could give no explanation; that he had used a proper lancet and proper lymph. That is another victim I have also a copy of the Newcastle Daily Chronicle of October 11th, in which there is an account of a case of "Alleged Death from Vaccination." An inquest was held on the body of Henry Mould, aged four months. The child was vaccinated and had died. Dr. Abrahath, who was present at the inquest, said that "no one could tell good from bad lymph, no microscope or chemical tests could detect it. He had himself poisoned three children by so-called healthy Vaccination lymph, and this made the 121st case he had seen where children had suffered visibly from Vaccination." The jury, after a long consultation, returned a verdict—"That deceased died from diarrhea, accelerated by Vaccination, duly and properly carried out under the Act."—From Mr. W. Tern's Defence before the Magistrate at Marylebone Police Court.

MR. ISAAC PITMAN ON VACCINATION.

In a letter to his brother Henry, not before published, Mr. Isaac Pitman, the inventor of Phonography, says:—

"The Times and Mr. Simon are both prejudiced witnesses in respect of Vaccination. No one would look to the Times for any truths that are not yet accepted by the majority. Vaccination for the small-pox is only a less evil than Vaccination for the small-pox. Medical men did this formerly! The devil of disease is to be driven out by the angel of health, and not by another devil of disease, although he may be less malignant than the one to be ejected.

"It is simply impossible that any child can be benefitted or in any way fortified against disease by having a poisonous virus inserted into the blood. He may be strong enough to withstand the evil effects, and most children are when the virus is not very malignant, but it is impossible that he should be rendered more healthy, or more proof against the attacks of disease by it. So long as the State pays for Vaccination, and insists upon its being done on every child, it would be impossible to get a conviction against a doctor for killing a child with bad virus. I commend you for protesting against the iniquitous Compulsory Vaccination Laws by refusing to pay the fine. If all parents went on contentedly having their children vaccinated, thus killing some of them, while the State pays the doctor, there would be no end to the evil. It must be protested against; and if I had understood the matter fourteen years ago as I do now, my two boys should not have had the virus of any diseased child inserted into their arms. Whatever distempers Vaccination may develop in them will be more easily shaken off, in consequence of the absence of the corrupting flesh of animals in their diet."

WHAT THE DOCTORS WOULD LIKE.—The British Medical Journal, for April 19th, in an article on "Small-pox in Paris," concludes by saying, that "until re-vaccination is compulsory, like Vaccination, small-pox cannot be completely stamped out, and we shall always be liable to a recurrence of epidemics of a certain severity."

PREVENTION IS BETTER THAN CURE.—In looking over some of John Leech's sketches I came on the following—Old Lady—"But, going in four-wheel cab! I'm so afraid of small-pox." Cabby—"You've no call to be afraid o' my cab, mum, for I've had the hind wheel vaccinated and it took beautiful."
MR. P. A. TAYLOR ON VACCINATION.

The Irish Vaccination Acts Amendment Bill was read a second time in the House of Commons on Monday, 7th April. Mr. Hopwood, Member for Stockport, moved the rejection of the measure, on the ground that it would oppress the people of Ireland by compelling, with repeated convictions, any man in that country to do what he might honestly consider dangerous to the health of his child. Mr. P. A. Taylor, Member for Leicester, in rising to second the amendment that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said—

I am very sorry to be obliged to trouble the House with any remarks at this late hour of the evening, but I must remind the House that it is not my fault that I have to do so, but rather the fault of the Government in bringing on a Bill of this importance at the present hour. I will not, however, detain the House for more than a few moments. There appears to me to be a little confusion in the minds of hon. members on this subject, for they are mixing up in this debate the question of the excellence of Vaccination with the question of the desirability of making Vaccination compulsory, which is an entirely different matter. For my part, I have no opinion to express at the present moment as to the excellence of Vaccination, and the House would not care to listen to me if I ventured to express any opinion on that subject at the present time. I will only, therefore, say that I was a member of the Committee of 1871 which considered the subject of Vaccination. Since that time my attention has been directed to the subject, in consequence of what I believe to be the injustice and the impropriety of compulsory Vaccination, and from the statistics and other information which I have since that time been able to obtain, my opinion has been so far modified with regard to Vaccination that I could not now put my name to the report of the Committee, which at the time was unanimously agreed to. The objection I have is to compulsory Vaccination. My hon. friends round me, and my hon. friend the Member for the County of Galway (Mr. Mitchell-Henry), boast of the enthusiastic adherence of the Irish people to Vaccination. The obvious answer to that boast seems to me to be, that if they so willingly accept it, there is no need for pressing upon them this terrible compulsion—for terrible it is to those who object to it. In my opinion every element which could justify the compulsory enforcement of Vaccination, and could justify the State in standing between parents and the health of their children, is wanting in the present condition of the science and the statistics of Vaccination. At one time and another there has been a good deal of opinion expressed in this House as to the views of the anti-vaccination party, and much expression of disgust at their views, and repudiation of their conduct in opposing the Vaccination of their children. They have been talked of as prejudiced fools, as traders in disease, and as mere obstinate, wrong-headed persons standing between the self-evident good and advantage of their children, and the benevolence of the State. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that that seems to me to be an altogether wrong way of putting it. We cannot express the general opinion on the question of Vaccination without taking into consideration what is undoubtedly the fact, that there does exist in the country a great amount of honest opposition to the principle of Vaccination. I have seen dozens and scores of persons who tell me that they honestly believe that their children have died from Vaccination, and who have told me all that had happened, with every circumstance and detail. They have told me how they took perfectly healthy children to be vaccinated, how an incision was made in the arm, how in the course of a few days a sore appeared there, how it spread on the arm, and from thence all over the body, and how finally the children died in agony. Now they may be wrong in their opinions, if you please, but they would be utterly heartless and unfeeling, if, holding the opinion that Vaccination is dangerous, they were to suffer their children to undergo Vaccination. I maintain that all the elements justifying compulsion on the part of the State are wanting in this instance of Vaccination. In the first place, there is not that certainty in the results which was boasted of by Jenner, and believed in as the fact at that time. During his life time Vaccination was believed to be an absolute cure and specific for small-pox. It was said that children who had been vaccinated were subsequently inoculated, or attempted to be inoculated with small-pox, and that the attempt entirely failed, thus proving the excellence of Vaccination. But if that was true then, it is most clearly not true now; for whenever there is an epidemic of small-pox scores and hundreds of children die of small-pox, and are acknowledged to have died of small-pox although previously vaccinated. It must be remembered, also, that the figures put before us by the Government are unreliable; unreliable partly because it is acknowledged by medical men to be impossible, when children have died of small-pox, to tell afterwards
whether they have been vaccinated or not; and unreliable, also, because it is a principle with medical men not to return children who have died from the effects of Vaccination as having so died. It has been stated by medical men that they do not like to cast a slur upon the system, and, therefore, they do not return deaths by Vaccination, even when they do occur. There was a case at Leeds the other day where the child died from Vaccination, and the surgeon inserted that as the cause of death in his certificate. But the coroner, who was also a medical man, was one of those who do not like to cast a slur upon Vaccination, and opposed that course. He said Vaccination was not a death known to the law, and accordingly the child was returned as having died from another cause. In fact, the poor child had committed a legal offence in venturing to die under such circumstances. Then again, since Vaccination has been made absolutely compulsory in this country, deaths from small-pox have positively increased (hear, hear). Actually since the year 1833, or whatever the year was when Vaccination was made compulsory, there had been an increase in the percentage of deaths. Then there is Germany, the best vaccinated country in the world. There the deaths from small-pox in the last epidemic were something frightful. All these are ample evidence to show that there is ground for the presumption and for the doubt whether it is wise for us to vaccinate our children. Far more than this, however, it is no longer held absolutely safe to vaccinate children, as was stated to us when the Committee sat in 1871. During the first part of the time that the Committee sat, the doctors who were called before us declared it to be impossible that syphilis and other diseases could be communicated by inoculation; nevertheless it was proved to demonstration before we finished our sittings, that thirteen cases of syphilis had arisen from one case of Vaccination (hear, hear). Indeed that fact is now notorious all over Europe. Not so very long ago that famous physician, Dr. Ricord, declared that if it could be shown in any one case that syphilis was the result of Vaccination, Vaccination must cease to be practised, because it would be perfectly impossible to make sure that the child from whom the lymph was taken was safe. I do not think that it is going to far to say that where there is risk on the one hand, and this chance of syphilis and other horrible diseases on the other, that it is abominable tyranny for the State to step in, to stand between the parent and the child, and to say that the child shall incur the risk of syphilis rather than incur the risk of catching small-pox. Then, at the very least, the State is in this dilemma. Either Vaccination is a certain prophylactic, and then you don't need compulsion, because those only run a risk who neglect the operation, or it is not at all certain, and then you have no right to enforce it on parents. But the real fact is, you do not enforce it in a straightforward way. You do not dare to enforce it. The only thorough way to enforce this compulsion is for the State to take the child out of the mother's arms and vaccinate it. You do not dare to do that, and you further only oppress the very poor, who have no power to resist your tyranny. People in the middle classes who object to compulsory Vaccination are not summoned, and there are actually members in this House who avoid the law, who do not have their children vaccinated, and yet are not punished (loud cries of 'No, no.') Therefore the law ceases to become something enacted for the protection of society at large, and degenerates instead into merely a piece of class legislation. Finally, if Vaccination were the finest and safest thing in the world, your attempt to spread it by compulsion is an outrageously mistaken policy, because you are setting against you numbers of people whose views may be only based on prejudice, but whose prejudices are intensified at the distinctions which you most unjustly make. I beg to second the amendment of my hon. and learned friend.

After some discussion, the amendment was negated, and Mr. Taylor's speech was only suppressed in the morning papers.

For the present, Vaccination is entrenched in the ignorance and terror of our legislators, and every demand of the medicine men they abjectly concede. They know nothing of themselves, they say, but the medicine men cannot be wrong! Indeed, many M. P.'s, in excusing and defending Vaccination, reproduce precisely the arguments which seem so ridiculous in the mouths of savages when justifying their superstitions.

PRO-VACCINATORS' DISCREPANCIES REQUIRE EXPLANATION.—The occurrence of small-pox after vaccination required to be accounted for. There were strong temptations to say that those who died were either unvaccinated or imperfectly vaccinated. To say that a person who died of small-pox after vaccination was "imperfectly vaccinated," was to give up the argument, or to suppose that the listener was ignorant of the subject. These discrepancies in the evidence require to be explained.—Sir Thos. Chambers, M.P.
VACCINATION AND SMALL-POX IN IRELAND.

THEM INTIMATE RELATION DEMONSTRATED.

Ireland has been recently visited by another epidemic of small-pox, and as that country has been referred to so frequently by the so-called "authorities" as an example of vaccination stamping out small-pox, I think it may be useful to recall to notice some of the evidence which was given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Vaccination Acts in 1871.

It was in the spring of that year that the great epidemic rose in England. It was not unnatural, therefore, that I should be questioned on the subject.

In my examination before the Committee of the House of Commons, 1871, the following question was put to me (on the 10th of March)—

Question 1141—Then, if I understand you rightly, the statement that I have often seen of late, that Ireland is free from small-pox because it is more completely vaccinated than England, is not a true statement?

Answer—It is not founded on fact. [In answers to previous questions I had furnished the official statistics.]

Q. 1148—Can you tell me, then, how it is that Vaccination should be thought to prevent small-pox in Ireland, and yet, that in spite of Vaccination we have an epidemic in this country at this time?

A.—Simply from the absence of the epidemic. In all probability, following the epidemic wave which is now passing over Europe, Ireland next year, or even this, will present a very heavy mortality from small-pox.

On the 28th of April, 1871, Sir Dominic Corrigan, M.D., was examined by the Committee with the following result—

Q. 4002—Do you take it that the great freedom from small-pox and from deaths from that disease in Ireland is at all owing to the way in which Vaccination has been carried out in that country?

A.—I think the true state is, that Vaccination has been carried out very well, and that the people are most favourably disposed towards it.

As usual, the absence of small-pox was attributed to Vaccination having been so superior in Ireland, and the people so obedient that, in the opinion of Sir Dominic Corrigan, M.D., no compulsory action was needed by his countrymen. (See Questions 4002 to 4008 in evidence.)

It does seem monstrous that, notwithstanding the abundance of evidence of the failure of Vaccination, its advocates should still persist in demanding a more stringent Act of Parliament to enforce it. A bill now in the House of Commons, no doubt will pass that House without a division.*

There has recently appeared a pamphlet entitled, On the Prevalence of Small-pox in Dublin, by Thomas W. Grimshaw, M.A., M.D." The substance of the pamphlet appeared in the Dublin Journal of Medical Science, June, 1878. Dr. Grimshaw's reason for bringing his papers under the notice of the Medical Society of the College of Physicians "was to show in a most conclusive manner the great benefits which Vaccination has conferred on the community."

In Table I. given by Dr. Grimshaw, the average annual number of deaths from small-pox in Ireland in the decade 1851-61 was 1,278, and in the decade 1861-71 was 411. The Compulsory Vaccination Act and the Act for the Registration of Births and Deaths both came into force on the first of January, 1864. Prior to 1864 there were no reliable statistics. "During the last decade, 1861-71, the most important change took place in the Vaccination Laws. The result of the enforcement of this Act is remarkable; for, during the decade the mortality fall from 1,278 to 411."

Dr. Grimshaw says—"These statistics show that the deaths from small-pox have decreased in the decade 1861-71, and are accounted for in a most satisfactory manner by the progress of Vaccination." He attempts to make the public believe not only that vaccination diminishes the mortality, but that it prevents the recurrence of epidemics.

It is lamentable that the advocates of Vaccination should be guilty, as they are, of suppressing facts in order to sustain their theory by patented statements.

Dr. Grimshaw read his paper and published it only last year, and he must have been in possession of the official statistics in the Annual

* While writing this, I have just received a report of a speech by Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P., delivered in the House of Commons on the second reading of the Irish Vaccination Bill—a speech which has never been excelled in that House on this subject.
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Report of the Local Government Board for Ireland published in 1874, which includes the mortality from 1864 to 1878. Indeed, at page 6 of his pamphlet he gives the number of deaths from small-pox in Ireland in each year, from 1864 to 1877, comprising a period of fourteen years, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Deaths from Small-pox</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Deaths from Small-pox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>2243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we have statistics furnished under the Registration Act, 1866, and it is notable how disappointing must be the truth when it comes out.

Dr. Grimshaw makes his deacade end, as given above, in 1871. Why he excluded the following six years can only be interpreted by inferring that the including of those years of increased mortality would have shown the fallacy of his assertions.

Let us take these fourteen years and divide them into two equal periods—

In the first seven years | Small-pox Deaths, 1864 to 1870, 1,605
In the second seven years | 1871 to 1877, 5,607

Dr. Grimshaw tells the Medical Society that "in 1864 a serious epidemic of small-pox (causing 864 deaths) prevailed, which had commenced in the previous year. The enforcement of the new Act, and the panic caused by the epidemic had stimulated Vaccination to such an extent that 191,810 persons were vaccinated by the Dispensary medical officers during the year ending September, 1864, the number of vaccinations exceeding considerably the number of births registered. The result of this activity in Vaccination was a diminished prevalence of small-pox—the deaths from this disease falling to 461 in 1865, and further falling the next year when the epidemic ceased."

Here we have a restoration of the old oft-told story—"See what Vaccination has done! When the epidemic, in this instance as in every other, had subsided by a natural law, i.e., when it had prevailed for about two years it died out,* and immediately the vaccinators exultingly exclaimed, "See what we have done! we have stamped out the epidemic!"

Now for a moment let us look at the relation existing between the number of vaccinations and the numbers who died of small-pox.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Persons Vaccinated</th>
<th>Died of S-Pox</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Persons Vaccinated</th>
<th>Died of S-Pox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1,911,810</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1,798,889</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1,699,142</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>2,233,484</td>
<td>2,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1,787,124</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,588,733</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1,257,741</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1,799,687</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1,313,426</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,873,540</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1,256,672</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,144,879</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,404,220</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sir Dominic Corrigan was probably stating the truth when, in 1871, he told the Committee of the House of Commons on the Vaccination Acts that "the people of Ireland are most favourably disposed to Vaccination," for we find in the foregoing table that in that same year, 1871, the number of births in Ireland was 161,665, while in the same year 180,000 were vaccinated. More astounding still, in the year 1873, 149,292 were born and 285,484 were vaccinated.

Thus we have here a further confirmation of what I have repeatedly observed recorded and published—that the same result as that which followed inoculation in the last century is now occurring as the consequence of Vaccination, viz., the more Vaccination the more small-pox. A careful inspection of the foregoing table should convince the most sceptical of that fact.

The Local Government Board for Ireland, in their report to the Lord Lieutenant, dated March 31, 1874, thus remark on the considerable increase of Vaccination:

"The exceptionally large number of Vaccinations, the result of alarm in 1872, (282,484), assisted to a very considerable amount of Vaccinations and re-Vaccinations of adults. Such Vaccinations in 1873 exceeded those of the same class in 1871 by 98,988 cases, and exceeded those of 1878 by 130,285. The increase between the two former and decrease between the two latter years coinciding with the rise and subsidence of the small-pox."

So much for Ireland. I will conclude this paper by referring briefly to the city of Dublin, where we have the usual phenomenon presented to us—that small-pox was "stamped out" by Vaccination—a "proof" of which was, it was boasted, evident by the fact that in the year 1867 there were only 2 deaths from small-

---

* The epidemic broke out in the autumn of 1871, and left in the summer of 1872.
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pox. In 1868, one death only. In 1869 one death. In 1870 not a single death from small-pox was registered. "Stamped out"—the cry was uttered not only by Sir Dominic Corrigan but by Dr. Lyon Playfair, by Dr. Brewer, by Mr. W. E. Forster—by indeed every member of that Committee, to all of whom I said when the "fact" was thrown in my face, "Wait till the epidemic visits Ireland and then you will see that the small-pox will pay no respect to the vaccinated." Before that year expired 207 died of small-pox in Dublin alone. In the following year (1872) no less than one thousand three hundred and fifty died. Two thousand five hundred cases were admitted into the hospital alone.

For Dublin, let us now take the mortality as registered from 1864 to 1877.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Died of Small-pox</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Died of Small-pox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the Compulsory Act of 1863, leading to increased vaccination, we have in the first septenniad, 1864-70, 142 deaths; second septenniad, 1871-77, 1624 deaths; these are the latest returns. Dublin is now blessed with a second epidemic since 1871, when small-pox was "extinguished." I cannot close this article on Ireland without adding a quotation from the report of Dr. Seaton on the late epidemic of small-pox in the United Kingdom, contained in the report of the medical officer of the Privy Council to the Local Government Board, 1874. Dr. Seaton says—

"In the year 1872 the disease was diffused more or less over the whole of Ireland, with the exception of the province of Connaught. The chief mortality was in the cities of Dublin and Cork. The deaths in Dublin in 1872 were 1,350, and throughout the whole of the epidemic 1,557, or the rate of five thousand per million of the population. The deaths in Cork were 1,878, or at the rate of nine thousand six hundred per million living, which is a higher rate than that of any large town in England."

I sincerely hope that Dr. Grimsbaw will give more serious attention to this matter without bias or prejudice and become convinced of the prevailing error in assuming that small-pox is controlled by Vaccination. It is lamentable, with all the foregoing facts before them, that members of Parliament should favour by their assent a still more stringent law for enforcing Vaccination on the people of Ireland. Still more is it to be deplored that Her Majesty's Government by leading an ear to the interested promoters of such Acts should favour the extension of a depositions which will sooner or later endanger the peace of the nation, the credit of the profession, and jeopardise, it may be, the lives of public vaccinators and inspectors of Vaccination.

Charles T. Peace.

Our Common Crazes.—It is a melancholy reflection for human nature, how easily and completely even the most intelligent classes of even the most intelligent people may sometimes be imposed upon. There seems some inherent proneness in mankind to great national delusions. The same men whom we find as individuals watchful and wary, will, as a body, often swallow open-mouthed the most glaring absurdities and contradictions; and the press, which ought to be the detector of such delusions, will sometimes stoop to be their instrument.—Earl Stanhope's History of England.

Swarmery.—All the world assenting, and continually repeating and reverberating, there soon comes that singular phenomenon, called Swarmery, or the gathering of men in swarms; and what prodigies they are in the habit of doing and believing, when thrown into that miraculous condition! Singular, in the case of human swarms, with what perfection of unanimity and quasi-religious conviction the stupidest absurdities can be received as axioms of Euclid, nay, as articles of faith, which you are not only to believe, unless maliciously insane, but are (if you have any honour or morality) to push into practice, and, without delay see done, if your souls would live!—Thomas Carlyle.

A Satanic Suggestion.—In the Medical Press and Circular of 23rd April, we read—"It is, however, evident that the opposition to Vaccination is gaining ground among a certain class of people. Perhaps it would be as well if, after all, they were allowed to have their own way, with the proviso, that in the event of their unvaccinated children dying from small-pox they should be considered guilty of manslaughter." Would it not be much more consistent if, in the event of a child dying from Vaccination, the inflicter of the injury should be considered guilty of manslaughter?
VACCINATION IN CANADA.

In few parts of the world has resistance to Vaccination been more consistent and inflexible than in Lower Canada. Conservatism has its disadvantages, but it has also its advantages, not the least of which is avoidance of the quackeries of the day. One of the steadfast opponents of Vaccination is Dr. Emery Coderre of Montreal, who is ever ready for duty when attempt after attempt is made to seduce his countrymen into the evil practice of other nations. He has recently been challenged to a test—the well-known fallacious test of inoculation with small-pox after Vaccination—and in his support, and in evidence of hearty English sympathy, Mr. Alexander Wheeler has addressed the following letter to the editor of the Montreal Star:

VACCINATION AND INOCULATION.

Sir,—In your impression of December 31, 1878, Dr. Bessey is reported to repeat a challenge to Dr. Coderre as follows—

"Will you, or will you not, submit the question of the prophylactic power afforded by Vaccination to a practical test, in the presence of a committee of medical men, chosen promiscuously from both nationalities and all the schools, and who must be taken to be competent and impartial judges of the results of such experiments?"

The "test" may or may not have been decided upon, and even carried out—that is not my interest in this proposition. My object is to put the historical evidence before your readers, because it is both more complete and more comprehensive than anything which would be tolerated now. Unhappily, this country and America a hundred years ago had a greater experience of inoculated small-pox than is again possible. And the evidence, extensive though it be, conclusively sets at rest the question as to the possibility of "testing" Vaccination by its means.

Baron Von Swieten* and Kirkpatrick† can not be accused of saying anything in favour of Vaccination or against it, since they both wrote when Jenner was a youth. And yet both tell us that there were many whom it was not possible to inoculate with the small-pox. Dr. Kirkpatrick gives 89 cases of inoculated small-pox producing "no effect." Dr. Wagstaffe tells us, and he was confirmed by the equally high authority of Dr. Friend, that in addition to those who suffered "no effects," there were many who had an abnormal small-pox in no way like the natural or casually caught disease. Dr. Wagstaffe also quotes Dr. Nettleton as supporting "the best observation on those who have been inoculated in London, scarcely a fourth part of them have had a true and genuine small-pox." Isaac Massey, appealing to the high authority of Sir Hans Sloane, 1722, says of some who were inoculated as an experiment, "Every physician that saw them knows that not one of them had the true genuine small-pox." In many instances scarcely any pustules followed even where a small-pox resulted. On page 245 of Baron's Life of Jenner it is stated that "after a series of inoculations with true variolous matter it has often been observed that the severity of the symptoms, and the number of the pustules gradually diminish till only one is seen, at the point of insertion, and that this pustule may excite no constitutional indisposition." Condamine, quoted by Bouquet (Traite de la Vaccine), says that half mankind are insusceptible to small-pox.

Now this evidence surely is conclusive on one point, viz., that unless the experiment, meant as a "test" of the "prophylactic power of Vaccination," was on a very extensive scale indeed, far beyond what is at all possible now, it would be wholly inconclusive. For if "no effects" followed, it would not prove prevention by anything but constitutional predisposition, such as enables those mentioned by these celebrated doctors to resist contagion when wholly unprotected.

But Edward Jenner carried his experiment much further than this, and (Baron, p. 284) "proved that by inoculating a person who had gone through the cow-pox with variolous matter, that it was possible to excite a local vesication from which virus was obtainable, capable of producing a mild but efficacious small-pox." Thus, the ground has been thoroughly gone over by experiment already. Not only is it true that all inoculated do not take small-pox, though wholly unprotected, but even when vaccinated by Jenner himself the vaccinated will, if inoculated, yield a matter capable of propagating small-pox.

But we must not stop even here, for Dr. Ingenhousz, a very eminent physician, inoculated a farmer who had had the cow-pox, and produced small-pox, which was caught by another who died of it.

But, amid all these various difficulties, let us suppose the learned gentleman concluding the
"test" experiment to have gone. What then? We are no nearer a settlement than before. For, what is our experience? After eighty years of Vaccination, we do not need any test but that of experience. And experience shows that hundreds of thousands of vaccinated persons have been exposed to small-pox by contagion, and have both taken it and died of it. The Lancet, during the 1871-1872 epidemic, declared that 190,000 vaccinated persons had probably fallen victims to the disease.

During this same epidemic, 1870-1-2, 14,898 persons were admitted to the Metropolitan Asylums, suffering from small-pox, and the attendant doctors recorded no fewer than 11,174 as vaccinated. Mr. Simon, our Privy Council medical officer, sent circulars out in 1857 to the several European Governments asking their experience, and in the Blue Book we have the replies. These replies show that 152 vaccinated small-pox deaths occurred in Holstein; 5,217 cases of vaccinated small-pox in Austria; 8,178 cases of vaccinated small-pox in Prussia; 19,864 deaths from small-pox in Sweden, with the declaration that Vaccination does not confer security against death from small-pox. It also records 1,888 cases of vaccinated small-pox in the Austrian army.

Here is positive evidence: any amount of similar evidence is attainable. It conclusively settles the question whether Vaccination is a protection against small-pox. It shows that it is no protection, no prophylactic, no modifier of the disease.

No one can deny the truth of this evidence. No one can question the authorities. Then why act as if it did not exist? Why seek "tests" which must be inconclusive when general and extended experience is against the rite.

By experience, by observation, by the admissions of its own defenders, by undeniable historical and present-day experience and evidence the rite is pronounced a failure. Then why not act on this experience and cease the practice? Everywhere it fails; and yet people are so supine as to endure its enforcement. Were we wise, we should be ashamed to enforce a faith so disproved. It is as wrong to punish men for disbelieving in Vaccination, supported as they are by this experience, as it would be to punish men of science for affirming that the earth goes round the sun.—Yours truly,

ALEXANDER WHEELER.

DARTFORD, 4th March, 1870.

SMALL-POX IN PARLIAMENT.

Mr. A. P. Taylor proposes to move the following amendment in the House of Commons on Dr. Cameron's motion in favour of the substitution of pox from calves for pox from babes in the public practice of inoculation—

"That in the present uncertain condition of medical opinion in regard to the safety of using humanised lymphe, as also of the safety, effectiveness, and possibility of the use of animal vaccine, it is, in the opinion of this House, inexpedient and unjust to enforce Vaccination, under penalties, upon those who regard it as useless or injurious."

As an auditor of the debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Pease's motion a year ago, it is not difficult to predict the fate of this amendment; but all the more have we reason to thank Mr. Taylor for the courage wherewith he comes forward to support a policy so distinctly unpopular. It is true he does not condemn Vaccination, but merely advises that a practice so questionable should not be penalised enforced; but his adversaries will exhibit less than their usual ingenuity if they do not brand him as anti-vaccinator, a character scarcely less odious than that of Fenian or insidious. Those whose acquaintance happens to lie among anti-vaccinators gradually lose the full sense of horror or contempt with which average Englishmen regard those who fail to recognise in Vaccination "the noblest victory which science has achieved;" and anti-vaccinators are frequently unjust to those who have to fight their battle under the pressure of overwhelming prejudice, and who have to conceal half they think in order to be heard at all. It is, I allow, difficult for anyone who has examined Vaccination, and has discovered its utter imposture, to have patience with the insolence of ignorant prejudice; but, difficult though it be, patience is none the less duty and true policy. The more we are in the right, the better we can afford to be gentle and forbearing, though none the less persistent. An anti-vaccinator may temper his vehemence with the reflection that he, too, doubtless, entertains many a prejudice, baseless as that in favour of Vaccination, as yet undetected and unsuspected. We are all too much alike to have any right of intolerance by reason of the possession of special truth on any special subject.

As for the Vaccination prejudice, it is simply prejudice, and like all opinions based on prejudice, it will come down with "a run" like a house of cards when it does come down. There

* The words of Dr. Charteris, Professor of Medicine, Glasgow.
are many structures in which sound and un-
ound materials are intermixed, and the sound
sustains the unsound; but in Vaccination, what
is there that is sound? The practice was deliv-
ered to the world as dogma, was received as
dogma, and is maintained as dogma with such
proofs as are involved in the veracity of the
dogma itself; as for example in the perennial
argument, that Vaccination prevents small-pox;
and that if small-pox follows Vaccination, it is
because the Vaccination has been imperfect; for
no properly vaccinated person can take small-pox.

The claim of vaccinators to enter their practice
under the protection of science is preposterous.
Whenever the methods of science are applied to
Vaccination, it will vanish like smoke. Perhaps
there is no conviction begotten of science more
satisfactory to the human mind, and more fruit-
ful in results, than the uniformity of nature—
that in nature the irregular and exceptional are
only apparent, and are certain to be reduced to
sequence and conformity under deeper investiga-
tion. Now there are a set of diseases designated
symptomatic, which diseases it has been discovered
may be suppressed (as they are suppressed in
well-conducted prisons) by attention to sanitary
conditions; and among these symptomatic disorders
is small-pox. Yet this symptomatic disorder is picked
out, specialised, and separated from its fellows
and deliberately exempted from the common
law of symptomatic disease! Anyone familiar with
the methods of science, but unfamiliar with
medical practice, might suppose that in this
statement I am advancing what is incredible;
but such is the fact, and here is the fact. Dr.
Seston, Medical Officer to the Local Govern-
ment Board, in his Report for 1874 thus
delivers himself—

"If I have not adverted to any influence
which general sanitary conditions may have
exercised on the small-pox mortality at home
and abroad, it has been because the amount of
any such influence is known to be wholly insig-
nificant as compared with the presence or absence
of effective Vaccination in controlling small-pox
mortality, especially in young children."

The radical heresy of such an utterance will
be apparent to any mind en rapport with
modern science, whilst it gives the measure of the
Vaccination craze—a craze which owes its
prevalence to the persuasion that medical mat-
ters are for medical men, and that private
judgment on medical orthodoxy is irregular and
dangerous. The absurdity of the position is
graphically reduced to even childish compre-
hension by Dr. Girth Wilkinson’s Catechism—

Q. When whooping-cough is not rife, what is
that due to?
A. Nature.
Q. When scarlatina is not rife, what is that
due to?
A. Nature.
Q. When cholera is not rife, what is that due to?
A. Nature.
Q. When small-pox is not rife, what is that
due to?
A. Vaccination.
Q. When other diseases in the course of time
have become mild or died out, what is that due to?
A. Nature.
Q. And when small-pox has become mild or
died out, what is that due to?
A. Vaccination.

We trust anti-vaccinators in every consti-
tuency will urge their representatives to support
Mr. P. A. Taylor’s amendment, and likewise
petition in its favour. There is no better oppor-
tunity for bringing on discussion and letting out
the truth. Vaccination has obtained its present
place and power through public inactivity and
indifference; but the feet of the monster are
rotten, and there is no telling how soon, with a
few well-directed shoves, it may topple over.

St. Mungo.

WHAT MR. TEBB’S CASE ENFORCES.—The fines
and incidental expenses of these prosecutions,
with the Queen’s Bench Appeal Case, amount
to no inconsiderable sum; and had Mr. Tebb
been a poor man unable to meet these penalties,
the greater part of his time during the past three
years might, according to the ruling of the Lord
Chief Justice (Tebb v. Jones), have been spent
in prison. He may be right or wrong; I do not
here argue the medical aspects of the subject,
which in this Journal might be considered out
of place; the medical virtue of Vaccination is
an open question, on which public opinion is
divided, and high authorities may be quoted on
either side; but when loyalty to conscience, and
obedience to a high sense of parental duty are
punished as a crime, when a particular medical
heresy is treated as a felony, and those who
cannot subscribe to and carry out in practice the
creed of medical orthodoxy are classed with and
subjected to the penalties of pickpockets and
swindlers, an amendment of the law which
creates this offence is surely urgent and impera-
tive.—MR. THOMAS SHORTER in Nonconformist.
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER III.

MAYLAND’S EXPERIMENTS.

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu returned to England in 1718, but not until 1721 did she fulfill her intention of making war on the doctors, and incurring their resentment for the good of mankind. In the spring of 1721 she commenced action in earnest by the inoculation of her daughter—the infant that it was considered unsafe to “engraft” when at Pera in 1718. In Mayland’s words—

"The noble Lady sent me last April, and when I came, she told me she was now resolved to have her daughter inoculated, and desired me forthwith to find out matter for the purpose. I pleaded for a delay of a week or two, the weather being then cold and wet. I also prayed, that any two physicians whom they thought fit, might be called, not only to consult the health and safety of the child, but likewise to be eye witnesses of the practice, and contribute to the credit and reputation of it. This was at first denied me, it may be out of a design to keep it secret, or lest it should come to nothing.

"In the meantime having found proper matter, I engrafted it in both arms, after the usual manner. She continued easy and well till the tenth night, when she was observed to be a little hot and feverish. An ancient apothecary in the neighbourhood being then called, prudently advised not to give the child medicine, assuring them there was no danger, and that the heat would quickly abate, which accordingly it did, and the small-pox began next morning to appear. Three learned physicians of the college were admitted, one after another, to visit the young lady; they are all gentlemen of honour, and will on all occasions declare, as they have done hitherto, that they saw Miss Wortley playing about the room, cheerful and well, with the small-pox raised upon her; and that in a few days after she perfectly recovered of them. Several ladies, and other persons of distinction, also visited this young patient, and can attest the truth of this fact.

"One of the learned physicians who had visited Miss Wortley, having some years since fully informed himself of this method of practice, and being thoroughly satisfied of the safety and reasonableness of it, at length resolved to try it in his own family; he had formerly lost some children in a very malignant kind of the small-pox, and therefore advised me to lose no time to engrat the only son he had left. The boy (who was not quite six years of age) being of a pretty warm and sanguine complexion, the Doctor ordered about five ounces of blood to be taken from him; and then, in ten days after, having found matter which he liked, I inoculated him in both arms. This was performed the 11th of May, 1721."

The learned physician here referred to was Dr. Keith, and the facility wherewith he adopted the novel practice supplies an instructive commentary on Lady Mary’s anticipation of the resentment of “the profession”—her first imitator coming from the ranks of the dreaded, self-seeking obstructives. Furthermore, we have to observe how different is Mayland’s account from the heroic myth current of “the one woman confronting the prejudice and ill-will of the world.” Even Lady Louisa Stuart, who made it her business to correct many
misconceptions as to her grandmother’s career, writes—

“Only the higher motive of hoping to save numberless lives could have given Lady Mary courage to resolve upon bringing home the discovery. For what an arduous, what a fearful, and, we may add, what a thankless enterprise it was, nobody is now in the least aware. Those who have heard her applauded for it ever since they were born, and have also seen how joyfully vaccination was welcomed in their own days, may naturally conclude that when once the experiment had been made, and had been proved successful, she could have nothing to do but to sit down triumphant, and receive the thanks and blessings of her countrymen. But it was far otherwise. . . . Lady Mary protested that in four or five years immediately succeeding her arrival at home, she seldom passed a day without repenting of her patriotic undertaking; and she vowed that she never would have attempted it, if she had foreseen the vexation, the persecution, and even the obloquy it brought upon her. The clamours raised against the practice, and of course against her, were beyond belief. The faculty rose in arms to a man, forestalling failure and the most disastrous consequences; the clergy descended from their pulpits on the impiety of thus seeking to take events out of the hand of Providence; the common people were taught to look at her as an unnatural mother, who had risked the lives of her own children. . . . We now read in grave medical biography that the discovery was instantly hailed, and the method adopted, by the principal members of the profession. . . . But what said Lady Mary of the actual fact and actual time? Why, that the four great physicians deputed by Government to watch the progress of her daughter’s inoculation, betrayed not only such incredulity as to its success, but such an unwillingness to have it succeed, such an evident spirit of rancour and malignity, that she never cared to leave the child alone with them one second, lest it should in some secret way suffer from their interference.” *

Thus is History written! An apothecary and three doctors, selected by the Wortleys at discretion, and admitted singly to view a private experiment, are converted into “four great physicians deputed by Government,” rancorous and dangerous! Thus are myths generated!

Lady Mary was a woman of mark in society, fashionable and literary, and her exploit was naturally the talk of the town. Among her friends was Caroline, Princess of Wales, a lady of more than ordinary strength of mind and intelligence, with a taste for theology and philosophy, the patron of Butler, and his sympathetic student. It has been said, “There never was a clever woman that was not a quack;” and Princess Caroline was an illustration of its truth. The new remedy for small-pox caught her fancy, and she determined to put it to the test. She begged of George I. that six felons should be pardoned on condition of their submission to inoculation, and the King was pleased to comply with the extraordinary request. Maitland was then called upon to exhibit his skill, but he hesitated to act as hangman’s substitute; whereon Sir Hans Sloane, the court physician, was appealed to. Sir Hans held counsel with Dr. Terry, of Enfield, who had practised physic in Constantinople, and knew something of inoculation; and fortified with Terry’s assurance, he was enabled to overcome Maitland’s scruples, real or affected. Accordingly, on the 9th of August, 1721, writes Maitland—

“I performed the operation of inoculating the small-pox on six condemned criminals at Newgate in presence of several eminent physicians, surgeons, and others. The names of the criminals were—

1. MARY NORTH, . . . . . . . . Aged 86 years.
2. ANNE TOMPTON, . . . . . . . . 25
3. ELIZABETH HARRISON, . . . . 19
4. JOHN CUTHBERT, . . . . . . . . 25
5. JOHN ALCOCK, . . . . . . . . 20
6. RICHARD EVANS, . . . . . . . . 19

On Wednesday morning, the 9th August, he made incisions in both arms and the right legs of all the six. Thursday passed and Friday passed without any indications of constitutional disturbance, and, despairing of success, he obtained fresh pox on Saturday from Christ’s Hospital, and repeated the inoculation in new incisions in the arms of five of them. He had no matter left for Evans, who, it appeared, had had small-pox in September, 1720, and who therefore escaped hanging unwarrantably. The disease now “took,” and progressed satisfactorily. Says Maitland—

“One day Mr. Cook, an eminent Turkey merchant, having seen the persons engrafted in Newgate, and having fully considered their incisions and eruptions, he openly declared they were the very same as he had observed in

Turkey, having seen a great many instances; and that we might be assured they would never again be infected with small-pox."

Dr. Mead suggested another experiment—that cotton dipped in pox, and pox crusts should be inserted in the nostrils; and a young woman sentenced to death received her life on condition of submitting to the operation; the result was only a sore nose.

Finally, says Maitland, "on the 6th of September they were all dismissed to their several countries and habitations. The thing has been successful on all the five, far beyond my expectation, considering their age, habit of body, and circumstances; and it has perfectly answered Dr. Timoni’s account of the practice, and also the experience of all who have seen it in Turkey." *

So Maitland asserted, but others were of a different opinion. Dr. Wagstaffe, who visited the patients in Newgate regularly, maintained in a letter addressed to Dr. Freind—

"Upon the whole, Sir, in the cases mentioned, there was nothing like the small-pox, either in symptoms, appearances, advance of the pustules, or the course of the distemper. And it would puzzle any one to conceive how it is possible that small-pox can ever be prevented by inoculation. With the exception of one of the men, the girl who had cotton dipped in matter thrust up her nostrils, had as fair a small-pox as any in the place." †

Sir Hans Sloane and Dr. Steigertahl, physician to the King, to test the matter farther, "joined purses," and had one of the women inoculated in Newgate sent to Hertford, where small-pox of a severe form was prevalent, to lie in bed with small-pox patients. This she did with impunity; but it was reasonably objected that many who were not inoculated did so likewise, and also escaped without harm.

The Newgate experiment, of course, caused great excitement, and induced many repetitions in town and country. The Princess of Wales was especially alive to the importance of "the great discovery;" and for her additional satisfaction, six charity children, belonging to the parish of St. James, were inoculated; and all but one "took" and did well; the exception being due to the craft of the child, who, for the sake of the reward, concealed the fact of having had small-pox.

"Upon these trials, and several others in private families," writes Sir Hans Sloane, "the Princess of Wales sent for me to ask my opinion of the inoculation of the Princesses. I told her royal highness, that by what appeared in the several essays, it seemed to be a method to secure people from the great dangers attending small-pox in the natural way. That preparations by diet and necessary precautions being taken, made the practice very desirable; but that not being certain of the consequences, which might happen, I would not persuade nor advise the making trials upon patients of such importance to the public. The Princess then asked me if I would dissuade her from it: to which I made answer that I would not, in a matter so likely to be of such advantage. Her reply was, that she was then resolved to have it done, and ordered me to go to the King, who commanded me to wait upon him on the occasion. I told his Majesty my opinion, that it was impossible to be certain but that raising such a commotion in the blood there might happen dangerous accidents not foreseen: but he replied that such might and had happened to persons who had lost their lives by bleeding in a pleurisy, and taking physic in any distemper, let never so much care be taken. I told his Majesty that I thought this to be the same case, and the matter was concluded upon, and proceeded as usual, without any danger during the operation, or the least ill symptom or disorder since." *

The Princess Amelia, aged eleven, and Caroline, aged nine, were inoculated on the 19th of April, 1722.

Let us return to Maitland, whose triumph for the moment appeared complete, and with it his assurance. To his detractors he professed boldly—

"I could bring a great many cases of persons inoculated in Turkey to prove the constant and certain success of the practice; in all which I have never seen any miscarriage, except in one, which was wholly due to the rashness and inadventure of a surgeon at Constantinople.

"Is it not a matter of the greatest importance for us to know how to prevent the mighty contagion of the small-pox, and how to preserve our children from the violent attacks and fatal effects of it?"

---

* Mr. Maitland’s Account of Inoculating the Small-pox. 2nd ed. London, 1723.
† A Letter to Dr. Freind showing the Danger and Uncertainty of Inoculating the Small-pox. By W. Wagstaffe, M.D. London, 1723.
To divine Maitland's character—to determine how far he was rogue and how far he was fool, is not easy. He obviously made professions in vast excess of his knowledge. One of his contemporaries writes—

"I remember Mr. Maitland at Child's Coffee House, when the experiment was just begun at Newgate, was as confident and positive of the success and security proposed by inoculation as if he had had twenty years experience without any miscarriage, which made those who heard him justly suspect he was more concerned for the employ than for the success of it." *

He had not the proper craft of the conscious rogue, for alongside his assertions of absolute competence and safety, he set forth such confessions of ignorance and disaster, that one is impelled to pronounce him a purblind enthusiast. For example, take this case, which he published without apparently any sense of its scope—

"2nd October, 1721.—After due preparation of the body, I engrafted Mary Batt, an infant of two years and a-half old, daughter of Thomas Batt, a Quaker, living at Temple, within three miles of Hertford. The red spots and flushings appeared on her face and neck the fourth day; and she kept playing about well till the seventh or eighth, when she became a little heavy and thirsty, with a fuller and quicker pulse; then the pustules came out fresh and full, and the incisions discharged a thick and well digested matter. She had not above twenty in all upon her; they continued about three or four days, then dried away and fell off, and the child recovered perfectly.

"Thus far all was well; but what happened afterwards was, I must own, not a little surprising to me, not having seen or observed anything like it before. The case was in short this. Six of Mr. Batt's domestic servants, namely, four men and two maids, who all in their turns were wont to hug and caress this child whilst under the operation, and the pustules were out upon her, never suspected them to be catching, nor indeed did I, were all seized at once with the right natural small-pox, of several and very different kinds; for some had the round distinct sort, some the small continued, and others the confluent; all of 'em had a great many, but especially the last, with the usual bad symptoms, and very narrowly escaped. But they all (God be thanked) did well (except one maid, that would not be governed under the distemper, who died of it) and now enjoy a perfect state of health." *

Thus at the outset small-pox and death were the products of inoculation—the peril to be averted was incurred and multiplied. Yet the man who thus records his own infamous ignorance, had the impudence in the same pages to assert—

"The practice prudently managed, is always safe and useful, and the issue ever certain and salutary." †

Words are wasted on such manifest folly: we perceive how true is Carlyle's observation—

"Stupidity Intellectual always means Stupidity Moral, as you will, with surprise or not, discover if you look."

Before leaving Maitland, we may take another leaf from his experience. He writes—

"12th October, 1721.—I inoculated Joseph and Benjamin, sons of William Heath, of Hertford; the first of about seven, and the second three years of age; both with the same matter and at the same time: the last had a gentle and favourable kind; but the first, namely, Joseph, being a fat, foul, glutinous boy, who would not be confined to the rules and directions I had strictly charged his mother withal, as to diet and keeping warm, was taken very ill before the eruption, and after it had a great load of the continued small kind, but at last recovered and did well.

"What a mighty difference is here to be observed between those two boys! The reason of it seems to be plainly this: the younger, who had the favourable kind, was of a clean habit, moderate appetite, and easily governed during the whole process. The elder was not only of a gross foul constitution, but likewise had a voracious appetite, always eating and filling his belly with the coarsest food—as cheese, fat country pudding, cold boiled beef, and the like, which I saw myself as I came in by chance the third day after the operation; nor was there any care taken to restrain or keep him within doors in cold, windy, frosty weather; he once wet his feet in water—inso much that had he taken the small-pox by infection, the world could not have saved his life. Hence it appears how necessary it is to cleanse thoroughly foul habits before the operation, and, withal, to keep patients to a very strict regimen under it." †

Verily, as Cobbett said, quackery is never without a shuffle. As we shall see, inoculation came to require a preparatory course of very

---

* Maitland's Account, p. 27. † Ib., p. 33. ‡ Ib., p. 27.
strict regimen—so strict as to be impracticable for the rank and file of the world; but the practice was at first commended without any such conditions. What said Maitland’s patron, Lady Mary, in her famous letter from Adrianople—

“‘The small-pox, so fatal and so general amongst us, is here entirely harmless by the invention of ingrafting. . . . Every year thousands undergo its operation; and the French ambassador says pleasantly that they take the small-pox here by way of diversion, as they take waters in other countries. There is no example of anyone that has died in it.’

It was under cover of such seductive assurances that inoculation was introduced to England, and established itself in ignorance, stupidity, and quackery.

MR. W. GIBSON WARD’S PETITION.

The following petition has been forwarded to Mr. Taylor for presentation, and to be read at the table of the House of Commons—

“To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, the humble petition of the undersigned sheweth—

“That whereas the Hon. Member for Leicestershire (F. A. Taylor, Esq.) has given notice of motion in your Honourable House (as an amendment to the notice of motion) by Dr. Cameron on the subject of Animal Vaccination) to the following effect—

‘That in the present unsettled condition of medical opinion in regard to the safety of using ordinary humanised lymph, as also of the safety, effectiveness, and possibility of the use of animal vaccine, it is, in the opinion of this House, inexpedient and unjust to enforce Vaccination, under penalties, upon those who regard it as useless and injurious’—

‘Your Petitioner, therefore, humbly prays your Honourable House to affirm the above motion of amendment when brought before you, and to pass a measure founded thereupon for the entire repeal of the Vaccination Acts.

‘For your Petitioner respectfully but firmly maintains, that no English Parliament ever had, or can have, the power to make laws contrary to the laws of Nature or right reason, as Judge Blackstone and many Judges have affirmed, even so far back as Lord Chief-Justice Hobart, Sir Francis Bacon, and Sir John Davis.

‘Secondly, That Dr. Jenner gained the national reward by a false and fraudulent representation of the effects of Vaccination. He, after receiving the first instalment of public money, betrayed his utter want of faith in Vaccination by not protecting (?) or polluting his second son with it, but subjecting him to inoculation of variolous matter—now a criminal proceeding subjecting the operator to serious penalties by an enactment of your honourable House.

‘Thirdly, That there never was so severe an epidemic of small-pox in England as in Norwich in 1819, after house-to-house Vaccination, and the poor had been bribed with public money to bring their children to be polluted with vaccine virus. That in 1871, in South Shields, after 70 years of Vaccination, the deaths from small-pox were (within a fraction) one-fourth of the whole number of deaths. Such a circumstance was never known in England before small-pox was made malignant by the stupid meddling of doctors.

‘Fourthly, The character of small-pox has been misunderstood and unjustly maligned by medical men. It is not so much a disease as a natural remedy for a diseased and ruinously corrupt state of body. Small-pox, even when a raging epidemic, never raised, but always reduced the general mortality. Therefore, any attempt to remove small-pox except by raising the hygiene of the people is an insane and a criminal folly.

‘Fifthly, That the mass of the people of England are convinced of the uselessness of the so-called Vaccination. More, they are convinced of its extreme mischievousness. That now there is a double absurdity, as well as a double crime, in enforcing the polluting process. There never was a benefit by cow-poxing when cow-pox matter could be had; but now, when there is not such an article as cow-pox virus in existence, there is no possibility that Vaccination can be done at all. No medical man can say that the fifth he uses now is cow-pox matter in any degree. He cannot but say that it is variolous matter more or less, or that he has no means of knowing what it is.

‘Sixthly, That this so-called Vaccination was at first nothing but a gross superstition and a wicked fraud. Now, it is a contrivance to gain fees and public money by the wholesale slaughter of infants. This crime is now arousing a revolt in England—one growing in intensity and breadth—driving numbers of fathers to submit to ruinous fines or to imprisonment rather than allow their children to be polluted under the despotism of doctors, backed by wicked Acts of Parliament.”
"Your Petitioner is willing to prove the truth of these statements at the bar of your honourable House. He, therefore, earnestly hopes that these and other facts will have their due influence on the decision of your honourable House.

"And your Petitioner will ever pray, etc.

"WILLIAM GIBSON WARD,
"F.R. His. Soc., and a Guardian of the Poor,
"Ross, Herefordshire."

A shorter petition Mr. Ward got numerously signed by nearly every one he asked; among them four druggists, one surgeon, the Vice-Chairman of the Board of Guardians, one other Guardian, and the leading tradesmen of the town.

THEN AND NOW.

In 1800 Edward Jenner wrote—

"Having now pursued the inquiry into the nature of the cow-pox to so great an extent, I am able positively to declare that those who have gone through this mild disease are rendered perfectly secure from the contagion of small-pox."

Simultaneously, the chief London physicians and surgeons subscribed and published the following manifesto in the newspapers—

"Many unfounded reports having been circulated, which have a tendency to prejudice the mind of the public against the inoculation of the cow-pox; We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons, think it our duty to declare our opinion, that those persons who have had the cow-pox are perfectly secure from the infection of the small-pox, provided this infection has not been previously communicated."

Such was prophecy in 1800. Now let us turn to the response of Nature. Here is a summary of a few Hospital Reports prepared by Mr. Wheeler.

**Hospital Small-Pox.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Small-Pox Cases</th>
<th>Total Vaccinated Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool, 1875-6</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow, 1870-2</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homerton, 1871-6</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>4,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan, 1870-1-2</td>
<td>14,808</td>
<td>11,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin, 1870-8, 1876-8</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,465</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,058</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventeen thousand and fifty-six attested confutations of prophecy! And, wonderful to relate, attested by those who still assume to believe in the prophet and his prophecies.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER ON SMALL-POX PANIC.

The manner in which newspaper writers intensify panic in small-pox epidemics is due to ignorance, but ignorance that is disgraceful. The assumption is that every death from small-pox is a death in addition to the ordinary mortality. It is not so. Small-pox merely displaces and replaces some other form of symptomatic disease. Small-pox is an unpleasant form in which we have for a season to draw a portion of the average mortality, but it is no more. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his treatise on the Study of Sociology, makes a happy use of the London panic of 1871 in illustration of the mode in which fear affects the judgment. He writes—"An instance of the manner in which dread destroys the balance of judgment was thrust upon my attention during the small-pox epidemic, which so unaccountably spread, after twenty years of compulsory Vaccination. A lady living in London, sharing in the general trepidation, was expressing her fears to me. I asked her whether, if she lived in a town of twenty thousand inhabitants and heard of one person dying of small-pox in the course of a week, she would be much alarmed. Naturally, she answered, no; and her fears were somewhat calmed when I pointed out that, taking the whole population of London and the number of deaths per week from small-pox, this was about the rate of mortality at the time caused by it. Yet in other minds, as in her mind, panic had produced an entire incapacity for forming a rational estimate of the peril. Nay, indeed, so perturbing was the emotion, that an unusual amount of danger to life was imagined at a time when the danger to life was smaller than usual. For the returns showed that the mortality from all causes was rather below the average than above it. While the evidence proved that the risk of death was less than common, this wave of feeling which spread through society produced an irresistible conviction that it was uncommonly great."

PERSIAN PRACTICE.—O. J. Wills, M.D., describes the practice of surgery and medicine in Persia as extremely rude and superstitious. "Vaccination," he says, "is not in favour; inoculation, or the direct communication of the disorder by placing the patient in the same bed with one suffering from small-pox of the most virulent type, is the method pursued."—British Medical Journal, 26th April, 1879.
VACCINATION VIEWED POLITICALLY.

Professor F. W. Newman, in a letter to Mr. Henry Pitman, writes—

"You are fighting a battle not against Vaccination only, but against insidious medical tyranny, which is as concealed and fatuous as it is immoral. Nothing can justify Parliament in enacting a medical creed, or enforcing any special medical procedures. We all ought to be re-vaccinated periodically, according to the Lancet. Does Parliament dare to enact such a thing? It does not; else I might be taken by force and vaccinated to-morrow.

"One who carries disease with him is ostensibly dangerous. This and this only justifies legislation against him. But when a man or child is ostensibly healthy, no case is made out for legislation at all. To enact that a healthy person shall have a disease lest hereafter he get a worse disease, is a form of despotism hard to parallel; and what is peculiarly disgraceful, it is directed against innocent infants alone, because they are helpless; it does not dare to attack us adults. This fact justly arouses parents to indignation.

"Let Parliament enact that every M.P. shall be at once vaccinated, and that it shall be done from arm to arm among them every four or five years, as the doctors may prefer—if they will enact such things concerning children. The law now says to a parent—'We are alarmed to see that your child has no disease. Cow-pox (for the public good) it must have, with the chance of other hideous diseases. Submit, or else make yourself a criminal, have your hair cropped, and dress in prison garb.'

"Such legislation implies that Parliament is a medical pope, and would justify no end of monstrous violations of sacred personal right. As a surgeon cannot be omniscient, he cannot know the diseases hidden in a particular child; he is not to blame for not knowing; but this is precisely the reason why Parliament ought much rather to forbid than to enforce the vaccinating of one child from another. It makes the enforcement so indefensible, that one is unwilling to affix the right epithet.

"But even if cows would kindly get cow-pox for our convenience, so that each child might have the disease direct from the cow, even so it would be blind tyranny for the law to say to a parent—'You shall not keep your child in perfect health; that is too dangerous a course.' When to this the parent replies by defiance of the law, and is treated as a criminal, the law-makers are (in my opinion) the real criminals before God and man. Parents who become martyrs by resisting the law, deserve a sympathy akin to those who are martyrs of religion."

POCK-MARKED FACES.

The Archbishop of York in one of his letters asked if Vaccination was to be credited with the absence of the pitted faces after small-pox, which were common when he was a boy. I replied—"Certainly not." It is a coincidence, not a consequence, and is no more owing to Vaccination than to the introduction of railways.

In the first place, pock-marked faces have not altogether disappeared; while observation and inquiry will establish the fact that vaccinated persons who have small-pox are often marked, and are more liable to be marked, than the unvaccinated. The healthier the body the more capable it is of throwing off the vaccine poison without leaving injurious consequences. The "vaccine disease" corruptions the blood, retards recovery, and predisposes to marking.

When the Archbishop of York was a boy the orthodox medical treatment of small-pox was irrational. The poor patients lay on feather beds, shrouded with curtains, in unventilated rooms; they were denied water to drink and the water-cure, and had their blood inflamed by a beef and brandy diet, and no precautions were taken to temper the light scientifically. The wonder is that any small-pox patients recovered under such ignorant treatment. It is not surprising that those who escaped death often had their faces painfully scarred.

Further, it must be remembered that inoculation was practised for a hundred years before Vaccination. This insane practice of imparting small-pox spread a virulent form of the disease so alarming that inoculation was prohibited by Parliament, and it is now a penal offence.

Decrease of marking is mainly due to improved medical treatment. Small-pox is not a difficult disease to cure. The late John Smedley, of Matlock, and other hygienic physicians, have, to my knowledge, treated hundreds of cases of small-pox without losing a patient or leaving a mark.

The last reason I need adduce against the popular belief is sufficient to settle the question. It is this: the absence of pock-marked faces cannot be owing to Vaccination, because there have been more cases of small-pox since Vaccination was made compulsory than there were before.

Henry Pitman.

Manchester.
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BANBURY ANTI-VACCINATORS. In no town is public opinion more pronounced on the question of Vaccination than in Banbury, and three working men—Cluff, Claridge, and Herbert—recently did honour to their convictions by going to Northampton jail, rather than pay the fine imposed upon them for obedience to conscience.

On Tuesday evening, 6th May, a public meeting was held in the Temperance Hall, Banbury, to welcome the sufferers on their release from prison. Mr. Charles Gillett, banker, presided on the occasion, and observed that they might all feel encouraged over the progress that the opposition to Vaccination was making. The doctors themselves were divided. Some thought no lymph should be used but calf lymph. Others said calf lymph was not to be had, and that if it could be had, it would do more mischief than human lymph. Then, too, it came out that a large part of the lymph in common use was simply small-pox matter passed through cows—a procedure at utter variance with all that Jenner taught, and for which he was publicly rewarded.

Mr. Cluff related some of his prison experiences, and among them a conversation with the chaplain, who tried to convince him that he should take the law for his conscience, surrender his private judgment, and "leave the rest to God." Mr. Cluff, however, reminded him that such reasoning would have made an end of Christianity, not to speak of Protestantism and English freedom, and that it is idle for a man to shut his eyes to the light of truth, and pretend to believe that wrong is right, even if wrong happens to be law. The chaplain also enlarged on the disgrace of imprisonment, but was reminded that prison had been the portion of apostles, martyrs, and patriots, and that it was a place of honour when occupied for conscience sake.

The Rev. C. H. Collyns, Rector of Wirksworth, in seconding a resolution, said he looked on Vaccination as the greatest physiological heresy of the day. The vaccinators said every child was a centre of infection until they had poisoned its blood—until, that is to say, they had corrected the work of God Almighty. Vaccinators, on the pretext of preventing small-pox, not only did not prevent, but increased it, and multiplied other diseases by their filthy practices. It was for us to preach the truth about Vaccination, earnestly, firmly, and constantly. One of the greatest curses of this country was the vested interests which grew around abuses. A vested interest had been created by Vaccination, and there was now a whole army of officials and practitioners ready to defend the law, and to maintain its expediency at any cost. Whatever bishops, judges, and magistrates might say, he denied that he was bound to obey unjust law. On the contrary, he maintained he was bound as a Christian to disobey unjust law. Many an unjust enactment would never have been abolished had it not been for the brave resistance of men like those they welcomed from Northampton jail to-night.

The Chairman said the committee were preparing addresses for Messrs. Cluff, Claridge, and Herbert, which would be presented in due course. He then read the following address, remarking that the two others would be similar—

TO CHARLES HERBERT, Grimsbury, Banbury.

The Committee of the Banbury Anti-Compulsory Vaccination Society desire to express the pleasure they feel at your release from a term of a month's imprisonment in Northampton jail, nobly endured by you for resisting the wicked compulsory Vaccination Acts in refusing the Vaccination of your child, Florence Amelia Herbert. The Committee herewith offer you their sincere thanks for the valuable help you have thereby rendered the cause. They deeply regret the privations you have had to undergo, but they trust that such self-denial for the rights of parental liberty, and for the sake of our little children, may hasten the day for an enlightened and impartial inquiry into the evils of Vaccination, and the repeal of the compulsory Acts.

CHARLES GILLETT, Treasurer.
T. J. NORTON, Secretary.
SOLOMON SHRIMPTON, Secretary.
Banbury, May 8, 1879.

BEDFORD ANTI-VACCINATORS.

At the Bedford Petty Sessions on Monday, 12th May, a number of anti-vaccinators were brought up for judgment. The first, Mr. Saunders, raised a variety of legal objections, which were overruled, and an order was made that his child be vaccinated within three months. John Craddock was summoned for not having complied with an order to have his child vaccinated within four months. He asked the Bench to be lenient with him. He did not intend to have his child vaccinated, and if they fined him heavily he would have to go to prison. He was a hard-working man, and it was all he could do to keep his home respectable. The Boston Bench had recently twenty anti-vaccinators before them, and they were fined £d. each, and
FEROCIUS GUARDIANS.

Perhaps the worst evil of the Vaccination Act is the contest it provokes and allows between Guardians and Anti-Vaccinators, whereby law is brought into contempt. Guardians get enraged over the defiance of their authority and their sense of practical impotence, and try to satiate their fury in repeated prosecutions. A wealthy Anti-Vaccinator pays his fines and laughs at Bumbledon, but the contest is a serious affair for a poor man. There is, for example, Mr. Alexander Hume, of Walthamstow, reporter and journalist, who suffers under the relentless persecution of the West Ham Guardians. They are determined that Mr. Hume’s child be vaccinated, which it never will be; and as they cannot have their way, they worry the father without mercy. At a recent meeting of the Board, the chairman, the Rev. T. Parry, read the following letter, which had been addressed to him—

“7 Woodford Terrace, Woodford Road, “Forest Gate, E.”
“5th May, 1879.”

“Rev. Sir,—I have decided to apply to you as chairman instead of seeking an interview with the West Ham Board of Guardians. You are doubtless aware that your Board have from time to time, for, I believe, nearly three years, been prosecuting a friend of mine, Mr. A. Hume, of Walthamstow, who, with his wife, conscientiously objects to Vaccination. As there is no prospect or likelihood of the operation being performed in his family, myself and other friends think it time that an appeal should be made to the Guardians to relax their hostility, especially as the president of the Local Government Board advises the relinquishment of prosecutions in such cases. I think it desirable to make this application to you in the first instance; perhaps you will kindly make this known to the Guardians.”

“John Stevens.”

The force of this sensible note was evaded on the plea that the Guardians had ordered Hume’s prosecution, that the magistrates had granted a warrant, and that the matter was for the present out of their hands. One or two of the Guardians showed some sense of their ignominious position, but the general feeling was for a continuance of the fray. One of them, a Mr. Morgan, said it was a test case, in which they were dealing with a man who might be said to be in full rebellion, and trying to injure the cause of Vaccination by false statements, and that nothing would satisfy
the Board short of the Vaccination of the child. The answer is that the Board has no power to secure the desired satisfaction: the Guardians can only tease and plunder a man, who, if he happened to be rich could snap his fingers at them in defiance; and this we say, that Guardians with the spirit of English gentlemen in them would scorn to administer such damcastle law.

---

AT LAST! GOOD SENSE.

"And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone."—GAMALIEL.

There having been new elections in St. Pancras, the Guardians have reconsidered their policy, and accepted the prudent advice of the Local Government Board. At a meeting on Thursday, 22nd May, Mr. Skoines moved and Mr. Ives seconded the resolution that no further prosecutions be instituted against Mr. Tebb. Of course there was resistance; there are irreconcilables in every assembly; and Mr. J. L. Seaton, Mr. Spencely, and Mr. Bower were for, going on to the bitter end—that is to say, wasting time, wasting money, and gaining nothing. Such is fanaticism. To the support of Mr. Skoines came Mrs. Howell, Messrs. Bradley, Byrne, Severell, Furniss, Guerrier, and Thornton—9 for the resolution, and 8 against. Then Mr. Skoines moved, and Mr. Guerrier seconded, that Mr. James Mansfield suffer no further molestation, which motion was passed unanimously.

Thus ends a couple of irritating prosecutions, which, from the outset, were doomed to failure, which only served to exhibit the malignity of certain Guardians, the impotence of the law, and, fortunately (as good out of evil), to excite wide interest in Vaccination, and to diffuse a vast amount of information as to its vile origin and pernicious effects. For the deliverance St. Pancras is chiefly indebted to Mr. Skoines, and his example shows how much a little energetic common-sense may achieve, where common-sense has hitherto been conspicuously absent.

An amusing incident in connection with the case of Mr. Mansfield occurred on the following day. Under a former order of the Board, a summons had been taken out against him, and in due course he appeared before Mr. Barstow at the Clerkenwell Police Court. Mr. Barstow is a magistrate with a better reputation for severity than for wisdom, and to Mr. Mansfield’s gentle reminder that he had repeatedly come before him for the same offence, and that with him lay full discretion to terminate a prosecution that had degenerated to wanton persecution, he grimly inquired whether that was all he had to say. His Worship then proceeded to observe that anti-vaccinators were an obstinate set of people who perversely set their ignorance against the intelligence of the Legislature, and did what they could to spread a loathsome and horrible disease. So far, therefore, from exercising leniency, he would inflict the highest penalty the law allowed. At this juncture the Clerk interposed, and pointed out to his Worship that the time for vengeance had not come, and that it was only a vaccination order that he was asked for. Very ruefully the uplifted sword was dropped, and instead the order was pronounced that the child be vaccinated within fourteen days.

---

A FEW WORDS ON PRECEDING ARTICLES.

Were any law enforced with the scandalous irregularity of the Vaccination Acts, we should soon have the press thundering loudly and parliamentary echoes. Consider the facts set forth in the preceding articles. At Banbury, anti-vaccinators sent to prison; at Bedford, fines of 6d. and 2s. costs imposed; at Walthamstow, a poor journalist made a butt for the vindictive archery of Jacks in office; in St. Pancras, two citizens prosecuted over and over again, and finally dismissed as unconquerable.

At present the position of anti-vaccinators is much akin to that of the American abolitionists prior to the Great Rebellion. Nothing was less respectable than anti-slavery, and abolitionists, who suffered under law or outrage, met with scant sympathy, and had to take comfort in the great thoughts of God. A man like Garrison had often to cheer himself with lines like those of Wordsworth—

"Thou hast great allies;
Thy friends are exultations, agonies,
And love, and man’s unconquerable mind."

The service of truth (however humble) may be hard service, and the reward for the individual may be deferred, but the issue is certain; and we may assure ourselves that the great forces now arrayed on the side of Vaccination will in due time change position, and what is now highly esteemed among men will become an abomination in their sight. Meanwhile it is for us to act as if the battle were ours, and to relax no effort for victory.

We cannot but believe there are many among our legislators who, whatever their faith in Vaccination, have yet the chivalry to regard with indignation the operation of a law that crushes
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the poor and accords impunity to the rich; that is administered with rigour in one parish, and lenity in others; and that is withdrawn from action when persistently resisted. For legislation so inequitable there can be no defence; not even the common defence for what is anomalous and illogical, that it works well. Moreover, the law begins to operate in a direction which must speedily demand attention, namely, in causing the omission of the registration of births. People generally have no taste for voluntary martyrdom, and knowing the suffering and dangers of Vaccination, they take care to give the Vaccination officer no hold over them by keeping clear of the registrar. Thus, as those whose acquaintance lies among anti-vaccinators can testify, there are hundreds of children, sometimes whole families, growing up unregistered in order to escape Vaccination. And whilst we cannot approve of the practice, there are many excuses for it; and it is obvious that as the truth about Vaccination becomes popularised, and the fear of parents become excited and justified, the registration of births will be more and more evaded.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

The following letter has been addressed to Mr. Gladstone—

Sir,—In common with many others, I was much concerned to see that at Croydon a few days ago Dr. Carpenter stated that he had received from you an assurance that you were a staunch believer in Vaccination, and that you had no intention of interfering with the Vaccination Acts. Inasmuch as you supported Mr. Peto's Bill for the abolition of repeated penalties for non-Vaccination, I cannot but infer there is some mis-statement on the part of Dr. Carpenter as to your attitude towards the existing law, and I would fain conclude that he is equally at fault in representing you as a staunch believer in Vaccination. I had been led to suppose from your letter to Mr. Henry Pitman that your mind was open and uncommitted on the question of the goodness or badness of Vaccination; and I cherished the hope that if ever you found leisure to investigate the evidence wherever with the practice of blood-poisoning to avert small-pox is sustained, you would not fail to detect and expose its illusory character. It is possible to believe in Vaccination as an act of faith, but it is scarcely credible that any man of scientific capacity can at this day be a staunch believer in such quackery after independent investigation.

G. B.

CAN SMALL-POX BE SUPPRESSED?

The Lancet and other medical journals, and following in their wake the various medical officers who issue voluminous reports, are extremely persistent in designating small-pox a preventible disease. It is matter of notoriety, and unnecessary to prove by quotation, that they consider small-pox could be entirely extinguished if the means they advocate were followed out.

So far as we know, small-pox did not exist in Greece and Rome during the time of their illustrious medical literati; and yet it is not clear that there was not some disorder which took its place and effected the work it accomplishes. In India and China, however, the disease can be traced to a great antiquity, and then exhibited the same characteristics as at present. It is now the almost inseparable companion of typhus, in war, famine, and want.

The Franco-Prussian war was a remarkable instance of its method of manifestation; also the Russo-Turkish war; likewise the wars of last century. Yet it is probable that all the thousands of German soldiers who were its victims in 1870-71 were not simply vaccinated, but re-vaccinated, while large numbers of French soldiers were at least vaccinated.

Small-pox comes upon people generally in epidemics, and these epidemics are as severe, as fatal, and as persistent as of yore, as recent experience in London, Dublin, and Paris proves. As instances of epidemic small-pox accompanying famine, we need only refer to Madras and Brazil. Is there, then, any evidence that small-pox so begotten is really and truly "preventible"? Is the prophecy one of faith or of hope; or is it an attempt to explain defeat by promise of future victory?

Edward Jenner is responsible for the prophecy. Let usom and others diffused it, but Jenner was the seer of the vision. From medical sire to son has the cry been passed on, but few have challenged its truth. Let me cite, however, two ardent followers of Jenner: one the acknowledged head of Vaccine practice in America; and the other the Prize Essayist of Vaccination, and now H.M. Inspector of the same.

Dr. Martin says: "It cannot be doubted that if it were possible in this country to afford an unlimited supply of true animal virus gratuitously to the profession for every possible need and emergency, a great step would be thereby taken towards the realisation of what has been called 'Jenner's dream,' viz., the annihilation of
small-pox—a dream, only because the possibilities of Vaccination have never been universally or even generally appreciated, nor that universal and complete Vaccination and re-Vaccination ever done or half done, on the complete doing of which depends settling whether Jenner, and many more, were dreamers or fools." *

Here it is expressly given us to hope that a general and complete Vaccination is possible. It is also prophesied that, that so much accomplished, “Jenner’s dream” would be fulfilled. But Dr. Martin forgets that he has distinctly stated on page 18 of the same work: “We can never hope for truly universal and perfect Vaccination.” He even says that when all he desires and hopes for as to the production, use, and distribution of perfect vaccine is generally conceded, still even then it will only be, that “we may begin to have some faint hope of that full, perfect, universal Vaccination which Jenner and his followers always maintained would annihilate the small-pox. We know what Jenner could not know, and what time alone has taught us, viz., that Vaccination before early puberty must be renewed in adult life to secure perfect protection. Our plan of small-pox annihilation includes general re-Vaccination as well as Vaccination.” And from such a column of “ifs” and “thens,” upon such a basis of sanguine hope and wild conjecture, he delivered this perversion of desire: “It may be, it doubtless, is, wildly Utopian for any one to hope for an instant that mankind will ever have the good sense to do so wise a thing; but there is nothing, either wild or visionary, in the belief that variola could thus be annihilated.”

Dr. Ballard, has, I think, more carefully estimated the facts before him and come to a juster conclusion. He wrote, before the great epidemic wave of small-pox of 1870, 1871, 1872, and 1873, and therefore he may be pardoned for delivering his opinion, that “epidemics have been less frequent visitants than formerly and less fatal.” But he was perfectly open to the fact that small-pox attacked the vaccinated, “insomuch as it is a matter of public notoriety that small-pox does occur even among those who have undergone the vaccine disease” (p. 96). And again, “A person may have the true vaccine disease and yet suffer from small-pox at a subsequent period of his life” (p. 97). But he sums up a long argument in favour of the theory of vaccine protection, nevertheless; and concludes (p. 118), it is “a sufficiently established fact that the majority of vaccinated persons are, to all practical purposes, absolutely protected against small-pox.”

It would therefore seem that Jenner’s dream was more likely of fulfilment on Dr. Ballard’s ground than on Dr. Martin’s. Nothing of the kind. For Dr. Ballard has left us in no doubt of his opinion: “Dr. Jenner’s sanguine hope has not been fulfilled. Experience has not verified his prediction. Small-pox has not been eradicated. Let me add, that scientific observation and reasoning give no countenance to the belief that it ever will be eradicated, even from civilized communities” (p. 87).

This is positive enough language deduced from experience, not encouraging or hopeful, but probably true.

ALEXANDER WHEELOCK.

“LIKE CURES LIKE.”—Dr. Garth Wilkinson, the eminent homeopathic physician, author of Human Science and Divine Revelation, says—

“Vaccination is sometimes claimed as in principle a part of homoeopathy. Falsely, as far as homoeopathy in its whole scope is concerned. Homoeopathy, by an incomparable drug science, cancels the symptoms of disease. There is no case in which it aims to give a disease. Vaccination is unsuccessful unless it gives a disease. It also violates the body in a way that no disease—not plague or scarlatina or typhus does—by an actual wound into the blood—a poisoned wound. Neither pestilence nor physic has any analogy with this procedure.”

PERSECUTION, PAST AND PRESENT.—Mr. W. E. Forster, speaking at Bristol, observed that, “Whatever argument there might have been for persecution in former days, it had no application in these times. It might have been possible for persecution to succeed in the past; it could not succeed now. The public opinion of the world would not support it. Persecution could only succeed by means of blood and fire, and the extermination of all who offered resistance.”—[True, in a measure. We do not persecute as to what concerns spiritual health, because opinion is divided as to spiritual regimen, force balances force, and the mass of mankind is indifferent. But as to physical health it is otherwise. Under the small-pox terror men are continually suffering persecution by fine and imprisonment, and stern measures are constantly advocated by the medical priesthood and their abettors. As Herbert Spencer remarks, religious popery, which men think so indefensible, is replaced by medical popery, which is considered perfectly defensible.—Ed.]
A CALF LYMPHERS' CARD.
The following card has been sent to me—

ASSOCIATION
FOR PROMOTING
VACCINATION DIRECT FROM THE CALF.

Physician—GEORGE WYLD, M.D., Edin.
Surgeon—THOMAS WILSON, L.R.C.P., Edin.

Open daily, except Saturday, 2 to 3 o'clock.
264 Oxford Street, London.

The object of this Association is to guarantee
a regular supply of fresh Calf Lymph to the
profession, and to vaccinate with the same all
who desire it.

Two Million cases have been Vaccinated with
this lymph during the last ten years in Belgium
and the United States without one single acci-
dent, and so far as the evidence goes with a
perfect protection against Small-pox. Success
about 98 per cent. A constant supply of Calf
Lymph is produced weekly in Hampshire, and
guaranteed. The profession is supplied with
glasses or large points, two for 1s., or 5s. the
dozen. Tubes 2s. each, on receipt of stamps or
P.O.O., Vere Street.

It is curious how steadily the quackish tradit-
ion of inoculation is maintained. It commenced
with the first inoculators, was continued by
Jenner and his followers, and here we have it in
the last card from Oxford Street! Absolute
assertions and promises to the utmost limit of
the public gullibility—the unhappy public loving
a full round lie without any of the awkward
roughnesses of truth. As for calf lymph we
shall learn what a dangerous imposture it is
when Dr. Cameron brings forward his motion
for its adoption in the House of Commons—a
motion which, we grieve to hear, may probably
be withdrawn "in the interests of Vaccination," it
being considered most undesirable to disturb
the common faith in its virtues. W. H.

HOW IT'S DONE IN FRANCE.
Dr. Bonneville, editor of the Progrès Médical,
thus writes of small-pox in Paris—

"The weekly increase of cases during the past
two months has compelled the opening of special
services in three hospitals. . . . The Directeur
de l' Assistance Publique declares that the or-
ganisation for re-vaccination leaves nothing to
desire, save deficiency of lymph, which he pro-
poses to make good by resorting to calves. But
in this connection we have to recall the experi-
ence of 1870, and the sad results which ensued
from the use of calf lymph. We insist upon the
advantages of human lymph, and the possibility
of obtaining supplies adequate to our daily needs.
We only require to repeat in all midwifery wards
the practice in the Hospital de la Pitié. With
most laudable devotion and activity Sister Ur-
sula vaccinates all infants born in the rooms at
the end of eight or ten days, and collects with
great care the lymph from all the healthy chil-
dren. Thereby she is able to supply a large
number of doctors in Paris and the provinces,
who, having been students at La Pitié, know
that they can be sure of good lymph from Sister
Ursula."

I was furnished with the Progrès Médical by
the kindness of M. Talandier of the Chamber of
Deputies, who also forwarded the public notices
posted in all the communes of France, which I
append, sure that they will be read with interest.

Indirect compulsion—such as, demanding cer-
tificates of vaccination from school children, from
recruits, etc.—is the rule in France.

French Republic.
City of Paris.
"Notices.
"The Mayor of the 6th Arrondissement has the
honour of informing Citizens that gratuitous
Vaccination and re-Vaccination for infants and
adults, organised by the Municipal administra-
tion with the assistance of the physicians of the
Bureau de Bienfaisance, will commence on
Thursday, 17th April, at the places, days and
hours following. [Then follow details.]

"A premium of three francs [2s 6d] will be paid
to needy families for every child vaccinated,
upon whom the operation has been successfully
performed.

"This premium will be raised to six francs for
those infants from whom the vaccinators collect
lymph. [There being no compulsion, as in
England, enforcing the attendance of the vacci-
nated.]

"Paris, 10th April, 1879."
A second placard contains a supplementary
notice from which I select the following:—
"The Mayor must insist on the fact that the
effects of Vaccination cease at the end of five or
six years, at which period re-Vaccination is
necessary."

Happy Mayor! He knows where others doubt.
With the voice of authority he pronounces Vac-
cination good for five or six years. If the ma-
majority die of small-pox within the magic term,
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they die outside official cognisance. Anyhow, it is satisfactory to have this public testimony that Jenner's lifelong protection is good for no more than six years. We may look for the complete truth by-and-by. ALEX. WHEELER.

THE LAW OF EVIDENCE.

ATTEMPTS are continually made to confound anti-vaccinators with private and partial evidence. Small-pox, they are told, broke out in a certain household; the vaccinated escaped or recovered whilst the unvaccinated died. The household experience is sometimes magnified to that of a village, an hospital, or a city; and the obvious conclusion is enforced with superfluous emphasis.

Stories of this kind are always to be received with suspicion or disbelief. They usually proceed from professional vaccinators; and we have to remember, that if the facts told against Vaccination they would be sedulously suppressed. Then, too, we have to remember, that whenever it has been possible to scrutinise evidence in favour of Vaccination, it has turned out false evidence. There was Leeds, for instance, where a strong case was made out, but which, under Mr. Pickering's examination, proved to be a tissue of fiction. The detection and exposure of the "got-up" evidence was an affair of so much labour and difficulty, that but for Mr. Pickering's indomitable courage, perseverance, and tact, it might have passed muster as truth unquestionable. It is much easier to concoct lies than to explode them, and liars generally reckon on the difficulty for impunity.

When the moralist is confronted with instances of successful immorality, he says they must be illusory, for to virtue alone belongs permanent success. When the man of science is confronted with what is irregular or exceptional in nature, he falls back on general law. He knows the order of the world, and confining in that order, he says, if the fact be a fact, it is in some way misunderstood, and when rightly apprehended, its irregular or exceptional character will disappear. And thus we treat the asserted advantages of Vaccination. It is in vain to tell any one who understands the laws of health that such a disease as small-pox can be mitigated or arrested by a device like that of Jenner. There are coincidences that may favour Vaccination, as they favour every quack remedy, but it is the first caution in scientific logic to distinguish post hoc from propter hoc. We may be unable to explain or to follow some asserted experience, but we do wisely when we refuse to be drawn from the sure ground of law by any plausible exception. We know that not only is Vaccination no preventative of small-pox, but that coincidently with the extension of Vaccination has been the extension of small-pox. Here are Dr. Pearce's famous statistics—

"Vaccination was made compulsory by an Act of Parliament in the year 1858; again in 1867, and still more stringently in 1871. Since 1853, we have had three epidemics of small-pox, each being more severe than the one preceding.

Date. Deaths from small-pox.
1st...1857-58-59......14,244
2nd...1863-64-65......20,059
3rd...1870-71-72......44,840

Increase of population from 1st to 2nd epidemic, 7 per cent.
Increase of small-pox in the same period, nearly 50 cent.
Increase of population from 2nd to 3rd epidemic, 10 per cent.
Increase of small-pox in the same period, 120 per cent."

In presence of evidence like this—voluminous and indisputable—of what avail is any individual experience? We have national Vaccination, and behold the result in the national small-pox.

ANOTHER MEDICAL CONFESSION.—DR. ROBERT CHARLES CROFT, a well-known practitioner in North London, writes in the St. Pancras Guardian of 3rd May as follows—"I repeat and advise your readers to take special note of what I say—that there is more harm done by the use of vaccine-lymph taken at the wrong time than in any other way whatever; and were the choice offered me whether I would be vaccinated with clear lymph from a thoroughly unhealthy child, or with opaque lymph from a perfectly healthy one, I would certainly choose the former. I do not believe that any harm can arise by the use of clear lymph, but I am certain that lymph with the slightest trace of blood or matter therein is a very dangerous poison." [Whilst we may leave those who believe in Vaccination-magic to decide whether they will have their conjuring done with clear or with opaque lymph, we note the fact, that lymph with the slightest trace of blood or matter is a very dangerous poison.—Ed.]
ADVERTISEMENTS.

VACCINATION TRACTS.

1. Letters and Opinions of Medical Men.
2. Facts and Figures, showing that Vaccination has failed to stamp out, arrest, or mitigate Small-pox.
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSSION.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FIRST OPPONENTS OF INOCULATION.

As we have seen, it is part of the legend that
the introduction of inoculation was fanatically
resisted by physicians, clergy, and mob, but the
resistance was neither fanatical nor extensive,
and is chiefly the invention of the romancing
biographers who represent Lady Mary Wortley
Montagu as a heroine and martyr of science.
To do that shrewd and brilliant woman justice,
she made no pretence to the character imputed
to her, and in her copious correspondence, there
is not a hint of annoyance on the score of her
patronage of the Turkish remedy for small-pox.
On the contrary, it would appear that inoculation
brought her a large share of that veiled
notoriety in which she had sincere pleasure.
Writing to the Countess of Mar in 1728, she
says—

"Lady Byng has inoculated both her children,
and since that experiment has not had any ill
effect, the whole town are doing the same thing,
and I am so much pulled about, and solicited to
visit people, that I am forced to run into the
country to hide myself." *

Lady Mary understood her countrymen thor-
oughly, and, thirty years after her exploits in
inoculation, she wrote to Mr. Wortley Montagu
as follows—

"Brescia, 24th April, 1748.

"I find Tar Water succeeded to Ward’s Drop.
Tis possible, by this time, that some other
quackery has taken place of that. The English
are easier than any other nation infatuated by

489, ed. 1851.

the prospect of universal medicines, nor is there
any country in the world where the doctors
raise such immense fortunes. I attribute it to
the fund of credulity which is in all mankind.
We have no longer faith in miracles and relics,
and therefore with the same fury run after
recipes and physicians. The same money which
three hundred years ago was given for the
health of the soul is now given for the health of
the body, and by the same sort of people—
women and half-witted men." *

Those who fancy there could be any wide or
effective resistance to inoculation in 1721 mis-
apprehend the conditions of the time. There
was no scientific knowledge of the laws of
health; diseases were generally regarded as
mysterious dispensations of Providence over
which the sufferers had little or no control, and
medicine was a combination of absurdity with
nastiness. It would not be difficult to compile
a series of recipes from the pharmacopoeia of
that day which would alternately excite amuse-
ment, surprise, and disgust, and to describe
medical practice from which it is marvellous
that ever patient escaped alive; but so much
must pass without saying. Suffice it to assert,
that to inoculation there was little material for
opposition, rational or irrational; and that what
we might think the natural horror of transfusing
the filth of small-pox into the blood of health,
was neutralised by the currency of a multitude
of popular remedies which seemed to owe their
fascination to their outrageous and loathsome
characteristics.

Moreover, as the dates prove, the interval was
brief between the introduction of inoculation
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and its authoritative acceptance. The girl Montagu was privately inoculated in April, 1721, Dr. Keith's boy on the 11th of May, the Newgate experiment took place on the 9th of August, a variety of experiments followed, and lastly the Princesses Amelia and Caroline were inoculated on the 19th of April, 1722—sharp work for one year. There was not time for opposition. The citadel of social approval was carried with a rush. As a contemporary observed—

"I could not but take notice with what united force and zeal the practice was pushed upon the life and reputation it received from its admission to the Royal Palace; all pens and weekly papers at work to recommend and publish it; and it was rightly judged, then or never was the time; and had it not been for some unlucky miscarriages, the Inoculators would have had the best chance for full practice and full pockets that ever fell into the hands of so small a set of men." *

The royal approval was assiduously worked, and there were not wanting hints that to question the goodness of inoculation was equivalent to disloyalty, and thus we find the Rev. E. Massey protesting in a letter to Mr. Maitland—

"I wish the Doctor more candour toward those who differ from him than to insinuate that they are guilty of high treason, and a better argument for this practice than the cry, Inoculation! and King George for ever!" †

Bad reasons are often advanced against bad policy, and whilst it is probable that some silly things were uttered against inoculation, yet I think every candid mind would be impressed with the moderation of Maitland's chief adversaries. There was Isaac Massey, for instance, apothecary to Christ's Hospital, who published several pamphlets in opposition, wherein candour and good sense are throughout conspicuous. He defined—

"Inoculation as an art of giving the small-pox to persons in health, who might otherwise have lived many years, and perhaps to a very old age without it, whereby some unhappily come to an untimely death." ‡

He objected to the exaggerated dangers of small-pox wherewith the Inoculators operated on the public fears, and appealed to his own experience in Christ's Hospital—

"Where there are generally near 600 children, the nurseries at Ware and Hertford constantly filling the places of those who go off. It hath sometimes happened that great numbers have been down of the small-pox, and 'tis but seldom that the House is free, or not long so: yet I daresay, and Sir Hans Sloane, I presume, will say so too, that in twenty years there have not died above five or six at most of the distemper, and in the last eight years there died but one." *

So lightly did he regard the peril of small-pox to the young that he delivered this challenge—

"Suppose that twenty-five Bluecoat Hospital boys at a medium, one year with another, taken ill of the small-pox.

"Suppose we likewise, that the Inoculators take out of the several wards, yearly, as they find them, twenty-five boys, which are inoculated.

"Quere, What the difference of success? I solemnly protest that if this could be put in practice, I would lay two to one against the inoculated.

"For, as I have said before, we have lost but one small-pox patient these nine years [writing in 1722] although 1800 children have been in the House during that time, and I declare to have met with no unequal success in other families amongst children about the same ages (that is between 8 and 10) where I have been concerned, and I doubt not but many of the Learned Faculty, as well as some others of my profession, can say as much from their own experience and observation." †

To appreciate Massey's contention on this point, we have to remember that small-pox is the designation of a disease of many degrees of intensity; a consideration which Dr. Wagstaffe, another opponent of inoculation, thus enforced—

"There is scarcely, I believe, so great a difference between any two distempers in the world, as between the best and worse sort of small-pox, in respect to the dangers which attend them. . . . So true is that common observation, that there is one sort in which a nurse cannot kill, and another which even a physician can never cure." ‡

* A Short and Plain Account of Inoculation. By Isaac Massey. London, 1734, p. 3.
† Letter to Mr. Maitland by Edmund Massey. London, 1722.
‡ A Short and Plain Account of Inoculation, p. 1.
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Of course the bills of mortality were appealed to in evidence of the extent and fatality of small-pox; and as it is matter of common belief that prior to inoculation and Jenner (there is always a haze about the date) people were mown down with small-pox, it may be worth while reviving the table of relative mortality in London during the first twenty-two years of the 18th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diseases</th>
<th>Burials from small-pox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>20,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>19,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>20,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>22,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>22,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>19,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>21,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>24,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>19,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>21,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>21,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>26,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>22,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>24,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>28,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>25,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>26,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>25,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>26,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>26,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

605,598 84,620

"By these tables," wrote Dr. Jurin, "it appears that upwards of 7 per cent., or somewhat more than a fourteenth part of mankind, died of the small-pox; and consequently the hazard of dying of that distemper, to every individual born into the world, is at least that of 1 in 14." *

The large induction from London to universal mankind is noteworthy, because as we shall see, it came to be often made, and involved a serious fallacy; for unless universal mankind dwell in conditions similar to Londoners, it was idle to infer a common rate of disease and mortality. The population of London in 1701 was estimated at about 600,000 (there was no exact census), rising to about 600,000 in 1720. It was closely packed and lodged over cess-pools; the water supply was insufficient, and there was no effective drainage. The vast multitude was disposed, as if by design, for the generation and propagation of symptomatic disease, and specially small-pox. Little attention was paid to personal cleanliness, and still less to ventilation, to light, to exercise. The condition of a large urban community a century ago is almost inconceivable at the present day; and Londoners were then only slowly and blindly rising out of those modes of existence which made the Plague of 1665, and other plagues, possible. Hence we need not be astonished that small-pox was a common and permanent affliction; but we may observe, it was far less prevalent and deadly than it is the custom of vaccinators to assert; and had the disease not been attended with injury to feminine beauty, there would have been no more fuss made about it than about any other form of eruptive fever.

It has also to be observed, that small-pox as a cause of death was probably much exaggerated in the bills of mortality; for as Isaac Massey pointed out—

"These bills are founded on the ignorance or skill of old women, who are the searchers in every parish, and their reports (very often what they are bid to say) must necessarily be very erroneous. Many distempers which prove mortal, are mistaken for the small-pox, namely, scarlet and malignant fevers with eruptions, swine-pox, measles, St. Anthony's fire, and such like appearances, which if they destroy in three or four days (as frequently happeneth) the distemper can only be guessed at, yet is generally put down by the searchers as small-pox, especially if they are told the deceased never had them." *

Massey, in the same spirit of good sense, objected to generalisations about small-pox from the bills of mortality, as if all who died were slain by the disease and by nothing else.

"There ought to be no comparison," he said, "between sick people, well regimented with diet and medicine, and those who have no assistance, or scarcely the necessaries of life.

"The miserable poor and parish children make up a great part, at least one-half of the bills of mortality; to confirm this I have examined several yearly bills, and I find that the out-parishes generally bury more than the ninety-seven parishes within the walls, and the parish of Stepney singly, very near as many as the City of London yearly; this sufficiently shows what little help and care are taken of the poor sick, which so much abound in all those places." §

*A Letter to Caleb Colesworth, M.D. By James Jurin, M.D. London, 1728.

Of course there lurks a fallacy in all statistics of disease wherein conditions of life are not discriminated. Whether patients survive or die from any ailment depends in the majority of cases upon their breed, their circumstances, their habits, and their medical treatment and nursing—all essential particulars, yet difficult to define and register on a large scale. It would appear that in sound constitutions, and with fair treatment, small-pox in 1721 was by no means deadly, whilst in bad constitutions, and with exposure and neglect, it was extensively fatal. Yet of these differences, little account was taken by the Inoculators, and the malady was measured and discussed as though it was something uniform like water or gold. Massey in one year had 49 cases of small-pox and one death; in Stepney an equal number of cases might have shown a mortality of 80 or 40 per cent.; whilst Dr. Nettleton reported that of 1245 cases in Halifax and adjacent towns in Yorkshire, there died 270, or about 22 per cent.

One of Massey's fears in relation to inoculation was the risk of poisoning the blood with more than small-pox. He was not disinclined to experiment with "duly prepared children infected with small-pox by inspiration," for then—

"They will run no hazard of being infected by a leprous, venereal, or scrofulous taint that may, for aught we know, be transplanted by inoculation." †

Massey's prescience has been woefully verified; is indeed under perpetual verification in the pollution and destruction of myriads of infants. The notion that virus with a complex of qualities can be transferred from one body to another, and operate with the single quality the operator is pleased to favour, is a notion that might pass muster in a manual of magic or folk-lore, but which never can have any warrant in human physiology.

Of course the chief strength of the opponents of inoculation (ere experience gave them stronger ground) lay in the assertion of the folly of incurring a certain injury for an uncertain advantage. Whatever the risk of small-pox to those who have it, yet large numbers, it was argued, pass through life untouched; and why should they make themselves sick, and risk their lives in order to obtain a superfluous security! ‡

The frequent assertion that the clergy thundered against inoculation is untrue and invented for effect. The Rev. Edmund Massey, Lecturer of St. Alban, Wood Street, did preach a sermon against the new practice, and a fair sermon it was, according to the standard of sermons. Maitland published some remarks on the sermon, to which Massey rejoined; and if I select a passage from the rejoinder it will prove, better than any description, that the divine was more than a match for the surgeon. Said Massey to Maitland—

"Inoculation, in your sense, is an engraftment of a corrupted body into a sound one; an attempt to give a man a disease, who is in perfect health, which disease may prove mortal."

"This I said was tempting Providence.

"To which you reply, It resembles that of a person who leaps out of a window for fear of fire; and surely that can never be reckoned a mistrust of Providence."

"No, certainly, Sir, if his house be really on fire, and the stairs burnt. 'Tis the only probable way of safety left; and if the leap should kill him, the action could neither be called sinful or imprudent. But what should we say to a man, who jumped out of the window when his house was not on fire, only to try what he might perhaps be forced to do hereafter? This mad action exactly hits the case between us. For if my house be not on fire, that is, if I am in no apparent danger, what need I jump out at the window? What occasion is there to inoculate me?

"'To carry on your own allegory, I would ask you, Sir, what human or divine authority you have to set a man's house on fire, that is, put a man who is in perfect health in danger of his life by a fit of illness? His own consent is not sufficient, because he has no more lawful power over his own life or health than you have, to put either of them in hazard.' ‡

In short, nothing can be more unfounded than the assumption in literature, popular and professional, that Maitland and Montagu were confronted by a crowd of howling fanatics over whom they triumphed as light over darkness. Marvellous is the imbecility wherewith biographers and historians reproduce the fables of any inventive predecessor.

I shall now proceed to show that the practice of inoculation introduced by Cotton Mather to New England, and by Maitland to England

* Mr. Maitland's Account of Inoculating the Small-Pox Vindicated. London, 1722, p. 20.

† Letter to Dr. Jurin, p. 12.

‡ Jurin's Yearly Account of Inoculation, p. 12.
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collapsed in a few years under stress of the mischiefs and fatalities which attended it; that it was revived in a subsequent generation; that it proved a frightful curse wherever introduced; and that finally it was abandoned and forbidden in the western world with execration.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE DEFENCE OF COMPULSION IN THE MATTER OF VACCINATION.

The advocates of the Vaccination Laws are actuated by two ultimate reasons in their support of the principle of compulsion, which underlie all their arguments, and to which, as their radical bases, all unsordid motives for supporting such exceptional legislation may be directly referred. One reason or pretext put forward in vindication of the resort to measures so extreme, is the benevolent one of desiring—

1st, To promote the substantial good of the children of (a) those who are indifferent about, and (b) those who object to Vaccination per se.

The other reason, which springs more especially from the innate principle of self-protection, is—

2ndly, To make sure that such un-vaccinated children shall not become a source of danger to them the (vaccinated) and to their vaccinated children.

It has seldom, if ever, been publicly sought to justify the compulsory enforcement of the practice in question, simply on the ground of plea the first—the assumed benefit to the children who might otherwise remain in the natural condition; although, united with the second, the first pretext has been urged occasionally as an adjunct.

The two reasons thus advanced, as will readily be seen, raise distinct questions, and to consider them separately will facilitate their critical examination. Taking the first in order, it will be observed to have reference to two classes of children; class a, children without parents or guardians, or whose parents, guardians, or care-takers are neglectful or careless; having either so little interest in the child, or so slight a sense of responsibility, or of the importance of the subject, as to have given little or no thought to it; or being so uncertain as to whether the balance of advantage lay on the side of the practice or its omission as with laisser faire indifference to allow nature to take her own course: and class b, whose parents or guardians have an antipathy to Vaccination on what they believe to be sufficient and convincing grounds. As to the power, or moral right which a legislature may justly possess to step in and define the obligations of parents, guardians, or care-takers of children of class a, to prescribe and implant or cause to be implanted a certain form of disease, it does not fall within the scope of the present paper to inquire;* such people feel no particular interest in the matter, and can plead no scruple about it: we are at present dealing with the question of coercion of those who, as protectors of their children, have decided objections to Vaccination, and who feel or believe this form of State medicine to be peculiarly aggressive, and an invasion of the natural rights of mankind. If it be a defensible proceeding—which remains to be proved—to compel by law the Vaccination of children of class a, it is another matter to urge that those who desire the good of class b—the un-vaccinated children of their neighbours who dissent from State medicine—can properly make penal laws to compel such dissenting neighbours to accept a medical dogma, having for its leading feature the disestablishing of the healthy, simply because they themselves believe it beneficial, moral, and wise thus to “degrade” the blood of helpless infants, with perhaps the lowest form of filth—vitalised diseased matter thrown off by the body of a beast. In 99 cases out of 100 they believe in it without having ever made it their business to investigate the foundation on which the creed is accepted. It is recommended by his physician, and at present that is usually enough for the average man.

Now, it may be argued that any object, the attainment of which can be alleged in defence of intolerance of the medical heresy of the parent who declines a prescription for a child in sound health, can be no higher in its aim than the objects formerly assigned for enforcement of prescriptions of a religious character; and yet the assertion of a right appertaining to those versed in theological dogmas, to interfere in the judgment and opinions of the parent in

*This involves the question, How far a majority, or otherwise expressed, the State, should properly have absolute power to inflict a disease with profoundly beneficent intention—absolute only because of the apathy of parents, &c., or the defencelessness or friendlessness of children; while, at the same time, its power is far from absolute, and can easily be defeated as against a child with a natural protector, as daily experience proves. In a word, Does the defencelessness create a prerogative which is otherwise defensible?
matters of religion, after being long and tenaciously maintained, by ecclesiastical authority, as positive in its opinion, and as unanimous in a given country as ever medical authority has been since, was subsequently abandoned; and that it was abandoned rightly is the judgment of an overwhelming majority at the present day. In this example, besides the question of ensuring the good of the child—and not merely a temporal but an eternal good, as was then supposed—there was the further question of securing the community also from a contamination involving consequences then believed to be eternally disastrous. Thus, this first pretext for coercion in the matter of Vaccination cannot be said to seek a higher object than that which ecclesiastical authority sought, when it advanced its generally rejected pretensions. It may be objected, however, that although the securing against a merely temporal, bodily ill, be not claimed as a greater or worthier end than the securing of an eternal good, Vaccination, nevertheless, imports a good to mankind which we have more unquestionable reasons to warrant our using force to endeavour to achieve, and to compel others to accept; that, in fact, the best way to reach the highest good may not be so clearly and certainly known, as the best manner of securing a good of minor importance. This opens up a host of debatable points at once, the satisfactory proving of most, if not all of which, must precede the admission that a proper, laudable, efficient and not seriously and fatally objectionable way of compassing this physical good, is by making infantile Vaccination compulsory; otherwise it is open to dispute whether it be really a good which, as compared with the spiritual good referred to, we have “more unquestionable reasons to warrant our using force to endeavour to achieve.” The points on which the acceptance of this averment hinges are really assumptions, into the validity of which space does not admit of examining: to mention some of them briefly may be sufficient; such as—that a partial law is warrantable, which operates against a child, but exempts the adult, “guilty” of precisely the same “offence,” and also exempts the un-revaccinated, assumed to be similarly dangerous:—the assumption that satisfactory protection is the result:—that small-pox is due to happen as the normal condition of things, and that most people would probably catch it without Vaccination:—that the advantage is in excess of any disadvantage:—that a much debated medical theory, as to the beneficence of disease, is nevertheless sufficiently faultless to justify the making penal its non-acceptance:—that a healthy child is a source of danger, and an intolerable public nuisance, demanding Parliamentary interference:—that the non-interruption by a parent of the natural health of his child is no longer his sacred duty, but that, on the contrary, by his refusal to interrupt it at the bidding of a doctor backed by a law of doctors’ procuring, he becomes a criminal:—that a rich man should properly be able to purchase immunity from the operation of the law, but that a poor man, charged with precisely the same thing, must submit to it or go to gaol:—that it is right, physiologically and morally, to transfuse vitalised disease matter derived from the running sores of a beast, forcibly and directly into the blood and life of a child:—that it is right to mix up the diseases of human beings, or risk doing so, as well as to mix up the diseases of beasts with those of men and enforce that also:—that conscience, as it affects medical matters, is an inadmissible plea from a dissent from medical dogma:—that they that be whole do need a physician:—that the same Association which, until comparatively recently, extolled periodical blood-letting, extensive medical use of alcohol, mercury, &c., and notably inoculation with small-pox matter, is yet sufficiently infallible to be implicitly trusted when urging penal legislation in support of another medical postulate:—that statistics compiled by men strongly committed to, and deeply interested in maintaining a certain theory are to be implicitly received, while the means and opportunity of checking those statistics are steadily and perniciously denied:—that small-pox has not increased pari passu with the extension of Vaccination by law:—that strong protests against the present law as unjust, made by many divines, by eminent thinkers, doctors, lawyers, statesmen and journals, like the Medical Times and Gazette, count for little or nothing: that the late return of the Registrar-General showing an increase in the mortality of children under one year, from eight diseases only, either inoculable or arising from debility, of nearly 25,000 per million since Vaccination was made obligatory, may be silently ignored, and that it has no connexion with infantile blood-poisoning by Vaccination whatever:—that in the face of the late announcement by the Irish Local
Government Board, that the lymph procured at that commonly used now has admittedly been, viz., by inoculating calves or cows with small-pox virus "would communicate that disease to a human subject, and be thereby a fertile source of propagating that disease"—that the continuing to enforce this very danger thus denounced, is not an atrocious piece of tyranny:—

—that diseases as bad or worse than small-pox—hereditary diseases, etc., are not liable to be transmitted in Vaccination, and are not frequently so conveyed, &c., &c. We shall not at present discuss the merits or demerits of these various assumptions; all are open to challenge; dissent from many of them is, with an increasing number of thoughtful men, a matter not merely of opinion, but of conscience; their frequent readiness to suffer the loss of all things, and a prison itself, in obedience to their convictions, is the eloquent measure of their sincerity. A successful attack on any one of these positions might involve the extinction altogether of the claim to a right of coercion on the footing of beneficial intention. Their mention is sufficient to show on what debatable ground pretext No. 1 is found to proceed; and they must be steadily borne in mind in considering it, as also in considering the second, in regard to which they have an equal application.

Pretext No. 2 is the chief argument put forward in vindication of compulsion in the matter of Vaccination, and rests upon the old-fashioned instinct of self-preservation. However it may be expressed, the idea in the mind of its advocates is that, assuming that un-vaccinated children are liable and likely to take small-pox, their doing so would be a source of danger to the vaccinated, to be provided against effectually. Passing over the matter of this assumption, on which much could be said per contra, the natural reply is:—If the vaccinated are really protected, as they claim to be, how can the un-vaccinated so imperil them? Such a confession of danger to the vaccinated disparages gravely the claimed protection, and the more strongly the danger is alleged, so much the more grave is the disparagement; and now that a minimum "danger" of 2 to 5 per cent. of un-vaccinated children has, on the best authority, been reached, the very minuteness of their admitted proportion lends to that disparagement all the greater emphasis. The alleged protection being the plea for and justification of compulsion, in so far as real danger from small-pox to the vaccinated is admitted, just so far is the case for compulsion shorn of its weight. This is usually admitted; indeed, it is self-evident and axiomatic; but then follows, as a rule, the attempt to elude the logical consequence of the admission, by taking up this position, in which compulsion considers itself securely intrenched, namely, that, though vaccination is a preventive it is not an infallible one, and that therefore, as some danger to the vaccinated still remains, precautions, to guard the vaccinated against that danger, arising from the presence of un-vaccinated children, are still urgently needed: that, in other words, the protection believed to be conferred by the operation is not complete enough to warrant the exemption of the un-vaccinated, consistently with a due regard to the safety of the vaccinated, yet that it is so far a preventive as to justify, in the interests of the vaccinated, a resort to compulsion of others who object to it, in order to ensure to the vaccinated that measure of safety which it is assumed or believed to confer. This is the usual defence of compulsion fairly stated; let us see whether it rests on a reasonable basis, when we come to examine it critically and trace out the argument to its legitimate conclusion. The list of assumptions or considerations already given, amongst others too numerous to cite, should of course, as has been said, be satisfactorily disposed of and substantiated, before pretext either No. 1 or No. 2 could be seriously entertained; but limiting the argument for the present to the above basis the case stands thus:—

It is contended above that the protection "is not complete enough to warrant the exemption of the un-vaccinated," &c. This is an assertion that, not merely the potency of vaccine for its purpose shall justify compulsion, but the impotency also. We have, however, seen just now that, if the impotency of vaccine is admitted, "just so far is the case for compulsion shorn of its weight,"—not added to. We must, therefore, fall back on its potency; that the protection is complete enough to warrant the coercion of the un-vaccinated, and we are committed to this position:—

Compulsion is only defensible on account of the alleged largeness of the protection of Vaccination, and in direct proportion to the extent and perfection of that protection, for, on the other hand, if the efficacy of the protection went on reducing constantly, at a certain point of this decline in its power the extent of the protection would be so minimised as to
cease to justify compulsion.* Consequently it remains that the case for compulsion is more or less strong in direct proportion as the “protection” is more or less perfect. Syllogistically stated the argument is this:

Compulsion of the un-vaccinated, for the safety of the vaccinated, is defensible in proportion as entire protection is approached:

But, in proportion as entire protection is approached, the danger to the protected from small-pox becomes less:

Therefore—compulsion of the un-vaccinated, for the safety of the protected, is defensible in proportion as the danger to the protected from small-pox becomes less.

Or, otherwise expressed—The less danger there is of the vaccinated catching small-pox, the more reason why others should be coerced, lest they (the vaccinated) should catch it. It therefore follows that, if there were absolutely no danger remaining to the vaccinated, there would be all the more reason for enforcing vaccination on others, to save the “protected” from a danger admittedly non-existent. Consequently the necessity for compulsion is greatest when it is least!

The manifest absurdity of such a conclusion, naturally resulting from the premises, necessitates, it is submitted, the abandonment of plea or pretext No. 2, which, if it be incompatible with sound reason, clearly nothing is added to the cogency of plea No. 1, by advancing the two together, a thing not unfrequently done in the belief that they are mutually supporting. An argument, or reason proved to be intrinsically absurd, like the second one, can, however, add nothing but weakness to the first; and that the first, or benevolence pretext, cannot stand alone may be inferred; indeed, the very subordinate place assigned to it on the one hand, shows how conscious the few who employ it are of its insufficiency; the many whose sheet anchor, on the other hand, is the plea of justification on the score of self-protection are, it would seem, in unsuspecting ignorance of the dilemma, in which its advocacy can be readily shown to place them.

F. D.

PROOF AGAINST SMALL-POX.—There are some upon whom the contagion of small-pox has no influence.—Sir Thomas Watson in Nineteenth Century, Dec. '77, p. 726.

*That this point has been reached long since, is part of the contention of the anti-vaccinators.

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN ON THE BARBARISM OF VACCINATION.

[In future years it may be taken for proof of fixed and fearful opinion upon Vaccination, that in neither the Nineteenth Century, nor the Contemporary or Fortnightly Reviews, in which the free expression of opinion is in general chivalrously allowed, would an article be accepted in reply to Sir Thomas Watson on Compulsory Vaccination. After the lapse of a year, Professor Newman has, however, obtained a partial hearing in the Contemporary Review for June, under cover of a disquisition on “The Barbarisms of Civilization,” and thus delivers himself with the cogency and force which are the habit of his mind.—Ed.]

The physicians and physiologists who had so cleverly persuaded Parliament in 1846 to make the pollution of rivers compulsory were so elated with their success that very soon their ambition assumed new audacity. Sir Robert Peel died in 1850 by a fall from his horse; but they had already beset him with the project of making Vaccination compulsory: a thing which he protested the English public would never endure. He did not know how cleverly a devoted clique would manage the midnight hours of a wearied Parliament, nor what energy a united faculty could put forth when it had attained permanent office for ambitious schemers. The analogy was so beautiful between defiling the natural streams with a view to the public health and defiling the blood in the arteries with a view to the health of the individual, that those who had been bitten and infected with rabies for the one scheme took naturally and kindly to the other. No public debate took place on the topic, even among medical men; much less was any notoriety given to the debates in Parliament, if there were any, concerning compulsory Vaccination. Apparently the thing was managed in the mode now esteemed orthodox. Various esteemed medical men talked over the editors of London “Dailies:” it would seem that a “conspiracy of silence” was achieved in that early day; and, to use a very modern phrase, the whole thing “was sprung upon us” unawares, in 1858, just when our heads were getting full of Menchikoff and the Sultan, of Hungary and Austria, and much beside of foreign affairs. The Crimean War came, and was fought out, and departed, without one man in a hundred, out of those who were too old to have infant children, being aware of any change concerning Vaccination. But in the medical
profession itself there had always been avowed and pertinacious enemies of the practice. A small section of the nation knew and abhorred the law of compulsion. Out of this small but resolute school came stern remonstrances and solemn warning to the medical officials that Vaccination, especially from arm to arm, was apt to convey any or every blood disease. But the officials spurned them as mere "quacks." Within twenty years, however, the confessions of able pro-vaccinators were overpowering. Mr. Simon, medical officer to the Privy Council, could not deny the fact, but alleged that the operator must have dipped his lancet too deep, and taken a drop of blood. He did not, and does not, guarantee any one against a like misadventure in the future. The pro-vaccinators have not learned to blush at their persistent and rude denial of what is now a confessed danger. Sir Thomas Watson, an aged and leading physician, only last year (June No. of the Nineteenth Century) calls the chance of foul disease from the Vaccination now orthodox "a ghastly risk," and praises the father who will go to prison rather than permit it. Yet Sir Thomas Watson so huge Vaccination that he advocates the infusion of disease into calves in order to get cow-pox at first hand.

This is no place for nice medical argument, if the writer had tenfold knowledge; but many broad facts glare upon every one who has open eyes. In history, in theology, and equally in medicine, we have often to remember that there are some assertions, some doctrines, so paradoxical, so opposed to common sense, that when it is asked, what sort of evidence would avail to prove them? we are driven to reply, that we cannot imagine any: they are intrinsically incredible. Such to us is the doctrine that the Supreme God became a bull and a swan, and much beside which might be named. It generally happens that precisely those doctrines which thus startle us as incredible are eminently devoid of any proof that deserves regard. Just so is it here. A priori,—that is, from all the light of received physiology and ordinary common information,—we believe that the stronger is vitality, the sturdier is the resistance to contagion; and the purer the blood, the stronger is vitality. That corruption infused into the blood can secure us from contagion is certainly most unpleausible,—scarcely credible,—a doctrine not to be received without overwhelming proof. Yet no proof from science is even pretended, but only a proof from perfectly ridiculous statistics,—ridiculous, because ill imagined from the beginning, and variously self-refuting. As an eminent Austrian physician has lately argued:

—If tables were now drawn up to show how many of the vaccinated, and how many of the unvaccinated, die of diphtheria, the figures, if applied with the most perfect skill and fairness imaginable, must end in making out either the one side or other to have more deaths: thus (if the logic used concerning small-pox be admitted) it will be made out that either Vaccination or non-Vaccination tends to secure from diphtheria. Of course that would be nonsense; and why not equal nonsense to infer from statistics that Vaccination saves from small-pox? Meanwhile, the awful fact on a great scale confronts us, that small-pox has become more and more prevalent, more and more fatal, since Vaccination has been made compulsory. Now at last the cause comes out without a blush of shame from our orthodox school. The Government vaccinators have for many years obtained a large part of what they call lymph (a fraudulent name—pus, or matter, is the only right word) by inoculating calves or bullocks with small-pox. The result in the animals they are pleased to call cow-pox, and when the poisonous matter is transferred back to human infants they assume that it will not reproduce small-pox!! But while this doctrine is orthodox in London, the Local Government Board in Dublin allows no such dealing; for on February 10th last it warned all vaccinators that such proceeding spreads small-pox by inoculation, and is a crime against the law. Another broad fact is, the widespread suffering, disease, and death which Vaccination causes in infants. A third is, the utter failure of Vaccination to prevent small-pox, and the zeal of doctors for re-Vaccination. Numbers of the re-vaccinated have caught small-pox within a year or a month after. The medical men who pretend (to the vulgar and to the ignorant) that Vaccination is "a real and easy preventive" of small-pox often reply, when confronted with the fact of failure, either that the Vaccination cannot have been (/) well performed; others pretend (without a particle of proof) that the force of Vaccination lasts for seven years only; a segment which, if true, would not be to the purpose, would not relieve the facts. Finally (what to the present writer is by itself decisive), unless the causes of small-pox be removed (generally some impurity in the air or in the food), those causes will work mischief somehow. To throw an eruptive disease back into the system is proverbially dangerous. If Vaccination had this tendency, so much the more dangerous must it be; for it
cannot remove the causes of small-pox. Moreover, what right has any physician to neglect the cures of small-pox, by which herbalists, hydropaths, and Turkish bath keepers find it a most tractable disease? Some barbarians bastinado an unfortunate patient when he is seized by ague; is it less barbarous to infuse corruption into the blood of a healthy man, as precaution against a disease which may not occur at all? The last sentence touches on a great and critical fact. No doctor, no legislator has any right to assault the body of a healthy child or man under pretence of providing for the public health. A medical man, whatever his celebrity, proclaims his own folly when he entitles a healthy child a fountain of disease. These doctors, when they consent to stick by their own logic, avow, that as fast as a man or child throws off the effects of cow-pox, he becomes liable to small-pox, and therefore ought to be cow-poxed again. (It is not really cow-pox, but it is certainly disease.) Thus they confess that they dread perfect health: (must we add, of course a healthy person pays them no fees?) they want to keep us in permanent cow-pox; yes, and they know not what more beside they may infuse into the blood. But, what is here urged mainly, a legislator usurps, if he forbid perfect health; he might as well command vice. Legislators who do not despise the physician who weeps over healthy children as dangerous have less good sense than most barbarians.

ANOTHER SCENE AT FARINGDON.

At the Petty Sessions at Faringdon, Berks, on the 3rd of June, Mr. Joseph Abel appeared in answer to a vaccination summons. There were present on the bench, Messrs. T. L. Goodlake, D. Bennet, H. Palk, and W. H. Butler. When the case was called, Mr. Goodlake said, that as he had been objected to as chairman of the Board of Guardians, he would leave the bench. Mr. Abel replied that he need do not so, for he did not mind; but Mr. Goodlake answered, "You always have objected, and so I shall leave." Mr. Abel was then charged with disobedience to orders given by Mr. W. Dundas to vaccinate his two children within six weeks, and questioned as to whether guilty or not guilty, he replied, "If I were guilty, Gentlemen, I would not have appeared before you once, much less 29 times. I object to Vaccination solely on conscientious grounds, believing it to be a sin against God." Chairman: "Guilty, or not guilty." Mr. Abel: "My children are not vaccinated and never will be." Chairman: "If you plead not guilty, it will only add to expenses." Mr. Abel: "If you mean guilty in disobeying the orders, in that sense I am ready to plead guilty. Nevertheless, I would refer you to two cases similar to mine, one at Rugby and one in London, where the bench dismissed the defendants; or, if you cannot venture so far, I would ask you to do as has been done at Swindon, Malmesbury, and Oxford, inflict a fine of 1s, or, as the bench did at Bedford on the 12th of May in five cases, fine 6d and 2s costs. I can give you a list of about sixty vaccination cases in only four of which the full penalty has been inflicted. I hope you will accept these precedents, and deal as mercifully with me. Mr. Haines, the prosecuting attorney: "As I have not defended the case, I shall not ask for my fee." After a short consultation, the Chairman said, "It is very kind of Mr. Haines, but as Mr. Abel has not complied with the law, and expresses his firm determination not to do so, we shall not deviate from our usual custom, but shall fine him the full amount for each child, 20s, with costs 8s 6d each, total £2 17s." Mr. Abel refused to pay the money, and said, "Gentlemen, soon, perhaps sooner than you expect, you will have to appear before the Lord, the righteous judge, who will award you righteous judgment, and not such judgment as you have awarded me."

Mr. E. Abel, brother of the defendant, paid the fines and costs.
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

List of fines and costs imposed on Joseph Abel, of Faringdon, Berks, for refusing to have his two children vaccinated.

1876.

March 7. Fine 20s. Costs 3s. 6d. 8 6
May 5. Costs 3s. 6d. 0 9
" 23. Fine 20s. Costs 7s. 6d. 1 7
June 23. Costs 3s. 6d. Extra Cost for Distress Warrant 5s. 0 14
Aug. 8. Fine 20s. Costs 3s. 6d. 1 8
" 31. Fine 20s. Costs 7s. 6d. 1 7
Nov. 28. Costs 10 9

1877.

Jan. 9. Fine 20s. Costs 3s. 6d. 1 9
Mar. 6. Costs 0 10
May 8. Fine 20s. Costs 3s. 6d. 1 8
" 23. Fine 20s. Costs 7s. 6d. 1 7
June 26. Costs 10 9
July 31. Fine 20s. Costs 3s. 6d. 1 8
" 30. Fine ditto 2 0
" Costs ditto 2 0
" Prosecuting Solicitor’s Fee 1 0

1878.

Jan. 22. Costs (two children) 1 1
Feb. 26. Fine 40s. Costs 17s. do. 2 17
" 5. Costs ditto 1 3
Nov. 5. Fines ditto 2 0
" Costs ditto 1 9
" Prosecuting Solicitor’s Fee 2 2
" Two Commitment Warrants 0 3

1879.

Mar. 22. Costs (two children) 1 1
June 3. Fines ditto 2 0
" Costs ditto 1 7

£39 16 0

As has been long known, appeals to reason and pity are wasted on the dull obstinacy of the Faringdon Bench.

" Satire or sense, alas! can Socrates feel?"

But we would point to the preceding record and inquire, what credit it does to the majesty and the grace of English law? If all anti-vaccinators were dealt with as Mr. Joseph Abel, we should none the less protest against the tyranny; but even tyranny commands a certain sort of respect when it is consistent and inflexible; but what is to be said of a tyranny which for the same offence inflicts a fine of 6d. in one parish and 20s. in another! Was ever such an abuse heard of in England as law at discretion—pains and penalties delivered over to the caprice of any fellows who happen to be magistrates! Perhaps nothing is more disquieting to thoughtful observers than the indifference with which such a recurrent scandal as that at Faringdon is regarded. Time was when the tyranny of a compulsory vaccination law was pronounced by a statesman like Sir Robert Peel, “undeniable by the English people”; but now we not only have such a law, but submit to irregularities in its administration that would have stirred to the depths the indignation of a more vigorous political generation. A Joseph Abel case thirty years ago would have been impossible; but the effeminate imperialism of our new masters is careless concerning those safeguards of liberty so jealously and wisely upheld by their sagacious forefathers.

The Lancet for 22nd June, 1878, says—“The notion that animal lymph would be free from chances of syphilitic contamination is so fallacious that we are surprised to see Dr. Martin reproduce it, and so contribute to the perpetuation of the fanciful idea which too commonly obtains on the origin of vaccini-syphilis.”

Iniquity by Law.—It is admitted on all hands, and by the highest medical authorities, that fatal blood poisoning has followed vaccination in many cases; yet it is made compulsory by law. Parents are fined or imprisoned, not only once, but dozens of times, for refusing to be accomplices in the possible murder of their helpless offspring.—Herald of Health.

A CRY FROM HAMPSHIRE.—As is well-known, there is a small-pox hospital at Hampstead, which has been pronounced, after trial at law, a nuisance dangerous to the neighbourhood. Nevertheless it will not be closed until after appeal to a higher court, and meanwhile the terror continues. Mr. Willing writes to the Daily News from Upper Park-road,—“At the present moment so serious is the outbreak of small-pox around us that my family is absolutely confined to the house—really afraid to move out of doors—through dread of contagion. Within a few houses of where I live several persons are suffering from this malignant disorder. Our position, then, is this: Rather than remove the 28 patients to a place where contagion could be prevented, the hospital authorities expose me and my neighbours, with our wives and daughters, to death or disfigurement through small-pox.”—How strange are such complaints in the mouths of vaccinators! In Vaccination, they tell us, there is such absolute safety that not even a vaccinated nurse in a small-pox hospital ever catches the disorder. And yet with such an easy remedy, there is terror all the same! Why so faithless?
MR. COLLEY AT LEAMINGTON.

The Rev. Thomas Colley, according to the Leamington Chronicle of 6th June, was summoned before the Leamington bench to show cause why his daughter Clara had not been vaccinated. Mr. Colley, in reply, said—that he understood Vaccination meant inoculation with virus taken from a cow; but, as practised at Leamington, the virus was derived from the arms of infants, who had received the virus from other infants in backward series, until, at last, it was tainted with the diseases and depravities of many generations. Sir Thomas Watson had said that compulsory Vaccination could not be enforced unless we revert to Jenner's practice, and dismiss intermediary infants with the possibility of consumption, scrofula, and syphilis. What was Jenner's practice? Jenner derived cow-pox from "grease" in the horse; but it was impious to graft the impurity of a beast into the purity of an infant. Moreover, it was stated in the Lancet that "the sooner it is understood that Vaccination is not an absolute protection against small-pox, the better." Hence compulsory re-Vaccination was now the doctors' cry. He had himself been thrice vaccinated—as a child, as an Oxford undergraduate, and as a clergyman; and he supposed it would presently become a counsel of sanitary perfection to be vaccinated annually. Jenner held that cow-pox did not lose its venom by passing through multitudinous children; but Dr. Wyld was of the contrary opinion, and held that there was no true security away from the cow. Jenner said—"If there were a real necessity for the renovation of lymph, I should not know what to do; for the precautions of farmers, with respect to their horses [by the suppression of the affection called "grease"] have driven cow-pox away." Dr. Wyld himself admitted that the culture and distribution of cow-pox was so difficult and expensive, that he prayed the Government to take it off his hands. Against Dr. Wyld they had to set Dr. Seaton, who maintained that cow-pox lost its power in transmission through calves, just as it did through infants; and, lastly, Jenner emphatically testified that the cow-pox which did not originate in horse "grease" was "utterly useless as a defence against small-pox." When doctors thus differed, radically and hopelessly, what was he to do? Vaccination certainly did not prevent small-pox, as was obvious from the returns of the London hospitals, where 90 per cent. of the patients were vaccinated. Again, the turn. Vaccination Mortality, (No. 438), 1878, published by order of the House of Commons, proved, that for every child that dies from small-pox, forty die from diseases induced by Vaccination. Mr. Colley then proceeded to show how absurdly statistics were handled at home and abroad to fortify the practice of Vaccination. Small-pox was a recurrent epidemic. Before Vaccination was ever heard of, it was sometimes absent from communities for many years; but now, when a country is free from small-pox, it is said, "Behold! what we owe to Vaccination!" Then, when small-pox breaks out, and it is usually most virulent where Vaccination is most practised, it is said, "O! there must be some defect in the lymph, for it is quite impossible for small-pox to occur where there is efficient Vaccination." Thus vaccinators beguile themselves and others. Finally, Mr. Colley made some excellent remarks on the wickedness of poisoning a child with a mixture of the corruption of man and beast, in the vain expectation of improving the handiwork of God Almighty. He asked the Bench, if it was necessary to do anything, to inflict a trifling fine, as was done in cases like his, at Boston and Bedford. Mr. Muddeman said that the Bench must administer the law as it stood. The fine would be 1s., and 11s. costs, and the child must be vaccinated within a month. [The Bench was at fault in law. Their business was to issue a vaccination order, and if that was not complied with, then to inflict a fine.—Ed.]

DELICIOUS!—Mr. Bompas, Q.C., who aspires to represent Marylebone in Parliament, informs the electors that "A person not vaccinated is like a flaming firebrand among the people!"

ENGLISH FREEDOM!—Mr. William Tebb has demonstrated the fact that there is one crime for which an Englishman may be perpetually imprisoned unless he can give his persecutors money. The persecutors are medical men who pursue him with sharp lancets armed with poison. The poison is matter from a sore, containing the virus of one disease, and at times of many diseases, which the medical man is anxious to get into the blood of some baby that it may be made impure. Some babies are poisoned in this way so as to be diseased for long periods, and some are killed outright. The doctors know this very well, but they are quite willing to take the risk. Some parents are not so willing.—Dr. Nichols in Herald of Health.
THE VACCINATION INQUISITOR.

LEICESTER LEADS.

At the weekly meeting of the Leicester Board of Guardians on Tuesday, 10th June, the Clerk (Mr. Chamberlain) read the following resolution, which had been adopted at a meeting in Humberstone-gate the previous evening—"That this meeting has heard with much satisfaction of a resolution asking the Leicester Board of Guardians to memorialise the Local Government Board to petition Parliament for the total repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Acts, and earnestly trusts that so desirable a measure will receive the unanimous support of all those members of the Board who profess to advocate civil and religious liberty."

Mr. Wright, in pursuance of notice, then moved the following resolution on the Vaccination question—"That an address be sent to the Local Government Board, stating that in the present unsettled condition of medical opinion in regard to the safety of using ordinary humanised lymph, as also of the safety, effectiveness, and possibility of the use of animal vaccine, and seeing also that the present system of fining for noncompliance with the compulsory clause is so unequally carried out, varying (according to the will of the magistrate and the state of public opinion in the district), from 1d. up to 20s., and that this system is practically one of compounding for the offence, and therefore tends to bring all law into contempt; it is, in the opinion of this Board, inequitable and unjust to enforce Vaccination under penalties upon those who regard it as undesirable or dangerous. The Guardians of Leicester Union therefore humbly pray that the Local Government Board will take such steps as will effectually relieve them from the charge of intolerance in arraigning before the magistrates people, and especially the poor, who, on conscientious grounds, object to Vaccination." He said the Board as prosecutors were too little regarded by the magistrates in this matter. The majority of the people in the town were Nonconformists, and they all knew how strongly Nonconformists held out against the payment of a few pence because they would not support another man's religion; but with Vaccination the case was much stronger, because the people believed in their consciences that they were protecting their children. He could not understand the condition of mind of those who enforced the law, and saw people coming before the magistrates week after week, and fined 10s. He was a believer in perfect political and social liberty, and he regretted that people were prosecuted because they would not give in to the medical dogma of Vaccination. There were laws which the magistrates did not and would not enforce, and he instanced the cases which the Rev. A. A. Isaac on brought before the Leicester magistrates for people selling goods on Sundays. The law was clear, and yet the Mayor refused to carry it out, and ordered the prosecutors to pay the costs, and he only wished the Mayor would do the same with anti-vaccinators. He also pointed out that at Bedford the magistrates inflicted a fine of 6d. with 2s. costs, and at Boston a fine of 6d. with 1s. costs, and he thought Leicester ought not to be behind Boston and Bedford in this matter.

Mr. Lennard seconded the motion, and said in a matter of compulsion they would expect to find uniformity of medical opinion; but instead of this they found some doctors advocating Vaccination once, others many times, and some in one way and some in another, and they actually differed as to the material with which they were to vaccinate people. Now if Vaccination was the only preventive of small-pox, that it was said to be, it would never need compulsion to make the people of this country to adopt it; and on the other hand, when they had hundreds of men who were ready to come forward and refute the arguments in favour of Vaccination, and thousands who could bring forward the testimony of their experience in their own families of the evils of Vaccination, they attempted to do by compulsion what had never yet been done. The State had tried to thrust down people's throats by threats what they could not convince them of by argument; the State had applied compulsion to make people have one creed and one form of worship, but in all cases where compulsion was applied, in matters of conscience failure was the inevitable result. This law of compulsory Vaccination was grossly inconsistent. It provided for the payment of a fine, even although it denied the right of private judgment; and in some parts of the country a man might compound for his offence by the payment of a penny, while in other parts of the country a man might be subjected to penalties amounting to many pounds, and in one case a man had paid as much as £40 in respect of one child. Thus one man, for committing the same offence, and in the same degree, got off for a penny while another man had to pay many pounds. By means of this law the people were deprived of the stimulus that they would otherwise have to
secure pure air in their rooms, cleanliness in their habits, and good drainage in their houses, the neglect of which was after all the real cause of small-pox and all similar diseases. Vaccination was not forced upon tramps and wandering people who lived in close lodging-houses, who were likely to spread diseases, nor upon weakly children who had need of this protection if it was one, but upon healthy infants. Notwithstanding that the Vaccination officer, by fears and threats, induced many people to have their children vaccinated who had objections to it, there were over 200 people in Leicester who had paid the fine during the last twelve months rather than submit. As the Guardians of the poor they ought to do all they could to get the compulsory clause removed, because it operated with double severity upon them.

Mr. Brewin supported the resolution.

Mr. Moore though a believer in Vaccination protested against the people being prosecuted for holding opinions of their own. This memorial would have a considerable influence on the Local Government Board, and he suggested that the resolution should also be sent to other boards in the country calling their attention to the matter.

Mr. Beal said he believed there were a great many doctors who vaccinated children, who believed it was a very wrong thing to do. One or two gentlemen might say "oh," but it was a fact, and the late Dr. Derrington had told him so himself.

Mr. Langham supported the resolution.

Mr. Skillington said he had at one time two of his family ill with small-pox, one being vaccinated, and the other not, and the one who was vaccinated had the severest attack.

Mr. Whitehead also supported the resolution.

Mr. Wright said that a doctor from India had told him that he had 4,000 cases of small-pox in India under his observation, and those who had been vaccinated suffered the most.

The resolution was then put and carried without a dissentient.

A ST. ALBANS CASE.

Mr. W. H. Aston Peake, Analytical Chemist, Harpenden, Herts, was summoned to appear before the magistrates at St. Albans, on 14th June, for neglecting to have his child, Elizabeth Sexton, vaccinated. Mr. Peake was proceeding to state his reasons for objecting to the operation, when the magistrates informed him that they could listen to no excuse, but one arising from the state of the child's health; there might be much to say on his side of the question, but that they were there not to discuss the value of Vaccination, but to administer the law.

After some further observations, in the course of which Mr. Peake informed the magistrates that under no circumstances would he allow his child to be vaccinated, they fined him 4s. 6d. and 10s. 6d. costs. It is due to the magistrates to say that they were perfectly courteous and considerate.

AMAZING STATEMENTS.—At a recent meeting of the St. Saviour's Guardians, Southwark, there was a discussion on Vaccination, and Dr. W. T. IIiff was called upon for his opinion. He denounced anti-vaccinators for taking up stories to suit their purpose, and proceeded to mention two remarkable cases in his own experience. He had vaccinated two children, and the vaccine did not "take." The children had no blemish upon them, but two or three days after the operation, they were laid up with sickness, and the mother told him that if they had been vaccinated, she would have ascribed their illness to Vaccination. It seems incredible that a man in his senses should make such a statement, and suppose he was fortifying Vaccination. Why, it is well known that many of the worst cases of Vaccination are those that do not "take"—where the poison is retained in the system and is not got rid of, more or less effectually, by purgative discharge. In consistent ignorance, Dr. IIiff went on to assert that deaths among the vaccinated were rare, and that vaccinated nurses in small-pox hospitals got through their work unscathed. Lastly he said, that with the advance of sanitary reform it would not be necessary to enforce Vaccination so rigidly. Poor IIiff is not up to the mark of his profession, else he would know that sanitary reform has no influence over small-pox. Other forms of symptomatic disease may be kept away by obedience to the laws of health, but the only security against small-pox is Vaccination. So says Dr. Sexton, and whoever says otherwise let him be anathema!
PREVENTIBLE—BUT HOW?

It is admitted that there is a fearful mortality from "preventible diseases." Small-pox is one of these "preventible diseases." The question is—How is it to be prevented?

Great and successful efforts have been made by the Health Department of the Manchester Corporation to purify the city and lower the death-rate. Dr. Leigh, our Officer of Health, in his last report to the Health Committee, says—"The rate of mortality of the last year (1877) is perhaps the lowest that has ever been known in Manchester, and the reduction commenced with the inauguration of the Health Department." The whole of his report (with one exception) is in praise of sanitary measures. The exception is where he commends the activity and zeal of the officers of disease—the vaccinators.

Dr. Leigh reports that in 1876 and 1877 "the city suffered from a severe visitation of small-pox." 1116 cases of small-pox were sent to the hospital at Monsall. In those two years there were 411 deaths from small-pox. It is fair to infer that nine-tenths of these victims of small-pox had been vaccinated. But that is not my point at present. I want to draw attention to the following statement by our Officer of Health—"This invasion of small-pox is always accidental, and has nothing to do with the ordinary death-rate of the city and its normal causes."

A most unfounded and misleading assertion! It is unfounded, because small-pox is not "accidental;" there is always a "cause" for it; and that cause is the presence of filth in the food, in the air, in the blood, and not the absence of Vaccination, which is adding impurity to impurity; nor yet contagion, which may carry, but does not cause small-pox.

Florence Nightingale's words are again worth quoting:—"I have seen with my eyes, and smelt with my nose, small-pox growing up in first specimens, either in close rooms or in over-crowded wards, where it could not, by any possibility, have been 'caught,' but must have begun."

Dr. Leigh's statement is "misleading," because, if people believed and followed such teaching, they would pay no attention to sanitary matters. It passes my comprehension how an Officer of Health dare assert that the "normal causes" of disease and death "have nothing to do" with the production of small-pox. Dr. Leigh must know that the presence of small-pox is a constant admonition against filth; and in the next sentence he praises the officers for purifying the infected houses and clothing.

My contention is, that the more Vaccination is practised, the more small-pox there is likely to be, because Vaccination is only a modified form of variolation or inoculation with small-pox matter. In proof of this, I will give the opinion of another Manchester doctor of medicine. I have before me a Report on the Present State of Vaccination, made at the request of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association in 1889, by a committee of 28 duly registered medical men, of whom Dr. John Baron, of Cheltenham, the biographer of Dr. Jenner, was chairman. Dr. Daniel Noble, of Manchester, was a member of this committee, whose Report contains these words—"The vaccine disease is not the preventive of small-pox, but the small-pox itself—the virulent and contagious disease being a malignant variety."

This confirms the statement of anti-vaccinators—that small-pox would probably have disappeared had it not been propagated by Vaccination. My conclusion is, that "the devil of disease is to be driven out by the angel of health, and not by another devil of disease, although he may be less malignant than the one to be ejected."

HENRY PITMAN.
Manchester.

HINTS ON LECTURING.*

Anti-Vaccinators are compelled to public-speaking. If they are too modest for the lecture-room, they are left without choice in the police-court; and what we have to do, we should all strive to do in the best manner possible. To Mr. Henry Pitman the cause of anti-Vaccination owes much: his work has been as persistent as persuasive, and he has never hesitated to fulfil the eloquence of speech by the eloquence of example; and in a little volume, Hints on Lecturing, stuffed with facts, good sense and good advice, he goes as far as words can go to qualify his readers for speech efficient as his own.

In our account of the reception of the Banbury Anti-Vaccinators from prison, the Rev. C. H. Collyn was described as Rector of Wirksworth instead of late Head Master of Wirksworth Grammar School.

DR. CARPENTER’S REVELATION.

At the Croydon Police Court on the 14th of June, Mr. Frederick Cambridge and Mr. Francis Potter appeared in answer to summonses for the non-Vaccination of their children. Mr. Cambridge was represented by Mr. T. Young, who stated that whatever the Bench might do, his children never would be vaccinated. Mr. F. Potter spoke for himself, and having stated concisely the origin of the corruption wherewith it was proposed to pollute his child’s blood, he was answered by Dr. Carpenter, who sat on the bench. The Doctor said he regretted the state of the law that summoned parents, and incurred their defiance, instead of giving the magistrates power to order the Vaccination of children irrespective of their parents’ protests. With regard to lymph or vaccine, it was not animal matter at all.

Mr. Potter—What! Do you say that Jenner and other high authorities are wrong?

Dr. Carpenter—Yes; they are wrong in ascribing it to animals. Lymph is of vegetable origin, it is procured from a fungoid growth, and if used with proper care, no possible harm can arise from its conveyance into the human system. He had vaccinated hundreds of children, and had never seen any ill result. He knew well the protective power of Vaccination, and the dire effects of small-pox among the unvaccinated, who not only propagated the disease, but were the first to fall victims to it. He commended these remarks to Mr. Potter, and assured him that after Vaccination with pure lymph, carefully and properly performed, small-pox was impossible, and that it could do no mischief whatever. In the end, the Bench inflicted penalties to the amount of 30s. upon Mr. Cambridge, and a fine of 10s. and 6s. costs upon Mr. Potter.

The editor of the Croydon Advertiser is exulting over the new revelation. “It is indisputable,” he says, “that good service is done to mankind, when a mischievous error is set at rest for ever. Such a service was rendered by Dr. Carpenter when, in the calm but authoritative manner which befits a gentleman of his high standing and medical experience, he exposed the fallacious notions upon which the anti-vaccinationists have got up an unwelcome agitation against the Compulsory Vaccination Act. The chief opposition to that beneficial measure has been founded upon the assumption that the vaccine lymph is an animal poison, and that its introduction into the human system must therefore be fraught with dire results. This assumption was shown to be altogether erroneous, inasmuch as the vaccine lymph, instead of being of animal extraction is of vegetable origin. The fanatical argument about sowing corruption and reaping corruption has been destroyed by Dr. Carpenter, and there is no longer any valid excuse for evasion or defiance of the law. The compulsory act should now be rendered more stringent rather than undergo relaxation in any way. The safety of society is imperilled by a temporizing policy. The ground has been completely cut from beneath the feet of the opponents of Vaccination, and it is difficult to see what fresh arguments they can urge. Their premises and conclusions have been demonstrated to be false, and may now go to keep company with the long list of similar fallacies exploded by modern science.”

The exposure and overthrow of Vaccination would be greatly hastened if revelations like those of Dr. Carpenter were commoner. Some readers may imagine that the editor of the Advertiser isquizing the poor Doctor, but it is not so. A flunkey is often a consummate satirist—serenely unconscious of his mockery.

“PREMATURE DEATH.”*

One of the uneccy. bilious-looking Health Primers of Messrs. Hardwicke and Bogue’s series lies before us; and it is to be hoped that its exterior ugliness may prevent many looking into it for information. We fail to see the usefulness of such a work to those who most require it. Presumably, it is written for the masses, and intended to show them how to avoid the deaths which are “prematurely” carrying so many of them away.

Throughout the book, the leading idea is that of Quarantine. Perhaps an exception should be made in the case of typhus, which, our author says, “is pre-eminently the fever of overcrowding and destitution;” but why should any well informed man proceed to assert—“which happily are becoming things of the past in this country”? Where, in this country, are overcrowding and destitution becoming things of the past? Only where means are superior to needs. We are sick of the advice given ad nauseam to the poor in respect of the avoidance of diseases which are due to ills rarely faced by their advisers.

* Health Primer—Death; its Promotion and Prevention. Hardwicke and Bogue. 1s.
Small-pox, or scarlet fever, or diphtheria, appears in excessive severity and prevalence, whereon our authorities proceed to “stamp it out.” Isolation, infection by Vaccination, and disinfection are usually the agents resorted to. Yet, it is known, these are only temporary measures. The stamped-out disease returns, the same routine is gone through, and again authority breathes serenely.

If it is seriuously intended to lessen disease, something more must be done; for it is a notorious fact that, in some of the places where most has been spent in this kind of “sanitation,” the victims of disease are undiminished.

Take small-pox. Five Acts of Parliament organise and compel the general adoption of Vaccination, which, this Primer tells us (p. 89), is “an absolute preventive of small-pox, if we use it properly. In other infectious diseases we are restricted in our efforts of direct prevention to the isolation of cases. Isolation is also an important means of dealing with small-pox when present among a community; but while it is the sole means with which we can effectually combat scarlet fever, diphtheria, typhus, etc., with respect to small-pox we possess a sure preventive agent in Vaccination.”

If this were true, there would be no need to do more than turn to the statistics of Vaccination to discover the possible prevalence of small-pox. But there is not a particle of truth in it. Small-pox is not prevented by Vaccination, any more than it would be by stroking the monkey’s tail of an Indian medicine-man over the ground of the epidemic.

Where men’s needs have overrun their means, where human beings swarm beyond their power to properly feed, clothe, and comfortably house themselves—there is the realm of “preventible disease.” Take the case of Liverpool. The old parish (Liverpool) is one of our most striking instances of “premature death” districts. There the population is composed of human beings redundant beyond the means of wholesome existence. In consequence, there is so great a mortality, that if the population of the whole of Liverpool were as this district, the deaths would equal the births. But in West Derby there is a population able to feed, clothe, and bring up children in comfort, and this section of Liverpool adds 7,000 yearly to the busy hive. Their means are equal to, and beyond, their needs.

Who is there who cannot perceive, in this and similar instances, the moral of the facts? The fault is in certain conditions. These are only reprobated by authority, so far as the results are disagreeable. The conditions themselves are not reprobated by authority. The proper teaching for the masses is wanting. They are permitted—and even encouraged—to perpetuate conditions of redundancy and poverty, which beget disease; and when these appear, the only cry of authority is, “Quarantine!”

A. W.

SCOTTISH EVIDENCE AS TO VACCINATION.

We read in the Lancet of 17th May, that, according to the Report of the Registrar-General, 129,900 births were registered in Scotland during 1877. Of these children, 96 per cent. attained the age of six months, and were known to be successfully vaccinated. The Registrar-General says—“These figures give the most satisfactory assurance as to the working of the Vaccination Act;” and he adds, “Indeed, the circumstance that during the year 1878, there were registered, in the eight principal towns of Scotland, only three deaths caused by small-pox, affords strong presumptive evidence as to the efficiency of the Vaccination laws of the country.”

Now, let us go to Mr. Gibbs’s Table Turned,* and we shall find that nearly 96 per cent. of the children born in Scotland have been vaccinated annually, and that, therefore, there is no novelty in 96 per cent. for 1877. We also find that in 1873 in the eight principal towns, with 96 per cent. of vaccinated children, 66 small-pox deaths occurred of infants under one year. That 96 per cent. of the children born in Lanark were vaccinated, and that 538 persons had small-pox in that county. That 96 per cent. of the children of Renfrewshire were vaccinated, and that 227 persons had small-pox. That, with so trifling a minority of unvaccinated people in the country, there have been 16,442 small-pox deaths in Scotland in the years 1855 to 1878; and that 5,190 of these deaths were in the years 1870, ’71, ’72, and ’73.

Such is the state of affairs in one of the best vaccinated portions of the Queen’s dominions. Nearly every one born is vaccinated, “successfully,” be it remarked, and yet thousands die of small-pox. But because it sometimes happens that small-pox is not prevalent, the Vaccination laws are “efficient,” and have all the credit!

A. W.

*Darlington: H. Penney, 1878.
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

THE DEVIL AND VACCINATION.
[The following letter and poem were sent to Mr. Henry Fitman (see his *Prison Thoughts on Vaccination*) by Mr. H. Strickland Constable, of Wassand, Hull, author of *Our Medicine Men and Fashions of the Day*]

Sir,—Circumstances that have lately come under my notice have led me to share the doubts now so largely entertained upon the subject of Vaccination. It is said that Vaccination is proved to be beneficial by the fact that small-pox is less fatal than formerly. But gaol fevers, camp fevers, black death, sweating fevers, Oriental plague, etc., are less fatal than formerly, without any corresponding causes. The fact, no doubt, is that in former times medical practice was barbarous and sanitary considerations undreamed of. At most, Vaccination ought to be permissive, not compulsory. To imprison a man for refusing to have his younger child vaccinated, because he believes that his elder child has been killed by the operation, is extremely cruel. The sufferers are poor men. Their influence cannot tell upon political parties like that of brewers and railway directors, and therefore their cause has little chance of a hearing; but I have yet to learn that a poor man is not every whit as fond of his children as a rich one. One can fancy the Devil chuckling over this bit of legislation. Such cold-blooded cruelty must be perfectly charming to any spirit of unmixed malignity. I send you a new version of Coleridge's celebrated poem.

H. STRICKLAND CONSTABLE.

*Athenaeum Club, Pall Mall.*

From his brimstone bed at dawn of day,
From his bed the Devil is risen,
Risen and dressed in his Sunday best,
To inspect a model prison.

Villainous faces—burglars, thieves,
Murderers, too, he saw;
But the Devil was sad, for they put him in mind
Of just and righteous law.

He saw a bare-backed garrotter flogged,
Cursing and groaning with pain; [Book
But the Devil was sad, for he thought of the
That says—"Behold, the measure ye mete
To thee will be measured again."

Plenty of grovelling souls he saw—
Plenty of vice and wrong—
But petty and mean, so the Devil was bored,
For he loves it hot and strong.

There were two or three prisoners swearing hard,
And he caught the word "Damnation!"
The Devil was bored, yet he sneered a sneer
Of lazy approbation.

At length he came to an honest face—
"Hello! my man," said he,
"How in the world did you get here?
What crime can your crime be?"

"I had a bairn," the man he said,
"A bonnier could not be;
They poisoned his blood, and he died of sores,
A loathsome sight to see.

"Another was born, but I swore an oath
That murdered he should not be;
So here I am in a felon's cell,
And in felons' company."

"Ho, ho!" cried the Devil, as he rubbed his
"This is nuts, this is nuts," said he; [paws—
"A poor man crushed by the strong hand
Of legal tyranny.

"Oh! it's a treat to see a good man
Ground down for doing right!
Doubly a treat when the grinding is done
By law in its pitiless might!"

The Devil remained—he was far too pleased
To return to his place below—
He stayed and chuckled, and waved his tail
Gently to and fro.

ABSORBITY AND TYRANNY OF COMPELLARY VACCINATION.—As to its intense absurdity, there is no measure of that; and there ought to be no measure of contempt—and hardly of our indignation—when legal murder is founded on it. At what are they aiming? Forsooth, to protect us from small-pox. Yet they placard re-vaccination over the whole kingdom; hereby averring that vaccination is not a protection. And it is enforced on helpless infants only. I think we ought to petition Parliament to submit themselves to vaccination, from arm to arm, before they inflict the misery on us. Such conduct makes law hateful, and looses the bands of loyalty and patriotism. It is hard to speak of such legislation as it deserves. But, in fact, it was carried in the dead of night; no doubt, in an empty house. Such is the disgraceful stealth by which medical artfulness compasses its despotic objects. Once enacted, countless martyrs are needed before an ever-worked Parliament will rescind a bad law. The men who do these things are incendiaries of revolution.

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.
ADVERTISEMENTS.
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The Story of a Great Delusion.

Chapter V.
Collapse of Inoculation.

We sometimes fetch from afar what is to be found at our own doors; and thus it was with inoculation. No sooner was the great Eastern remedy advertised than it was said—Why, it is nothing more than a practice common in Wales and the Highlands of Scotland! Perrot Williams, M.D., and Richard Wright, surgeon, of Haverfordwest, communicated to the Royal Society* that the people in Pembroke-shire had practised inoculation “time out of mind.” They either scraped the skin thin or pricked it with pins, and then rubbed in pus from a small-pox patient. This they called “buying the small-pox,” as it was customary to pay something for what was fancied to be “good matter.” The Welshmen gave the same account of the practice as the Turks—there was no danger, no mishap, and certain security from small-pox. In Scotland it did not appear that the skin was scraped, but worsted threads saturated with pus were tied round the wrists of children to whom it was desired to communicate the disease.† Dr. Thomas Nettleton, of Halifax, Yorkshire, was an early and energetic inoculator. He prepared his patients by vomiting, purging, and bleeding. He disliked Maitland’s small punctures, and made gashes an inch long—one in the arm and one in the opposite leg, and inserted bits of cotton steeped in pus, and covered them up with plaster and rollers. It was his design to produce large wounds with copious discharges, so that scabulent matter might be freely evacuated. He was well satisfied with his heroic practice, and a record of his cases was sent to the Royal Society—a record from which any reader will be apt to conclude that there was little to choose between Nettleton’s inoculation and small-pox itself. He made no pretense that inoculation induced a trivial ailment, but only one less serious than the spontaneous disease, congratulating himself on having conveyed some sixty inoculated patients through grave peril; whilst, he wrote—

“In Halifax, since the beginning of last winter, 276 have had the small-pox, and out of that number 48 have died. In Rochdale, a small neighbouring market town, 177 have had the distemper, and 88 have died. It is to be noted that in this town (Halifax) the small-pox have been more favourable this season than usual, and in Leeds they have been more than usually mortal; but upon a medium there have died nearly 22 out of every 100 in these three towns, which is about a fifth part of all that have been infected in the natural way.”

English experience quickly made an end of the fiction under cover of which inoculation had been introduced—that it was attended with no risk, and might be performed by any old woman. Dr. Jurin, secretary of the Royal Society, and a steady advocate of the practice, thus laid down the conditions considered essential to success—conditions arrived at through stress of suffering and disaster—

“Great care ought to be taken to inoculate none but persons of a good habit of body, and

* Philosophical Transactions, No. 875, 1725.
† An Account of Inoculation in Scotland. By A. Monro.
Edinburgh, 1766.
free, not only from any apparent, but, as far as can be judged, from any latent disease.

"The body, especially if plethoric, ought to be prepared by proper evacuations—as bleeding, purging, vomiting, etc.—though in many cases there will be occasion for very little or none of these, it being sufficient to enjoin a temperate diet and proper regimen. But this must be left to the judgment of the physician.

"The utmost caution ought to be used in the choice of proper matter to communicate the infection. It should be taken from a young subject, otherwise perfectly sound and healthful, who has the small-pox in the most favourable manner. When the pustules are properly matured, and just upon the turn, or soon after, two or three of them should be ripped with a glover's needle or small lancet, and a couple of small pledgets of lint or cotton are to be well moistened with the matter, and immediately put into a little vial or box, and carried in the warm hand or bosom of the operator to the house of the person to be inoculated." *

The publication of these conditions was little short of a practical surrender, and the opponents of inoculation were not slow to avail themselves of the advantage. What had been proclaimed the easy and universal defence against small-pox proved hedged about with precautions and preparations for which only health with wealth was equal. Where was the profit, argued Francis Howgrave, of a practice which leaves the feeble and delicate and poor to their fate, which makes the well sick, and wounds those that are whole, whilst small-pox in the natural way very rarely affects life where the habit of body and constitution are good.† Isaac Massey was especially indignant over Jurin's comparison of the mortality of small-pox with the mortality of inoculation. Jurin reckoned that out of every 100 who took small-pox, 29 died, whilst only 2 in 100 died from the effects of inoculation. "He forgets," said Massey, "that the inoculated are picked lives. If this be fair, Hang fair!" Massey was right. It was absurd to institute a comparison between the common small-pox, comprising that of the poor and neglected, and the well-fed and carefully tended subjects of inoculation. Massey, too, was strong in his own experience, saying—

"I have a list of the names of 32 children, who are all that have had the small-pox during the last two years [1727] in Christ's Hospital, and every one recovered. I have had, besides, 17 or 18 more in my private business, of whom only one died. Here, then, we have 49 cases of natural small-pox and but 1 death." *

Emphatic likewise was his protest against the exaggerations of the inoculators—

"A natural simple small-pox seldom kills, unless under very ill management, or when some lurking evil that was quiet before is roused in the fluids and confederated with the pocky ferment." †

At this point we may say the judgment and the fears of the English people had gone against inoculation, and the practice appeared destined to gradual extinction. According to the inoculators, their work was thus summarised—

183 inoculations in 1721 and '22, with 3 deaths. 292 in 1723, with 6 deaths. 40 in 1724, with 1 death.

Prince Frederick and Prince William were among the inoculated of this year.

256 inoculations in 1725 and '26, with 4 deaths. 124 in 1727 and '28, with 3 deaths.

Dr. Schenckhzer, in 1729 tabulated † the cases and results of these years, 1721-28, as follows—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No operated upon</th>
<th>Perfectly inoculated</th>
<th>Did not take Small Pox.</th>
<th>Died.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year,</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2,</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3,</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4,</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5,</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10,</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15,</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 20,</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &amp; upwards,</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus stood the account by the inoculators' own showing, and it was by no means a satisfactory balance-sheet. What strikes one painfully in looking over it, is the vast preponderance of the young and defenceless (780 out of 897) upon whom the abominable experiment was tried. "Helplessness which commands the protection of the brave, is the opportunity of the

* Remarks on Dr. Jurin's Last Yearly Account of the Success of Inoculation. By Isaac Massey. London, 1727.
† Ib., p. 5.
‡ An Account of the Success of Inoculating the Small-pox in Great Britain. By John Gasper Schenckhzer, M.D. London, 1729.
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investigating sneak." Whilst the inoculators argued laboriously that if some danger attended artificial small-pox, it was trifling to that attached to the spontaneous disease (among other obvious replies), it was maintained that only after much wider experience could it be known what were the precise effects of inoculation. Inoculation, as introduced by Maitland in 1721, had proved vastly different after acquaintance, and there was no telling what remained to be revealed. As Dr. Wagstaffe observed—

"Had it always been slight, gentle, safe, and useful, with all those alluring epithets bestowed on it; had none had above a hundred or two hundred pustules, and no one died of it in the space of several years; and had there been no instance of any one's being ever again infected with small-pox who had any pustules at all, how few soever, raised by inoculation, nobody would sooner have subscribed to the practice than myself."*

The primal promise that the inoculated were thereafter proof against small-pox was speedily belied, but that difficulty was disposed of by the assertion that inoculation in such cases must have been imperfect, for it was impossible for any one to have small-pox twice. The admission of fatalities from inoculation was very tardily made; and they were generally referred to some cause perversely concealed from the inoculator, which, had he known, would have prevented his operation. Then, the manifest fatalities were naturally suspected to stand for a larger number sedulously kept out of sight. As Massey put it—

"The ill success of inoculation is very partially and sparingly given to the world. The operator will not tell it, who lives by the practice; nor will the relations, to whose authority the mischief is owing, be fond of revealing that to the public, which is grief to them in private."†

Fortunately for the public, several of the mischaps occurred in "good society," and were too conspicuous to be hushed up or denied. Miss Rigby died eight weeks after inoculation, "miserafully disordered by the operation." A son of the Duke of Bridgewater and a son of the Earl of Sunderland likewise perished; and a servant of Lord Bathurst died of confluent small-pox "consequent on engraftment." Such incidents struck terror everywhere, and caused wise and timid alike to face the ills they knew rather than risk certain peril for uncertain advantage.

Maitland returned to Scotland, his native country, in 1726, and, going among his relations in Aberdeenshire, showed off his skill by inoculating six children. One of them, Adam, son of William Urquhart of Meldrum, aged 18 months, sickened on the seventh and died on the eighth day. There was a great outcry, and Maitland tried to excuse himself by asserting that Adam was afflicted with hydrocephalus, which had been improperly concealed from him. Anyhow, the Aberdeenshire folk were satisfied with their experience, and recommended "Charlie Maitland to keep his new-fangled remedy for the English in future." He was more fortunate in the west of Scotland, where he "inoculated four children of a noble family," who escaped alive. The Scots, however, were deaf to his persuasions, and he made no headway among them. At a later date, 1733, inoculation began to be practised in and about Dumfries, and occasionally elsewhere. 3

In Ireland little more was effected than in Scotland. It was said that 25 inoculations took place between 1723 and 1726 with 8 fatalities. Dr. Bryan Robinson inoculated five children in Dublin in 1725, and was the death of two of them. †

Inoculation met with faint acceptance on the Continent. Maitland went over to Hanover in 1724 and inoculated Prince Frederick and eight children of Baron de Schulemburg. In France the practice had been discussed by Dr. Boyer so far back as 1717; and in 1728 the English experiments were recounted in Paris with much enthusiasm by Dr. de la Coste, evoking a declaration from the college of physicians, "that for the benefit of the public, it was lawful to make trials of inoculation." A commencement was about to be made in the hospitals under the sanction of the Regent, the Duke of Orleans, when his death put a stop to the design. Soon after Dr. Hecquet published Raisons de Doute contre l'Inoculation, which, coupled with bad reports from England, made an end of the project.

If a London journalist had been called upon in 1728 to report upon Inoculation, he might have written as follows—

Seven years ago the practice was introduced to this country under powerful suspicions. It was confidently averred that anyone might have his blood infected with the pus of small-pox, that a trifling ailment would ensue, and that theneforward he would be secure from small-pox in the natural form. Experience rapidly belied

* Danger and Uncertainty of Inoculating the Small-pox, p. 94.
† Massey's Remarks, p. 18.

* Monro.
† Scheuchzer and Massey.
these promises. The trifling ailment proved, in many cases, a serious ailment—so serious that physicians tried to anticipate and mitigate its severity by a preliminary regimen of bleeding, purging and vomiting. So exhausting and hazardous is the whole operation, that only sound and vigorous constitutions are considered fit for it; and the delicate and feeble, who require protection most, are advised to submit themselves as of old to the ordinary course of nature. Moreover, the induced small-pox is occasionally as severe as the spontaneous; the pustules are multitudinous, and sometimes confound with death for the issue. Fear may exaggerate the risks of inoculation, but more are believed to have perished than the inoculators are willing to confess. Again, many are not susceptible of inoculation, and though the infection fails to operate in their blood as desired, they do not always escape injury: they find their health disordered—are rendered sickly and uncomfortable. Worst of all, what none at first reckoned on, the artificial small-pox turns out to be infectious, and begets natural small-pox in those who are with the inoculated. Thus, the very means taken to limit the disease becomes a cause of its extension. Small-pox was more than usually prevalent in Hertford in 1721, and in London in 1724, and there was fair reason to conjecture that it was extensively disseminated by inoculation. Lastly, it is doubtful whether even successful inoculation protects from subsequent small-pox; for it is maintained that some of the inoculated have already fallen victims to the natural disorder. In short, the remedy appears to have so many drawbacks that it is questionable whether it is not worse than the malady; and it is probable that in a year or two it will pass into forgetfulness in common with many other remedies as highly extolled on early and imperfect acquaintance.

So much might have been stated and prognosticated in 1728: how the prognostic failed to be verified remains to be told.

LEEK ANTI-VACCINATORS.—The Leek (Staffordshire) Vaccination officer has applied to the Guardians for instructions to proceed against eleven persons for the third, and in one instance the fourth, time, for failing to have their children vaccinated. One of the Guardians indignantly protested against the law being carried out to the letter, saying that the proceedings were not prosecutions, but persecutions. Ultimately it was resolved to apply to the Local Government Board for instructions.

VACCINATION TROUBLE.

Perhaps nothing affects an honest investigator so painfully as the persistent assertion of so many medical men that Vaccination does no harm, can do no harm, and that they have never witnessed any ill consequences from the practice. It is an assertion known to be untrue in any company of mothers; and the doctors' assertion is an instance of how falsehood repeated blinds those who utter it until at last it is delivered with the air of verity.

Dr. Kirk of Edinburgh has contributed a long series of "Papers on Health" to the Christian News, and in the 207th thus discusses what he calls "Vaccination Trouble." A man of wide experience, and eyes of his own, he knows and testifies that Vaccination is not innocuous.—Ed.]

Some of the most distressing afflictions which one encounters arise in connection with the vaccination of children. We do not intend in this paper to enter on the controversy regarding the law and practice of this operation itself, but to do what little we may to aid those who are tried with those most heartrending effects that in so many cases spring from it. Here is a letter before us describing a fine healthy child up to the hour of his vaccination, turned into an object of deep commiseration as soon as the "law" has been obeyed in his case. What are the distressed parents to do? The medical man who performed the operation is worse than useless in the case. The drugs which he is almost sure to order are more rapidly destructive of the constitution of the child than even the poisonous inoculation which he has accomplished. His attempts to kill the virus he has introduced are much more likely to kill the remains of healthy substance yet in the child. The parents, if at all capable of thinking on the subject, see this, and what are they to do? This is just where we are anxious to help them. If possible, we should understand the kind of injury that has been inflicted. Positively diseased matter has been introduced into the body of their child. This is beyond all doubt. The pox on the udder of the cow is diseased substance. This substance has been introduced into the vital system of the formerly healthy infant. There is no controversy at this point. No one should be surprised that disease shows itself in the child, not only in the arm, but in the whole body. Until it shows itself more or less, the "vaccination" is "not successful," and the "law" does not recognise it! We have, then,
a point of truth not disputed, and not disputable, with which to begin our inquiry. Vaccination is the introduction of diseased substance into the inner skin. The outer skin is rubbed off in the process till the inner is exposed. The virus is then introduced by the vaccine matter being rubbed in. The effect shows itself as an inflammatory disease of the part of the skin that has been poisoned. It often spreads from this part all over the arm, greatly to the distress of the young sufferer, but it still shows itself a disease of the skin. When it spreads till it affects the whole body, it is still essentially a disease of the skin. When it affects the bronchial tubes or the lungs, as it often does, it is because it has disabled the skin from performing its proper functions, and so has thrown over-work upon the breathing organs. It is not, as we view it, a disease of the blood, though that may be unfavourably affected. It is a disease in the skin injuring the vitality of that most important of all our organs and its organic nerve system. This leads us to say that in remedying the evil done to a child in vaccination, we should seek to cure the skin. We can do this in various ways. Suppose we take the mixture used so successfully when life is melting away in sweats. That is, as our readers are aware, composed of a tablespoonful of common salt, a teaspoonful of really good cayenne pepper, half a pint of good white vinegar, and a whole pint of boiling water, and allowed to infuse for half an hour or so. The skin of the back of the little patient is to be gently rubbed with this liquid. In doing this the outer portion of the outer skin will come off in little rolls under the hand of the nurse rubbing. When this has been well done with the back, it should be equally well done over all the rest of the body. This may be carried out at various times so as not to make it a weariness. Thrice done on as many days, it need not be repeated till three more days have passed. But now a most important step should follow this one. When the baby has been treated all over with this mixture, we should have it gently rubbed all over—thrice, at least, with lather of barilla ash soap. No one who has not seen this well done can believe how blessed are its effects on an irritated skin. It soothes incredibly. When thoroughly covered, and covered again with well-made lather of this soap, the child will sleep beautifully. We should soap head and all, and let the little man sleep all night in the soap. He may be sponged in the morning with weak vinegar and water to clean off the remains of the soap, if there are any. Now there will occur a most important question, when so much is thought of—is the child cold or hot in feeling? If cold, then mix some good olive oil in your rubbing with the lather. If hot, then use no oil. If cold, rub all over with warm oil after the skin has been rubbed with the night-sweat mixture. If hot, then, as we have said before, use no oil. It will make no difference, or next to none, if the disease has broken out as a visible skin disease, only it will be necessary to use the acid and cayenne and salt on the whole parts of the skin, and not to distress the child by painful smarting. The soap will not need to be so restricted. That cures the most tender sores, and soothes in the most delightful way. It must, however, be distinctly understood that no wasting drug is to be used. The effect produced by the vaccine matter is really that of so far killing the organic nerves of the skin. The effect of arsenic, and such things, is only to kill more fully. If within reach, we should recommend Frank Wright's unfermented juice of grapes as drink and food, if the child has been weaned, and to the mother if she is nursing. Three glasses a day to the mother or the child would be a blessing. Other food, of course, may be used, as it can be taken and digested, but no drugs, properly speaking. By this treatment the poison would be gradually expelled from the skin, and the child would revive as that occurred. We have never seen the treatment fail, and we have had some very trying cases to deal with. The great difficulty occurs when doctors have reduced the vital forces till it is scarcely possible to find a foothold for right and natural treatment. Yet we should never fail to do our best to help any cure of so sore a trouble. When we have inwardly despaired, we have often found that, in the good providence of God, we need not have done so. In many cases there need be no despondency at all.

J. X.

Power of Words.—I find the process of converting newly vaccinated children into unvaccinated ones is very easy. It merely requires what the Devil in Goethe's Faust calls "the power of words"—

Mephistopheles.—Generally speaking, stick to words. The spirit of medicine is easy to be caught. Confide in yourself. Learn how to treat the women. You must have a title to convince them that your art is superior to most others; and if you only assume a moderately demure air, you will have them all under your thumb.—H. D. D.
DR. CAMERON’S BILL.
As we were led to expect, the bill introduced to the House of Commons to facilitate “Animal Vaccination,” has been withdrawn. At the rate at which Parliament transacts business, a bill set down for second reading in the middle of July is practically lost, and it is surprising that the fact is not adequately recognized by those whose experience should place them above illusions. It is, moreover, to be remembered how strong is the interest of all concerned in Vaccination to avoid and suppress discussion and investigation; and unless those who are bent upon raising the question are very much in earnest, there are tactics at Westminster whereby they can be quietly frustrated. None know better than the Vaccination Ring that when their craft is subjected to serious review in Parliament, it will be brought into serious jeopardy. It is their policy to represent Vaccination as something so certain and beneficial, that only fools and fanatics can impugn its wisdom. As a London magistrate observed in his audacity of ignorance—“You might as well ask me to decide against the rotation of the earth as against Vaccination.” The Animal Vaccination bill threatened to lead to revelations of which the mass of English people have no suspicion. They fancy they are living under the protection of the benign discovery of the immortal Jenner, and do not know that Jenner’s teaching is systematically set at naught, and that multitudes are annually infected with the pus of small-pox instead of that of cowpox, “the virtue of which it was the transcendent merit of Jenner to divine.” Obviously the endurance of what is called Vaccination consists in silence. As we have to observe continually, wherever the practice is examined, its fallacy is exposed. Whoever looks into it, speedily sees through it.
It is not easy to conjecture in whose interest Dr. Cameron’s bill was conceived. It might be supposed there was a party in the country clamouring for cowpox and could not have it. There is no such party. The public in general know nothing, and official vaccinators have no desire that they should know anything of the varieties of poisonous filth with which their blood may be infected under the designation of Vaccination. The fixed postulate of the medical set in Whitehall is the Vaccinator with his fees and his extras in the shape of bunnus, and it is inexpedient to be over curious as to the matter with which he tips his lancet. So far as anti-vaccinators are concerned, they no more believe in vaccinal than they do in various inoculations; the danger and the imposture of each are about equal. Their remedy for small-pox is the remedy for every form of zymotic disease, namely, conformity to the laws of health. They maintain that only through such conformity can zymotic disease be overcome, and on every side they have experience to justify their contention.

ANIMAL VACCINATION.
[Our readers may be pleased to see Dr. Cameron’s Bill at length. Here it is.—Ed.]

A BILL to encouraging Vaccination by providing facilities for the optional use of Animal Vaccine.

WHEREAS many persons object to Vaccination with the vaccine lymph provided by the State for public use on the ground that if such lymph has been obtained from an unhealthy child certain maladies may unintentionally be communicated along with the cow-pock: And whereas it is desirable to obviate this objection by providing facilities for the use by those who prefer it of vaccine lymph obtained directly from calves:

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen’s most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as the Vaccination (Animal Lymph) Act, 1879.

2. In this Act the following expressions shall have the significations hereby attached to them: (that is to say), “Animal lymph” shall mean vaccine lymph, either fresh or preserved, obtained directly from cow-pock vesicles upon a calf or heifer, and derived by propagation through a series of calves or heifers from virus obtained from a case of natural cow-pock: “A public vaccinator” shall mean a public vaccinator appointed under the Vaccination Act of 1867. “Vaccination” shall include re-Vaccination.

3. Whenever any parent or person having the charge of an infant required by law to be vaccinated shall require the public vaccinator to vaccinate the said child with animal lymph, it shall be the duty of the public vaccinator so to vaccinate it; and no prosecution under the said Acts shall lie against such parent or person in event of the public vaccinator refusing to vaccinate such child with animal lymph. It shall further be the duty of public vaccinators
when so requested gratuitously to perform vaccinations with animal lymph in all cases where it may be their duty to perform gratuitous vaccinations.

4. For the purpose of carrying out this Act the President of the Local Government Board shall take such measures (the cost whereof shall be defrayed out of moneys to be provided by Parliament) as may from time to time be necessary to secure for the public use a supply of animal lymph, and to provide for its distribution to public vaccinators and medical practitioners practising within the United Kingdom.

5. Any person who knowingly supplies or who knowingly uses for Vaccination as animal lymph which is not animal lymph as defined in this Act shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, punishable by imprisonment for any period not exceeding three months, or to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds.

(Prepared and brought in by Dr. Cameron, Earl Percy, Dr. Lyon Playfair, and Dr. Lush, and ordered, by the House of Commons, to be printed, 28 April, 1879).

PROPOSED NEW LEGISLATION.

Dr. Cameron's Bill has been withdrawn, but whether because opposed by the Government, or because of the parliamentary deadlock, I cannot say.

It is interesting to note what the three doctors and the noble Lord, who are responsible for the Bill, have set their seal to. Most important also because the three doctors are the medical element of the House, I believe, in toto.

In the Preamble, it is said, "Whereas many persons object to Vaccination with vaccine lymph provided by the State for public use on the ground that if such lymph had been obtained from an unhealthy child certain individuals may unintentionally be communicated along with the cow-pox: And whereas it is desirable to obviate this objection by providing facilities for the use by those who prefer it, of vaccine lymph obtained directly from calves," etc.

Here it is to be particularly noted that it was proposed to declare by Act of Parliament that lymph from unhealthy children is reasonably regarded a source of contamination. The rational issue from such a statement would be the prohibition of the use of unhealthy children as vaccinifiers, the imposition of a heavy fine for using such a vaccinifier, or the abandonment of compulsion. All, however, that these medical wiseacres can bring themselves to concede, is the substitution of a calf for a child; so that a parent objecting to the lymph from a child may have it from a calf instead. This calf-to-calf virus must (so runs Sec. 2) be derived by propagation through a series of calves or heifers from virus obtained from a case of natural cow-pock. But what remedy is that for a parent whose objection is to a constitutional taint? Dr. Seaton, the medical officer to the Local Government Board, in his Handbook of Vaccination, p. 337, quotes Mr. Ceeley as the best authority on animal vaccine in England, and declares that Mr. Ceeley considers the use of the natural cow-pock as seriously open to objection, and "so far from being likely to produce fewer ailments and cutaneous eruptions in the predisposed, he knows from his experience, that it would, as being more irritating, produce more." Now this opinion is completely supported by facts which have occurred since Mr. Ceeley wrote, and (Dr. Worlomont being the witness) the calves have been the means of imputing odious diseases as bad as the worst which a child could impart.

This is the remedy, then, which medical tyranny offers to insulted and outraged humanity. The last clause of the Bill imposes a penalty upon any vaccinator who proffers other than animal lymph as before defined. This penalty is £50 maximum fine, or three months maximum imprisonment.

Is this clause one of the strong reasons for the abandonment of the measure? Throughout the Bill not a word is said as to the superiority of animal virus to arm-to-arm virus for protection from small-pox. And I conclude therefrom that no one is now bold enough to declare to Parliament that it is any protection greater than the other. Why, in the name of sanity, we should continue to impose compulsion for either, is therefore amazingly strange, since the last voice of authority has declared, "I presume no one is prepared to state that primary Vaccination is an absolute protection for life from small-pox." (Dr. Gayton's Report, dated January, 1878.)

ALEX. WHEELER.

PARLIAMENT AND THE PEOPLE.

The English are the most law-abiding people on the face of the earth. How comes it, then, that so many fathers are fined and imprisoned for refusing to obey the Vaccination law? It is
because this law conflicts with conscience, violates the laws of nature, and repudiates parental duty. Laws which ordain usages contrary to human instincts, are unnatural; and laws which oppress the conscience are unjust. The Vaccination law is guilty on both these counts.

Anti-vaccinators cannot be said to "break the law," inasmuch as the law offers this alternative—freedom of body to the parent, with slavery of conscience and disease for his child; or, imprisonment, with a free conscience and his child uncontaminated. What brave, loving parent can hesitate in his choice?

We ought not to obey any law which violates nature or conscience. That Vaccination violates nature was proved by the celebrated John Hunter, a contemporary and acquaintance of Dr. Jenner. In his Dissertation on the Blood, Dr. Hunter says—"The blood has been supposed to be a passive, inanimate body. The blood I conceive to be alive, as it carries life to every part of the body. The introduction, by inoculation, of mineral or vegetable poisons is hazardous, and in certain quantities may be destructive; but the introduction of animal products from another living body is infinitely more pernicious, because allied to it in being vitalized."

It may be asked, "May not conscience be at fault?" No, because our conviction is based on irrefutable evidence, namely, that polluting the blood cannot promote health or ward off disease.

Parliament, or rather a few medical office-bearers, finding that the people hated and avoided this vile practice, miscalled "Vaccination," got a compulsory law passed stealthily in 1858. This compulsory law has, from time to time, been made more stringent and oppressive; nevertheless fathers and mothers have suffered fine and imprisonment rather than countenance this strangling of the national conscience, this destruction of the national health, this "breach in nature for ruin's wasteful entrance."

There have been abundant protests against this mistaken and tyrannical legislation, both in and out of Parliament. William Cobbett said —"What I am opposed to, and what I am alarmed at, is the proposition to obtain an Act of Parliament, which in its operation would be nothing short of a compulsion on every man to suffer the veins of his child to be impregnated with the disease of a beast—a measure to be adopted in no country where the people are not vassals or slaves."

Sir Robert Peel, the repealer of the infamous corn laws, declared that Compulsory Vaccination was opposed to the mental habits of the British people, and to the freedom in which they gloried, and that therefore he would be no party to it.

In 1871, a bill passed the House of Commons by a respectable majority limiting the penalties for non-Vaccination. The bill was rejected in the House of Lords by a majority of one. This was the vote of the Bishop of Chichester, Durford by name—a homoeopathist, strange to say, and formerly rector of Middleton, in Lancashire, a town which has taken an honourable part in the crusade against disease and death.

Dr. Cameron's delusive bill (Animal Vaccination) was down for its second reading on the 16th July. Mr. Peter Taylor, M.P. for Leicester, was prepared to move an amendment for the abolition of Compulsory Vaccination. The year's legislation having, as usual, got into arrears, the Government took possession of the day, and what promised to be a lively discussion, has been postponed to a future session. I had prepared to report the debate, when telegrams came from Mr. Taylor and Mr. Jacob Bright, to the effect that there would be no debate. Numerous petitions have been presented, so that some good has been done.

This question will come before Parliament again and again, and the agitation will not cease until State doctoring is disenowed. Compulsory Vaccination is a political blunder, if not a crime, and sooner or later this mischievous law will be repealed. That time will be near or distant, in proportion as the people exert themselves to send to Parliament sensible and honest men who understand this question, and will courageously declare their convictions.

Manchester.

HENRY PITMAN.

TWO SIDES OF A STREET.—In the Lancet of 26th April, it is said of the small-pox in the Faubourg St. Antoine, Paris, that "several very interesting facts have been observed in respect to the origin and spread of the epidemic. For instance, Dr. Rouxen, an eminent practitioner in one of the infected quarters, has stated the curious fact of one side of a whole street being full of cases, whereas the other was positively free from disease.” How satisfactory if Dr. Rouxen should discover that the residents on the small-pox side are unvaccinated, while Vaccinated and re-vaccinated on the healthy side! What a miracle it would be for the confusion of unbelievers in Jenner
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MR. W. GIBSON WARD AT LEDSBURY.

THOMAS JONES, a labourer, living at Much Marcle, was summoned before the Ledbury Petty Sessions on 25th June for neglecting to have his child vaccinated. On the bench sat the Rev. E. Higgins as chairman, the Rev. J. Buckle, Colonel Webb, and Mr. C. A Hewitt. The case was called, but Jones did not appear, when Mr. W. Gibson Ward entered the court, and said—

"I appear for him, having his written authority. The Act of Parliament says a man may appear himself, or his wife, or any other person for him."

CLERK.—Would you refer to the section, please?

MR. WARD.—Yes; the 11th of the Vaccination Act, 1867.

The Court having examined the section, found that Mr. Ward was correct, and decided to hear him for Jones.

The Vaccination Officer appeared as a witness, and Mr. Ward required him to produce evidence of his appointment to office, and then to prove his authority from the Guardians to prosecute. Having been satisfied on these points, Mr. Ward went on to observe, that infamous as is the Vaccination Act, its administration had been still more infamous.

CHAIRMAN.—We are sitting here to administer the law as it is, and I will take the opinion of the Bench whether the language you are using is such as we can listen to.

MR. WARD.—The law throws the whole responsibility on you. The 81st clause of the Act says that a magistrate may make a vaccination order "if he shall see fit." In another clause it is provided that if a parent offers a reasonable excuse for not vaccinating a child, the magistrate shall not make an order. Therefore you cannot plead the compulsion of the law. Jones does not refuse to vaccinate his child from any wish to break the law, but because he has had dire experience of the effects of Vaccination. A few years ago ten children were vaccinated by Dr. Wood, and the whole of them were afflicted with ulcers through which their bones could be seen. They were polluted for life. One of the mothers took her child to Dr. Wood, who pooh-pooed what he had done, and said he would give her a bottle of medicine. The poor woman had to walk ten miles, and had to pay 2s. 6d. for a bottle of dirty water which did her child no good.

REV. J. BUCKLE.—You ought not to apply the term "dirty water" to medicine dispensed by Dr. Wood.

MR. WARD.—I mean no harm. Call it medicine—a bottle of medicine. As for the vaccine, Dr. Wood was not blamable; the impurity of vaccine is beyond detection by any microscope. One of the children poisoned by Dr. Wood's vaccine was a child of the defendant, and Mrs. Jones seeing it very bad, took it to an old nurse, who, when she saw it, said—Ah! this is the effect of that nast vaccination."

CHAIRMAN.—Stop. We cannot hear—

MR. WARD.—I cannot stop. I say that with you rests the responsibility for whatever evil results from vaccination.

Then ensued a discussion with the Bench, the clergymen protesting that it was for them to administer the law and accept the consequences.

MR. WARD.—But Jones will not have his child vaccinated whatever you do; you cannot compel him; you can only worry him. The law you administer is an outrage on nature, and as Blackstone teaches, a law has no validity which does not harmonise with the laws of nature.

CHAIRMAN.—I will not sit here and have the law abused.

MR. WARD.—Then you can leave; I must go on. I say that this law is a violation of natural law.

CHAIRMAN.—We cannot endure this. You are addressing us as if we were idiots.

MR. WARD.—I shall have to speak to you as clergymen presently, and shall show that you are greater law-breakers than this man.

Another altercation hereon ensued. The magistrates retired to their room, and on their return—

The CHAIRMAN said: Mr. Gibson Ward, you commenced your oration by saying that this law is infamous, and infamously administered—

MR. WARD.—More infamously administered.

CHAIRMAN.—More infamously administered. Now, we think those expressions are totally inappropiate, and ought to be withdrawn. We do not want to hear quotations from Blackstone, or Bacon, or Hooker. The law is made, and it is for us to administer it, and therefore I do hope you will keep to the facts of the case.

MR. WARD.—Your worship will understand that I came here with a perfect wish to conciliate you; but if I fail to do so, I must go on. I sympathise intensely with the hardships of the poor, and therefore I cannot speak of them without some passion. If there is any liberty
in this country, it is the liberty of speech; and it is for you to hear me patiently as the unpaid advocate of the poor.

Mr. Ward then proceeded amid many interruptions to cite Hooker in evidence of the nullity of law at variance with divine order, to prove that there was no such thing in use as cow-pox, and that Vaccination under pretense of saving life, destroyed life, referring with much effect to the Registrar-General’s Return, Vaccination Mortality, No. 488, published last year by order of the House of Commons. Lastly he appealed to the consciences of the magistrates.

Chairman.—Never mind our consciences.

Mr. Ward.—But I do mind them.

Chairman.—We do not wish to interrupt you, and we have heard you patiently.

Mr. Ward.—You have not heard me patiently. You would not like to be interrupted in your sermon as I have been interrupted.

Rev. J. Buckle.—The Bench have told you time after time that they are not here to consider the merits or demerits of the law on Vaccination, and as you persist they decline to hear you further.

Chairman.—Thomas Jones must get the child vaccinated within a month; if he does not get it vaccinated in that time, he must again be summoned.

Mr. Ward.—Very well: then I shall come again in a month.

In the Hereford Times of 28th June, there is a report of this remarkable trial extending over two columns. Whatever some may think of Mr. Gibson Ward’s policy, he certainly manages to excite and inform the public as to whatever cause he takes under his energetic protection.

JOSEPH STAVLEY’S CASE.

On 3rd July, 1878, Mr. Joseph Stavley, of Bingley, Yorkshire, was convicted under the Vaccination Act, and fined 20s. and costs, or in default, fourteen days’ imprisonment with hard labour. On 11th February, 1879, Mr. Stavley was carried off to jail, and subjected to the following treatment—

1.—He was compelled to have a bath, and was then led naked to the haircutting room, where he had to sit for twenty minutes until his head and beard were cropped. Whilst still naked he had to stand another ten minutes until prison clothes were brought to him.

2.—He was put to oakum picking, to which he was kept for more than ten hours a-day during the time he was in prison. His food consisted mainly of dry bread and cold water. After he had been in jail for some days, the Home Secretary was communicated with concerning the judgment of the Bingley magistrates. Mr. Cross informed them it was illegal to sentence anti-vaccinators to hard labour, whereon a fresh commitment was made out, and the words “hard labour” omitted. The magistrates set up the plea that a “mistake” had been made by their clerk, hoping thereby to escape the consequences of their illegal action.

Mr. Stavley being a poor man, a committee has been formed to assist him in obtaining redress. His case has been placed in the hands of Messrs. Wilkinson & Son, of Lincoln’s Inn Fields, and an action for £100 damages has been commenced. Mr. T. Baker has been retained as barrister. It is estimated that £50 will clear expenses in any event, and anti-vaccinators are invited to contribute in order to ascertain whether—

It is legal to imprison anti-vaccinators with hard labour?

And if not, whether they are to be sent to prison as felons or as debtors?

And if as debtors, whether it is legal to cut their hair and beards, and compel them to wear prison dress and pick oakum?

The following committee has been formed to receive subscriptions and conduct the case—

Chairman.—John Jeffery, Thorn House, Harden.

Treasurers.—R. Duxbury, Main St., Bingley; James Lancaster, Low Street, Keighley.

Secretaries.—Samuel Holmes, 22 Regent St., Bingley; Geo. Kidson, 14 Daisy St., Keighley.

Committee.—Matthew Johnson, Bingley; Joseph Cockett, Bingley; Benjamin Judson, Bingley; David Wade, Harden, near Bingley; Robert Smith, Bingley.

LAW AND HEALTH.—There is a strong feeling abroad at this moment that legislative enactments are capable of doing service for the preservation of health and the suppression of disease. I do not deny that a decision in a law court may occasionally check or remove some real or supposed cause of disease. But I doubt the correctness of the principles of coercion, and more than doubt the general competency of the men upon whom may devolve the duty of inflicting fines and penalties on those adjudged guilty of breaking the law.—B. W. Richardson, M.D., F.B.S., in Health and Life.
MR. ALFRED StANSFIELD'S RELEASE FROM PRISON.

At Middleton, on 9th July, a large and enthusiastic meeting was held to welcome Mr. Alfred Stansfield on his release from prison for refusal to submit his child to Vaccination. The Rev. W. A. O’Connor, Reector of St. Simon and St. Jude’s, Manchester, occupied the chair, and in the course of an eloquent address observed—

“Some say we are bound to obey the law in any case, and even quote Scripture for the purpose of suppressing resistance. But there is all the difference in the world between law which is one with divine order, and law which is at variance with that order. If law interferes with religious liberty we are not bound to obey it. St. Paul himself would not have obeyed it, and the same principle of duty, as to what is divinely right, applies to the law which enforces the unnatural practice of Vaccination; we cannot obey it. Hence I have to say with regard to our friend, that he has done faithful and noble work in resisting the evil law. He has simply complied with Christian precept. Every man should bear his cross, and it is not too much to say that Mr. Stansfield has been bearing his cross for the deliverance of Englishmen from an overwhelming and loathsome burden.”

Mr. Stansfield’s imprisonment was effected with much cruelty and perfidy, but he assured the meeting he did not regret the course he had taken, and that if necessary he would go to prison again.

RE-VACCINATION.

We have for years thought that all policemen were re-vaccinated without exception. If we are not correct in this belief perhaps the Lancet will correct us. But if we are, the following should be headed—“Small-pox in thirty-one re-vaccinated policemen!”

“Efficacy of Re-Vaccination.—In the report for 1878 of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, the medical officer draws attention to the efficacy of re-vaccination as a means of preventing small-pox. He states that during the epidemic of 1871-72, 148 constables were re-vaccinated; 154 in 1878, and in the first quarter of 1879, 129, making a total of 481, of whom not a single member was attacked with the disease. We may add, that during 1878 thirty-one policemen contracted small-pox, which proved fatal in two instances. The operation, Dr. Nedley remarks, has been objected to in consequence of the unreasonable dread of the local inflammation, and the constitutional fever which accompany it; but the 154 constables vaccinated last year were, on an average, one and a-half days off duty, notwithstanding the arduous nature of a policeman’s duty, and the weight and tightness of his uniform.”—Lancet, 17th May, 1879.”

ANTIDOTES TO THE VACCINE VIRUS.

This subject, which was referred to in No. 1, deserves further investigation, for if a true antidote—inexpensive, safe, and easy of application—could be found, it would go far to nullify vaccination law. Dr. Willan, in his treatise on Vaccine Inoculation, London, 1806, p. 86, in a foot note, states—“Dr. Jenner was of opinion that sulphur, largely used, prevents the operation of the vaccine virus.” and refers for further information to Dr. Tierney’s Dissertation, and Bell’s Treatise on the Cow Pox, p. 87. Dr. Tierney cites the fact that Dr. Jenner failed in vaccinating thirty soldiers under treatment with sulphur. Dr. Tuthill Massey, in his Practical Notes on New American and other Remedies, p. 91, states—“After a fortnight’s course of sulphur six children were vaccinated. In only one, the youngest, who had taken the least sulphur, did the operation succeed.” Recently Mr. W. Gibson Ward has advocated the use of a solution of borax to be applied to the vaccine punctures immediately after the operation, as a means of destroying the activity of the pus. Personally I am of opinion that liquid ammonia, so effectual in neutralising the effects of bites and stings of snakes and insects, would be equally useful in neutralising vaccine poison. Let the experiment be tried and the results recorded. A few drops should be applied to the punctures in the arm with a feather or a camel-hair brush as soon as possible after the vaccinator has done his work. A pennyworth would suffice for the arms of fifty children. Those who would like to try the sulphur remedy should give to the infant every day for a week previous to the vaccination as much milk of sulphur as will lie on the point of a penknife.

Wm. Young.

Borax is a certain antidote to the vaccine virus. No pus can retain for an instant its infecting power when mixed with borax. Borax possesses singular powers: it is a disinfectant, and will purify or destroy the most infectious
matter; it is so antiseptic that it will preserve skins or other animal matter, and yet is not only harmless to an open wound, but it will heal it as quickly as any known article. It is not only harmless in the mouth or stomach, but it is the finest mouth-wash or teeth-cleaner. In bronchitis it will clean the mouth and throat of phlegm when all else fails.

Certainly no known article can in any way equal it as a cleanser of infants from the pollution of vaccine virus. It can be carried as a dry powder finely pulverised, by the mothers of infants, and instantly applied, even in the presence of the vaccinating polluter, and the fellow defied. He has no power over the mother or child it is back in her arms and charge. There is no law yet to prevent a mother disinfecting her child of pollution—from cleansing her offspring of filth—neither is there likely to be. Brutal and ignorant as our medical vaccinators are, and desirous of being despotic over every human right, and over reason and over truth, they are not likely to find a parliament debased enough to limit a mother’s right to cleanse her infant.

W. GIBSON WARD.

AN IRISH CASE. Mr. Joshua Jacob of Limerick, a Member of the Society of Friends, was fined 6d in April for the non-vaccination of his child Maria, and in May 10s. He appealed to the Quarter Sessions as to the legality of the second conviction, and Judge Purcell, without affirming or reversing the decision of the Magistrates, pointed out that the appellant ought to move by certiorari. We hear that Mr Jacob, in view of the uncertainty and annoyances of legal proceedings, does not intend to take further action, save by persistent resistance. In his family he has suffered severely from Vaccination.

MR. ALEXANDER HUME’S CASE. The West Ham Guardians have unanimously taken no further action against Mr. Hume for the present. The Guardians reasonably dislike to be defied with impunity. The editor of the Stratford Express says the law should be altered so as to have children vaccinated in spite of the parents. The suggestion is frequently made, and it is surprising that some of the bolder vaccinators do not exhibit the courage of their convictions in an Act of Parliament. "Vaccination and Re-Vaccination by Force," would be a nice cry wherewith to go to the country.

EDITORIAL CREDULITY.

What a wondrous instance you have given us in your last number of the way in which the many arrive at their conclusions! Dr. Carpenter sits upon the Croydon Bench, and in his wisdom, without a particle of proof, declares that vaccine pus is not animal, but vegetable matter. Straightway the editor of the Croydon Advertiser pronounces the question settled. Some laugh at Roman Catholics, because they say "Roma locuta est, causa finita est," but the Croydon Advertiser has a medical Pope, and that Pope is Dr. Carpenter. His word, his mere ipse dixit, is sufficient for the faithful worshipper. Talk of kissing Peter’s toe! This is kissing Carpenter’s toe! And the man who thus prostrates himself is a teacher of the people forsooth, a public journalist! Half the world’s opinions are thus formed. What are they worth? Clearly the editor of the Croydon Advertiser puts out his thinking which I profess to do for myself.

Wirksworth. CHARLES H. COLLINS.

SMALL-POX AFTER INOCULATION. Mr. Francis Toulmin, of Upper Clapton, writes to the British Medical Journal of 28th June:—“I saw, about forty or fifty years ago, so many cases of small-pox succeeding inoculation, that I have a firm belief that more cases occurred after inoculation than after vaccination, taking into account the minority of the former against the majority of the latter.”

SIMULTANEOUS VACCINATION AND SMALL-POX. In the same letter he relates, “I was requested to see two lads with confluent small-pox. I inquired of the mother, had she any other children, and had they been vaccinated. She told me she had five, and they had not been vaccinated, as her husband did not hold by it. I insisted upon doing it, and vaccinated them all. The arms all took, but small-pox appeared, and ran pari passu in all five, but in all in a modified form." Thus Mr. Toulmin testifies to the occurrence of a Jennerian impossibility—simultaneous vaccination and small-pox. How he knew the small-pox was modified by the vaccination, he leaves to conjecture. It is the pious formula, that vaccination must do some good; even where it fails, it saves from something worse. He adds, “In the house to which I went for the vaccine, I found a man much seamed with small-pox, having it again fully developed.” Thus he testifies to small-pox after severe small-pox—once also thought impossible.
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DR. ILIFF—A CORRECTION.
In your July number, you refer to a supposed statement by me, that I vaccinated two children unsuccessfully, and that extensive eruptions followed. What I said was, that eruptions often appear about the 3rd or 4th month, and that I myself had had two remarkable cases within the last ten years, in each of which the day for Vaccination was fixed, but the operation was not carried out; and that shortly after, without any visible cause, eruptions had appeared, and that I specially said to the mother of one of them, Had I vaccinated your baby, would not you have attributed the ailment to the Vaccination? 
WM. TIFFIN ILIFF, M.D.
37 Kennington Park Road, S.E.
22nd July, 1879.

UNVACCINATED INFANTS IN DUBLIN.—Whilst I entirely concur in the opinion that “the systematic neglect of infantile Vaccination would be certain to give origin to and cause the spread of small-pox,” I cannot admit that the spread of small-pox in Dublin is due to such systematic neglect during the past few years. If these were really the case, we should expect to find a great number of small-pox cases occurring amongst young unvaccinated children; but the reverse is the fact. Such cases are very rare. I can only recall one to memory for over two years, and the experience of such colleagues as I have spoken to on the subject agrees with mine.—Report of Jos. En. Kenny, M.D., Medical Officer, 2 North City, Dublin, 3rd Feb., 1879.

ANTI-VACCINATION AT HALIFAX.—An open air meeting was held at Halifax on 1st July, at which some excellent and effective speeches were delivered. Mr. Samuel Knowles gave a description of the origin and progress of Vaccination, terminating with the Parliamentary Return obtained by Mr. Hopwood, which showed how infant mortality had increased by 25,000 a year through inoculable diseases, the direct product of compulsory Vaccination. Mr. Amos Booth testified to the remarkable enlightenment of public opinion in Leicester during the past eight years in consequence of the diffusion of information accounted heresy by the medical profession. He denounced the Vaccination laws as an abominable swindle. Let people who believe in Vaccination keep it to themselves, and not force it with pains and penalties on those who know it to be pernicious quackery.

OPINION VERSUS FACT.
Dr. Seaton, Medical Officer to the Privy Council, in his Handbook of Vaccination, p. 272, says—“But even in its most modified form, small-pox is a disease which all would desire to escape, and well conducted re-vaccination appears to afford a very sure and reliable means of escape. After successful re-vaccination, small-pox, even of the most slight or modified kind is rarely met with.”
Yet the whole of the following are medically reported, or government reported, cases of small-pox in re-vaccinated persons—
Blue Book of 1867, 1888 cases occurring in the Prussian army.—Paris, Voltigeurs of the Guard, 1885, “many” cases.—German soldiers, 1870-2, 263 deaths, say 2600 cases.—Philadelphia Hospital, 1871, 1872, 1875, 52 cases.—Fulham Hospital, 1877, 4 cases.—Austrian State Railway servants, 1872, 73, and 74, 92 cases.—And Dr. Rowell, medical officer for San Francisco, 1868 and 1869, said—“Those vaccinated and re-vaccinated since the commencement of the epidemic of small-pox, were apparently thereby rendered more susceptible to the disease.”

COBBETT ON VACCINATION.—William Cobbett was an admirable detective, and had a sharp eye for a quack, and Jenner’s quackery did not escape him. Thus he wrote of the occurrence of small-pox after vaccination, which Jenner and his accessories had pronounced impossible:—
“Now, here are instances enough; but every reader has heard of, if not seen, scores of others. Young Mr. Codd, who had been vaccinated by Jenner himself, caught the small-pox at a school; and, if I recollect rightly, there were several other ‘vaccinated’ youths who did the same at the same time. Quackery, however, has always a shuffle left. Now that the cow-pox has been proved to be no guarantee against the small-pox, it makes it ‘milder’ when it comes! A pretty shuffle, indeed, this! You are to be all your life in fear of it, having as your sole consolation, that when it comes (and it may overtake you in a camp, or on the seas) it will be ‘milder!’ It was not too mild to kill at Ringwood, and its mildness, in the case of young Mr. Codd, did not restrain it from binding him for a suitable number of days. I shall not easily forget the alarm and anxiety of the father and mother upon this occasion; both of them the best of parents, and both of them now punished for having yielded to this fashionable quackery. I will not say, justly punished; for affection for their children,
in which respect they were never surpassed by any parents on earth, was the cause of their listening to the danger-obviating quackery. This, too, is the case with other parents; but parents should be under the influence of reason and experience, as well as under that of affection; and now, at any rate, they ought to set this really dangerous quackery at naught."

THE NANTWICH GUARDIANS had the cases of Mr. John Bell of Victoria Cottage, Pall Mall, Nantwich, and Mr. William Pedley of Burland, Nantwich, before them on 21st June. Both have been prosecuted and fined; Bell, a working man, going to prison rather than pay the penalty, his wife, brave woman, encouraging him to suffer for conscience sake. Some of the Guardians appeared disposed to leniency, but were under the conviction that their only course was to comply with the law, and have Bell and Pedley summoned afresh before the magistrates. It is odd how this notion of irresistible duty survives all correction. Guardians are not compelled to proceed against non-vaccinators after a first conviction. On the contrary, they are advised by the Local Government Board to exercise discretion and refrain from useless prosecutions. Many vaccinators see clearly that policy requires extremities to be avoided, and are by no means grateful to the zeal that stimulates and advertises resistance.

HINTON ON NURSING.—Of all the avocations open to women, Hinton gave the foremost rank to nursing, and was anxious that it should be raised to the dignity of a profession. He reversed the usual estimate of the relative importance of doctor and nurse, believing that the real curative power lay with the latter. An expression of surprise was once quoted in his presence—"How any woman could condensecnd to be a doctor who had the chance of being a nurse!" "Exactly so," he replied. "When a commonplace young man says, I want to be a doctor, I say, Very well; because I daresay he will do well enough. And if a commonplace girl wants to be a doctor, I take it for granted she will do well enough too. But if a girl says, I want to be a nurse, I begin to consider whether she has the requisite qualifications. For the nurse's profession embraces all that is good in both the medical and clerical professions; the positive elements of each without the negative elements of either. She has the doctor's science without his drugs, and the parson's religion without his dogmas."—*Life of James Hinton*, p. 255.

PHILADELPHIA.—Says the *Sanitary Record*, "An argument in favour of compulsory Vaccination is found in the fact that in Philadelphia, with nearly a million inhabitants, but where Vaccination is general, there was not a single death last year from small-pox. Under the old *regime* the number of deaths should be at least a thousand annually." [This paragraph has gone the round of the press, and will no doubt be regarded by many as conclusive for Vaccination as is Ten- terden Steeple for Goodwin Sands. That there should be no small-pox in Philadelphia for one year, or for a series of years, is in no wise extraordinary; but small-pox will in due season visit Philadelphia, and carry off its tale of victims irrespective of Vaccination.—Ed.]

THE GATESHEAD GUARDIANS had the case of the Rev. Mr. Tebb of Winlaton, under discussion on 8th July. Mr. Tebb has been repeatedly before the magistrates for the non-vaccination of his children, and on the last occasion was fined heavily, but a public meeting was held to congratulate him on his resistance to the law and to defray his expenses. The Guardians see plainly that a contest with a gentleman in Mr. Tebb's position is hopeless and humiliating, and their vaccination officer has been warned not to proceed against any parent twice without special instruction from the Board. Thus an absurd law is saved from contumely by the discretion of its administrators; but why one measure for Mr. Tebb at Winlaton, and another for Mr. Abel at Farington?

COMPULSORY VACCINATION AND PARENTAL AUTHORITY.—Compulsory Vaccination is beyond all comparison the strongest form of "parental government" that was ever introduced into this country. It overrides and tramples down parental authority in relation to children. It takes them out of the care of the father and mother, who are ordained by Providence to exercise their parental care, and it insists upon a disease being infused into the blood of every child in order to prevent the contingency of its catching another disease. That might be justifiable; but it could only be justifiable, not upon medical theories, not upon the observance of innumerable precautions and the presence of favourable circumstances, but upon a truth undeniable, universal in its operation, certain in its results, free from peril, and an absolute preventive.—*Sir. Thos. Chambers, M.P.*
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER VI.

REVIVAL OF INOCULATION.

The practice of inoculation, thus discredited, revived, and not only revived, but prevailed. The revival was gradual, and may be said to have acquired definition about 1748, under the powerful approval of Dr. Mead. In the score of years from 1736 to 1748, it is not to be imagined that the practice was abandoned: there were always a few repeating the attempt to have small-pox without the penalties of small-pox, but their success was not conspicuous or encouraging. Inoculation was introduced to a generation specially disposed to receive it; and it was only allowed to slip for a time under the compulsion of medical necessity. Perhaps there never was a people with such a taste for remedies as the English of last century: the common intelligence was invested in quackery. Even Wesley found time to dabble in medicine, and to compile a volume of prescriptions for his followers, entitled *PrIMITIVE PHYSIC*—a piquant mixture of good sense with absurdity and credulity. Our forefathers had no clear conception of the connection of physical well-being with physical well-doing, and many of the essential conditions of health were unknown to them. Their physical afflictions were regarded as mysterious dispensations to be endured with resignation or frustrated with medicines. The same attitude of mind is far from uncommon at the present day, and many will recollect how, ere sanitary science attained repute, it was considered profane to assert that the prevalence of typhus was subject to control, and that cholera might be arrested and suppressed; whilst a drug to subdue either would have been heard of with gratitude. Superstition has rarely had any objection to the apothecary.

An incident passed over in histories, although far more inwardly characteristic of the mind of the 18th Century than a multitude of the superficialities wherewith their pages are cumbered, is that of Joanna Stephens and her remedies for the stone. Her cures were so remarkable and (on evidence) so indisputable, that a general demand arose for the revelation of her secret for the public benefit. This revelation* Mrs. Stephens agreed to make on receipt of £5000 as compensation; and a subscription was started, to which Fellows of the Royal Society, physicians, noblemen, bishops, ladies, and kindly folk of all orders set their names. Such however was the unanimity and anxiety to possess the Stephens secret, that it was pronounced a national concern, and Parliament was invoked to supply the requisite funds; whereas an Act was passed * for providing a reward to Joanna Stephens upon a proper discovery to be made by her of the medicines prepared by her for the cure of the stone.* The discovery was duly disclosed to appointed trustees, one of whom was Archbishop of Canterbury, and the £5000 was paid over in 1739; and here we have the heads of the precious revelation—

"My medicines are a Powder, a Decoction, and a Pill.

"The Powder consists of egg-shells and snails, both calcined.

"The Decoction is made by boiling some herbs (together with a ball, which consists of soap, swine's crusses burnt to a blackness, and honey) in water.

"The Pills consist of snails calcined, wild
carrot seeds, burdock seeds, achen keys, hips and hawes, all burnt to a blackness, soap and honey. **Joanna Stephens.**

"16th June, 1789."

The public were apparently satisfied with the purchase, but with the usual levity of credulity forgot Mrs. Stephens and her marvellous cures in the pursuit of fresh nostrums. Fashions in medicine are on a par with fashions in dress, and have only occasional reference to the permanence and veracity of nature.

The revival of inoculation in England was stimulated by reports from abroad. For instance, in the Gentleman's Magazine it was stated that in 1787 there were inoculated in Philadelphia—

Men and Women, - - - 62
Children under twelve, - - 64
Negroes, - - - - - 82

and that out of the 128 only a Negro died. Again, in the same magazine for 1788 we read—

"In Barbados in March last there were upwards of 8000 persons down in the small-pox, where inoculation is practised with great success."

Such reports, whilst secure from examination, were none the less effective over the public imagination. There was a report published by Dr. Mead in 1747, which derived great credit from his endorsement, and which continues to be cited to the present day as proof for inoculation, but which is a model of convenient and circumstantial vagueness worthy of Dafoe. Thus Mead's story runs—

"The following relation was communicated to me by a gentleman of great credit. He was a merchant at St. Christopher's in the West Indies, and in the making of sugar employed a great number of slaves. In one year, when the small-pox raged with more than ordinary violence in the neighbouring islands, with his own hands he inoculated three hundred of them, from five to sixty years of age, with such success, that not one of them died, though most of them were negroes. And whereas all the Americans suffer this distemper in a most terrible manner, yet experience shows, that it is much more dangerous when it attacks the natives of Africa." *

Mead held positions which later and more exact inquiry rendered untenable. He would not allow that the pus of small-pox could communicate any disease but small-pox, if taken from a proper subject—a condition that required supernatural assistance to fulfil. He maintained that inoculation generated true small-pox, and that as no one could have small-pox twice, therefore no one could have small-pox after inoculation, and that reports to the contrary were not credible. It now goes without saying that in this contention Mead was completely at fault, but at the time his confidence was not inexorable; and whilst defending and recommending inoculation, he made admissions which fully justified those who resisted and condemned his counsels. Let us not forget that the following passage was published in 1747, and was the fruit of six-and-twenty years of experience in the best London practice. Thus Mead wrote—

"It ought not to be omitted, that boils and swellings under the ears and in the arm-pits arise more frequently after the distemper procured by art than after that which comes of its own accord; for this reason, as I suppose, that the venomous matter is pushed forward with less force, which disadvantages Nature makes amends for in this way."

"Therefore all possible means are to be used to ripen such tumours of whatever kind they are: if this cannot be done, they must be opened by incision; and when all the matter is drawn out, the body must be purged by proper medicines, which are to be oftener repeated in this than in the natural disease.†

How just are the judgments of Divine Order! These boils, swellings, and tumours were the sequencess of the violated harmony of the body—of the faithless anticipation, the meddling and muddling with its processes.

An extensive series of inoculations took place in 1742-45 in the south of England. Small-pox was prevalent in Winchester and adjacent towns, and Dr. Langrish operated freely on whoever resorted to him. In Portsmouth, Chichester, Guildford, Petersfield and Winchester, it was said that at least 2,000 were poded, and that only two pregnant women perished, who, as usual, "were inoculated contrary to the advice of their physician." The ill results, wrote Bishop Maddox, "were only such as might reasonably be supposed to have been worse had those operated on had small-pox in the natural way"—such being the euphemism wherewith boils, tumours, and other sequels were accounted for.

The reviving favour for inoculation was indicated in this paragraph from the newspapers of 18th April, 1744—

"Fourteen children, three years old, having

† Ib., p. 149.
been inoculated for the small-pox in the Foundling Hospital, Hatton Garden, all with good success, the Governors have resolved to have all their children inoculated at the same age."

An important movement was made in 1746 with the opening of a Small-Pox Hospital in Cold Bath Fields at which "the benefit of inoculation" was offered to the poor. At first those who applied were taken into the house, and nursed through their self-inflicted illness, but the proximity of the veritable small-pox, the regimen, and the seclusion were sufficient to deter applicants: those, however, who have a hobby to ride grow reckless in presence of obstacles, and by-and-by inoculation was offered to all comers, who were dismissed to recover and diffuse infection in their own homes.

With the revival of inoculation there was a revival of the controversy as to its lawfulness theologically. Dr. Isaac Maddox, Bishop of Worcester, preached a sermon on behalf of the Small-Pox Hospital in St. Andrew's, Holborn, on 8th March, 1752,* which excited considerable attention. He showed the necessity for such an hospital for the poor and forsaken of the great city—a necessity incontestable. He mentioned (and the remark supplies a curious note on the hygiene of the time) that ventilators were to be introduced, and it was expected that the success of fresh air might benefit the patients.

The return of the Hospital for 1752 showed 844 admissions, with 262 recoveries, and 82 deaths—a proportion that does not contrast disadvantageably with 19th century hospitals, fortified with sanitary appliances and vaccination. During the same year 112 inoculations were effected at the Hospital. The Bishop had been assured by three eminent surgeons that they had poked 1500 persons with only 8 fatalities, one of them (Sergeant Ranby) having accomplished 1000 without a mishap. The practice was without doubt lawful, for it averted a dangerous disease, and some risk was inseparable from all methods of cure. The practice had already done much to lessen small-pox, and, as it became commoner, it would do more. The result of the sermon was a subscription of £809 for the charity at the subsequent dinner in the Drapers' Hall.

The Bishop was singularly at fault in his ascription of diminished mortality to inoculation, for, in 1752, small-pox was more than usually rife in the Metropolis, and its prevalence was not unreasonably attributed to infection from the inoculated. In 1751 the deaths from small-pox in London were 998; they rose to 8588 in 1752; declined to 774 in 1753; and rose to 2859 in 1754.

Dr. Doddridge lent his powerful influence in favour of inoculation; and, considering the unqualified assertions of medical men as to its benefits and harmlessness, it cannot be said he was blameeworthy. The audacious assurance with which many of them bore down opposition overcame the simple-minded, who argued as if the world were constituted after the pattern of their own innocent hearts. That small-pox frequently followed inoculation is now known beyond dispute, and yet Dr. Kirkpatrick wrote—

"I have heard myself a great many rumours of the inoculated being naturally infected afterwards, which upon examination proved just as many lies."*

How could women and divines resist such evidence?

A valuble antagonist of inoculation was the Rev. Theodore Delafaye of Canterbury. He preached a sermon in that city on the 3rd of June, 1753, from the text, "Let us do evil that good may come" (Rom. iii. 8), and published it under the title of Inoculation, an Indefensible Practice. He was in turn attacked by the inoculators, and in 1754 issued A Vindication of 200 pages, in which he returned more than he received with vigour rather than discretion. His conclusion was—

"Inoculation I maintain to be, in a religious and moral view, a self-destructive, inhuman, and impious machination, and in a physical one an unreasonable, unnatural, unlawful, most hazardous, ineffectual, fruitless, uncertain, unnecessary device; in a word, a practice which nature recoils at, which reason opposes, and which religion condemns."

We sometimes read that inoculation was denounced as Atheism, and we are expected to reprobate or to smile at the bigotry; and, whilst we may not approve of the odious stigma, we may at the same time recognise the honest sense in which it might be affixed. Some who spoke of inoculation as Atheistic felt more vividly than they could otherwise describe, that it was an infraction of the deeper sanctity of nature, where man's hand cannot enter and prosper, and that those who made the attempt could have no proper sense of Him in whom they lived, and moved, and had their being. Moreover, if we are to admit that they who thus expressed themselves are blamable for excessive vehem-

---


ence, what are we to say of the more numerous party who did not hesitate to pronounce inoculation a discovery effected in the human mind by God himself? If it was reasonable to speak of the practice as Theistic, why should it be fanatical to assert the contrary, and maintain that it involved a negation of Divine Providence? Dr. Kirkpatrick, with the syropophagy which was the custom of his age, praised George II. for "the benevolent, and even celestial disposition," which induced him to patronise "the wonderful and probably Heaven-descended practice of inoculation;" and extolled "its equal simplicity and success" as demonstrating "to a reflective mind the goodness of Providence in making what may be so often necessary, so easily accomplished."* It would not be difficult to cite scores of confessions of gratitude to God for inoculation, but to what purpose?

What we think good we necessarily ascribe to God, and we do well; but much that we think good is otherwise, or is only partially good; and what then? Why, we are undeceived and corrected by experience. We put our notion of what is good to the test of practice, and God answers us in the event—justifies, amends, or confounds us. Thus with inoculation. It was fair that those who thought it good should refer it to God, and thank him for it; and it was equally fair that those who thought it bad should say it was none of his—that it was at variance with his order, and a discrediet to the intelligence of those who imputed it to Him. How was the issue to be determined? Only by God himself. And how would He speak? In the results of experience wherein his will would become manifest beyond equivocation.

In 1754 inoculation obtained full recognition from the London College of Physicians. It was declared "that experience had refuted the arguments urged against the practice; that it was now more extensively employed in England than ever; and that it was highly beneficial to mankind." The fence of hesitation was thrown down, and to be poxed became the distinction of all who wished to be numbered with the enlightened and the prudent. That the Circassians were famous for their beauty, and that they practised inoculation, was a staple argument, and an irresistible, with a multitude of Englishwomen. Opposition was chiefly confined to the lower orders, who objected to have the inoculated at large among them, and in some places they threatened to demolish the houses where inoculation was performed.* Occasionally a medical practitioner acquired reputation as an inoculator, and was resorted to by patients from a distance, and his operations were not regarded with much favour by his neighbours. Thus the physicians and surgeons of Newbury, Berks, were compelled by their townsfolk to promise to inoculate no one who had not resided in Newbury at least two years.

The new practice created much business, and its distribution excited some jealousy. Physicians complained that surgeons inoculated without their assistance, and surgeons that apothecaries did so likewise. Dr. Kirkpatrick laid down the rule that every rightly conducted inoculation involved the employment of physician, surgeon, and apothecary—the physician to prepare and prescribe for the patient, the surgeon to cut, infuse, and dress, and the apothecary to make up the medicines. Some, however, dispensed with all three, and effected their own inoculations, A boy poxed fourteen of his schoolfellows in sport, and amateur inoculators, male and female, multiplied. As an example of amateur procedure, Dr. Kirkpatrick relates that a gentleman of Kent sent his servant, Silvanus, a young man, to Mrs. Chapman, at Heathfield, to be inoculated. He had to ride thirteen miles, and arrived hot and fatigued at the house of the inoculator: he had taken his preparatory physic at his master's. Mrs. Chapman desired him to get ready at once for the operation, which he begged her to defer as he was in such a heat. She replied that he must be inoculated that very day, Tuesday, or remain until the following week, for Tuesday was her lucky day. The poor fellow allowed himself to be persuaded, and was then and there inoculated: severe small-pox ensued, and he died.†

Thus was inoculation revived and established, and small-pox with it—established and diffused.

---

†Kirkpatrick's Analysis of Inoculation, p. 280.
PERSECUTION IN ENGLAND.

There are circumstances in relation to persecution, for conscience sake, which seem to stupefy our minds. Can Englishmen in 1879, in this England of ours, be imprisoned for conscience sake? Yes; there is evidence of it from near the black country, in dingy and apathetic Birmingham. Has a father in England no right to protect his infant from serious evil—from an undoubted evil, which has slaughtered a dozen of his children? None whatever. If he attempts it, he is treated as a felon. England freed her bondmen from serfdom to landlords 800 years ago. England freed her negroes from slavery nearly 50 years ago. But Englishmen for the last dozen years or less, have been flung into an intolerable slavery. They are now the serfs of the doctors. For the doctors’ despotism is rivetted upon Englishmen by Vaccination spies—by policemen and by magistrates. The doctors cannot be trusted from riding churchyards—and so law binds them to decency! The doctors cannot be trusted with a dog or a cat and a torture chamber; so vivisection must be controlled, and doctors limited by law in their horrid tortures. But the child of every Englishman is handed over to the despotic and cruelty of the vaccinating doctor, and positively he may slay the child, and there is no punishment; he may pollute the infant with disease more horrible than death, and there is no penalty; not a scrap of English law to protect an English child from slaughter, or pollution: instant slaughter would be a mercy rather than the pollution.

This slavery of every English father is indignantly resented in numerous places; until the vile acts of Parliament are scorned and trampled under foot. But in Manchester they are so wildly seeking a compulsory suppression of publicans, that they are insensible to their slavery as fathers under Compulsory Vaccination Acts; they are so horrified at a reeling drunkard, that they are insensible to the slaughter of infants. Birmingham could raise a riot, and burst out the galleries of a church to suppress church rates. But the men of Birmingham are quite indifferent to the vaccinating doctors being put on the rates, and plundering the public; getting money under false pretences. They have so little sense of natural rights and social freedom that they are indifferent to an honest father being sent as a felon to jail for a “holy and just cause.”

This man John Cornforth has had twelve children slaughtered by vaccination, or crippled down to uselessness, and has sworn that he will not have another slain or polluted by the vaccinating doctor. For this noble resolution he is to be imprisoned for two months! Yet in Birmingham the men who ape philanthropy are silent as dumb dogs. Yet in Birmingham the men who call themselves liberals, and are seeking to represent liberal constituencies, in whose breasts “dire ambition reigns,” but not a sense of social freedom, are silent, as if God could not see John Cornforth in jail.

The candidates who are anxious to protect the freedom of the men of Nottingham and of Ipswich or Aylesbury, who are filled with the

“... damned ambition
That hurt'd from heaven's light millions of spirits,”

are yet empty of all pity for John Cornforth, and let him rot in jail, if the place is damp enough for the work. They who are faithless at home, will not be faithful abroad.

The case of John Cornforth is one of gross oppression beyond all precedent in England—the England which has denounced slavery—and theoretically given up persecution for conscience sake. It could not be believed only in evidence that no one can challenge. The following is the report of the case before the magistrates—Richards, Cheshire, Lowe and Ellis.—From the Birmingham Daily Post, August 2, 1879—

"PROSECUTION UNDER THE VACCINATION ACT.

"John Cornforth, brassfounder, Milton Street, was summoned for neglecting to have his two children vaccinated. Mr. R. Wilcox, vaccination officer, said that the elder child, Florence Hetty Cornforth, was born on the 8th of January, 1878, and as the defendant did not attend to the vaccination, he was summoned, and the justices imposed a fine of £1 and costs. Since then witness and others had visited him and endeavoured to persuade him to comply with the law, but he still protested against it and declined. The other child, Alfred Bos Cornforth, was born on the 12th March this year, and defendant persistently refused to have the child vaccinated. He had received no certificate from the defendant as to the children's state of health, and so far as he knew they were fit for vaccination.

"The defendant commencing with the words: — "With pleasure I stand here to vindicate my holy and just cause," said that the reason why he refused to have his children vaccinated was solely that the last he had vaccinated died in sixteen days afterwards, and another had died
with abscesses all over it, while another was ill for four months. One he alleged was a cripple through it, and he objected to complying with the law under such circumstances. **It was murdering his children.**

**"Ms. Fitter (magistrates' clerk).—Will you have these young people vaccinated?"**

**"Defendant.—No; I will not, because it murders them. I will go to prison first."**

**"Ms. Love.—Are you prepared to take the consequences, because we must really carry out the law?"**

**"Defendant.—I am not. The law has been shelved before. There are hundreds of cases this gentleman (Mr. Wilcox) does not seek after."**

**"Ms. Ellis.—We are bound to carry out the law, and you will be fined 20s. and costs, or one month's imprisonment, in each case."**

**"Defendant.—I must go to prison. Lock me up, gentlemen. I will not pay. I swear on my dead child's body that I would not. Defendant was then removed."**

The Englishman who can read this case, and can remain without flushed face, and raised pulse, and not indignant at the infamous political tyranny of the Compulsory Vaccination Acts is unworthy of the title Englishman, he should cease to

"... speak the tongue
That Shakespeare spake, the faith and morals hold
Which Milton held."

As to the magistrates, it is a compliment to assume that they never read the Vaccination Acts. Otherwise, we must believe that they are hypocrites. Tyrants at heart, with a profession of obligation on the lip. They must, under the first summons have tried the man by the 81st section. There the magistrate is not bound to fine, or imprison; he is not bound to any decision. He can, if "he sees fit," discharge the man, refuse to convict at all, applaud the man for trying to protect his children or anything else.

The spirit and animus of the magistrates are well understood, when after a tale of sorrow and suffering, they inflicted the highest penalty that the law allows. They were determined to have the pound of flesh exactly; not a drop of blood kept back. The man may die, but then the pleasures of tyrannical authority are sweetened! Authority that gives pain, and can crush with penalties, is what the Jack in office glories in. His dignity he measures by the suffering he can inflict, the ruin he can cause. But the England that tolerates such tyranny... no future. Its history would shame all English-speaking people. Better far such an England should perish, and its shame be atoned by its suffering. But we must hope that the apathy of such towns as Birmingham will be removed, and the shame of imprisonment under Compulsory Vaccination Acts be also removed by the indignation of a once free people.

W. G. WARD, F.R.H.S.

Since the above article was in type, we have heard that John Cornforth was not locked up; but no thanks to the magistrates. Two benevolent policemen collected 20s. in court, and the wife of John Cornforth made up the amount of fines and expenses. When a law is so cruel that it shocks policemen, and they collect money to save a victim from its fangs, surely law-makers and law-reformers should see that the English statute-book is no longer disgraced by an Act that panders to a gross superstition, which is treason to nature and to the rights of man.

W. G. W.

**DR. ALLBUTT'S STATISTICS.**

DR. H. A. ALLBUTT, of Leeds, is engaged on a "Defence of Vaccination" in the *Secular Review*, and in the number for 16th August, makes the following statement—

"Some time ago a discussion was held at Bradford, between Mr. Atkinson, of Leeds, and another gentleman, whose name I forget. Mr. Atkinson's opponent mentioned the fact, that in a certain small-pox hospital 1,000 vaccinated and 1,000 unvaccinated persons were admitted suffering from small-pox. Of the 1,000 vaccinated persons 750 recovered, and only 250 died; of the 1,000 unvaccinated individuals 750 died, and only 250 recovered. Mr. Booth, of Leeds, who was present at the discussion, asked Mr. Atkinson to give an answer to the question as to why the mortality was so much greater among the unvaccinated persons. Mr. Atkinson evaded a reply, but, on being pressed, said it was 'a lie,' and that the doctors of the hospital had 'cooked' the statistics. This was no reply—it was not an argument, and was a foul slander on honourable and upright gentlemen. I hold that the above statistics prove the value of vaccination as a scientific discovery of high value."

If Mr. Atkinson did say the statistics were cooked, and that the report was a lie, he committed no slander. The statement is so absurd that "lie" is an epithet too severe for the trumpery. And, Dr. Allbutt, in asserting that such statistics demonstrate the value of vaccination, proves how inadequate are his qualifications for the advocacy he has assumed.
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VACCINATION FROM THE CALF.
[Written for the coming meeting of the Social Science Association in Manchester.]

Whatever our opinions may be respecting Vaccination, we shall all admit that the question is of vital importance. The theory of Vaccination is that a mild dose of small-pox will prevent a severe attack. It is popularly supposed that vaccine virus is different from small-pox matter. I contend that it is small-pox matter, and I call as a witness Dr. Daniel Noble, of Manchester, who, in 1889, put his name to a Report of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association on The Present State of Vaccination. This report contains these words (page 81)—

"Cow-pox and small-pox are not bona fide dissimilar, but identical; and the vaccine disease is not a preventive of small-pox but the small-pox itself—the virulent and contagious disease being a malignant variety."

If it be denied that vaccine lymph is small-pox matter, then what is it? It is small-pox matter or something worse. Of vaccination, as universally done from 'arm-to-arm,' the Bishop of Manchester stated publicly in 1870—

"The ground of the opposition to vaccination is that the vaccine lymph carried from one person to another is so largely tainted with this poisonous [serofulous and syphilitic] matter, that parents dare not trust their children to be vaccinated."

To obviate this objection, Drs. Cameron, Lush, and Playfair laid a Bill before Parliament last session to legalise the use of animal lymph, which is thus defined—

"Animal lymph shall mean vaccine lymph, either fresh or preserved, obtained directly from cow-pox vesicles upon a calf or heifer, and derived by propagation through a series of calves or heifers obtained from a case of natural cow-pox."

But "natural cow-pox" is now happily unknown. Even in Dr. Jenner's day, spontaneous cow-pox was rare, and he declared it to be "inefficient." Jenner wrote—

"If there were a real necessity for renovation [of the lymph] I should not know what to do, for the precautions of the farmers with respect to their horses have driven the cow-pox from their herds."

How is it proposed to replace human with animal vaccine? Sir Thomas Watson has described how calf lymph can be produced. In the Nineteenth Century for June 1876, he says—

"It is certain that one objection [to vaccina-

[Continued on page 82]
impression that it was a safe and certain preventive of small-pox. Dr. Jenner in his Inquiry (1798, page 6) says, "The person who has been thus affected is for ever after secure from the infection of the small-pox." Jenner wrote to a friend, "The public thinks it is not a complete protection. Don't listen to every blockhead who says it fails." When failures multiplied, and notably after the case of Lord Grosvenor, Jenner modified his theory so far as to admit that vaccination was only equal in its protection to an attack of small-pox. But that was a very partial protection, according to his own words, for he wrote, "What if 100 or 500 persons have small-pox after cow-pox; as many can be produced who have small-pox after small-pox. I can collect cases of small-pox after small-pox in thousands."

The history of vaccination and small-pox proves that Jenner's theories were unfounded. His biographer, Dr. Baron, says—"It is a pity that the modified statements of Dr. Jenner were not pronounced to the world." If Jenner had pronounced them, Parliament would not have granted him £80,000, nor would vaccination have been made compulsory.

What ground is there for compulsion? Every person is not liable to small-pox; then why insist upon vaccinating every child? Vaccination either protects, or it does not. If it does, the vaccinated are safe; if it does not protect, compulsion becomes tyranny.

It is admitted that the influence of vaccination vanishes in a few years, and that re-vaccination is necessary. If so, must we submit to compulsory re-vaccination? The English people will never submit to that. My conclusion is that where doubt and danger are admitted, and where guarantee of success, and compensation for injury are impossible, compulsion is unjustifiable.

HENRY PITMAN.

WHIMSICAL MEDICINES.—Unicorn’s horn and the “skull of a man who has died by a violent death” appear in the pharmacopoeia of the College of Physicians of 1678. Unicorn’s horn, human fat and human skulls, dog’s dung, toads, vipers, and worms, are retained in the same pharmacopoeia for 1734. A committee revised the pharmacopoeia in 1742, and retained centipedes, vipers, and lizards.—H. N. Moseley. [Dr. Ratcliffe, Dr. Mead and Dr. Freind in consultation prescribed for a young nobleman in small-pox, “mixture of the spirit of a human skull, and volatile salt of ammonia.” Nevertheless the patient died.]

MR. W. GIBSON WARD’S SECOND VISIT TO LEDBURY.

Mr. W. Gibson Ward reappeared at Ledbury Petty Sessions on behalf of Thomas Jones of Much Marcle on the 6th of August. Mr. Osman Ricardo was in the chair, and six other magistrates were present. The court was crowded to hear the champion of the anti-vaccinators. After some preliminary sparring, the Chairman said that Mr. Ward would have to show cause why they should not convict.

Mr. Ward.—I object to the summons altogether. If you like to ask your vaccination spy, I daresay he will tell you the age of the child. I believe it is about 10 months, and the law implies that no proceedings are to be taken under the 29th clause of the Act until the child is past 15 months.

The vaccination officer stated that the child was born on the 15th September, 1879; and the Chairman said that the Bench considered that the order was properly made.

Mr. Ward.—That is, that you completely set aside the 29th clause?

Chairman.—We consider the order properly made, and that is the only answer I shall give you.

Mr. Ward.—Very well, I shall proceed.

Thomas Jones has no theoretical objection to the Vaccination Act, but his previous child was vaccinated with nine others by Mr. Wood, and all ten of them had ulcers through which their bones could be seen.

Chairman.—We have nothing to do with other children, and do not wish to hear of them. The case before us is that of Thomas Jones.

Rev. E. Higgins.—It is for you to show cause why we should not convict.

Mr. Ward.—I am not here to be told what I am to say. I appear as advocate for the poor, to speak for the helpless in God’s name, and I hope the Court will have the decency not to interrupt me at every moment.

Chairman.—I must request that you will keep yourself to the case of Thomas Jones. As to defending the poor, we all defend the poor as well as you can.

Mr. Ward.—Jones’s child was one of the ten ulcerated through vaccination, and it is perfectly in order for me to refer to them as collateral evidence. What I now wish you to understand is, that under the 81st clause of the Act you are left to exercise your discretion. To your conscience and to your humanity, I therefore appeal. Jones has one child at the point of death in consequence of vaccination, and
why should you insist that he place another in similar peril? Surely you cannot consider it an offence for a father to protect his offspring! Moreover, if you determine to enforce vaccination, you have to remember that vaccination is impossible, for there is no vaccine in existence. There has been no case of cow-pox since 1826, and that was a doubtful case. If you go back to 1818, and look at Baron's Life of Dr. Jenner, you will see that Jenner himself said that if cow-pox had to be renewed, a supply could not be found. For sixty years then, matter had been passing through scores and scores of infants, accumulating in its passage the evils of many generations, until, at last, no one knows what the matter really is, nor if it is vaccine at all. If therefore you order Jones's child to be vaccinated, and it cannot be vaccinated, you are the law breakers.

Rev. E. Higgin.—What you state has nothing to do with us. The law has been read, and I shall ask the Clerk to read it again.

The Clerk read Section 81 of the Act which empowers a magistrate to make an order for the vaccination of any child if he sees fit.

Mr. Ward.—If he sees fit: it is left to his conscience.

Rev. E. Higgin.—I will ask you a question. Is the child vaccinated?

Mr. Ward.—No, nor ever will be.

Rev. E. Higgin.—Is it unfit to be vaccinated?

Mr. Ward.—It is a strong healthy child.

Rev. E. Higgin.—The Act then says that conviction is to follow unless some reasonable ground is shown that the order cannot be carried into effect. You have therefore to show some reasonable grounds against a conviction.

Mr. Ward.—Every word I have spoken constitutes reasonable ground. One or two of you have spoken about time. You surely do not imagine that her Majesty's commission of the peace is merely to add J.P. to your names! If public convenience requires you to sit six hours or six days, you have no right to plead time against an advocate who has a duty to perform.

Chairman.—You do not confine yourself to the case, and you do not give us evidence.

Mr. Ward.—I am here to give plenty of evidence, but you will not listen.

Chairman.—The decision of the Bench is, that Thomas Jones be fined 1s. and expenses, that is 10s. 6d.

Mr. Ward.—Under the circumstances, your decision is reasonable, but Thomas Jones will not pay a brass penny.
MR. YOUNG'S VACCINATION TRACTS. *

Among Mr. Young's many services, the publication of the Vaccination Tracts is pre-eminent, and we congratulate him on their collection into a volume with a Preface and a Supplement which bind them into corporate unity. We sometimes hear anti-vaccinators described as fanatical and ignorant; and we are all by nature so lazy, that a summary dismissal of those who bother us with difficulties is apt to meet with favour and acceptance; but the last charge a careful reader of these Tracts will make against their authors is that of fanaticism and ignorance. On the contrary, the charge of ignorance is likely to be shifted to the other side, and as for fanaticism, where is it displayed with greater virulence than where men and women are fined and dragged to prison because they will not submit their children to a filthy and dangerous rite, whilst their medical persecutors howl for yet wider and intenser vengeance? Many of us who lift our eyes with amazement over the bigotry of the 16th Century are blazing bigots of the 19th. As of old, we build the sepulchres of the prophets slain by our fathers, and the doods of our fathers we repeat. As we read in the Preface to the Tracts—

"Considering the circumstances brought before the reader in those pages, it is wonderful that persecution in favour of the condemned system still goes on with magisterial power. Fine and imprisonment are the iron legs on which Vaccination stalks, for it has no other leg to stand on. This fine and imprisonment are in themselves chaotic; for the fines vary from sixpence in one court to twenty shillings in another; and the imprisonment varies from simple confinement to cropped hair and hard labour. It is surprising. For it is a mark of the hardness of heart and dullness of mind of the scientific nineteenth century; the epoch of legalised vivisectors, legalised vaccinators, and legalised purveyors of clean prostitutes for the vaccinated services which defend the United Kingdom from domestic disorder and foreign foes. These things are the ministries of health which Parliament and Government provide for us; and the dissenters from these things are persecuted to ruin by magistrates clerical and lay—especially clerical—though the light of knowledge in favour of these dissenters is now accessible to the whole people."

"To the martyrs themselves we can only say, —


Be of good cheer, and endure to the end. The brand that afflicts you 'is lighting a candle in England,' as a fellow-martyr said to Brother Latimer at the stake, and 'that candle, by God's grace, will not be put out;' but its light will shine down into the darkest and cruellest places of medical despotism, until people are their own masters for their bodies and their children, just as the other greater candle under God's Providence showed them 'the Way and the Truth for the emancipation of their souls and minds. . . ."

"Civil and religious liberty requires continual completion and realisation as new ages make claim upon it and new dangers from the powers of darkness assail it. For our homes and our children, for our parental love, liberty is an empty phrase, a skin with nothing inside it, so long as any profession under licence of Parliament can violate the hearts and consciences of parents and the bodies of children and be upheld by force in the violation. It is 350 years ago since what is now our New Testament, our soul's health, was burnt by our Bishops and Archbishops as a noisome pestilence infecting the human mind. At this day our sound bodily health, the very testament of our bodies, the clean tablet of successive childhoods, is branded by a vaccinating Parliament as a nuisance and also as a pest. It is time that the people should stop this burning also, for they alone can do it, and it is their sin while it endures."

Lastly, if one may say so in presence of matter so serious, there is much in these Tracts remarkable as mere literature—thoughts new and deep, felicities of phrase and cadence that an artist in words will appreciate and envy. Altogether these Tracts are admirably adapted for circulation among those disposed to consider the Vaccination question, and a compendium of facts and arguments for those who are engaged in the arduous controversy.

VACCINATORS' SILENCE.—The South London Post asks—"If there is a remedy to arrest small-pox, why so much reticence and dislike of criticism? If our medical officers of health are masters of the question, it is their duty to afford the public the most complete information." [The vast majority of medical practitioners know little of the history or theory of vaccination. They have inherited the practice as a sacred tradition; it fills their pockets, and they are disgusted and horrified when it is attacked. Hence the double attitude with which anti-vaccinators have to contend—silence or abuse.—En.]
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DR. BRAIDWOOD

UFON ORDINARY LYMPH.

Dr. P. M. Braidwood of Birkenhead thus writes in the Edinburgh Medical Journal—

"Dr. Seaton is carried away with the single idea, that arm-to-arm vaccination carefully conducted is perfect, and is the only perfect form of vaccination. He nevertheless gives certain directions for the renewal of the vaccine if it shows certain improper qualities. The seed is to be always the same, but the soil is to be changed. Vaccine removed from the cow more than eighty years ago by Jenner has been transmitted continuously from that time through human beings, sometimes through children of decidedly unhealthy parentage, sometimes through those in imperfect health, sometimes after purulent transformation has affected the lymph; and yet this fluid is to be considered purified, 'due and effectively' protective, by being now transmitted with care through properly-selected healthy children!

"If vaccine lymph, a most delicate organic fluid, has once been allowed to undergo pathological changes in the vesicles—has been permitted, for example, to remain in the vesicle till the ninth day, or even later, after vaccination, when suppuration has commenced to alter its composition—can it be supposed that it has undergone no deterioration? And if such lymph is used for vaccination, is it reasonable to conceive that the passage of this fluid through a child's body is sufficient to restore its purity, and to supply any protective power it may have lost? It is generally admitted that vaccination has been performed very carelessly in this country till within the last few years, that vaccine has been removed from vesicles undergoing suppurative changes and used for vaccination, that vaccination has been performed with lymph from imperfectly or improperly developed vesicles, and yet it is affirmed that if such lymph be carefully employed, hereafter it will produce results identical with those of the true virus—will be equally protective with the original cow-pox. According to this view, the system of a child is made to serve the part, not only of a searching filter, but of a reproducing and restoring spring. If vaccination has been performed in this country so that one half of those vaccinated are not in reality protected, seeing that 50 per cent. of all vaccinated persons present imperfect cicatrices, it is presumable that the 'ordinary lymph' (not only the lymph used in certain parts of the country, but all the vaccine employed) has suffered from this instantation to the necessities of safe vaccination."

[Dr. Braidwood is arguing in favour of a resort to "animal vaccine," and it is evident that if this discussion is continued and widened, Vaccination will come to an end without much help from anti-vaccinators. How little the public suspect the absurdities, not to mention the mischiefs, concealed under that blessed word Vaccination! A reader of Dr. Braidwood's article will readily understand the dislike and dismay with which Dr. Cameron's Animal Lymph Act was regarded by the official Vaccination Ring, and with what devout thankfulness they saw it disappear in the ordinary July massacre.

The ignorance of those who write about Vaccination would be incredible on any evidence short of actual demonstration. Here, for instance, Dr. Braidwood pursues a course of reasoning on the supposition that all the virus in use is derived and descended from Jenner's cow-pox! He appears never to have heard that a large part of the lymph in official circulation is small-pox pus inoculated on cows, having no connection with Jenner whatever, nor with the prophylactic the discovery of which conferred upon him immortality as well as other more substantial advantages.—Ed.]

VACCINATION IN NEW YORK.—Mr. Wm. Tebb who is on an American tour writes—"I called on several anti-vaccinators in New York, and shall see others on my return; the question here is in a most unsatisfactory condition. An orthodox M.D. that I met on the Fulton Ferry said that if statistics could be obtained the results would show that vaccination was productive of a vast amount of mischief in New York City. He was constantly hearing of diseases communicated by the operation; and as small-pox was not arrested by it, the practice must sooner or later come up for reconsideration. The Board of Health regulates the mode of vaccination and the times of its repetition; but no statistics are obtainable, and I have not been able to hear whether any are kept. Some public vaccinators who have charge of thickly populated quarters in New York City are said to make from £20 to £30 a week, though my informant, a New York physician of forty years' practice, said the fee paid by the Board of Health is only 2s. for each vaccination. The virus in use is provided by the Board of Health, and is said to have originally come from France as the product of spontaneous cow-pox, the kind condemned by Jenner as possessing no prophylactic power.—4th August, 1879."
VACCINATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

From the Eighth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, just published, we obtain some interesting information as to the extent and expense of public Vaccination in England and Wales. The final returns for 1876 are now made up and are thus summarised—

Births, ........................................ 887,694
Successfully Vaccinated, ..................... 768,277
Insusceptible of Vaccination,..................  848
Had Small-pox, and therefore un-
vaccinated,.................................... 107
Dead unvaccinated, ..........................  84,980
Vaccination postponed by medical
certificate, .................................... 5,528
Percentage of Children not finally
accounted for, including Cases
postponed, ..................................... 4 8

This return is described as exceedingly satisfactory as showing that of the entire number of children whose births were registered in England and Wales, during the year 1876, only 4-8 per cent. remained unaccounted for. The percentage similarly unaccounted for in the four preceding years was 5-1, 4-6, 4-8, and 4-7 respectively.

The returns show a marked difference in the amount of Vaccination in different parts of the kingdom. The Metropolis is still conspicuous as furnishing the largest proportion of cases which escape Vaccination. In 1875, the cases unaccounted for in the Metropolis amounted to 9-3 per cent. of the births registered; in 1876, this percentage fell to 6-5, and it is hoped that future returns will exhibit still further reduction. In Poplar, St. Olaves, Wandsworth, Clapham, Kensington and Westminster, the cases unaccounted for are only 8 or 4 per cent.; while in Lewisham, a total of 29 cases are unaccounted for out of 1,985 children registered, being only 1-5 per cent. On the other hand, the cases unaccounted for in Shoreditch amount to 12 per cent., in St. George's-in-the-East to 11 per cent., and in the Strand and Whitechapel Unions to 10 per cent.

The question is sometimes asked, Who are the Unvaccinated? and the Report offers this explanation—

"No doubt a large proportion of the unions, with a high percentage of unvaccinated children, is of a floating character, and may be otherwise difficult to deal with. And there is one class of children which creates a special difficulty, namely, those born in work-houses and lying-in institutions, whose mothers often leave for places unknown soon after their confinement, and before the children have arrived at the age at which Vaccination can be conveniently performed, and who cannot afterwards be traced. There does not, however, seem to be any reason to believe that the results which have been attained in Poplar and St. Olaves might not be attained elsewhere. In the parishes of Shoreditch and Whitechapel the proportion of cases which apparently escape Vaccination, is double that which is shown in the returns for Bethnal Green, which lies between them; and in St. George's-in-the-East the percentage is 11, while in the adjacent parish of Stepney it is only 6."

We now come to a pleasant paragraph, one which renders due credit to those centres of good sense and enlightenment, namely, Keighley and Dewsbury. We read—

"Next to the Metropolitan division, and nearly approaching it in the proportion of cases unaccounted for as regards Vaccination, is the county of York, where the default is much swelled by the returns from the Unions of Keighley and Dewsbury, which are the chief, and it may fortunately be said, almost the only important centres of extensive opposition to the Vaccination Acts. The localised character of that opposition may be illustrated by the fact that, while the default in Keighley is 46, and in Dewsbury 33 per cent., the default in all the rest of Yorkshire is only 41 per cent."

Banbury, Brentford, Cheltenham, and Lincoln are specified as exhibiting low returns of Vaccination, and the authorities have been re-monstrated with.

Then some towns are cited as evidence of what is practicable in the way of approach to complete Vaccination, as Blackburn with 0-5, Huddersfield with 0 8, Leeds with 1-5, Wigan with 1-6, Ashton-under-Lyne with 1-8, and West Ham with 1-9 per cent. of cases unaccounted for as regards Vaccination.

The Divisions of the Kingdom which are most completely vaccinated are the Eastern and South-Western; in both of which 97 per cent. of children registered are vaccinated; and there are about a dozen counties in which the proportion rises to about 98 per cent. Of all the counties in England and Wales, there are only nine in which the proportion of cases unaccounted for reaches or exceeds 5 per cent. of the registered births.

It is expected that year after year will exhibit still closer approaches of vaccinations to births. To excite activity, the sum of £11,094 has been
awarded among 760 "Vaccination Contractors"—their official designation, for the year ending 29th September, 1878. It is said, "We are glad to observe that the stimulus of these awards," (extras, in nowise representing the cost of Vaccination), "and the close supervision exercised by our inspectors over the work of public Vaccination, continue to produce very satisfactory results as regards the quality of the Vaccination performed, which now, in most cases, attains a very high standard."

The return for the year ending 29th Sept., 1878, shows 893,823 registered births, of which 518,775 are said to have been successfully vaccinated by the 3,091 public vaccinators in the 649 Unions of England and Wales. The re-vaccinations in the same time were 14,552.

The various returns are presented with all the dexterity of pushing tradesmen—all that is disagreeable and questionable being suppressed. Vaccination is a thriving business, which is not likely to fall off as long as there is craft on one side and cash and credulity on the other.

NATURAL COW-POX.

[From the Veterinarian for August, 1879, edited by Professor Simonds, assisted by Professors Brown and Tuson, and T. Spencer Cobbold, M.D., F.R.S., F.L.S.]

"We are exceedingly desirous of obtaining some lymph from vesicles on the teats of cows in cases of so-called natural cow-pox. It should be taken on ivory points, and as early as possible after the development of the vesicles. Our numerous readers, especially those residing in dairy districts, will, we feel sure, kindly make inquiries as to the existence of the disease in their respective localities, and take the necessary steps to furnish us with a supply of lymph."

[One might say, Don't they wish they may get it! But if they do get it, What can they make of it? Jenner taught nothing more desicively than that natural cow-pox was of no avail against small-pox: and if these Professors assert the contrary, where is their reverence for Jenner? Gloucestershire milk-maids a century ago believed they were protected from small-pox by inoculation with cow-pox, but Jenner, in common with other Gloucestershire practitioners, knew they were mistaken; but the new school of Calif. Lymphers appear disposed to maintain that the milk-maids were right.—Ed.]

DR. MEAD'S NEWGATE EXPERIMENT.

Histories to be worth anything has to be accurate, and in your description of the famous experiment in inoculation in Newgate in 1721, you are not accurate as concerns Dr. Mead. You say his attempt to infect with small-pox by inserting pox-crusts in the nostrils was a failure, and only resulted in a sore nose. I know not what may be your authority for the statement, but I think Dr. Mead himself is to be preferred to any reporter; and in his treatise on Small-pox and Measles, published in 1747, he thus describes his experiment—

"A learned author has given an account of the practice of sowing small-pox, as they call it, known to the Chinese above three hundred years, which is this. They take the skins of some of the dried pustules, which are fallen from the body, and put them into a porcelain bottle, stopping the mouth of it very close with wax. When they have a mind to infect any one, they make up three or four of these skins, putting between them one grain of musk into a tent with cotton, which they put up the nostrils.

"I myself have had an opportunity of making an experiment to this purpose. For, when in the year 1721, by order of his Sacred Majesty, both for the sake of his own family, and of his subjects, a trial was to be made upon seven condemned malefactors, whether or not the small-pox could safely be communicated by inoculation; I easily obtained leave to make the Chinese experiment in one of them. There was among those who were chosen out to undergo the operation, a young girl of eighteen years of age. I put into her nostrils a tent, wetted with matter taken out of ripe pustules. The event answered: for she, in like manner with the others, who were infected by inosions made in the skin, fell sick, and recovered; but suffered much more than they did, being, immediately after the poison was received into the nose, miserably tormented with sharp pains in her head, and a fever, which never left her till the eruption of the pustules."

Thus you see, Dr. Mead accomplished what he intended, and probably in a better manner than did Maitland; but it was a bad business from first to last.

S. A. ELDER.

NEW YORK, July 10th.

*Moore's History of the Small-Pox, p. 323, was the authority, and the statement is repeated elsewhere; but there is no reason to distrust Mead's version of the affair.—Ed.
PAPERS OF
SIR JERVOISE CLARKE JERVOISE, bart.  

The avowal of the good woman who said, "O, no; we never read the books of the other side, for, you see, we might get prejudiced," is more amusing than extraordinary. The chairman of the Vaccination Committee of 1871 informed the House of Commons that the Committee was only granted on the understanding that "no doubt should or could be cast on the great value of vaccination as a prophylactic against small-pox."—as if doubt could be excited, it was not to the interest of truth and the community to have doubt excited! Out of the same lack of confidence in what is sound and veracious to take care of itself, was the suppression of Mr. P. A. Taylor's speech on the Irish Vaccination Act by the managers of the London newspapers. They supposed it might disturb the public faith in a sacred medical rite, and in officious zeal protect their readers from imagined injury. Such tactics are rarely successful; what is concealed acquires vivid importance and is sought after and scanned with eager interest. And thus it has happened with Mr. Taylor's speech. It is reprinted, widely circulated, and perused, not only for its conspicuous merits, but because in the interest of the medical faction it was attempted to huddle it out of sight.

Sir Jervoise Clarke Jervoise has done well to reprint Mr. Taylor's speech by way of preface to his own evidence as witness before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1871. Mr. Taylor was a member of that Committee, and now avows that owing to the force of evidence subsequently brought to bear on his mind, he could no longer put his name to the report of the Committee, which at the time was unanimously agreed to. Such candour in presence of an unconvincing public is by no means common, but devotion to truth at any cost has been the distinction of Mr. Taylor's life.

Sir J. Clarke Jervoise's evidence was chiefly directed to prove that vaccination was no safeguard against small-pox, and that the common notions about infection are illusions. We take Sir J. C. Jervoise to mean that there is no danger from disease apart from actual contact, but what constitutes contact? A sufferer from typhus, scarlet fever, or small-pox, generates an effluvium which may be harmless in the open air or in a well-ventilated apartment, but which if inhaled by a visitor in a close chamber may beget in the visitor the same disease. The effluvium, we apprehend, would serve for contact, in Sir J. C. Jervoise's sense. Of course there is often contact, and intimate contact, without infection; some correspondent condition of body is requisite to breed disease from disease. We heard the other day from an old gentleman that in his boyhood his mother put him to bed with his brother who had small-pox, in order that he should catch the disease and get through it at the same time. He was kept in bed for two or three days, and smoked oranges his brother sucked, but in vain; small-pox he did not take, though neither inoculated or vaccinated. Thus even intimate contact will not at times serve to communicate syphilitic disease. We thoroughly agree with Sir J. C. Jervoise that it is most desirable that the prevalent terrors as to infection should be dissipated. They occasion great inconvenience and expense; as for example when all the boys at Eton, 880 in number, were re-vaccinated at 10s. 6d. a head because some re-vaccinated Scots Fusilier Guards happened to be down with small-pox at Windsor; and when the inmates of the Hants Lunatic Asylum were re-vaccinated because there were cases of small-pox in different parts of the county—a folly against which Sir J. C. Jervoise protested in an excellent speech at the Winchester Quarter Sessions, here reprinted.

The pamphlet also contains some notes on the identity of the vaccine disease with rinderpest or cattle-plague illustrated with coloured plates. When we observe how the diverse forms of syphilitic disease are generated in similar conditions, and how when one type prevails another abates or ceases, the conclusion is almost inevitable that they are at root varied manifestations of identical disorder.

NORWICH SMALL-POX.—Daylight is a bright little paper dealing with the sayings and doings of Norwich citizens in delightful contrast with the lifeless imbecility of the average newspaper. Commenting on the annual report of the Medical Officer for the City it is observed—

"The protective power of Vaccination is illustrated in a peculiar fashion. Five persons were attacked with small-pox, two were vaccinated, one was not, one was doubtful, and the fifth is discreetly passed over without comment. Now, we happen to know that this fifth was a vaccinated case. 'The protective power of Vaccination is, therefore, shown thus—Five cases during the year, of which three were vaccinated, one was not, and one was doubtful. Two deaths—one vaccinated, and the other not. So much for 'the protective power of Vaccination!'"

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER VII.

TRiumph of inoculation.

It having come to pass, according to the boast of Dr. Kirkpatrick, that inoculation was regarded as "the most salutary practice ever discovered for restraining a very loathsome and destroying disorder, which it had nearly expunged from the catalogue of mortal diseases," it was the aim of physicians and patients to reduce the trouble and hazard of the operation to the lowest terms possible. In the words of Dr. Jenner, "There was bleeding till the blood was thin, purging till the body was wasted to a skeleton, and starving on vegetable diet to keep it so;" and practitioners who promised to mitigate these rigours, placed themselves in the line of popularity and prosperity.

Among distinguished easy inoculators was a family named Sutton—"the Suttons" was a familiar name a century ago. Dr. Robert Sutton practised surgery and pharmacy at Debenham, in Suffolk, and went into inoculation with such energy that between 1767 and 1768 he operated on 2614 patients. His son, Robert, set up as inoculator at Bury St. Edmunds, where he did a large business; but a second son, Daniel, was the genius of the household.

He had been acting as assistant to Mr. Bumstead at Oxford, and returned to his father in 1768, enthusiastic over a new plan of inoculation whereby the time of preparation was to be shortened whilst the patients were to live in the open air. Old Sutton showed no favour for the projected innovation, whereas Daniel opened an inoculating house on his own account at Ingatestone, in Essex, advertising himself as inoculator on a new, safe, and sure method. The speculation answered. In 1764 he took 2000 guineas, and in 1765 his receipts were £6000. His fame spread throughout the country, and so many resorted to him that lodgings were scarcely to be had in and around Ingatestone. His practice in Kent was also extensive, and he was obliged to employ assistants. To crown his enterprise, he kept a parson—the Rev. Robert Houlton, to puff his skill and success. According to Houlton, the business of Daniel Sutton during three years was as follows—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Inoculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>4347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>7816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18,792

to which number was added 6000 inoculated by Sutton’s assistants, making a total of 20,000, without, said Houlton, a single death.*

Sutton was denounced as a quack, and if to reserve as one’s own, and to traffic in what is proclaimed to be for the common advantage of mankind, constitutes a quack, Sutton was one. Nevertheless he was successful, and his success begot much jealousy, and much ingenuity was exercised in ferreting out his secret.

His secret, so far as it was anything, was an open one; and supposing it necessary to infect men’s blood with various pus, and then to operate for their recovery, there would be much to say for Sutton’s procedure. His patients were obliged to go through a strict preparatory regimen for a fortnight, during which every

---

*Sermon preached at Ingatestone, 12th October, 1766, in defence of inoculation, with Appendix on the present state of inoculation. London, 1767
kind of animal food, with the exception of milk, and all fermented liquors and spices were forbidden. Fruit of all sorts was allowed, unless on days when purges were taken. In the course of the fortnight a powder was three administered at bed-time, and a dose of salts on the succeeding morning. When the days of preparation were accomplished, the patient was taken to the inoculating house, where in the public room was found an array of people in various stages of small-pox. From one of these sufferers, the operator selected a pustule to his mind, opened it with his lancet, and, turning to the patient to be poxed, raised the cuticle on the outer part of his arm with the moist lancet, and pressed it down with his finger. This was the entire operation: no plaster or bandage was applied: and from that moment the patient was pronounced proof against small-pox, even if he should lie in bed with one suffering from the disease. Of course there remained the various affection to be dealt with. The regimen of preparation was continued unchanged, and a pill was taken nightly until the fever came on. None were allowed to rest in bed, except for sleep, but had to walk abroad and enjoy fresh air, even in winter weather. If a patient was too sick to go alone, he was supported by attendants; and when the fever was at its height, he was encouraged to drink copiously of cold water.

Much more was attributed to Sutton’s pills and powders than to his regimen, and these were no more than preparations of antimony and mercury, with which practitioners of all orders were only too familiar. Sutton, however, contrived to maintain his mystery until he had no longer occasion for it, and lived to recognise a worthy successor in Jenner. He removed to London in 1767 in hope of enlarging his income, but, like many other provincial celebrities, discovered that he had better have remained where he shone without rivals and detractors.

The Sutton regimen, so far as it might be described as “cool,” came into general favour, whilst what was called the hot regimen of warm rooms, bed, and cordials was correspondingly discredited. Contrasting the two methods, Sir George Baker, writing in 1771, observed—

“I found that in the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, many thousands of people of all ages and constitutions, and some of them with every apparent disadvantage, had been inoculated with general good success; whereas at Blandford, in Dorset, out of 884 who were inoculated, 18 actually died, and many others narrowly escaped with their lives from confluent small-pox.”

A famous inoculator was Dr. Thomas Dimsdale of Hertford, a Quaker of easy principles. He published in 1766 a treatise entitled The Present Method of Inoculating for the Small-Pox—an exposition of the most approved practice of the time, which, by one of those curious felicities of circumstance, conferred on him a European reputation; and in 1781, Tracts on Inoculation—a record of his opinions and adventures at home and abroad.

Dimsdale desired to universalise inoculation, but with circumspection. He recommended that the inhabitants of a suitable district should be dealt with as a whole and at once. That the names of all should be taken, and on a certain day that everyone, who had not had small-pox, should be inoculated. That the district should then continue in quarantine for about three weeks, at the end of which the danger and the fear of small-pox would cease, until an unpolluted generation should assert itself. The project was not mere dreaming. Dimsdale was a man of wealth, influence, energy, and effected several complete inoculations of villages and parishes in Hertfordshire according to his plan. In later years, he combined banking with medicine, and the firm of Dimsdale, Fowler and Co. of Cornhill originated with him and perpetuates his name.

Dimsdale’s practice lay chiefly among the upper classes, to whom he made matters very comfortable. As he wrote—

“I do not enjoin any restriction in respect to diet, nor direct any medicines to be taken before the time of operation by such as appear to be in a proper state of health.”

He was satisfied with administering a powder on the evening of the day on which a patient was poxed, consisting of calomel, tartar emetic, and crabs’ claws.

Whilst labouring to popularise inoculation, Dimsdale was strongly opposed to the trade therein passing to unauthorised hands—simple, safe, and salutary though he asserted it to be. Thus he averred—

“The mischief arising from the practice of inoculation by the illiterate and ignorant are beyond conception.”

How illiteracy should affect inoculation, he left to conjecture. He apparently forgot that the practice was derived from people who made no pretence to literature, and whose efficiency

† Tracts on Inoculation, p. 190. I Br., p. 107.
and success were, moreover, set forth as warrant and encouragement for English imitation.

In 1775 a Society was formed for General Inoculation, and an hospital was opened for the purpose at Battle Bridge, on the site of what is now the Great Northern Railway station, King’s Cross. Dr. Lettsom, a popular Quaker physician, issued an appeal on behalf of the enterprise, and having invoked Dr. Dimsdale’s approval, a lively controversy ensued between the brethren—personal rather than profitable. Dimsdale disapproved of indiscriminate inoculation: he was ready to inoculate the whole world, but systematically, and under strict safeguards. He pointed out that whatever might be the advantage to the individual, unless the inoculated patient was rigorously secluded, he would diffuse the disease from which he sought to be delivered, and that the price of his life might be the destruction of many. Dimsdale’s warnings were, however, slightly disregarded, and inoculation was pursued with criminal recklessness. As Pascal observes, of all the faculties given to man, the most awful in its consequences is the power of standing amid a number of facts, and seeing such as we please to see, and being blind to the rest.

Specially remarkable in connection with the small-pox of last century was the exaggerated terror expressed for it by professional inoculators, and the little real terror practically manifested. It was by no means the most fatal of diseases, nor was it a large factor in the common mortality. Wherever we test the matter by unbiased contemporary evidence, we find the outcry factioning, and that the dreadful and desolating malady from which Jenner delivered his country is merely a fiction continued by the vaccinators from the inoculators. For proof let us turn to the evidence of Dr. Alexander Monro, Professor of Medicine and Anatomy in the University of Edinburgh. The Faculty of Medicine in Paris had appointed a commission to inquire into the advantages of inoculation, which in the course of duty applied to Monro, who in response produced and published in 1765 An Account of the Inoculation of Small-Pox in Scotland. He reported that from the introduction of the practice by Maitland in 1726, there had been 5554 inoculations effected in Scotland with 72 fatalities; that is to say about 140 annually with deaths 1 in 78, according to the confession of the inoculators themselves. Monro further stated that the practice was disliked in Scotland as “a tempting of Providence,” an unwarrantable risk of life for an uncertain advantage. Our present interest, however, is in the statistics of deaths from small-pox in Edinburgh for a series of twenty years thus adduced by Monro.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burials from all Diseases</th>
<th>From S-Pox</th>
<th>Burials from all Diseases</th>
<th>From S-Pox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1744........1845........107</td>
<td>1754........1315........104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745........1468........141</td>
<td>1755........1187........ 89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746........17126........128</td>
<td>1756........1316........126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747........1200........... 71</td>
<td>1757........1267........118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748........1286...........167</td>
<td>1758........1001...........59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749........1182...........192</td>
<td>1759........1186........282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750........1086........... 64</td>
<td>1760........1128...........66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751........1241...........109</td>
<td>1761........ 908........... 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752........1187...........147</td>
<td>1762........1505...........274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758........1105........... 70</td>
<td>1763........1160........128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12,709 1256 11,618 1185

Here we have a piece of valid experience with every advantage to the small-pox terrorist: for Edinburgh last century was a city contrived as if for the generation and perpetuation of small-pox. The population of 45,000 was lodged thickly in flate, in houses of many storeys, closely built in lanes and courts—a population densely compacted as any in Europe, with arrangements for cleanliness indescribable, at this day perhaps incredible. Yet in conditions so propitious to small-pox, we see before us the total outcome during a series of twenty years; and reprehensible as the result may appear to contemporary sanitarians, who hold, and rightly hold, that all zymotic diseases are preventible, yet it affected Monro with no anxiety or dismay: nor does the rate of mortality of old Edinburgh contrast unfavourably with that of the modern city. The case of Edinburgh, however, serves to show that in all cases when we hear of the ravages of small-pox before Jenner appeared as deliverer, our policy is to insist firmly upon the production of special and adequate evidence: it is monstrous that the assertions of common quacks, whether inoculators or vaccinators, should pass into tradition and be accepted as unquestionable verity.

We have, moreover, to observe that the mortality from small-pox in Edinburgh was infantile mortality; for as Monro testifies—

"The inhabitants of Scotland generally have the small-pox in their infancy or childhood; very few adults being seen in this disease. Whether this is owing to any particular constitution of the air, or of the people, or to the

* Monro accounts for the excessive mortality of this year by the presence of regiments in Edinburgh after the suppression of the rebellion of 1746.
We have in the foregoing epitaph the legend which has caught the popular fancy, and which is likely to survive corrections and contradictions innumerable. It is the custom of mankind to identify a common movement with some prominent or picturesque figure in the movement, and to suppress and forget the rest. The practice is convenient, but illusory, and taints all history with fable.

It may be said that the practice of inoculation met with no active resistance in England during the last thirty years of last century. How widely and deeply it extended it would be difficult to determine. The probability is, that the mass of the population was untouched, and that poxing was limited to the upper and middle classes, and to the lower so far as they came under the immediate influence of those above them. We have, perhaps, an index to the condition of affairs in Dr. Wm. Buchan’s Domestic Medicine, first published in 1769, which ran through eighteen editions, amounting to 80,000 copies, in the author’s life-time. It is not uncommon to refer contemptuously to Buchan, but his work was the production of a man of vigorous good sense with faith in the good sense of his readers—a book creditable to the author and to the multitude who appreciated him.

Buchan was an inoculator, a zealous advocate of inoculation, and earnestly laboured to universalise the practice. In the Domestic Medicine, ed. 1797, he wrote—

“No discovery can be of general utility while the practice of it is kept in the hands of a few. Had inoculation been practised by the same kind of operators in our country as in the countries from which we derived it, it had long ago been universal. The fears, the jealousies, the prejudices, and the opposite interests of the Faculty are, and ever will be, the most effectual obstacles to the progress of any salutary discovery. Hence it is that inoculation never became in any manner general in England till taken up by men not bred to physics.”

Consistently with this opinion, Buchan strongly advocated domestic practice, saying—

“They know very little of the matter, who impute the success of modern inoculators to any superior skill, either in preparing the patient or communicating the disease. Some of them, indeed, from a sordid desire of engrossing the whole practice to themselves, pretend to have extraordinary secrets or nostrums for preparing persons for inoculation, which never fail of success. But this is only a pretense calculated to blind the ignorant and inattentive. Common-

“Sacred to the Memory of

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu,
Who happily introduced, from Turkey,
Into this Country,
The Salutary Art of Inoculating the Small-Pox.
Convinced of its Efficacy,
She first tried it with success
On her own Children,
And then recommended the Practice of it to
Her Fellow-Citizens.

Thus, by her Example and Advice,
We have softened the Virulence,
And escaped the Danger, of this Malignant Disease.
To perpetuate the Memory of such Benevolence,
And to express her gratitude
For the Benefit she herself received from
This alleviating Art,
This Monument is erected by
Henrietta Inge,
Relict of Theodore William Inge, Esq.,
And Daughter of Sir John Wrottesley, Bart.,
In the Year of our Lord,
1769.
sense and prudence alone are sufficient both in
the choice of the subject and management of
the operation. Whoever is possessed of these
may perform this office for his children when-
ever he finds it convenient, provided they be in
a good state of health.

This statement is not the result of theory,
but of observation. Though few physicians
have had more opportunities of trying inocula-
tion in all its different forms, so little appears to
me to depend on those generally reckoned im-
portant circumstances, of preparing the body,
communicating the infection by this or the other
method, etc., that, for several years past, I have
persuaded parents and nurses to perform the
entire operation themselves.

I have known many instances of mothers
inoculating their children, and never so much
as heard of one bad consequence. Common
mechanics often, to my knowledge, perform the
operation with as good success as physicians."

Having described the ordinary method of
inoculation by incision with a lancet dipped in
pus, he goes on to say—

"If fresh matter be applied long enough to
the skin, there is no occasion for any wound at
all. Let a bit of thread, about half an inch
long, wet with the matter, be immediately
applied to the arm, midway between the shoulder
and the elbow, and covered with a piece of
common sticking-plaster, and kept on for eight
or ten days. This will seldom fail to communi-
cate the disease.

"Instead of multiplying arguments to recom-
mand this practice, I shall beg leave to mention
the case of my own son, at the time an only
child. After giving him two gentle purges, I
ordered the nurse to take a bit of thread which
had been previously wet with fresh matter from
small-pox, and to lay it upon his arm, covering it
with a piece of sticking-plaster. This remained
on six or seven days, until it was rubbed off by
accident. At the usual time small-pox made
their appearance, and were exceedingly favour-
able. Surely this, which is all that is generally
necessary, may be done without any skill in
medicine."

Thus was small-pox made easy!

Buchan appealed to the clergy for co-opera-
tion as inoculators—

"The persons to whom we would chiefly re-
commend the performance of this operation are
the clergy. Most of them know something of
medicine. Almost all of them bleed, and can
order a purge, which are all the qualifications
necessary for the practice of inoculation."

And as propagandists—

"No set of men have it so much in their
power to render the practice of inoculation
general as the clergy, the greatest opposition to
it still arising from some scruples of conscience,
which they alone can remove. I would recom-

ommend them not only to endeavour to remove
the religious objections which weak minds have
to this salutary practice, but to enjoin it as a
duty, and to point out the danger of neglecting
to make use of a means which Providence has
put in our power for saving the lives of our
offspring. Surely such parents as willfully
neglect the means of saving their children's lives
are as guilty as those who put them to death."

How familiar have vaccinators rendered this
line of adjuration! If you do not comply with
our prescription, and your children catch small-
pox, then are you their murderers.

Here is another passage from Buchan, which
with equal accuracy might apply to Vaccination
—is indeed what is perpetually asserted to be
the truth concerning Vaccination—

"As the Small-pox is now become an epi-
demical disease in most parts of the known
world, no other choice remains but to render
the malady as mild as possible. This is the
only manner of extirpation now left in our
power; and though it may seem paradoxical,
the artificial method of communicating the
disease, could it be rendered universal, would
amount to nearly the same thing as rooting it
out. It is a matter of small consequence whether
a disease be entirely extirpated, or rendered so
mild as neither to destroy life nor hurt the con-
stitution; but that this may be done by Inocula-
tion, does not now admit of a doubt. The
numbers who die under inoculation hardly
deserve to be named. In the natural way, one
in four or five generally dies; but by inoculation
not one of a thousand. Nay, some can boast of
having inoculated ten thousand without the loss
of a single patient."

In this deliverance, Buchan did not lie, nor
did he speak for himself alone, but expressed
the medical opinion of his time, precisely as a
physician of to-day testifies concerning Vaccina-
tion. Yet we all know that Buchan was
radically at fault, and substituted what he
wished to be true for what was true.

I cannot leave Buchan without a few words
in his favour, for, according to his lights, he was
a worthy fellow, and the words shall be his own.
He wrote—

"I am old enough to remember the time
when the success of inoculation was supposed to
be entirely owing to the preparation of the body, as it was called; but I am convinced that such preparation always has done, and still does, more harm than good. The body cannot be better prepared to meet a disease, than by being in good health. Medicine may cure a disease, but it cannot mend good health. When a person enjoys the blessing of health, he ought never to meddle with medicine on any account whatever."

No: nor with half an inch of thread dipped in pox.

UNANIMITY OF MEDICAL AUTHORITIES.

MR. STRICKLAND CONSTABLE in Our Medicine Men relates how he has given himself to the study of Vaccination. Some years ago he commenced to examine authorities on each side of the question, but finding nothing but confusion, he says—"I decided to do what I ought to have done at first, namely, to examine and ascertain solely the opinions of the advocates of Vaccination." The result of his investigation he sets forth in forty contradictory propositions, amongst which are the following—

"(1) That vaccination is an almost perfect safeguard against small-pox.

"(2) That vaccination has no protective effect against severe small-pox.

"(3) That lymph should only be taken from a healthy child.

"(4) That it is no matter whether the child be healthy.

"(11) That the more punctures the greater the protection.

"(12) That one puncture is as good as a hundred.

"(28) That impurity of lymph is easy to tell by the eye-sight.

"(29) That impurity of lymph cannot be discovered even with the strongest microscope."

He further says—

"I could fill volumes with similar contradictory opinions held by the advocates of vaccination. It is really very disheartening to an earnest searcher for truth to find such hopeless difference among the doctors; but I suppose there is no help for it."

TEMPER AND TRUTH.—Our opinions are less important than the spirit and temper with which they possess us, and even good opinions are worth very little unless we hold them in a broad, intelligent, and spacious way. —JOHN MORLEY.

CROWN OF CULTURE.—Of all mental gifts the rarest is intellectual patience, and the last lesson of culture is to believe in difficulties which are invisible to ourselves. —MISS WEDGWOOD.

MEMORIAL

To the Right Hon. the Marquis of Hartington, M.P., from the Northumberland and Durham Association of the Opponents of Compulsory Vaccination.

MOST NOBLE MARQUIS,

The undersigned do not, in addressing your lordship, call your attention to a matter affecting only a few, and lightly thought of by those whom it affects, but they desire very respectfully to urge your lordship to the consideration of a question which affects every British subject born in the realm, and which is always a matter of concern, and often of very serious moment, to British parents.

We must not lightly pass over the fact that vaccination is stringently enforced. Where, as in education, there can be no question as to the good done by compulsion and the enforcement of public sentiment upon private opinion, the risk of rousing opposition run by the State is grave enough; but where exception can be taken to the enforcement upon the individual of certain State-supported doctrines, there is tyranny and oppression, begotten of discontent, and eventually revolt. Were this subject left to the judgment of every parent, your memorialists would not be found agitating for a change. But it is far otherwise. No option is allowed; no judgment, however well formed; upon however carefully collected evidence decided; upon whatever indubitable basis of fact it is built, avails anything. The rite must be blindly obeyed and submitted to.

And even here, if we were not confronted with an array of facts of most overwhelming importance, we should hesitate to demand freedom from this restraint in the present political juncture. But unless we would be false to every true parental and manly instinct worthy of regard, we must demand that legislation which outrages truth, health, and science be no longer enforced upon us. If, as is now incontestably proved, and in part generally admitted, primary vaccination is no preventive of small-pox, then the Acts enforcing primary vaccination (and our laws do no more) are among the most wanton and cruel which ever ruler set hand and seal to.

We would, in support of our contention, particularly direct attention to three points crucial to the whole matter of vaccination.

First—The enforcement of vaccination does not alter the incidence of small-pox.
Second—it does not produce any security in the vaccinated.

Third—even supposing that there is less small-pox than before its enforcement, vaccination gives no saving of life, for the death-rate remains the same.

As to the incidence of natural small-pox, it remains exactly what it ever has been—an epidemic disorder. As an epidemic it visits the best vaccinated countries of the world, as it visited them before vaccination was dreamt of. There were then periods when it was almost unknown, alternating with times of extreme prevalence. And the causes of this prevalence in epidemic years are as little certainly understood now as then.

But this is not all. We appear to have not only no alteration of the incidence as regards prevalence, but, as stated in our second point, the vaccinated are not secure. Not to go to great detail, let us for example take the Liverpool (1876-78), Glasgow (1870-72), Homerton (1871-76), Metropolitan (1870-71-72), and Dublin (1870-73, 1876-78) Hospitals. These treated 22,465 cases of small-pox. And the doctors attending these patients have recorded 17,056 of them as vaccinated. Mr. Marson showed conclusively in his evidence before the 1871 Select Committee, that the vaccinated patients rose in proportion with the increase of vaccinations among the general public.

So great an experience of vaccinated small-pox must, you will say, have produced an expression of opinion different from that of Edward Jenner. And it has. On page 44 of the very-much-quoted Hospital Report of Dr. Gayton he declares—"Re-vaccination after puberty has been acknowledged over and over again to give to those who have been indifferentlv vaccinated in infancy another chance of being protected, and as I presume no one is prepared to state that primary vaccination is an absolute protection from small-pox, it is at least a good plan, as a rule, to re-vaccinate after a certain age."

It is of the first importance to us that this is now acknowledged. The Lancet is equally frank in its expressions, and it may be now taken as generally conceded that primary vaccination does not protect from small-pox.

But if so, we must press our case as complete. Re-vaccination is not enforced, except in the army. It is held that it cannot be enforced. And if it was, precisely the same history of failure would in time be recorded. There are thousands of medically-recorded cases of re-vaccinated small-pox, and great numbers of our hospital patients upon whom many vaccine marks are found are probably re-vaccinated. The marks, of course, do not show whether the vaccination was primary or secondary.

Then we are compelling the infliction of a perfectly useless rite. We say perfectly useless, because there is no ground in fact for declaring the "protection" to wear off "at puberty." At every distance of time, from vaccination the disease of small-pox occurs, and death from it.

But the third point will further enforce our contention; for Edward Jenner and his friends were particular in affirming that the influence of Vaccination in reducing small-pox, and especially fatal small-pox, would reduce the death-rate. Dr. Baron, in his Life of Jenner (vol. II., p. 247), gives the "accurate calculation" of the death-rate of 1801 as one in 47 (or 21.29 per thousand). It is to-day about 23 per thousand. There was comparatively little Vaccination performed in 1888 (the first year of registration), and compulsory Vaccination dates only from 1858; yet, with the exception of cholera years, the death-rate is about the same all through from that year to this (1888 to 1878).

We hold that these considerations should make our case convincing.

But we cannot conclude without referring to a difficulty which is acknowledged as it never has been acknowledged before. For a very long period all the medical authorities were united in refusing to acknowledge that the practice of Vaccination was fraught with risk of evil contamination, by conveying with it other diseases than cow-pox. To-day this risk stands fairly and frankly admitted.

Your Lordship is aware that Dr. Cameron, Earl Percy, Dr. Lyon Playfair, and Dr. Lush, have made this now acknowledged risk the basis of their "Animal Vaccination" Bill, which was introduced into the House of Commons in the session just closed. Sir Thomas Watson and other eminent doctors' strongly expressed opinions we need not here recount. But it is not a trifle that a contention so long held should be at last abandoned. It also presumptively shows the large amount of evil influence before change of opinion was brought about.

We would strongly impress upon you that the declaration of some partisans that the calf is clear from such dangers of contamination, is emphatically disproved by unfortunate occurrences, some of which are mentioned by Dr. Seaton in his "12th Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council," 1869, and by
ocurrences named in other works. Dr. Martin, the celebrated heifer cow-pox specialist, has published a pamphlet specially dealing with these “unfortunate results” (1877), which appear to have been only less numerous than by the other practice, if indeed they have, because of the special care with which the use of heifer cow-pox has been attended, care which would not be possible if it was taken from the hands of the specialists and remitted to the profession generally.

An immense sum of money is being annually wasted upon Vaccination, more than £100,000 of public money, exclusive of private fees. A very great amount of hardship is endured by parents and guardians of children; a large sum of misery falls to the children themselves. Government in enforcing Vaccination becomes the enemy of infant health, makes many a home miserable by the evils which result from it, and rouses unnecessary hatred and ill-will among its subjects.

No good come of the practice. Small-pox is not averted. Epidemics are not prevented or arrested. Deaths are not decreased.

In the name of freedom outraged; in the name of health always invaded and too often banished by this rite; in the name of economy, more than ever necessary in the distribution of taxation, we ask you to use your influence in the time which is coming, when the opportunity may be yours, to wipe out from the Statute-book these instruments of useless oppression, these enactments whose work is to disease the young and taint the life of the healthy, these vestiges of ignorant superstition—the Vaccination Acts of England and Wales.

G. S. GIBBS, F.S.S., Darlington.
JOHN LUCAS, Gateshead.
Councillor ROBSON, Gateshead.
Rev. A. TEBB, Winstanley-on-Tyne.
Councillor McDERMOTT, Gateshead.
ALEX. WHEELER, Darlington.

Executive Committee.
EDMUND PROCTOR, Newcastle-on-Tyne,
Hon. Secy.

ROYAL TURK’S HEAD HOTEL,
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, 18th Sept., 1879.

Sir,—I am directed by the Marquis of Hartington to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated September 15, in which you request him to receive a deputation during his stay in Newcastle from the Northumberland and Durham Association of the Opponents of Compulsory Vaccination.

His lordship, in acknowledging the receipt of the memorial enclosed in your letter, wishes me to express his regret that he is unable to accede to your request, as his arrangements will not admit of his receiving the deputation during his stay in Newcastle.

I remain, yours faithfully,

R. BAILLIE BRET.

ALEX. WHEELER, Darlington.

A FRENCHMAN’S CRITICISM.

I must say that I think Mr. Young and Mr. Ward are mistaken in suggesting and recommending remedies for vaccination. We may be sure that the poisoning of the blood by the vaccinator’s lancet is instantaneous, and cannot be arrested by ammonia, borax, or any other. For what chemical reason Mr. Ward selects borax in preference to soda, caustic or carbonate, I cannot conceive. Were any chemical available, I should specify a few grains of permanganate of potassium, or your Condy’s fluid, a most powerful oxidiser and disinfectant; but to do so would be to mislead. We have also to remember that a child is not vaccinated until the vaccinator is satisfied that his virus has taken effect, and he has granted his certificate. Do not then add illusion to affliction.

Nor ought any favour be shown to medication of the blood to frustrate vaccination. If a child or adult is vaccinated, nothing is more desirable than a “good arm”—free inflammation and suppuration; for thereby the poison is to a greater or less extent eliminated from the system. Nothing can be worse than inoculation that does not “take.” The poison is retained in the system, and re-appears in disorders—some transient, some permanent, some fatal. The curses of Vaccination are Protean.

It seems to me that you Anti-Vaccinators are a helpless party, given to screaming and scolding rather than to business after the practical English fashion. Why do you not form a League for mutual defence, for the provision of legal assistance, and for the payment of each other’s fines? It is certain you will never secure respect and attention until you contrive to act like a Trades Union. I know that you are in the right, but to be right is not sufficient if you have not savoir faire; in which respect, I have long remarked, you are strangely deficient—for Englishmen.

E. ZOLL.
HOW I BECAME AN ANTI-VACCINATOR.

The vexed question of Vaccination came under my notice in this way. My wife and I allowed our first-born children to be vaccinated as a matter of course. Like most young couples, we had not studied the question physiologically or politically, and never dreamt of questioning its rightfulness. It was considered to be the doctor’s business, not ours. We have since learned that it is perilous for people to submit their bodies to the doctors or their souls to the priests.

The Vaccination of our second daughter was followed by a shocking abscess under one of her eyes, which threatened to destroy her sight. This led me to think, read, and inquire into Vaccination. I discovered that abscesses, ulcers, and erysipelas, often followed the infusino into the blood of the corrupt matter miscalled “lymph.” I got a second-hand copy of Dr. Jenner’s “Inquiry” (which cost me half-a-guinea), and the description he gave of the effects of Vaccination convinced me that it was a much worse infestation than small-pox, which is not a disease to which infants are particularly liable; in fact, more children die from burns and scalds than from small-pox.

I questioned our doctor, a homoeopathist, but he could not give a scientific explanation of the action of the vaccine poison. The doctors say that Vaccination from arm-to-arm is the proper thing; but this does not accord with Dr. Jenner’s theory and practice. In short, I found that the whole thing is a muddle, a delusion, an old medical superstition, and that the pretended “lymph” is small-pox matter, or something worse. Jenner asserts that a vaccinated person is “ever after secure from the infection of the small-pox.” Experience in small-pox hospitals has shown that statement to be wide of the truth.

Notice was served to have our youngest child vaccinated. I told the officer that no more of our children should be “blood poisoned,” whatever the consequences might be to myself. He said, “I shall have to summons you.” I replied, “Do your duty and I will do mine.” My duty clearly was to suffer anything rather than submit another child to the “ghastly risk” of Vaccination. I little thought what a rough road I was entering, in deviating from the customary medical track. In a few days I received a “summons” to attend the police court to answer the grave charge of being an “obstructive” to Vaccination. I was familiar with the police court as a “reporter,” but not as one accused of “breaking the law.” The ordeal was unpleasant; no wonder, therefore, that parents submit, even when convinced that Vaccination is injurious, rather than suffer the opprobrium of being treated as a “criminal,” pay fine and costs, figure in the Police News, and be ridiculed by writers for the Press. So far, however, from regarding myself as a culprit, I feel that “the law makers are the real criminals.” Bad laws will never be repealed unless they are broken. But does an anti-vaccinator “break the law” when he chooses the law’s alternative of fine or imprisonment? The law is not really “compulsory”; and any attempt to make it so would probably lead to a “mother’s rebellion.”

“I suppose you want to be a martyr,” said the Stipendiary.

“I want to protect my child from disease.”

The full penalty was inflicted; 20s. and 10s. costs. I am sorry to say I paid the fine.

Manchester.

HENRY PITMAN.

MR. COX AND MR. COOKE.

At the Marylebone Police Court on the 10th September, the Rev. J. M. Cox was summoned for neglecting to have his child vaccinated. Mr. Cox, in his defence, referred to Jenner’s description of the vaccine disease, and stated that he could not conceive on what ground he should be required to make his child sick in order to protect it from an improbable ailment, from which, moreover, he believed it would be no protection. He did not wish to set himself against the law, but he could not consent to commit an offence against nature and against common sense. Mr. Cooke replied that it was not for him to discuss Mr. Cox’s objections, but simply to administer the law, and inflict a fine of 20s. and 2s. costs.

Mr. Cooke appears to be a reasonable and kindly person, but his contention that he has to do his duty, and that his duty leaves him no discretion is scarcely candid. The statute fixes the extreme penalty at 20s. and he would equally have fulfilled the law if he had fined Mr. Cox 1s., after the precedent of many magistrates with a finer sense of what is due to men who are ready to suffer for conscience sake, and who are the very backbone of the community. If Mr. Cooke feels like his brother Barstow of Clerkenwell that a fine of 20s. is far too slight a penalty for the diabolic perversity that resists vaccination, we should like him all the better if he boldly said so.
INFANTICIDE BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT.
Mr. John Cornforth, of Birmingham, who was sentenced to two months imprisonment by the orders of two or more magistrates, for the terrible crime of striving to protect his two infants from pollution—which has been to him more terrible than the plague, and more murderous than cannon shot—whose case was taken up energetically by Mr. W. G. Ward, has written the following account to him—

Sir,—You ask me to give you all the information that I can. I must content myself with the last case, as I could not state all. My son, Charles Frederick Cornforth, was pronounced by Charles Warden, M.D., to be in a fit state for vaccination, and that he had got lymph as pure as it could be got. But if I should like the heifer lymph best he would do him with that. I had him done from the heifer, and Dr. Warden attended him till death. The certificate was, "died of exhaustion." It was sixteen days after the operation. I have purchased my freedom for two months from jail. But should I become a Wat Tyler, I have had more provocation than he had.—Truly,

JOHN CORNFORTH.

Yes, blood for blood, how cheaply would the doctors' lives be held!

JENNER'S STATUE.
At the meeting of the British Association at Sheffield, Dr. Pye-Smith was pleased to observe that—"The fruits of Jenner's discovery are spread over the whole earth. This humble village doctor has saved more lives than the most glorious conquerors destroyed; but his name is little honoured, and the only monument to his memory has been banished from association with vulgar kings and skillful homicides to an obscure corner of the great city, where his only homage is the health and beauty of the children who play around his statue."

To render this reference intelligible, it may be mentioned that some years ago Jenner's statue was set up in Trafalgar Square, alongside the College of Physicians—a most suitable site, supposing small-pox was the dragon described by vaccinators and Jenner its destroyer. But the public, with a true instinct, felt that the monument represented a questionable character, and one fine day it was quietly removed to obscurity in Kensington Gardens, where, I suppose, it will remain until finally transferred to Madame Tussaud's well-known apartment.

JOSHUA JACOB AND
ARCHDEACON REICHEL.
Mr. Joshua Jacob, of Rockspring, Limerick, a member of the Society of Friends, has written to Lord Clarina as follows—

"TO MY LORD CHALLONER H. MASY, STYLED LORD CLARINA, ELM PARK, CO. KERRY.

"FRIEND,—Permit me to address thee in consequence of the language which thou art reported as having used at a recent meeting of the Guardians of Limerick. The words which I complain of are these—it would be nonsensical to allow anybody to defy the law, and carry out any sentimental and newfangled dodge. If that were to be allowed small-pox would become rife, as it did some years ago.' I must remind thee that I did not attend the Board of Guardians as a beggar to crave mercy, neither did I present myself in that spirit which would defy law and set aside right authority; but I did seek for an interview to explain that, because of injury to my children I cannot, and dare not comply further with the requirements of the Vaccination Acts; and also to show that I have suffered two penalties already for claiming to protect my daughter Maria from possible, if not very probable danger. I further wished to warn the Guardians to beware of persecution. As regards the 'newfangled dodge,' I appeal to thy intelligence as to whether this term of derision is not more applicable to the vaccination legislators of the present day than to me or those who are opposed to vaccination. Now, vaccination is so 'newfangled' that positively, for nearly six thousand years, during which time millions of men lived upon this earth, from generation to generation, mankind existed without it—from Adam to the Flood, Noah to Moses, Moses to the Prophets, the Prophets to the Apostles, and from the Apostles to Dr. Jenner—embracing in the world's vast history the records of Israel, Egypt, Babylon, Nineveh, Persia, Greece, Rome and Carthage. To come to England. Parliament passed the first Vaccination Act as late in her history as 1858. Had England no history previous to that date? and did she not hold her head above all other nations of the world anterior to the Westminster vaccination legislation of 1853? To come, now, to the real kernels of the case as they present themselves to the unprejudiced mind. Vaccination has the credit of an absolute remedy or cure by prevention of small-pox. Now, if this position can be maintained by arguments, based upon facts and experience,
and safe vaccination can be carried out, I shall submit, and Maria Jacob shall not again trouble the Guardians. But if, on the other hand, vaccination can be proved to be a disastrous delusion, then the Guardians may prosecute and persecute, but they shall never move me from off one inch of the ground upon which I have a moral right to stand."

Mr. Jacob then cites Dr. Pearse's well-known statistics, which prove that small-pox has increased, and the death rate from small-pox has rapidly risen, contemporaneously with the extension and enforcement of vaccination; and referring to the recent parliamentary return, entitled "Vaccination Mortality," which shows how vaccination in England is accountable for the deaths of 25,000 children annually from inoculable diseases, he goes on—

"Prominent amongst these inoculable diseases is that of syphilis, which is that awful punishment or penalty which the prostitute and her guilty companion are subject to. Many children have been killed right off by such vaccination, and yielded up their little lives as though by a definite poison. Others have lived to spend their days as vaccination victims upon the earth. Doctors do not, as a rule, go to the beast of the field for lymph; but they have kept up their supply, since the days of Jenner, by obtaining it from the ripened sores of children upon whom they have operated. Thus has this system become a medium through which diseases of the most horrible and ghastly nature are circulated in the veins of otherwise pure-blooded children."

Mr. Jacob's case excites much attention in Ireland, and Mr. F. Davis, jun., of Enniscorthy, has come to his defence in the newspapers with information and arguments that evidently take the public by surprise, who have been accustomed to regard vaccination as something settled by science and placed high above question. Among the more remarkable correspondents that the discussion has brought forth is the Archdeacon of Trim, Dr. Reichel, who in the Dublin Daily Express of 15th September, says—

"The question as to the propriety of compulsory vaccination may, I conceive, be summed up in very few words. Let vaccination be brought back to what it was when Jenner introduced it, and what the term means—viz., inoculation with actual cow-pox, taken directly from the cow, and then it will recover its protective power, will cease to be dangerous, and may, therefore, with propriety be enforced. This is what is being now done in Belgium. There the State provides that the lymph shall be got in each case direct from the cow. But the system in use in this country, which enforces inoculation with lymph not taken directly from the cow, but necessarily altered in character by being transmitted through hundreds, perhaps thousands, of human beings, many of them tainted with hereditary, and consequently transmissible, diseases, is a mischievous absurdity. Vaccination, thus performed, has ceased to be an effectual protection against small-pox, as is virtually confessed by medical men themselves; for they are beginning to say it ought to be repeated every seventh year; and in many cases, beyond all doubt, it introduces poison into the system which it may take years to eliminate. Dr. Drapes himself confesses that it 'can transmit one or two contagious diseases.' Why 'one or two' only? And if it can transmit contagious diseases why may it not transmit diseases arising from contagion? Medical men may deny this; but until I see stronger reasons against it than the ipse dixit of a member of a profession notorious for great changes of opinion, I shall believe what seems to be the dictate of common sense."

We trust that Dr. Reichel, having got so far, will presently get farther, and discover that vaccination, in any form, is not only impotent against small-pox, but an active agent in the perpetuation of a disease which otherwise would probably have disappeared from among us like leprosy and plague. The calf-lymph prescription, which he commends, is merely a last attempt to maintain a doomed superstition.

BINGLEY ANTI-VACCINATORS.—Mr. Brown Lee of Bingley, Yorkshire, sent to prison for seven days for refusing to pay a vaccination fine, had a hearty welcome at a public meeting on his release, 12th September. Mr. Bentley said he hoped many would follow Mr. Lee's example, for he was afraid the law would never be altered until the prisons were filled with anti-vaccinators. Mr. G. Kidson was of the same opinion, and advised steadfast defiance of the law. He was glad to see that Mr. Lee had come out of prison as he went in, and that it had at last been discovered that it was dangerous to crop an anti-vaccinator's hair and set him to hard labour. Mr. Lee said he had asked the vaccinator for a guarantee that his child would not suffer by the operation, nor catch small-pox after it; but the guarantee was refused. He would encourage every parent to refuse to pay fines and go to prison rather than have his children's blood polluted.
LEICESTER GUARDIANS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

It will be remembered that the Leicester Guardians resolved to address the Local Government Board, urging that in the present unsettled state of opinion as to the character and efficacy of Vaccination, and in view of the gross irregularity of the penalties inflicted for non-compliance with the law, they desired to be relieved from the odious duty of prosecuting their townsmen who object to Vaccination.

The Local Government Board were in no haste to reply, but on 16th July they met the Guardians' appeal by denying that medical opinion was unsettled as to the virtues of vaccination, and asserting that though millions of vaccinations had been performed in England, "the close and habitual inquiries of the Board as to any mischief arising, or alleged to arise, in performance of vaccination, have not made them acquainted with a single instance of disease communicated by the vaccine lymph employed." Nor, in the irregularity of penalties enforced, did the Board see any cause of offence, but on the contrary they had to recognise the judgment and discretion with which, as a rule, the law was administered.

We do not suppose the Leicester Guardians were greatly surprised with their answer. A gentleman complained to his house-keeper that a fish brought to table was not fresh. "That cannot be," said she, "for the fishmonger told me it was perfectly fresh." "What else could he tell you, seeing he sold it to you," was her master's rejoinder. In like manner, what else could a Department, which exists and subsists by traffic in Vaccination, aver save that Vaccination was from first to last faultless—"not a single instance of disease communicated by the vaccine lymph employed."

Whatever they might think, it was the policy of the Leicester Guardians to treat the answer of the Board gravely, and in an admirable reply they have marshalled a series of medical testimonies, many of them of unquestionable authority, as to the injuries inflicted by Vaccination, especially in the communication of syphilis.

Coming to their own experience they observe—

"The prosecution of over 300 of our townsmen during the last twelve months in deference to your authority, and the incarceration of 80 of them in our jail since the enactment of the compulsory law, has made us painfully aware that a great deal of injury is alleged to have arisen in Leicester from Vaccination, and we shall be glad to know when, where, and by whom, your close inquiries were made in this town, so that we may satisfy ourselves, by comparison of the evidence, of the value of the allegations."

As to the judgment and discretion with which the law is enforced, the Guardians point out that—

"In the towns of Bedford and Boston, the usual course is to fine each anti-vaccinator 6d., and to prosecute only once; in our town of Leicester a fine of 10s. including costs is inflicted, and that only once; while in many places the full penalty of 20s., and costs is inflicted, and that many times over; as for instance, Henry Pride and Benjamin V. Scott of Liverpool were each fined 20s. and costs on 21st July. Pride having been previously mulcted in penalties 18 times, and Scott 17 times. We could mention many such cases, and give instances by the hundred in which the full penalty is inflicted, but should your Board desire further information, you will find it in the Anti-Compulsory Vaccination Reporter in which a condensed account of the prosecutions under the Vaccination Acts is given every month."

Words would be wasted in reprobation of the shameless audacity which can treat such manifest facts as non-existent; but the frequent assertions and denials of official folk in Parliament and elsewhere, have rendered us so familiar with equivocation and mendacity, that what we might a priori have pronounced impossible, we take as matter of course.

In conclusion, these good men of Leicester say—"Elected to be the Guardians of the Poor, we feel that we are acting the part of oppressors in carrying out the law as it now stands. Many of our constituents, we know, deem Vaccination a blessing, but many deem it a curse. We do not wish to be made use of to force the opinions of either upon the other. We prefer to throw our weight into the scale of even justice for both views, believing, as we do, that open discussion is a more elevating and civilising influence than tyranny and repression of private judgment."

DIFFICULTY OF TRUTH.—Often have we to recall the fine saying of George Eliot in this struggle of ours against blood pollution—"We cannot command veracity at will. The power of seeing and reporting truly is a form of health that has to be delicately guarded, and as an ancient Rabbi has solemnly said, The penalty of untruth is untruth." It sometimes seems as if doctors had come to think that Vaccination is such a good thing, that to lie for its honour is not only blameless, but praiseworthy.—A. F.
MORE ABOUT ST. PANCRAS.

Some time ago we mentioned that the St. Pancras Guardians had wisely resolved to cease from the prosecution of Mr. Tebb and Mr. Mansfield, the resolution being chiefly due to the good sense and energy of Mr. Skoines, a recently elected Guardian. It would appear, however, that some of the Guardians, who constitute the Vaccination Committee, felt aggrieved at being cut off from the sport of worrying anti-vaccinators, and appealed to the Local Government Board for the restitution of their pleasant privilege; but, to the confusion of the busybodies, the Board replied that it was considered expedient to cease from prosecuting those whose repeated and successful resistance only served to bring the law into disliking and contempt. On receipt of this communication, Mr. J. L. Seaton, the chairman of the Vaccination Committee, immediately resigned his post, saying that he could no longer conscientiously remain a member of the Committee. Conscience has often served to cover acts of wickedness and folly; but perhaps conscience was never before prostituted to more grotesque service. Conscience wronged because forbidden to tease, molest, and violate other consciences! Vain is it to argue with those who thus put darkness for light, and bitter for sweet, but possibly their evil energy would be considerably damped if they only knew how they are regarded as nuisances at Whitehall. What the Local Government Board desire is that the Vaccination Acts be steadily enforced, but without noise and scandal; and Guardians who get up rows, and keep up rows, are specially objectionable, and meet with no encouragement.

WHAT HAPPENS.—In the Times of 10th Sept., under the heading of "Public Health," we read, "The deaths of two infants, aged three and four months, in St. Bartholomew's Hospital, on 30th August and 2nd September, admitted from Clerkenwell, were referred to pyemia and inflammation following vaccination."

Were inquests held on the bodies of these slaughtered infants? and if not, why not?

The publication of these cases, and their reference to their true cause, supplies a useful hint. A child seriously injured by vaccination should immediately be sent to the nearest hospital. Mr. May of Birmingham has described how the general practitioner conceals the truth, lest the credit of vaccination should suffer; but hospital surgeons do not vaccinate, and have a sharper sense of the danger of issuing false certificates.

OUR ROLL OF MARTYRS.—Mr. A. J. Otway, M.P. for Rochester, has moved in Parliament for "Returns showing the number of persons who have been imprisoned or fined for non-compliance with the provisions of the Act relating to the vaccination of children; distinguishing imprisonment with fines, the length of imprisonment undergone by such persons, the number of times any person has been imprisoned, being more than once, and the number and amount of fines paid by any person who has been fined more than once for the above mentioned offence." We have cause to thank Mr. Otway for his action in this matter. This roll of martyrs for conscience sake will prove that it is as possible to be a bigot, a fanatic, and a persecutor in the name of science as in that of theology, and that the difference between the days of Victoria and those of Elizabeth is not so wide as is commonly supposed.

J. EMERY CODERRE, M.D.—Mr. William Tebb, writing from Quebec, 1st September, says—"On Friday I had a most interesting interview with Dr. Coderre of Montreal, the leader of the anti-vaccination movement, in which he has been interested for a quarter of a century. The French newspapers of Montreal have always with the utmost fairness opened their columns for the discussion of vaccination, and Dr. Coderre has never been slow to avail himself of the advantage. The French Canadians of Montreal are therefore enlightened as to the dangers of the imposture, and when in 1876 the Medical Board of Health tried to get the Municipal Council to pass a compulsory vaccination act, the Council discovered an unsuspected amount of resistance. About ten thousand citizens collected in front of the City Hall, and, being unable to obtain an assurance that the arbitrary measure would be withdrawn, smashed every pane of glass in the building, and threatened to tear it down. Dr. Coderre expected a serious loss of life, but considered that 'the slaughter of the innocents,' which would ensue upon the passage of such an act, a thousand times more terrible. Dr. Coderre spoke warmly of the efforts of Mr. John Pickering, Mr. and Mrs. Hume-Bothery, Mr. W. Young, Mr. A. Wheeler, Mr. Gibbs, and other faithful workers in the good cause, and expressed a hope that some of them might be induced to visit Montreal and deliver lectures. Dr. Coderre pressed me earnestly to pay him a visit on my return to Montreal, in order to make the acquaintance of other helpers in the work, and this I intend to do if time permits."
OVER-VACCINATED Royalty.—We read in the
Medical Tribune that the death of the Princess
Christina of Spain, following that of her sister
the young Queen Mercedes, is the fourth of the
family of the Duke of Montpensier cut off in
the flower of youth; that they were vaccinated and
re-vaccinated to fortify them against peril;
and it is not unreasonably conjectured, that
their over-vaccinated constitutions yielded and
broke down under fevers which might otherwise
have been resisted. "They were well; they
would be better; low they lie."

Boston Anti-Vaccinators.—At the Boston
Police Court on 5th September twenty persons
were charged with neglecting to have their
children vaccinated, the majority being trades-
men of respectable position in the town—three
of them chemists and druggists. They confessed
to the charge brought against them; the magis-
trates made an order for each child to be
vaccinated within a month, and reduced the costs
to 3s. 6d. for each summons, a reduction that
was received with satisfaction by the defendants.
There are few towns where vaccination is held
in such proper discredit as in Boston.

Norwich Anti-Vaccinators.—Mr. R. Lee
Bliss and Mr. W. B. Pearson were summoned
before the Norwich magistrates on the 29th
August for the non-vaccination of children.
They raised the objection that the guardians
had not provided a vaccination-station, as re-
quired by the law, other than the house or
surgery of the vaccinator. The objection was
over-ruled on the ground that the existing
arrangement was temporary and unavoidable,
and each was fined 1s. and 9s. 7d. costs, with
intimation that if vaccination was still evaded
heavier penalties would be imposed.

Dr. Alibut't's Logic.—Dr. Haughton observes
in the Secular Review—"Your correspondent,
Dr. Alibutt, has written a very elaborate account
of the degeneration of 'vaccine lymph;' in order
to convince your readers that the vaccination
laws deserve their approval. This appears to
me a very curious procedure. He seems to
say: So far we have been fining and imprisoning
her Majesty's loyal subjects for not accepting
'degenerate lymph.' We are not at all sorry
for this wickedness; but we will make you a
concession. For the future you shall have your
choice of the degenerate 'lymph' and the new
'calf pox' from Belgium. To be sure, the
inhabitants there don't believe in it; but 'exer-
cise faith, only vote plenty of money, and all
will be right.'"

Mr. W. G. Ward and the Ross Guardians.—
The Ross Guardians have reconsidered their
intended application to the Local Government
Board as to how to deal with their too powerful
member, and have decided to summon the
parents who have not had their children vacci-
nated. Mr. Ward resisted the motion with
many vigorous arguments, from which his asso-
ciates sought shelter on the usual plea of dutiful
and blind submission to the law. No doubt when
the summonses come on, he will make himself
heard to good purposes.

Missing Children.—The Medway Board of
Guardians have been rendered uncomfortable by
their vaccination officer reporting that he cannot
account for 10 children in Rochester. The
chairman thought the matter serious, and that
possibly Mr. West had prevailed on the parents
to hide them away in order to avoid vaccination.
The Rochester Observer anticipates the following
scene in the city streets—Enter Bellman—"Oh
yes! Oh yes! This is to give notice. Lost,
stolen, or strayed 19 children, supposed to be
hidden away by the Anti-Vaccinators. Any
informatio will be gladly received by the
motherly guardians of the Medway Union."

English Equity!—Four Stamford tradesmen
were summoned before the borough magistrates
on 80th August for disobeying orders made upon
them to have their children vaccinated. They
urged the magistrates to take into consideration
the fact that they had been previously fined £1
and costs for each child, that other magistrates
in the country had inflicted a fine of 6d. only,
and that it was not the wish of the Local
Government Board that prosecution should
become persecution. The plea was entertained,
and fines of only 1s. 6d. were levied. One of the
defendants had paid nearly £30 for summonses
from first to last, having had 50 served upon
him.

Prussian Vaccination.—The following para-
graph is going the round of the newspapers—A
great calamity has befallen the village of Brahlitz
in the Königseburg district. A medical man from
Zehden vaccinated last week all the children of
the age of twelve and the young infants. All
of them—about 70—have become ill, and several
have died. A commission of inquiry, consisting
of the district physician, the district surgeon,
the public prosecutor, and a member of the
Board of Health, has been appointed. The re-
port of the commission will, we trust, be pub-
lished.
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER VIII.

INOCULATION ABROAD.

Before proceeding to relate how Inoculation was superseded and ultimately suppressed in England, it may be expedient to make some notes on the prevalence of the practice in other lands.

And first in New England where, as we have seen, Cotton Mather had precedence in subjecting the reports of eastern inoculation to the test of western practice. Mather and his coadjutor, Boylston, did not propose to make inoculation habitual, but to reserve it for use in epidemics. Sometimes years elapsed in New England without small-pox: there were no dense urban populations to constitute seats of zymotic disease; and to provide perpetually against what was occasional was obviously unnecessary.

Nevertheless the colonists shared the common disposition of the time for pottering in remedies, and their slaves afforded convenient opportunities for experiments in which tenuity had the sanction of beneficence. With the Whites cleanliness, ventilation, drainage and pure water conditions of accident rather than of providence, but with the Blacks life was that of the Black eye, and the consequences in small-pox were thought to be sufficiently accounted for by the pre-diagnosis that Negroes were constitutionally predisposed to that disorder. Wherefore the Black man from Boston to the Spanish Main were all to time to time remorselessly inoculated, and them who afterwards escaped small-pox their immunity ascribed to their inoculation. The disease itself was usually accounted for as importation by ships from Europe, if not openly, then covertly; for, it was argued,
complete, complete beyond his intention; for it came to be as thoroughly inoculated as any town in these days is vaccinated. Dr. Waterhouse, writing on 28th October, 1788, says—

"We find that in 1752 there were but 170 persons liable to small-pox in Boston, and in 1754, when there was a general inoculation in the town, I question whether there was a quarter of that number which did not receive the infection *vita natura vel artis*. In the years 1776-77 and '78 they inoculated pretty freely throughout the State. Two days ago, I was at the review of part of the militia of the county of Suffolk, and of 520 men, I scarcely think there were a hundred above twenty-five years of age that had not passed through small-pox by means of inoculation; and of 3000 reviewed a week or two before, in the county of Middlesex, there was not a greater proportion of the same age liable to take the disease. Since 1764 the dread of small-pox has lessened considerably; and since 1778 we meet the disorder with as little fear as any people you can mention."

In another letter, dated 15th October, 1787, the Doctor says—

"I do not believe there is at present a single person infected by small-pox in all the four New England Governments, that is, not one in a million of people."* *

However it may have been elsewhere, inoculation was conducted in Boston with a formality and deliberation that might have satisfied Dimsdale himself. There was an inoculation hospital erected on Sewell's Point, which juts into Charles River, remote by a mile and a half from the common road, and situated in pleasant grounds with trees and walks. Three weeks were devoted to inoculation and the subsequent sickness, and before dismissal, wrote Dr. Waterhouse—

"The patients are washed all over in soap suds, then rubbed with brandy, and lastly washed in vinegar; they put on fresh clothes, and bury those they wore during their stay in the hospital. But even then they are smoked and fumigated with sulphur in the smoke-house, which is about twice the size of a common sentry-box. This smoke-house has a hole in its side for the patient to put his head out of during the operation. Although this seems formidable on paper, yet patients submit cheerfully, and with no slight merriment.

"There are perhaps 150 under inoculation at present at Sewall's Point, not one of them pau-

pox: no instance of the kind has ever been produced. Persons have been inoculated with various matter taken from patients afflicted with venereal disease, yet they have received no ill effects save that of small-pox only. It would be superfluous to deal with the fallacies involved in these statements: they served to satisfy those who were disposed to be satisfied with the science of inoculation; hence inoculation became the fashion among the scientific and enlightened. Dr. Trenchin, a well-known inoculator, was summoned from Geneva to Paris in 1726 to operate upon the children of the Duke of Orleans, and his success was pronounced decisive. Nevertheless inoculation did not extend beyond people of leisure and culture, and in 1763 an outbreak of small-pox in Paris made an end of the practice. An inquiry was instituted by the authorities, and the evidence left no doubt that the epidemic had been diffused, if it did not originate, with the naturally poxed; and inoculation was thenceforth prohibited in Paris. Any citizen who was resolved to have the induced disease had to retire to country quarters.

Here we may observe that the confidence of the inoculator was grounded on the assumption that whoever had once passed through small-pox, whether natural or artificial, could never contract the disease. Nevertheless the inoculated did contract the disease, and the disaster was uniformly accounted for as due to some imperfection in the inoculation. There were also instances of small-pox after small-pox, but these too were discredited; the first small-pox could not have been small-pox, but chicken-pox, measles, or some other eruptive disorder. There was a conspicuous confusion of the evasions in the case of Louis XV. He had a small-pox unquestionably in his 14th year, and of unquestionable small-pox he died in 1774 in his 64th year. Notwithstanding, the assertion was perpetuated that there was no possibility of small-pox after small-pox, and it was only when it became necessary to maintain the credit of vaccination that the facts were admitted; and in this form—Small-pox after vaccination is no more common or extraordinary than small-pox after small-pox—a falsehood on the back of a former falsehood.

We have seen under what safeguards inoculation was practised in Boston, and now we shall turn to Geneva and discover how all the American precautions were set at naught in that city without apparent impunity. The details are in a letter of the Council of Geneva, dated December, 1701, addressed to Dr. Haygarth in answer to his inquiries and suggestions. Des Gouttes, secretary to the Geneva Syndic, wrote—

"I.—The Republic of Geneva contains about 85,000 inhabitants, of whom 26,000 dwell in the city, and 9,000 in the adjacent country.

"II.—The city is of small extent, and ill adapted to so large a population; and its extension is not easy on account of the fortifications wherewith it is surrounded. There are little more than 1200 houses in the city, which are built in many storeys of many apartments like the ancient part of Edinburgh, each house sheltering on an average twenty-one inhabitants.

"III.—A great part of the population consists of strangers, not only because most of our servants and labourers are natives of other countries, but because Geneva being a frontier city, girl about by Savoy, Switzerland, and France, and situated on the highways of intercourse between these states, travellers are always coming and going.

"IV.—Notwithstanding this continual resort of strangers within our walls, an epidemic of small-pox is of almost regular occurrence every five years; and between the epidemics it frequently happens that we have no natural small-pox whatever, either in the city or its vicinity.

"V.—Inoculation began to be practised here in 1751, since which date we have inoculated a very large number of children annually, and with such marked success that the deaths have but slightly exceeded 1 in 800. Although we have often had to inoculate with pus brought from a distance at times when there was no small-pox to be found in the city, and although children so inoculated have gone freely into the streets, walks, and other public places, before, during, and after the eruption, we have never observed that they were sources of contagion, nor that they produced any intermediate epidemic, nor that they accelerated the return of the periodical epidemic.

"VI.—Lastly, our citizens enjoy a republican constitution which requires us to pay most scrupulous regard to the liberty of every individual. No coercive measures to hinder the introduction or communication of small-pox are here practicable; and we believe we ought to limit our action to advice, and to simple precautions of police, which must not, nor even seem to be, oppressive to the citizens."

This glimpse into old Geneva is not only instructive as concerns inoculation, but it is another exposure of the monstrous fable that represents European cities as decimated with
small-pox until Jenner’s advent as saviour—a fable that vanishes like smoke whenever brought into contact with matter-of-fact.

Inoculation was introduced to Rome and Florence during a severe epidemic in 1754; and attention being drawn to the remedy, it was discovered that the Italian peasantry had long practised voluntary small-pox just as did the peasantry of Wales and the Highlands of Scotland. In Spain inoculation made little headway: in the words of Moore, “Some inoculations were effected in a few trading cities, which held communication with England; but these efforts were of short duration, and from the distinguished inaction of the Spaniards, inoculation was soon relinquished; and no other country in Europe has suffered so little from small-pox.”

In Holland and Denmark inoculation acquired a certain vogue among the upper classes, and in Germany the like was true to a less extent. In Sweden inoculation was encouraged by the court, and Dr. Schultz was deputed to visit the London hospital. His report was so favourable that in 1755 inoculation houses were opened in several parts of the kingdom, and the benefits of the practice were commemorated by a medal in 1757—a curious trophy of illusion under possession.

Perhaps the most notable event in the story of inoculation was its introduction to Russia: how it was brought about is thus described by Mr. Morley—

“As soon as Catherine came into power (1762), she at once applied herself to make friends in this powerful region [French letters and philosophy]. It was a matter of course that she should begin with the omnipotent monarch at Ferney. Graceful verses from Voltaire were as indispensable an ornament to a crowned head as a diadem, and Catherine answered with compliments that were perhaps more sincere than his verses. She wonders how she can repay him for a bundle of books that he had sent to her, and at last bethinks herself that nothing will please the lover of mankind so much as the introduction of inoculation into the great Empire; so she sends for Dr. Dimsdale from England, and submits to the unfamiliar rite in her own sacred person.”

One day in the summer of 1768, at his house in Hertford, Dimsdale received an unexpected message from Pouschin, the Russian minister in London, to wait upon him; and in his presence he learnt that he was required to proceed at once to St. Petersbourg to inoculate the Empress. There was of course some hesitation about undertaking so long a journey, but Pouschin had been authorised to overcome all obstacles. What would the Doctor require in the way of expenses? The Doctor discreetly answered that he would leave that to her Imperial Majesty, whereon Pouschin handed him £1000 to pay his way to St. Petersbourg. Dimsdale summoned his son from his medical studies in Edinburgh, and the two set off for the North on the 28th of July.

At St. Petersbourg Dimsdale was received with every mark of respect and liberal hospitality. He was introduced to the Empress, who was charming and gracious; and he was instructed to make the requisite preparations for the serious duty before him. He had to find pus, and to obtain pus he had to lay hands on a suitable sufferer from small-pox—a task which proved by no means easy. Having discovered a case to his mind, he had then to overcome an obstinate objection to the abstraction of pus.

He had, at the same time, to find a couple of healthy young men, who had not had small-pox, on whom to raise secondary pus, for the Empress could not be expected to run the risk of small-pox without mitigation. His first attempt was a complete failure, and he had to report accordingly to his expectant patient. Catherine heard his report with philosophical equanimity, and left him to try again. At last he was successful, and at the palace of Czarsoe Selo on Saturday, 11th October, 1768, the Empress swallowed five grains of mercurial powder, and late on Sunday evening Dimsdale inoculated her with fluid matter by one puncture in each arm. She did well. From the time of the inoculation to the commencement of the eruption, she walked every day for two or three hours in the open air, and on the 1st November she returned to St. Petersbourg “in perfect health, to the great joy of the whole city.”

The Grand Duke was inoculated on the 30th October, and by 22nd November had “perfectly recovered.”

The Empress having played, the nobility had to follow suit, and Dimsdale was requested to proceed to Moscow to take them in hand; and at this point there was a new difficulty. There was said to be no small-pox in Moscow, and as Dimsdale could not inoculate without fresh pus, he had to pox two girls in St. Petersburg, designing so to time their disorder that he should arrive with them in Moscow in prime condition.
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for business. One girl was a failure, and mis-
haps and delays on the sledge journey almost
made a failure of the other. He did, however,
reach Moscow in time enough to communicate
the requisite infection to fifty patients, and in
Moscow he remained for two months operating
and playing the lion. Then he set off for home,
and on his route through St. Petersburg found
Catherine suffering from pleurisy, for which he
bled her, drawing eight ounces of the imperial
blood. Then came the reckoning. In substan-
tials he had—

£10,000 down;
£2,000 for travelling expenses;
£500 a year for life, to be paid in net
English cash, and
A superb gold snuff-box set with diamonds
for Mr. Dimsdale.

In honour he had the appointments of—
Counsellor of State;
Physician to her Imperial Majesty; and
Baron of the Russian Empire, with descent
of title to his eldest son.

It was a barbarian's style of recompense, made
under the eye of Europe. It cost Catherine
nothing, for it is subjects who pay for the extra-
vagance of despotism.

Dimsdale had plans for the systematic inocu-
lation of Russia, but they resulted in little.
Catherine's purpose was sufficiently served in
the display she had made; and possibly she
came to consider Dimsdale an appendage of
that deceiver Voltaire, whose busts, that had
adorned her saloons and corridors, were by her
orders thrown into the cellars when the French
revolution opened her eyes to the consequences
of French philosophy.

In perusing the literature of inoculation, noth-
ing impresses a reader, enlightened by sanitary
science, so much as the manner in which small-
pox was regarded as something like hail or
lightning that might be averted, but could not
be prevented. So far, I have not met with even
a hint in that literature that small-pox was
either induced by unwholesome modes of life, or
that it could be avoided by wholesome modes.
In conjunction with this blindness was the amaz-
ing assumption of the inoculators, that every one
inoculated was to be placed to their credit as
saved from small-pox, as if (granting inoculation
to be prophylactic) small-pox was ever a uni-
versal epidemic, and as if multitudes did not pass
through life without small-pox before inoculation
was heard of. The true problem to be set and
solved in all epidemics, whether of influenza or
small-pox, is why some are susceptible and some
insusceptible, and whether it is not practicable
so to modify conditions as to carry over the
susceptible to the ranks of the insusceptible.

MR. W. G. WARD IN HIS OWN DEFENCE.

At the Ross Petty Sessions, on 26th September,
Mr. W. G. Ward appeared, in answer to a
summons for not having his son, born 2nd
March, 1878, vaccinated. There were on the
bench Mr. J. M. Herbert (in the chair), Mr.
George Clive, M.P., Rev. E. Palin, Dr. Strong,
Mr. J. M. Bannerman, and Mr. A. Wood-Aston.

Mr. Ward said—I shall not ask the witnesses
any questions. I admit that the child is un-
vaccinated, and unvaccinated he shall remain
as long as I have any power over him. I do
not wish to appear here as a law-breaker. I
believe, after forty years' connection with this
neighbourhood, I have shown myself law-
abiding, but every Act of Parliament is not a
law. You know very well by what you are
taught by all judges, that if any Act of Parlia-
mament is made contrary to the laws of God or
Nature, it is our duty to disobey such an Act.
Judge Blackstone lays that down emphatically.
I deem it monstrous that any Act of Parliament
should say I shall not keep a healthy child in
my house. I deem it monstrous that any Act
of Parliament should say a healthy child is a
nuisance. I deem it monstrous that an order
should be made upon me to pollute my child,
to subject that child to numerous diseases, and
possibly to death. Only in last week's paper
we have the statement that of 70 children vac-
cinated in one place, half of them are seriously
ill, and several have died. (Applause in court.)

The CHAIRMAN—The court will be cleared at
once if we have any noise of that kind.

Mr. Ward—It is left to the conscience and
good feeling of magistrates to make an order if
they see fit, and I appeal to you most earnestly,
and to every man who respects human welfare
and parental authority, whether it is right to
make an order upon me. In that splendid book
of Hooker's, the first which he wrote, he laid
down the principle that there was no law pos-
sible against a virtuous man. If, therefore,
you make an order against me, you attack and
condemn what is virtuous in me. I have con-
scientious motives for defending my child from
evil, and, I am persuaded, authority from God
to protect that child and every other child from
pollution by a foul medical concoction. I wish
to draw your attention to one or two points. It
is absurd for you to make an order which, even
were I willing, could not be obeyed. The word vaccination means that cow-pox be put into my child. Now there has not been a single case of true cow-pox since 1826, and even that was a questionable one. If, therefore, I were to allow my child to be what is called vaccinated, it would be to allow the pollution of every foul creature through whom the matter has passed for many generations to mingle with his blood. Jenner said in 1818, that if vaccine required to be renewed, it would be impossible to do so. Moreover, I maintain that Jenner himself never really believed that vaccination protected from small-pox. I know that is a strong statement, and unless I can substantiate it, and easily substantiate it, I would be unwise to make it in the presence of our learned Chairman. In 1802 Jenner persuaded Parliament to give him £10,000 for his discovery, and afterwards petitioned and got £20,000 more; and between the terms of these awards, he had an infant boy, and one day a doctor called, and while playing with the vaccinated child, remarked that he had just come from a house where there was small-pox. Jenner was horrified.

Mr. Clive—Will you allow me to make a remark? We are not here to inquire into the expediency or inexpediency of vaccination. We are convinced probably as strongly as you are, I individually know the evidence with regard to vaccination as well as you do. I entertain one opinion; you another. I may be wrong; you may be right. We are here merely to carry out a particular law, which in my opinion we are bound to do, without reference to the question whether vaccination is a poison or a protection to the public. I believe it is a protection, and that no individual has a right to risk an evil to the public on account of his own particular child. Men may think as you do, but you must give others credit for thinking the reverse. The question is, Are we to carry out this law or not?

Mr. Ward—I stated at the commencement that this is a question of personal appeal to you, because the Act leaves it to your conscience.

The Chairman—Those words "if you see fit" must apply to an exceptional case. The Act of Parliament clearly makes it compulsory on all parents to have their children vaccinated at a certain time, and that enactment the magistrates are bound to carry out, unless they "see fit" not to do so; but that must apply to a peculiar, particular, and special case. If you can show there are any specialties or peculiarities in your child, that may induce us not to make an order, but do not address to us any arguments to prove that the Act of Parliament is altogether mistaken, because it is a waste of time. It may be so, but this is not the place for agitating against it. If the Act of Parliament is injudicious and prejudicial to the public health of the English people, the proper course is to apply to Parliament.

Mr. Ward—We are doing that, sir.

The Chairman—Very well; but you cannot make a justices' meeting a place for agitating against the Act.

Mr. Ward—I can convert Mr. Clive. (Laughter.) He wrote a letter saying he would not vote for any change.

The Chairman—I have known Mr. Clive longer than you have, and I am sure you will not convert him.

Mr. Ward—I was saying, sir, that Jenner—

The Chairman—Now you are going against the Act of Parliament again. We cannot set aside the Act of Parliament.

Mr. Ward—The Act of Parliament leaves it to your conscience, and I am trying to move your conscience.

The Chairman—That is not so. I should consider myself deserving of being struck off the roll if I interpreted these words as entitling me to override the Act of Parliament.

After some discussion, Mr. Ward proceeded to say that vaccination never improved the general health of the country, and that small-pox not only did not augment the national mortality, but, in those years when prevalent, reduced it below the average. In 1871 there were about 2200 deaths from small-pox in England, and in the following year there were 22,000, but the entire mortality of the land was less by nearly 1000. No one can refute such facts. My next point is, that my child cannot have small-pox, for he is born of parents who are vegetarians, and he will be brought up a vegetarian. He is so fine a boy! I can say it coolly, there is no boy like him in the neighbourhood. Mr. Clive's grandson, born next day, is about half his weight. (Laughter.) Well, this boy can never have small-pox. Should not I be a fool, then, to subject him to a pollution that involves serious disease and possibly death to prevent him from having that which he cannot have? Mr. Clive has made a single remark—a remark that refutes itself. He said my child may give the complaint to some one else, and may be a nuisance in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Clive—I never said a word of the kind.
Mr. Ward—You said, "You have no right to allow your child to be a cause of danger in the neighbourhood." If a child when vaccinated is protected, how can any other child give it the disease? You, sir, have not the courage, after being vaccinated three times, to go into a room where there is small-pox. You had a case of small-pox in your own house, and the girl was got out through the window.

The Chairman—That has nothing to do with us. If you satisfy us that Mr. Clive has a great terror of small-pox, what has that to do with us?

Rev. E. Palin—If all the rest of the children in your neighbourhood went unvaccinated, would not there be a common danger?

Mr. Ward—No, sir. Mr. Hopwood moved for a parliamentary return to show the deaths of children since vaccination has been made compulsory, and from that parliamentary return it appears that 37,000 children are killed every year in consequence of vaccination, out of twelve diseases that affect children below one year of age. Mr. Simon in the very report that moved Parliament to pass this vile Act, proved that small-pox was only accountable for 5 per cent. of the common mortality, and that vaccination in every instance had increased it. He brought forward Professor Monteggio, of Italy, to show that if a syphilitic child was vaccinated, the pustule would contain two diseases. Look at that! I do hope the Chairman will consider these things. He may be a father, and would he subject his child to the horrors of syphilis? For many years the medical men of this country asserted it was impossible to give syphilis by vaccination. It is now admitted by high authorities that syphilis is given, and given very numerously. Sir Thomas Watson commends a father who submits to fine or imprisonment rather than subject his child to the ghastly evil of syphilis; and can you wish for a moment—I know it is not in your hearts to do any unkindness to a human being, and I know you would not trample upon my rights as a father, and say I should subject my healthy infant to the possible chances of syphilis, or that you will order me to pay penalties or to be imprisoned. You cannot do it. I have a different opinion of you. I know the exigencies of your position, standing by that Act of Parliament, but I trust that you will do as other magistrates have done—descend from the Bench rather than commit the crime of ordering a father to pollute his own child. I could bring forward evidence after medical evidence to show the fearful evils which I speak of. In the volume on vaccination that won a prize, Dr. Ballard admits that syphilis is transmitted by vaccination. There sits a magistrate (pointing to Mr. Wood-Aiton) near to whose house a child was killed by vaccination. Near him, again, a girl now 14 years of age, vaccinated by Dr. Simmons, of Ludbury, has existed for 12 years with cancerous syphilis, and it would have been an act of humanity to have destroyed her life at once. Here is the father of a fine grown girl who, until you lifted your head upwards to her nose, was really a model of beauty and good growth; but syphilis has undermined the nose and eaten a passage under the left eye, and soon that eye, an eye of beauty hitherto, will be a cavity of death. Nothing but the grave can hide her misery. Surely, then, you would not compel me to subject my boy to a process so criminal, so indefensible! Just outside this town there is a child of well-to-do working people named Rudge, and they have paid more than £20 to try and cleanse their child of the filth the doctor put into it. But it will never be cleansed. I could go on and describe other horrors I have seen, and with these fearful cases before us, with evidence all round this town and neighbourhood of the evils of vaccination, I appeal to you, sir (the Chairman), as a Christian, and as a man of honour, and as a man who would glory to be the father of such a child as I am pleading for—I ask you how you can, in the light of any medical teaching, in the light of respect of the right of every father to protect his own child, and when our population is being destroyed, polluted, and reduced in power by this foul practice—I ask you, how can you for a moment order me to do it? If you feel it is compulsory on you to enforce the law, I entreat you to make the order seven years long, and then I shall get, at the end of seven years, another reasonable man like yourself, and with another seven years I can then defy the Act of Parliament. I do not wish to speak under any disguise; be it prison or penalty after penalty, as long as I am a living man my child shall never be polluted by any vaccinator. When I have such strong convictions, when I have medical knowledge on the matter so that no man will stand up and discuss the question with me—there is a medical gentleman on the Bench, but he would not contradict a single statement I have made—then any acts of compulsion are only acts of persecution. For over thirty years I have been a vegetarian, and have never been subject to any disease. I would go to-morrow without any hesitation and visit any small-pox patient. With these reasons then why I and
my child cannot have small-pox, it is a mockery of good sense to make an order upon me.

The CHAIRMAN—We are all of opinion that we are bound to make an order——

Mr. WARD—For seven years?

The CHAIRMAN—No. You cannot suppose we should make such an order. We order your child to be vaccinated within two months.

Mr. WARD—It never will be.

The CHAIRMAN—I may say that for my own part I have no doubt you honestly believe the opinions which you have expressed here to-day.

Rev. E. PALIN—And let me add one thing more. You are evidently perfectly convinced vaccination as at present dispensed does harm, but why do you not, instead of kicking against the pricks, and appealing to courts of law for the reversal of the law, which of course you cannot get—why do you not use your powerful energies towards purifying vaccine and vaccination?

Mr. WARD—It cannot be done.

Rev. E. PALIN—in Belgium and Holland it has been done.

Mr. WARD—Well, if you want it discussed, take the Corn Market. (Laughter.)

As usual, Mr. Ward’s case was reported at length in the Hereford Times, and excited wide attention. Sooner or later the Compulsory Acts will end in familiarising the public with the facts about vaccination, and the result is certain.

Science is harsh in its demand for realities. It has no sympathy with the romance of human life, still less with its superstitions.—Sir Henry Holland.

DID THE CAT STOP GARROTTING?—Mr. P. A. Taylor in answering the question in the negative in the Daily News observes—"How difficult, how impossible, it seems to kill and bury a fallacy that has fairly got hold of society! I believe Lord Beaconsfield on some occasion thanked heaven that we were not governed by logic; perhaps similarly we ought to be grateful that belief is not affected by facts. For this belief in the proved efficiency of the ‘cat’ there never was the shadow of reason. It has been disproved a thousand times, yet still one hears for ever, ‘Well, at any rate, flogging stopped garrotting.’ This ‘cat’ has far more than the traditional nine lives. Will you allow me once more to cut off its head, at the risk, I acknowledge, that a hundred shall rise in its place."—It is just the same with the vaccination cat that stopped small-pox; and there is nothing for it but to keep on maintaining the truth unflinchingly until the growth of lies is stopped.

JOSHUA JACOB AT LIMERICK.

At the Limerick Petty Sessions on 26th September, Mr. Joshua Jacob was summoned for refusing to comply with an order made on 29th August, to have his child, Maria Jacob, vaccinated within a fortnight. The presiding magistrates were the Mayor, Dr. O’Shaughnessy, Alderman Cleary, Captain Spaight, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Thomas Boyce, Mr. Maurice Lenihan, Mr. John M’Donnell, and Alderman O’Callaghan. The court was crowded.

The MAYOR—As I understand, you admit the case, Mr. Jacob?

Mr. JACOB—I admit I have not vaccinated the child, and I appear to show cause why I have not done so. As my wife knows more of the children than I do, I wish to examine her first.

Mrs. Jacob then testified that their family generally had been vaccinated, but that three days after the vaccination of the elder brother of her little girl, he was covered with a rash that made him red as a lobster, and his features were swollen. Nevertheless, that experience did not constitute her sole objection to vaccination: she had reason to believe that other diseases were communicated by vaccination.

Edward Haughton, M.D., of Upper Norwood, London, was next called as witness.

Mr. JACOB—Hast thou examined Maria Jacob, and dost thou consider that there is any possibility of danger to her or other children from vaccination however carefully performed?

WITNESS—Yes, I have known evil consequences ensue with the best lymph that could possibly be obtained.

Mr. JACOB—Besides cases coming under thine own knowledge, canst thou testify as to what is admitted by the advocates of vaccination, as to evil results in spite of all precautions?

WITNESS—The diseases which are ascertained to have been thus transmitted are syphilis, scrofula, leprosy, and eczema, besides the lowering of the patient’s vitality, and so increasing the susceptibility to disease. It is admitted by some of the principal advocates of compulsory vaccination that many cases have occurred of all these diseases even when the lymph used was taken from apparently healthy children. There are no means by which lymph taken from vaccine vesicles can be ascertained to be pure from that shameful hereditary disease which is capable of transmission to the third generation.

Mr. Hennessey, the vaccination officer, at this point objected, and asked Mr. Jacob to confine himself to the child in question.
The Mayor—He will be allowed the same latitude as anyone else.

Mr. John M'Donnell—I think you are showing him more latitude than to anybody else. We are dealing here with a plain Act of Parliament, and we should confine ourselves to our strict duty in connection with it.

Mr. Jacob—Thou hast in the course of thy practice known of the worst forms of disease being introduced by vaccine lymph?

Witness—Yes. I have known cases of erysipelas occur, and I have also known the nervous system to be injuriously affected. I saw a boy covered with an eruption, notwithstanding that the vaccination was performed in the most careful manner. I have also known the case of a son of an eminent physician whose arm got so swollen from the fingers to the armpits that it was apprehended he would die.

Mr. Hennessy—All this evidence does not refer to the child in question.

Mr. M’Donnell—The charge brought by Mr. Hennessy is that the child has not been vaccinated in accordance with the order of the magistrates. We are here to try that and nothing else.

Mr. Lenthall—He is giving us reasons why the child should not be vaccinated at all.

Mr. Hennessy—The only reason which can be entertained is that the child is unfit or susceptible of vaccination. If Dr. Haughton proves either, I shall consent to a dismissal.

Dr. O’Shaughnessy—He should prove that the child is not constitutionally suited for vaccination.

The Mayor—Go on, Mr. Jacob, with the evidence.

Mr. Jacob—I am defending this case upon the reasonable ground that vaccination would be injurious to my child.

Captain Spaight—You are trying to show us that the law is wrong and unjust, but that is no reason why we should not carry it out.

Mr. Jacob—Dr. O’Shaughnessy has taken considerable pains to inform me on the question of pure lymph. I now want to know from this gentleman, as a London physician, whether pure lymph can be provided, and whether I can with safety have this child vaccinated. Are there any means known to the profession by which pure lymph can be distinguished from that which may convey the seeds of other diseases?

Witness—The law does not define what lymph should be used. A physician can vaccinate your child with any lymph he may wish to use, and you cannot object to it. At present various kinds are in circulation, including a large amount of more or less modified small-pox matter, which, after being passed through the system of the cow, is fraudulently forced upon the people under the name of pure vaccine lymph. Pure lymph cannot be distinguished from what is impure unless the impurity be in great quantity, and may thus be discovered by the microscope.

Captain Spaight—Is it possible, if lymph were obtained direct from the cow, that disease could be introduced into the system?

Witness—I am not personally aware of any cases in which disease has been transmitted under such circumstances, but I do know that cases of this kind have been reported in the medical journals.

The Mayor—are you an opponent of vaccination?

Witness—I think it humbug, and am therefore opposed to it.

Mr. M’Donnell—I wish to know from Mr. Hennessy whether he has met with any similar resistance in connection with other cases which he has charge of.

Mr. Hennessy—I have not.

Mr. Jacob—I must ask George Hennessy if he has not come in contact with cases of the most heartrending nature where other children, besides Maria Jacob, have been concerned?

Mr. Hennessy—I cannot answer the question. I know nothing about vaccination. My duty is simply to see that the law is complied with.

Mr. Jacob—Does what is called vaccination always mean the same thing?

Dr. Haughton—It is almost universally admitted by the medical profession that the lymph now used is much less efficacious than in the days of Jenner, and the proportion of cases of small-pox brought to the hospitals subsequent to vaccination have certainly increased during recent years.

Mr. Hennessy—are you regular in your ideas about vaccination?

Dr. Haughton—I represent the ideas of a great number of persons, I am happy to say.

Captain Spaight—There is no doubt that many agree with Dr. Haughton.

Mr. Hennessy—if you had no objection to vaccination, would you think the child fit to be vaccinated?

Dr. Haughton—I would.

Mr. Jacob—is there any number of years during which vaccination is held by medical men to protect from small-pox?

Dr. Haughton—It is not now pretended, as
in Jenner's time, that one vaccination, or even two or three, will certainly protect from smallpox during a lifetime. The doctrine now received by most medical men would make it appear that a very large proportion of the population are in a practically "unvaccinated" condition; and would be described as "unvaccinated" if they should contract small-pox in a severe form, so as to render the vaccination marks indistinct.

Mr. Jacob—Has the proportion of cases of smallpox to population been diminished during the operation of the vaccination laws—say during the last quarter of a century?

Dr. Haughton—The proportion of cases of smallpox to population has certainly not diminished in this realm since the introduction of compulsory vaccination. On the contrary, the very disease which it was boasted would be thus "stamped out" has prevailed more than in the previous quarter of a century, and has been especially fatal in Ireland, which used to be considered the best vaccinated part of the United Kingdom. Besides, the general death-rate among infants has increased in the most alarming manner. I think the law-makers have been the greatest law-breakers, for, while it is punishable to inoculate a person with small-pox, that disease is introduced into the system by smallpox pus passed through the cow, and then called vaccine.

Mr. Jacob then addressed the Court, and said that in this case mercy should cover the judgment-seat. For the past six months I have been persecuted by the Limerick Board of Guardians. I was fined, and I had to appeal to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions. I had to bear heavy expenses, and I was fined again. This is the third time I have been brought before this Court. Now, I have a deeply-rooted conviction that we should not interfere with the noblest workmanship of Heaven by attempting to improve what God has turned out, and what He has declared in the Scriptures to be very good. I may say here what I have said at the Board of Guardians, that I could not, while the penalty, even were the prison to be my grave, submit to have that beautiful child (pointing to the little one) destroyed by the introduction of any lymph, whether taken from the body of a beast or the body of a man. (Applause in court.) You cannot by any amount of persecution force me to yield, and by persecution you defeat your own object, for by the inquiry you excite you compel the discovery of what a dangerous process vaccination is. The advice of the Local Government Board is worth your consideration. It is to the effect, that while prosecutions should not cease for non-compliance with the Vaccination Act, yet if such prosecutions are obviously ineffective, and, whilst useless, excite sympathy with the prosecuted, and tend to a more extensive resistance to the law, then it is advisable to consider whether it is not expedient to withdraw from a contest that is simply mischievous. Speaking in the House of Lords in 1874, when the present Act was introduced, Lord Walsingham said the bill was not designed to encourage prosecutions to the extent of persecution, but that a fair discretion would be exercised towards conscientious objectors. In conclusion I would say, that seeing how the health and lives of many thousands of poor children are dependent on the settlement of this vaccination question, I shall not pay another fine, and shall therefore go to prison. It may be said that my goods will be distrained, and if such be your intention, I would ask you to stay execution for one or two months, in order that I may be able to appeal to the Local Government Board. At all events, I shall pay no more fines, and if my goods are distrained, you shall do it by force of police.

Alderman O'Callaghan—Many of the magistrates are opposed to the law, but they must enforce it. It is a cruel law, and I pray that it may soon be reversed.

A fine of 20s. and costs was imposed, Mr. Jacob's goods to be seized in default of payment; or, in the event of seizure not being effected, imprisonment for a fortnight. Execution was stayed for one month.

THE IRISH PRESS ON MR. JACOB'S CASE.

Mr. Jacob's case excites much interest throughout Ireland, and his determined attitude naturally begets much sympathy in generous Irish hearts. Among the newspapers, the Dublin Express (a Conservative daily) is especially to be commended for the free discussion of vaccination in its columns, and for the editor's frank expression of opinion, affording a welcome contrast to the silence and timorous time-serving of the English press. Summing up the discussion of his correspondents, the editor observes—

"The inference is plain that if the remedy be doubtful, it is an outrage upon constitutional liberty to compel all persons by an arbitrary and harsh law to adopt it. Nothing could justify such a measure but the clearest proof that it was
necessary for the general protection of the public. But the case against the Act rests on far stronger grounds. We have assumed that all that had been proved was that it was doubtful whether vaccination was an effectual remedy against the disease; but if it can be shown that while it is only doubtful at best as a remedy it directly communicates other diseases which may be as fatal as small-pox, it seems a crime against society to enforce it. The doctors, however, admit that it does convey other diseases, and some of the most terrible kinds, into the human system at the most tender and critical period of life, when the germs—i.e., it may be of a slow and lingering, but not the less certain death—are implanted in the constitution, and can never be eradicated. It is shocking to think that this is done by Act of Parliament, and that the Legislature insists that parents shall be instrumental in vitiating the blood and saddening and shortening the lives of their children. The subject is one that demands a searching inquiry as to the medical question, but in the meantime Parliament should be called upon by urgent petitions to repeal an obnoxious and tyrannical law, and leave the public free to act as they think fit in a matter which affects their own lives."

And at the end of a summary of Mr. Jacob’s defence, he concludes—

"After all the ‘healing art’ is a very inconsistent one. The great body of medical practitioners repudiate homoeopathy, and would refuse to meet those who follow that system, but here in vaccination they adopt the very principle—similia similibus curantur—and are so confident of its efficacy that they have induced the Legislature to pass a highly penal law to enforce it. There is a visible change, however, in public opinion on the subject, and the law is not immutable."

A Reasonable Inquiry.—As there existed in nature an antagonist and preservative influence against the small-pox, and Jenner’s sagacity was sufficient to recognise and enforce it, we are tempted to ask whether the other pests, such as measles and scarlet fever, might not be dealt with in a similar way.—Pall Mall Gazette, 18th March, 1878. [The suggestion here made is a strictly logical one; for we may be sure that what is true of one form of zymotic disease is true of other forms; and there is no better proof of the unscientific character of vaccinators than their incapacity to generalise and extend their practice.—Ed.]

MR. BERNHARD SAMUELSON
AT BANBURY.

Addressing the Banbury Working Men’s Liberal Association on the 8th October, Mr. Samuelson is reported to have said—

With regard to vaccination, he did not think it should be made a political question. He thought it was the duty of constituencies as well as of members of Parliament to make some sacrifice for the sake of union. While expressing personal belief in the value of vaccination, he had received information upon which he could rely, that vaccination amongst the poor had been insisted upon in a manner it ought not to have been, and had been performed with a degree of carelessness which ought not to have occurred. He thought it matter for regret that those who had conscientious objections to vaccination had been treated too much as criminals. He thought there should be a fresh inquiry into the subject, and he should be prepared to propose such an inquiry if no one else did. Personally, he had no doubt of the enormous benefits which, in spite of occasional drawbacks, had been derived from vaccination, but there were more serious grounds for complaint on the part of those who objected to it than he had hitherto believed, and therefore he was anxious for a parliamentary inquiry.

We have to be thankful for all who show themselves ready to move in this matter, and now that Mr. Samuelson has got upon the fence, it is to be hoped that he may find courage to drop over on the right side. For his faith in vaccination, and its enormous benefits, it would be interesting to have his reasons. Many loud confessors in favour of vaccination would have to render a humble answer to the query, “Speakest thou this of thyself, or did another tell it unto thee?”

WHAT AN EDITOR CAN SAY.

Referring to the foregoing declaration of Mr. Samuelson, the Daily Chronicle of 10th October testified as follows—“That a promise to vote for a government inquiry into the operation of the vaccination laws, with a view to their repeal, should be made a condition of a man’s entering Parliament, proves to what abyssal depths of absurdity the human mind is capable of sinking. That small-pox is the most fearful scourge which ever afflicted the human race, and that vaccination is a cure for it, are facts upon which the scientific opinion and the common sense of the whole civilised world are agreed. There has been no greater benefactor of humanity than Edward Jenner. Previous to his remarkable
discovery, Europe was annually decimated by the loathsome disease, which was literally a terror by night and a pestilence that wasted at noonday," etc., etc.

This is a fair sample of the imaginative rant that is taken for evidence and argument as concerns small-pox and vaccination, and there is no remedy save in the firm and persistent demand for facts, and the exhibition of authentic history and statistics. To the credit of the editor of the Chronicle, he has inserted several criticisms of his article from Mr. Wm. Young, Mr. John Stephens, Mr. John Morison, and Mr. Alex. Wheeler. Mr. Wheeler in his letter observes—

"It was by no means the case that Europe was annually decimated by small-pox. Upon this question Dr. Farr is surely the best authority a pro-vaccinator need require, and in his article on Epidemics in McCulloch's Statistical Account of the British Empire, he admits that small-pox was on the decline before Jenner appeared with his 'discovery.' Dr. Farr's words are, 'Small-pox attained its maximum mortality after inoculation was introduced. Between 1760 and 1779, the annual deaths from small-pox in London was 2,328; and in the next twenty years they declined to 1740; this disease, therefore, began to grow less fatal before vaccination was discovered, indicating, together with the diminution of fever, the general improvement in health then taking place.'

"The deaths from small-pox in London from 1870 to 1874, show an annual average of 2,157; but when we compare the present century with the last, we are comparing a time when every one desires to be rid of small-pox with a time when every one desired to have it"—if not naturally, then artificially by inoculation.

"Tens and hundreds of thousands of small-pox patients have been recorded as vaccinated. Diseases of the most virulent character are acknowledged to be transmissible by vaccination—acknowledged by pro-vaccinators of eminence and position. Yet we are guilty of folly if we question the wisdom of continuing the rite!

"Public money is spent for vaccination, and the public are entitled to ask value for the same. Public inquiry is done, and the public are right in asking for inquiry. And inquiry, if impartially conducted, will result in banishing vaccination to the limbo of forgotten superstitions."

Among the correspondence on the other side was a letter which thus concludes—

"With reference to the people who profess to have 'conscientious objections' to vaccination, the self-same 'scruplers' have precisely the same 'conscientious' objections to their children being educated, and often appear in our police courts as defendants in what are termed 'School Board Cases.' So much for 'conscientious scruples!'

A curious example of superfluity of falsehood—of falsehood without mitigation; and the more remarkable as the writer questions Mr. Samuelson's veracity as to his information about vaccination!

HOW I BECAME AN ANTI-VACCINATOR.

II.

The first part of this narrative recorded the payment of fine and costs (amounting to 80s.) for avoiding the "vaccine disease." I afterwards regretted having made a compromise between conscience and a bad law. Moreover, the payment of one fine did not purge the offence. Parents are liable to repeated prosecution until their unvaccinated children reach the age of fourteen.

Being of a combative nature, I attacked the law by publishing the Anti-Vaccinator, with this motto from Dr. Garth Wilkinson's masterly writings on the subject—"Other wars are toward death, but in this crusade the war is against death." My object was to expose the evils of vaccination, and arouse public opinion against the compulsory law.

Notwithstanding the labours of Mr. R. B. Gibbs and other pioneers in this movement, the people generally were ignorant and apathetic. They were told by doctors, magistrates, and the press, that vaccination had "saved millions of lives." It was as positively asserted that no disease could be imparted by vaccination. This and a hundred other lies were refuted, and the whole subject received illumination in its medical, political, and other aspects.

The Preface to the first volume of the Anti-Vaccinator contained these words—"No pleasure can exceed that of saving innocent children from the contamination of the poisoned lancet. Every parent who prefers a prison to the abominable empiricism of vaccination is helping to free the statute book from a disgraceful and deadly law. We demand, in the name of the suffering people, the repeal of the obnoxious and tyrannical Compulsory Vaccination Act. We say—leave vaccination optional. If the practice be curative, it will live, and be its own defence. That vaccination is not a preventive of small-pox, but rather a promoter of endless and fatal
diseases is proved by grievous and unassailable evidence. Reliance on a nostrum also lulls the people into a false security, and induces neglect of the laws of health. Thousands of parents have allowed their children to be vaccinated against their better judgment. The time has come when it is no longer tolerable that a doubtful medical dogma shall be enforced by pains and penalties. The Act is most oppressive upon the poor. The Compulsory Vaccination Act is doomed; and if the people use the power they possess, its speedy abrogation is certain. Agitate! Exercise this devil of disease, and then the angel of health will enter the purified sphere."

Of course I became a "marked man," and was summoned again; and, declining to pay the fine, was sentenced to fourteen days' imprisonment. How I fared is told in my Prison Thoughts on Vaccination, which I shall be happy to send freely to any applicant.

HENRY PITMAN.

41 John Dalton St., Manchester.

LORD F. CAVENDISH AT KEIGHLEY.

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH, M.P. for N.W. Yorkshire, received a deputation of anti-vaccinators at Keighley on 18th October. Mr. R. A. Milner acted as leader, and expressed a hope that his Lordship might be so disposed as to ensure their hearty support at the next election.

Mr. Dawson, of Bingley, drew attention to the fact that whilst vaccination had been universalised, small-pox had gone on increasing; that whilst population had increased 10 per cent., small-pox had increased 120 per cent., and at the same time infant mortality had risen in a manner that only the illnesses consequent on vaccination could account for. Mr. Jeffery, of Harden, said he had been an anti-vaccinator for more than forty years, and that he had first looked into the question when he saw his sister's child killed through vaccination. He defied any one to prove that vaccination had either diminished or ameliorated small-pox.

Mr. George Kiddon then called attention to the Report of the Select Committee of 1871, which at the time was unanimously agreed to, but was now repudiated by several who had signed it, and among them by Mr. Alderman Carter, Mr. J. P. Hibbert, and Mr. F. A. Taylor. He thought it was most abominable tyranny for the State to stand between parent and child and say that the child should incur the risk of syphilis to escape the risk of small-pox. Mr. Crossley said he was opposed to the Compulsory Law because it led to the treatment of good men as common vagabonds and criminals. One of their friends had been sentenced to a month's imprisonment with hard labour because he would not submit to vaccination, and the treatment he received so weakened his health that he sickened and died, and but for the accrued Act he had no doubt he would have been with them that day.

Mr. Milner then put the following questions to his Lordship:

1st. I beg, on behalf of the deputation, to ask your Lordship whether you are prepared to vote for the repeal of all penalties for non-compliance with the Vaccination Acts.

2nd. Will you bring in, or support, a measure to relieve all persons who have conscientious objections to vaccination (free of cost to them) from fine and imprisonment?

3rd. Will you move for the appointment of a Royal Commission to go from town to town to collect evidence for and against vaccination?

His Lordship in reply spoke warily. He did not think that those who at this day discussed the Vaccination Laws could realise what a fearful and loathsome scourge small-pox had been, nor therefore what vaccination had delivered us from. They had argued from their own experience that vaccination was insufficient, but in a question of this sort he preferred to be guided by authority, and the weight of authority in favour of vaccination was overwhelming.

Reference had been made to the Committee of 1871 as no longer unanimous, and if new facts had come to light, he would be glad to have a new inquiry. It was not however for him to move for such an inquiry. For himself, he was perfectly satisfied that vaccination had greatly diminished small-pox. The argument that if vaccination is beneficial, it might be left to prevail of itself, struck him as unfair. Children were helpless, and as the State now came between parents and children and enforced education, it was equally just for the State to enforce vaccination in the interest of the same helpless creatures. That a parent should be sentenced to prison and hard labour for non-vaccination was deeply to be regretted, but, as he understood from the Home Secretary himself, when the Summary Jurisdiction Act comes into force on 1st January, 1880, it will be clearly impossible to sentence a parent to hard labour for non-payment of vaccination fines.

A meeting was held after Lord F. Cavendish had retired, and the resolution was carried unanimously, "That this meeting is highly dissatisfied with the evasive answers given by Lord F. Cavendish, M.P., to the questions put to him."
Interviews like the foregoing with M.P.'s are eminently useful, and we hope anti-vaccinators every where will follow the example of our Keighley friends, nor be disappointed if they make little immediate impression. Much is gained if only scepticism and inquiry be excited. As for Lord F. Cavendish he is of little account personally, and it need excite no surprise that he should recite parrot-wise the commonplace nonsense about "the fearful and loathsome scourge of small-pox from which vaccination brought deliverance." It could only be through some convulsion of human nature that such a man could stand up and say, "I have investigated for myself, and admit that you Keighley men hold true doctrine, and I am your convert." Such a miracle is not to be looked for. Lord F. Cavendish confesses that his opinions are formed by authority; and as soon as authority veers, he will veer likewise, and not improbable will persuade himself that he has assumed his new position altogether by force of his own intelligence. Such transformations are of constant occurrence in the political world, and when vaccination comes to be "authoritatively" denounced we shall discover that all along we have been surrounded with latent sympathisers.

TRUTH WITH VIGOUR.

The Rev. W. Stoddart, B.A., Stockton-on-Tees, had an order made upon him, on 25th September, to have his child vaccinated within fourteen days, and at the same time was sentenced to pay 8s. 6d. costs. The case excited public attention, and Mr. Stoddart replied as follows to a letter in the Daily Gazette—

"I have just noticed a mean and dastardly attack on me in the Gazette of 30th September. The writer, Mr. J. Metcalfe Garry, confesses that 'cases do occur where children and even adults have had by this means their existence blighted,' and yet, because I will not expose my child to the risk of having its existence blighted, this gentleman classes me with returned convicts and cut-throats 'as being one of those very dangerous class of law-breakers who ought to be placed under supervision of the police.' Is it because I am a Unitarian minister that I am thus to be insulted in the public papers? J. Metcalfe Garry is evidently actuated by some religious animus against me, although he is quite a stranger to me. Or, is it because I consider it my duty to preserve my child from having a disease put into its blood? I have been summoned before the magistrates and compelled to pay costs because I will not risk the life and happiness of my child by allowing the virus of cow-pox to be injected into its blood. If my child's happiness was blasted, who would be responsible? If my child were murdered by law, could the law clear my conscience of the crime of murder? Should I not be responsible before God for the murder of my child, and doubly guilty because I knew it was morally wrong to risk a child's life or happiness by putting a disease into its blood? I could not plead ignorance of my duty. I consider human life too precious and too sacred a thing to be wantonly risked. It is unnatural and immoral to give a disease to a child, and when the laws of God are better known and taught, it will be considered a monstrous crime to poison the blood of a child. The natural way to prevent disease is to keep the body healthy by obedience to the laws of health. Cleanliness, temperance, fresh air, pure water, wholesome food, these are the natural preventives of disease. All disease is the result of the violation of the laws of God. Let the laws be made to pull down the dens of infamy in Stockton; to clean out the back alms where men and women herd together like swine, and propagate vice and disease; let the cesspools be removed from the backs of the houses, which are poisoning the atmosphere; let the drinking water be kept free from sewage; restrict the liquor traffic, and promote habits of temperance and cleanliness among the masses;—these are the natural ways of preventing disease. Vaccination is radically wrong. Why should we not give our children a mild form of fever to prevent them from taking the typhoid or scarlet fever? Hundreds of children have had their existence blasted by this vile law. Hundreds of helpless infants have been massacred by this immoral law, and it is the duty of every parent to protect his offspring against cow-pox and the horrible diseases which are sometimes communicated by vaccination. I shall do my duty in spite of fine, imprisonment, and public insult; I shall obey the dictates of my conscience; I shall obey the law of God rather than that of ignorant men; I shall protest against this law as unnatural and immoral; and I shall teach men to disobey this State law, because it is a direct violation of the laws of God, a disgrace to the education of the age, and a scandal to public honesty and religion."

The order made on 25th September was not served upon Mr. Stoddart until 8th October; and the order was followed by a summons for 16th October; but over-seal defeated itself. The magistrates dismissed the summons because sufficient time had not been allowed between order and summons.
THE COMING GENERAL ELECTION.

The time between the present moment and the approaching election offers such opportunity as seldom occurs for directing attention to the iniquity of compulsory vaccination. Every opponent of the law who has a vote should address a letter to each candidate for the borough or county of which he is an elector asking his opinion on the question. The following may afford hints for such letters, which should generally be short. Correspondents can choose the points they prefer to enlarge upon, and wherever possible the letter and reply should be got into the local newspapers.

Sir,—As an Elector for ——, may I ask your views as to the policy of that legislation which seeks to compel, under pain of fine and imprisonment, conscientious parents (who study the laws of health and vital statistics) to submit their children to an operation which they are persuaded is always pernicious, and which likewise involves risks to life itself; and this at the dictation of official experts who subsist on the public money, who are always receiving grants, and whose interest it is to increase both fees and grants by the extension of their unworthy practice.

Considered on broad principles, had legislation in no man’s mind been vanquished in the past, had the minority been compelled to submit to the majority in matters of religion, science, duty, and habit, where would have been the liberties of Englishmen? And why is an exception now made with regard to an operation so manifestly against Nature, and in favour of an art so notoriously empirical as medicine?—of which nothing is so predicable as that the certainties of this generation will be discredited by the next.

For the truth as concerns Vaccination it is difficult to obtain a hearing. The writers on physiological subjects on the London press are almost invariably medical men; and, with the instinctive jealousy of trades unionists, they suppress every fact and opinion which threatens their craft. It is a part of their tactics to represent Vaccination as beyond discussion, as something demonstrable like the rotation of the earth, or combining proportions in chemistry, which only the ignorant or foolish would venture to question. As recent instances of this suppression of facts, I may mention that a return, Vaccination Mortality, No. 495, 1877, moved for by Mr. Hopwood and printed by order of the House of Commons, and Mr. P. A. Taylor’s speech on the Irish Vaccination Act were passed over by London editors with absolute silence. Mr. Hopwood’s Return showed conclusively that as vaccination extended, infant mortality increased—a fact which, if “let out” in the manner that would catch public attention, would irretrievably injure a thriving department of medical business.

Enclosed I send you a copy of Mr. P. A. Taylor’s speech, of a speech by Sir Thomas Chambers, of an Analysis of the Returns of the Registrar General, of Mr. Young’s Vaccination Tracts—or other anti-vaccination literature, which the writer may consider appropriate and effective.

Allow me in conclusion to ask whether if elected for —— you will be prepared to vote for the repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Act? and permit me to make use of your reply in advocating, as I trust I may be able to do, your return.

TO BE MADE A NOTE OF.

A hardship which persecuted anti-vaccinators have frequently had to endure, has been the appearance of magistrates on the bench, who as guardians initiated their prosecution. Now, it turns out that such a combination of prosecutor and judge is wholly illegal! The Stamford Guardian states:

“Messrs. Paradise, Browning, and Betts did not sit on the Bench during the hearing of the vaccination cases. The Court of Queen’s Bench on the 15th of May last, in an appeal against a conviction by the justices of Weymouth, decided that, notwithstanding an enabling clause in a general Act of Parliament, justices who had taken part in the proceedings which led to the prosecution were disqualified, by their interest in the matter, from sitting at the hearing of the summons, and quashed the conviction.”

This decision must not be lost sight of. Many a poor fellow has suffered sharply through having an envenomed guardian as adversary to pronounce judgment.

WRONGFUL LAW.—The Compulsory Vaccination Acts violate the liberty of the person, imposing a real and present danger against a remote and contingent one; they place the respectable, sober, well-educated man in a false position, putting him on a level with the dishonest and disreputable, the burglar and the thief. There can be no more dangerous innovation on our liberties than that which places the better part of the community in discord with the laws of the country.—Rev. W. A. O’Conor.
VACCINATION IN INDIA.

Dr. Lowndes writes in the *Lancet*, October 11, 1879, a very curious paper commenting on Professor Newman's "Barbarisms of Civilisation," which appeared in the June number of the *Contemporary Review*. Dr. Lowndes has been vaccinated and three times re-vaccinated. He has been often exposed to small-pox, and has escaped, therefore he says vaccination saved him. There is no such thing as argument in such statements. It assumes that all the unvaccinated must have small-pox. It assumes that all doctors before Edward Jenner who attended small-pox caught it. It assumes ignorance on the part of the readers of the facts respecting small-pox. Note the treatment he gave to the believers in Sitla, the Hindoo goddess of small-pox. These superstitious people were afraid the goddess would be angry if they vaccinated their children. Dr. Lowndes asked if Sitla was not angry when she sent small-pox, as a person is angry who gives a disease often fatal. They usually agreed that this was the case, and it was then suggested to them that the goddess was angry with them for not being protected by vaccination. This mild reasoning was always acquiesced in, and produced a smile, and "Wagh! wagh!" "Surely some such reasoning may not be out of place," continues Dr. Lowndes, "to more learned heads (but perhaps not wiser) than those poor Rajpoot cultivators." I hope many English doctors do not resort to such superstitions to aid them. If they do, they deserve little pity if small-pox coming among the vaccinated should turn these poor Rajpoots' acquiescence into anger. That small-pox never does affect vaccinated people in India, one would suppose from Dr. Lowndes' narrative. If so, the true Indian influence must be obtained for the English vaccinators, for it is not so here.

Dr. Lowndes objects to the term "pus" for "vaccine lymph." But if pus is the wrong term to use, so is lymph. Virus is more correct, and is the term we generally use.

Dr. Lowndes talks of the inductive mind of Jenner giving him posthumous fame. But if by this he means that Jenner discovered a natural law, what is this law? There is no law to which vaccination conforms. It is opposed to law, opposed to science, opposed to experience. It is as much a superstitious rite as any of the follies performed by the credulous worshippers at Gurgaon before the goddess of small-pox.

ALEX. WHEELER.

VAGARIES OF CIVILISATION.

We are rare promoters of civilisation! Among the articles in the treaty of peace with the Zulu chiefs is one which signifies that no witch-doctors are to be tolerated. If that be so, the oppressed natives of Zululand are, after all, better off than the be-doctored inhabitants of these northern isles, who are tormented out of their lives by the Compulsory Vaccination Acts. It may be feared, however, that such congratulation will prove but temporary, for the Jennerian boon may yet be conferred on poor Africans if they are sufficiently docile under British rule.

JOSEPH TOWERS.

EXPERIENCE AND PROPHETY.—You in Derby, who have had an epidemic of small-pox, know from your own experience that vaccination is downright medical humbug; that there is no good in it; that the thing is senseless in theory, and as worthless as it is unnatural in practice; that it is a craze and a nuisance. I visited Newmarket, Birmingham, and Harwich, when small-pox was raging and destroying in those places. I went from house to house, and from bed to bed; and I can testify from what I saw and heard that vaccination had no effect whatever in preventing the worst forms of small-pox or deaths from small-pox. Vaccination! It is the greatest medical delusion of the age. It implies that good health is dangerous, being the highway to disease; and that disease is safety, being the road to health. It is a piece of medical insanity, and hereafter medical men will be ashamed to think of it.—W. HUME-ROTHERY at the Derby Conference.

BRADFORD IN DANGER.—The *Lancet* (Sept. 27) laments the escape of so many children in Bradford from vaccination. Out of 6797 infants born in the borough in 1877, probably "550 are now living unvaccinated." This condition frightens the *Lancet* into asking "can it be necessary to wait for the next epidemic of small-pox to do its worst among the unvaccinated in Bradford?" Now, we are not so foolish as to make any stupid prophecies. But we are perfectly certain that if an epidemic comes to Bradford, the number of vaccinated small-pox patients will greatly exceed the unvaccinated, and as often before the probabilities are 6797 to 550 that a vaccinated person will be the first to suffer. How long will the *Lancet* continue to talk against facts? In the great epidemic in London, 11,174 were vaccinated, according to medical records, out of 14,808 hospital small-pox cases.—A. W.
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

AMERICAN ANTI-VACCINATION LEAGUE.

(From the New York Daily Sun, 4th Oct, 1879.)

The "First Anti-Vaccination League of America" was formed in the Lecture Room of the United States Medical College, Thirteenth Street, last evening. The movement was brought about mainly by the presence in the city of Mr. William Tebb, an Englishman, who lives in London, and who has stubbornly resisted thirteen prosecutions for refusing to have his children vaccinated. He was prosecuted twelve times, but on the thirteenth the British Government got tired and did not molest him further. His attention was first drawn to the subject by taking his second daughter to be vaccinated after one effort to vaccinate her had failed. The physician said, "Take your daughter home and let her alone. Vaccination won't prevent small-pox, and it may do the child an injury." Soon he made up his mind that the Compulsory Vaccination Act was tyranny, because it made people liable to take inoculable diseases, and did not insure them against taking small-pox. He hunted up books and statistics, and ascertained that at least eighty per cent. of those who died of small-pox in England were those who had been vaccinated. The more he read and investigated, the more he became determined to resist the vaccination laws. He published tracts, got up lectures, established an anti-vaccination journal, and paid his fine every time rather than permit his child to be vaccinated. His case was carried to a higher court, where it was decided against him. Still he would not yield, and he has not yielded to the vaccination of his child. Wherever he goes he carries his anti-vaccination tracts, and preaches resistance to the law as the chief means of effecting a change in public sentiment. He announces that in two Yorkshire towns the opposition to vaccination is so strong that in each of them there are 6000 children not vaccinated. He numbers among the leading public men who oppose compulsory vaccination, John Bright, W. E. Gladstone, Jacob Bright, P. A. Taylor, J. W. Pease, Thomas Burt, W. E. Forster, C. H. Hopwood, and other M.P.'s; Professor F. W. Newman, Herbert Spencer, Dr. Garth Wilkinson, Dr. Pearce, and Dr. Collins.

Finding his idea was not entirely new to New Yorkers, Mr. Tebb was glad to attend the meeting last evening.

Alexander Wilder, M.D., on taking the chair, said he had long been hostile to vaccination. He was satisfied that after vaccination persons are more likely to take any disease—even small-pox itself. When once the blood is contaminated by bovine virus, the chance of taking small-pox is greater than if the vaccination had not been done. From his observation among relatives and friends and patients, he was satisfied that many persons contract small-pox after vaccination, and even after they have had small-pox itself.

Mr. Tebb gave his views and experience to the meeting. In addition to the facts recited above, he said that he had known several cases of great hardship, in which poor men had been persecuted for refusing to have their children vaccinated. He spoke of the case of a man named Nye, a clockmaker, who had been imprisoned nine times because of his refusal to comply with the law. Nye's resistance was due to the fact that two of his children had been poisoned by vaccine virus. Mr. Tebb related the experience of a physician, a neighbour of his, who had lost $2500 a year in his practice by refusing to vaccinate. One lady, a passenger on the steamship, told Mr. Tebb that she had lost two children by vaccine poison. She told the doctor that he had used bad virus, but, she said to Mr. Tebb, "at that time I did not know that it was all bad." In Montreal, where the vaccine virus was punctured into the people wholesale, regardless of law, the public indignation at the outrage became so strong in consequence of the obvious fact that vaccination did not prevent small-pox, that a mob of 10,000 people threatened to tear down the buildings in which the authorities were assembled to pass a Compulsory Vaccination Act. The people had seen their children diseased by the poison of vaccine virus, and that nothing but a mob could put an end to it.

Dr. R. A. Gunn concurred in what the previous speaker had said.

Dr. Wilder said that to start a running ulcer in a man's arm would be about as useful in preventing him from taking small-pox as any other method. "Indeed, that is about what vaccination is." He added—"Half the doctors in America have lost faith in vaccination, but unfortunately continue to practice it rather than lose their fees. What is wanted is a Lloyd Garrison or George Thompson to lead the opposition to this mischievous medical delusion."

The Anti-Vaccination League was organised by the choice of Dr. Alexander Wilder as President, J. W. Nickles as Secretary, M. L. Holl-
brooke, Treasurer; J. E. Briggs, M.D., Thos. A. Granger, M.D., and R. A. Gunn, M.D., as Executive Committee. The object of the society is to awaken the attention of the public to the evils of vaccination and to its inutility, to put an end to its practice, and to prevent legislation for its enforcement.

WHAT IS SUCCESSFUL VACCINATION?
This question is one which every medical man who signs a vaccination certificate has to decide, and the failure of vaccination is leading to a refinement of terms in order to ward off the confession of total defeat.

Mr. Makuna has been praised by the Lancet for his services in the line of definition, and as he has favoured me with a copy of his Report,* I am enabled to make a few remarks upon his method.

First, he tells us roundly that no standard is common to the profession. “What one will call an indifferent mark, another will call fair, a third moderate, a fourth bad, and so on, till confusion is worse confounded,” but Mr. Makuna has no hesitation. He says, “A good mark is that which is well foveated (that is depressed towards the centre) well fitted, with its area well defined, commonly by a serrated margin.” Further, “good marks always remain good.”

For vaccinated, Mr. Makuna substitutes “vaccinated”; and no one is vaccinated who has not “four or more good vaccine cicatrices”; for, he adds, “I believe it to be an undisputed fact, that only those enjoy complete immunity from the infection of variola before puberty, who are vaccinated.”

Now were Mr. Makuna in earnest instead of trifling, he would be able to show that no one with four good marks appeared in his Hospital. But Table V. gives 161 patients with “good marks,” and of these 22 had “four good marks,” or more. The Hampstead Hospital Report shows 940 patients to have had “good marks,” and of these 222 had “four marks and over,” and were therefore vaccinated. The Homerton Hospital Report gives 1197 cases of “good marks,” and 222 with “four marks or more.”

Leaving this method, Mr. Makuna reverts to the only scientific method of classification, namely, by the degree of eruption.

Now, as ever, if the eruption be extensive, the tax paid to death is heavy. Now, as ever, if the eruption be slight, the deaths are few. Mr. Makuna’s return of mortality, 16·6 per cent., is almost identical with that of Dr. Jurin in 1738; and it is therefore perfectly clear that nothing has been effected by vaccination in modifying the disease.

Thus the term “vaccinated” represents nothing new; and until Mr. Makuna shows that no one “successfully vaccinated with four good marks” has died of small-pox at Fulham or elsewhere, he leaves matters as he found them.

ALEX. WHEELER.

INCONSISTENCIES OF VACCINATORS.
Dr. Lyon Playfair, whose name I mention with respect, has ventured the assertion in Parliament that vaccination saves 80,000 lives which would otherwise be sacrificed by small-pox. I learn again and again that in small-pox years the total mortality is not greater, but rather less, than in others. How, then, can 80,000 lives be saved by vaccination when there is no saving? It is to me a shocking thing to find Members of Parliament saying vaccination is a medical question which they do not understand, but vote as medical experts tell them. For instance, Dr. Seaton for a long time past, has taken matter from small-pox patients and given it to a cow, then taken matter from the cow and called it cow-pox: someone in Dublin did the same thing, but the Irish Local Government Board said “this is sowing small-pox broadcast.” Thus, what the London authorities commend the Dublin authorities forbid! Again, Mr. Simon, some few years back, after Mr. Hutchinson had proved the transmission of odious diseases by vaccination, being compelled to admit it, says the operator must have dipped his lancet too deep. In that case there is no blood disease which may not be propagated; yet Parliament cannot guarantee that doctors won’t “dip too deep.” Doctors, acting as coroners, have refused to receive the verdict of a jury that, according to the clearest testimony, children have been killed by vaccination. They reason thus: “Vaccination caused erysipelas; erysipelas caused death, therefore vaccination had nothing to do with the death.”—Professor F. W. Newman at Derby Conference of National Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League.

THE CALF AGAIN.—Dr. T. Wilson, Yoxall, Burton-on-Trent, formerly of Alton, Hants, has recommended his calf vaccination, and is prepared to supply the profession with pure Animal Vaccine Lymph. Points, 6d. each; Tubes, 2s.—Lancet, Oct. 11, 1879.—N.B. Tubes were condemned by Dr. Wyld.
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER IX.

The illusory character of human testimony is graphically illustrated in the case of inoculation. Suppoposed to be mild, to be feared by none; yet, as an inquirer wished to ascertain the ratio of deaths to inoculations, he would be completely deluded. We have seen what Dr. Buchan wrote—

"In the natural way, one in four or five really dies of small-pox; but by inoculation as of a thousand. Nay, some can boast of having inoculated ten thousand without the loss of a single patient."

John Birch, an eminent London surgeon, writing in 1806, attests—

"Not one in three hundred dies of inoculation in the general irregular mode of proceeding, and in the small-pox and of nothing but small-pox."—Edinburgh Review, October, 1806, we read—

"Of those who have small-pox naturally, one dies on an average in two hundred and fifty. This at least is Dr. Willan’s calculation; and we are convinced that it is very near the truth. In London, where it ought to be best ascertained, eminent practitioners have stated the proportion to be so high as one in the hundred. The jealous anti-vaccinists have denied it to be greater than in the natural small-pox; under judicial treatment, than one in a thousand. It cannot be denied, however, that the risk to life, the disease, even under the mitigated form, has frequently proved an exciting cause of scarlet and other dreadful distempers, and has often been attended with blindness and deformity."

Mr. Marson in Reynolds’s System of Medicine says—

"The Small-Pox and Inoculation Hospital was founded in London in 1748, and inoculation was discontinued there until 1822. Dr. Gregory went carefully over the records of the Hospital for that period of seventy-six years, and found that only three in a thousand died of inoculation. The inoculated disease was usually very mild, but not invariably so."

Scores of such testimonies might be adduced, twitching the reader from conclusion to conclusion; and in the conflict of authorities what is to be said? It is true that if we select what evidence we like, and call it sound, and reject what we dislike, and call it unsound, we may prove anything; but it is also true, that if we are to be fettered by evidence we shall stand paralysed amid contradictions. When men who are competent, and obviously honest, deliver varying testimony, we are driven to seek some method of reconciliation; and in this matter of inoculation whereby our resort is to books, and about which we can have no immediate experience, we may derive much light from the corresponding practice of vaccination. Thus, what is commoner than for vaccinators to assert, that never within their sphere of observation have they witnessed a single case of injury resulting from vaccination—not one! Subject any dozen ordinary practitioners to judicial examination, and they would thus testify with scarcely a note of variation. On the other hand,
take any dozen mothers of families, especially from among the poor, and they would tell of illness, disease, and death following the vaccinators’ lancets. The men are more or less competent and honest, and the women likewise, and how shall we account for their variance? In the first place the men have been drilled from the outset of their profession into the conviction that vaccination is absolutely necessary and harmless, and if any disaster follows the rite, it is coincidence not consequence. Occasionally a practitioner of more vigorous intelligence than the average, like Mr. Henry May of Birmingham, sees what the mothers see, but does he report accordingly? Not at all. In Mr. May’s own words—

“A death from vaccination occurred not long ago in my practice, and although I had not vaccinated the child, yet in my desire to preserve vaccination from reproach, I omitted all mention of it from my certificate of death.”

Mr. May recognised the fact and concealed it: a duller man would have ascribed the death mechanically to coryza or pyemia. Indeed, it is a commonplace with medical men, that no child dies of vaccination; and hence vaccination is not an admitted cause of death; and when the fact is insisted upon, there is no limit to the hardness of the truth is crushed down and covered up. Coroner refuse to hold inquests on children slain by vaccination, and Dr. Lancaster, as coroner for Middlesex, did not hesitate to authorise and endorse a false certificate of death in order, like Mr. May, “to preserve vaccination from reproach.” As for mothers, poor creatures, few of them have minds of their own, and if only they were adequately assured that it was for the good of their offspring that their noses should be slit, they would believe, weep, and submit.

But it will be pointed out that inoculators of the more reasonable sort admitted a certain mortality from their practice, from which that of vaccinators is at least free. It is so; but the admission was unavoidable. Inoculation communicated small-pox, and there was no evasion of the fact that occasionally the malady assumed a severe form, and the patient died. For such mishaps, however, there were always excuses. The patient was not in a suitable condition of body, he had been eating improperly, he had caught cold, and so on. There remained, nevertheless, the sequelae of inoculation, which were just as persistently denied as are those of vaccination, although there were always clear-sighted observers who maintained that it was impossible to infect the blood with a complex organic virus, and that it should exhaust its effects in a single and definite issue. We all remember how we used to be assured with contemptuous emphasis that it was utterly impossible to communicate syphilis by vaccination, and that assertions to the contrary were fables of ignorance and malice; yet, we see that what was fabulous a few years ago, is now accepted as medical matter-of-fact. Nowhere is scepticism so useful as among physicians; for whenever they protest most, suspect most.

With the close of the 18th century inoculation with small-pox to avert small-pox was accepted as sound practice throughout England. Its safety and efficiency were extolled by medical writers in terms curiously identical with those applied to vaccination. The objectors were few, and for pious rather than physiological reasons; and the question that exercised practical and benevolent minds was how to universalise the remedy, which, on account of its troublesome accompaniments, was chiefly confined to the upper and middle classes. On this point it may be well to cite the words of Dr. Haygarth of Chester, who, in a letter to the Council of Health of Geneva, dated 10th Feb., 1792, thus sets forth the position of affairs—

“In Chester, and, I believe, in most of the large towns of England, the casual small-pox is almost constantly present. All the children of the middle and higher ranks of our citizens are inoculated in early infancy. The populace are generally regarding the danger as inevitable, neither fear nor shun it; but much more frequently by voluntary and intentional intercourse, endeavour to catch the casual infection. All the difficulties of our Small-Pox Society in Chester proceeded from this strange delusion and perversity of disposition. With us the small-pox is seldom or never heard of except in the bills of mortality; but there its devastation appears dreadful indeed.”

The strong objection to inoculation was, that it diffused the disease generally which it was supposed to avert individually. Inoculators tried to minimise and deny the danger, but in vain; and nothing so contributed to the supersession of the practice by vaccination as the expectation of escape from the artificially propagated disease. How extensive was that propagation, we leave a writer in the Edinburgh Review of October, 1806, to describe—

“The inoculated small-pox is an infectious
disease, and those who take it naturally from an inoculated patient have it as violently as if they had been infected from a case of spontaneous disease; it is to all intents and purposes the natural small-pox again in them. Now, if it be considered that several hundred thousand persons have been annually inoculated in these kingdoms for the last fifty years, it will be easy to calculate the immense addition that must have been made in that period to the cases of actual disease, and the increase of natural small-pox that may be supposed to have arisen from this constant multiplication of the sources and centres of infection."

Unless this culture and this traffic in small-pox throughout the United Kingdom be realised, the potent cause of the immediate and extravagant success of vaccination will be left out of reckoning. When we are harassed, anxious and impatient under some course of conduct, our ears are open to any promise of relief; and it was to a generation so afflicted and so receptive that Jenner in 1798 made his revelation of the virtue of cowpox. No more need, said he, to inoculate with small-pox. Substitute cowpox; and whilst it will protect as effectually, it will inflict no injury and diffuse no infection. The revelation was received with acclamation, and within eighteen months of its delivery (without due experience, and without any warrant that could pass muster in the severe realm of science) the leading physicians and surgeons of London subscribed and published the following manifesto in the newspapers of 1800—

"We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons, think it our duty to declare our opinion, that those persons who have had the cowpox are perfectly secure from the infection of the small-pox, provided this infection has not been previously communicated."

I do not wish to anticipate the wondrous tale of Jenner—my present purpose is to show how inoculation was set aside; and it suffices to state that cowpox rapidly made an end of inoculation with small-pox. Indeed, I question whether a revolution in practice was ever effected with similar facility. Within eight years of the delivery of Jenner’s revelation, the writer in the Edinburgh Review of 1806, already cited, was able to testify—

"The bitterest enemies of vaccination will not deny, that more than nine-tenths of the medical world are decidedly and zealously in favour of it, and that all their demonstrations of its dangers and terrors have been insufficient to convert a single one of their brethren from so damnable and dangerous a heresy. Testimonies, it may be said, should be weighed, and not numbered; and in this respect the vaccinators, we are afraid, will have a splendid and indisputable triumph. We give the anti-vaccinists all the advantage in our power when we assign to them a few members of the profession in London; for in the country at large, we believe, they have not one respectable practitioner on their side in five hundred. In this great city and school of medicine (Edinburgh) we are assured, they are without a single public adherent."

The resistance to vaccination was almost entirely confined to the resistance of inoculators, who were too deeply compromised by their own disloyalty to Nature, to make effective resistance. They were steadily borne down by the vaccinators, many of whom had been energetic inoculators, and displayed the usual ardour of apostates in condemning what they had formerly approved. Indeed, when we consider how inoculation was commended for its efficiency and harmlessness by the same medical authorities who, within a year or two after Jenner’s appearance, denounced the practice for its difficulties and dangers, their turgid discourse appeared little short of shameless. Dr. Lettsom had been an inoculator, yet on 2nd July, 1806, he felt warranted in writing—

"What have not the abettors of variolous inoculation to answer for! To shoot a dozen or two innocent people in the public streets of London would not be half so injurious as allowing the murderers to kill the rising generation, the future hope of the State. Nothing can show the supineness and ignorance of the Government more than legalising these various murders."

How far the conquest of the inoculators by the vaccinators had advanced, appeared in a debate in the House of Commons in 1806, when Wilberforce urged that inoculation should be suppressed, or at least that those who insisted on inoculation should be compelled to place their patients in quarantine. Mr. Windham admitted the scandal of wretched and miserable subjects of inoculation being carried about in the streets, but he hesitated to recommend coercive legislation until persuasion had been fully tried and had failed. Dr. Matthews, M.P. for Hereford, took occasion at the same time to run with the hounds. Inoculation, he said, was a frequent cause of disfigurement and of death in its most awful form; it was a magazine of the most dreadful evils; a magnifier of mortality; and a
means of introducing scrofula, a more dangerous and pernicious disorder than small-pox itself—facts which it would have been more creditable to have proclaimed when inoculation was in fashion. It is so easy to kick when a foe has fallen, and where all are kicking! Human nature is never so despicable as when thus engaged.

The question of restraining inoculation came again before the House of Commons in 1807, when the practice of inoculating out-patients at the London dispensaries and hospitals was energetically condemned. "I think that the legislature," said Mr. Sturges Bourne, "would be as much justified in taking a measure to prevent this evil by restraint, as a man would be in snatching a firebrand out of the hands of a maniac just as he was going to set fire to a city."

No one was more eager to suppress inoculation by force that Jenner himself, and in July 1807, he sought an interview with the premier for the purpose. In a letter to Dr. Letsom he thus describes his mortification—

"You will be sorry to hear the result of my interview with the Minister, Mr. Percival. I solicited this honour with the sole view of inquiring whether it was the intention of Government to give a check to the licentious manner in which small-pox inoculation is at this time conducted in the metropolis. I instanced the mortality it occasioned in language as forcible as I could utter, and showed him clearly that it was the great source from which the pest of small-pox was disseminated through the country as well as through the town. But, alas! all I said availed nothing, and the speckled monster is still to have the liberty that the Small-Pox Hospital, the delusions of Moseley, and the caprices and prejudices of the misguided poor, can possibly give him. I cannot express to you the chagrin and disappointment I felt at this interview."

We are not accustomed to regard politicians of Percival's order as favourable to liberty, and yet it is refreshing to remark in even the Tories of the Georgian age a jealous regard for the personal freedom of Englishmen, and a hearty contempt for the plausible quacks who were always contriving to circumscribe it. Percival was not opposed to vaccination, but he would not consent to give it an illicit advantage over inoculation. If it were the good thing it was asserted to be, it might be left to prevail by reason of its own quality.

Under medical and social pressure, the practice of inoculation at public institutions was gradually abandoned. On 5th May, 1808, the inoculation of out-patients was discontinued at the London Small-Pox Hospital, but not until 30th of June, 1822, did the inoculation of in-patients cease. In 1816 the Colleges of Surgeons of London and Dublin pledged themselves against the practice. A formal attempt at coercive legislation, often called for, was at last made by the directors of the National Vaccine Establishment. They framed and promoted a bill, which was introduced to the House of Lords in 1818 by Lord Boringon, but it was ignominiously withdrawn in 1814—a choice example of grandmotherly legislation. Among its provisions was the enactment that whenever an inoculation took place, the clergyman of the parish should receive notice, and that red flags should be displayed from the house where the patient lay! As Earl Stanhope observed, instead of being a measure of humanity, it would, if passed into law, be one of the most troublesome, inconvenient, and mischiefful ever enacted.

In the discussion on this foolish project, Lord Eldon pointed out that the common law was already sufficient to arrest the exposure of sufferers from infectious disease; and acting on the hint the Vaccine Establishment prosecuted a woman, 27th April, 1815, for carrying her inoculated child covered with pustules through the streets of her neighbourhood. Evidence was adduced that she had thus infected eleven persons with small-pox of whom eight had died. The Court of King's Bench pronounced her conduct illegal and criminal, but as it was the first prosecution for such an offence, she was let off with a sentence of three months' imprisonment.

A practice thus banned could not long survive in England, and by and by a medical man who would consent to inoculate became a rarity, or was accounted disreputable. Yet there remained old-fashioned folk who would have nothing to do with cow-pox, and insisted on having genuine human pox for their children and grandchildren. Hence Dr. Epps writing in 1831 had to say—

"There is a class of medical practitioners who inoculate for the small-pox. Society should utter its voice of moral indignation against such individuals, who glory in anything by which they can claim singularity, or by which they can increase their pecuniary means. Let not society be deceived into any parley with such practices upon the plea, that parents will have their children inoculated with the small-pox."

Gradually the inoculating practitioner ceased, and the practice remained in the hands of "ignorant and unqualified persons, old women, and itinerant quacks;" and then the end came. An Act of Parliament was passed in 1840 wherein it was enacted that—

"Any person who shall produce or attempt to produce in any person by inoculation with variolous matter, or by wilful exposure to variolous matter, or to any manner, article, or thing impregnated with variolous matter, or wilfully by any other means whatsoever produce the disease of small-pox in any person in England, Wales, or Ireland, shall be liable to be proceeded against and convicted summarily before any two or more justices of the peace in petty sessions assembled, and for every such offence shall, upon conviction, be imprisoned in the common gaol or house of correction for any term not exceeding one month."

The Government did not at first intend to make the prohibition absolute, but Mr. Wakley insisted that the time had arrived to suppress the nuisance summarily, and that not a voice would be raised in opposition. Nor was there any opposition. Mr. Goulburn expressed some hesitation, but the House was practically unanimous.

Outside the House few regrets were expressed. Dr. George Gregory, physician of the Small-Pox Hospital at St. Pancras, was, however, a man of philosophic turn, and he did not see the old idol cast down unmoved.

"On 23rd July, 1840," he wrote, "the practice of inoculation, the introduction of which has conferred immortality on the name of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, which had been sanctioned by the College of Physicians, which had saved the lives of many kings, queens, and princes, and of thousands of their subjects, during the greater part of the preceding century, was declared illegal by the English Parliament, and all offenders were to be sent to prison, with a good chance of the treadmill. Such are the reverses of fortune to which all sublunate things are doomed."

Gregory was not blind to the extravagant claims made for vaccination, and evidently had a lurking conviction that all was not gain in the substitution of the new practice for the old, saying—

"Had not the discovery of Jenner interfered to interrupt its extension and improvement, inoculation would have continued to this day increasing yearly in popularity."

Yet was not inoculation abolished. Sometimes when we get the devil out at the door, he presently re-enters by the window; and thus while Parliament was making an end of inoculation in one form, it was reviving in another.

It is to be understood that Jenner's cow-pox, whatever it might be, was an uncommon and erratic disease, and its discovery and maintenance difficult. To provide a substitute, cows were from time to time inoculated with small-pox, and the resulting pusular virus was used instead of the genuine and infallible Jennerian specific. Lest one should be accused of false witness, let us refer to Dr. Seaton's Handbook of Vaccination. There we read—

"Mr. Ceely of Aylesbury in February, 1889, succeeded in inducing vaccine vesicles on two sturks by inoculation with variolous lymph, and in thus establishing lymph-stocks, which passed at once into extensive use, so that, in a few months, more than 2000 children had been vaccinated from them. In December, 1840, Mr. Badcock succeeded in variolating [small-poxing] a cow at Brighton, and deriving therefrom a stock of genuine vaccine lymph. In this manner he has raised stocks of vaccine lymph for use on no fewer than thirty-seven separate occasions. The lymph thus obtained by him is now largely employed; it has been supplied to many hundreds of practitioners, and very many thousands of children have been vaccinated with it. Mr. Ceely's experiments were repeated in America in 1852 by Dr. Adams of Waltham, and Dr. Putnam of Boston, who were able, it is said, to furnish the city and neighbourhood of Boston with all the vaccine matter used there since that period."

Again, Sir John Cordy Burrows, a surgeon, speaking as a magistrate, at Brighton on 5th February, 1876, observed—

"The public seem scarcely to understand what vaccination means. The vaccine lymph taken from a child is nothing more than what has passed from a small-pox patient through a cow. In 1856-58 I took an active part in inoculating seventeen cows with small-pox, producing in three cases vaccine lymph, and from these the world has been supplied."

Thus, as asserted, has inoculation been revived, and Jenner's specific set aside. When Dimsdale had an Empress to operate upon he tried to mollify the small-pox virus by passing it through...
children. Cows have now taken the place of children, and the virus in its passage from arm to arm may still further be reduced in virulence, when it does not take up fresh malignities such as syphilis; but it is inoculation with small-pox all the same.

ANTI-VACCINATION
IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.
NOTES OF A RECENT TOUR.
By WILLIAM TEBB.

CHAPTER I.—Incident on board the City of Berlin, Disease and Death Induced by Vaccination in Pennsylvania—All Vaccine Virus alike—Professor R. A. Gunn’s opinion of Vaccination—The New York Board of Health—How it is recruited—Vaccination Fees—Tyramical Form of Compulsory Vaccination—Dr. Constantine Herbig.

In visiting America it was not my intention to conduct an anti-vaccination crusade. I had not the physical strength, and my medical friends had cautioned me when leaving home against any exertion which would tend to exhaust the small reserve of nervous force left to me. At the same time, I desired to learn by inquiry on the spot how the question was regarded by medical men and by the public of the United States, and particularly by those who had given it special attention.

I took with me, as I generally do in travelling, a considerable number of publications relating to vaccination. Some of these I left on the tables in the saloon and ladies’ drawing-room on board the good steamer, the City of Berlin. I had talked with my fellow-passengers on a variety of subjects, but no mention had been made of vaccination. The sea-air, quiet, change of scene, and agreeable company had produced a favourable alteration in my health. I had been on board five or six days when a quaker lady from Pennsylvania, but residing in New York, accosted me with the question, “Are you the gentleman who is opposed to vaccination?” I said, “I am,” and then she replied, “Then I wish to shake hands with you,” and proceeded to relate the terrible results following the vaccination of her own children. Her eldest daughter, a well born child without spot or blemish, had been so fearfully poisoned by vaccination that the flesh dropped from her arm within a short time of the operation. She is now a woman, and through life has been afflicted with humours requiring surgical treatment, and her existence had been rendered miserable. Her second child broke out in suppurating sores after vaccination, when she was examined with the doctor, accusing him of using bad matter; adding, with tears in her eyes as she revived her painful experience, “I did not know then, as I know now, that all such matter is bad alike.” Another child, one of twins, had been killed outright by vaccination. I said, “Madam, how is it that after your first child had been so seriously injured, that you allowed the others to be vaccinated?” She replied, “Because I was compelled to do so according to the laws of the State of Pennsylvania.” A medical friend of hers, an enthusiastic vaccinator, inoculated one of his children with measles, believing it would have that disease in a milder form, but the experiment cost him his child’s life.

Shortly after my arrival in New York City, I had the pleasure of meeting Professor Robert A. Gunn, of the United States Medical College, who informed me, that in 1872 he was requested to prepare a paper on Small-Pox and Vaccination for the Medical Convention, which had led him to a thorough investigation of the question. The results of his inquiry he has published in a pamphlet entitled Vaccination: its Fallacies and Evils. He told me that he had had the misfortune in his practice to communicate syphilis by vaccination, and that he had come to the conclusion that whilst vaccination is a frequent cause of exciting serious and fatal diseases, no one is protected thereby from small-pox. He had endeavoured to obtain statistics relating to vaccination from the Board of Health, but the medical officers, for reasons known to themselves, persistently refused to furnish them. The majority of medical men throughout America accept vaccination without inquiry, and when pressed for facts, invariably cite English authorities. Many of the more enlightened physicians, however, according to Dr. Gunn, are opposed to vaccination, and if they practice it, do so reluctantly, and on the responsibility of those who require it.

Boards of Health make whatever regulations they think fit, and send round vaccination officers from house to house, and, with rare exceptions, old and young submit themselves to their lancets as to an ordinance of necessity. The New York Board receives, by way of remuneration, £1 from the City for each person vaccinated, of which the vaccinator receives one-half, or 2s. per head. Dr. Winterburn informed me that a smart public vaccinator in a densely populated quarter of New York would sometimes earn £25 a day, or £80 a week! In districts where a small-pox panic has been created, the vaccination officers frequently receive fees in addition to their official allowances. A high-
class medical practitioner is paid from $2 to $5 for each vaccination, and in times of epidemics large incomes are realised. There are in the United States 40,000 registered doctors, or twice as many as in Great Britain and Ireland, a large number of whom are half-educated and incapable of securing support and earning a livelihood. They are nevertheless not without friends, and manage by hook or crook to get billeted on the public purse as officers of Boards of Health and public vaccinators. Recently the English furor for sanitation has crossed the Atlantic, and these perfidious officials have not been slow to take advantage of the wind and to poison the public blood with renewed energy in the name of the public health.

The superintendents of the public schools are compelled to exclude all unvaccinated children; and if conscientious parents who object are too poor to provide their children with private tuition, this regulation consigns them to perpetual ignorance. This is a form of tyranny more mischievous than the English Vaccination Act.

Orthodox medical practitioners have informed me that they believe that if City Boards of Health, particularly in New York, kept records of the result of vaccination, they would show a startling amount of disease and death as the direct consequences of the practice. I have conversed with doctors of all the schools, and while the majority declare their faith in vaccination as a prophylactic against small-pox, they agree unanimously that diseases other than cow-pox are induced by the rite. Dr. Lewis de Wilder, a homeopathic physician of New York, whom I met at Saratoga, told me that vaccination was accepted by both homeopathic and allopathic schools without question or inquiry. He knew Dr. Garth Wilkinson of London, as an accomplished physiologist and man of letters; also Dr. Constantine Hering of Philadelphia, who holds one of the first positions in the world as a homeopathic physician; but he did not know that both were utterly opposed to vaccination. I gave him statistics from the Registrar-General’s Returns as to the results of compulsory vaccination in England, and referred him especially to the Parliamentary Return, No. 488, 1877, entitled Vaccination Mortality, over which such an ominous silence is maintained by English vaccinators. He said that he had no sort of doubt as to the dangers of vaccination. Some time ago he vaccinated a healthy little boy who died of convulsions a few days afterwards, and, he believed, in consequence of the operation. Nevertheless, he said, there was a general recognition of the value of vaccination among parents, and when a physician attended a mother during her confinement, he was expected to vaccinate the infant without extra charge. I expressed a hope that as he knew the high reputation of Dr. Garth Wilkinson and Dr. C. Hering he would look into the matter and see whether he could not occupy the same ground.

I had the pleasure of meeting the eminent and venerable Dr. Constantine Hering, a physician of fifty years standing, during my brief visit to Philadelphia. He kindly invited me to call on the following evening when he would furnish me with all the information in his power as to vaccination in Philadelphia, but unfortunately I had to leave in the morning for New York City. Dr. Hering is a pronounced anti-vaccinator, and regards compulsory vaccination as intolerable tyranny.

**VACCINATION FALLACIES.**

The history of vaccination discloses a succession of fallacies. Dr. Jenner began experimenting with “horse grease,” which he declared was the only true source of his “benign” matter. That idea is now universally designated a “fallacy.” Jenner afterwards used impure matter from cows, and sometimes from pigs. He inoculated his eldest son with swine-pock, and it hastened his death from consumption. Phipps, the first person Jenner vaccinated, is believed to have died from its effects.

Jenner asserted positively that a person once vaccinated, was “for ever after protected from the infection of small-pox.” This is also generally admitted to be a fallacy, seeing that above 80 per cent. of the patients at the small-pox hospitals have been vaccinated.

When it was evident that vaccination did not perfectly “protect” from small-pox, the next fallacy propounded was that the sufferers had the disease in a “milder” or “modified” form; therefore, when it even proved fatal, there was the satisfaction that the vaccinated patients died of small-pox in a modified form.

In Jenner’s time the fallacy was believed that an attack of small-pox never occurred more than once in a person’s life. Experience has disproved this. Individuals having corrupt constitutions have had to undergo this purifying process—for small-pox is not a “disease”—two or three times. As the majority of persons are not liable to small-pox, it is a fallacy to vaccinate
all alike. Medical men must be very ignorant of physiology if they cannot estimate a person's susceptibility to a blood eruption. When there is small-pox matter in the system, it is a dangerous fallacy to prevent its exit.

Another vaccination fallacy is, that its supposed "protection" is in proportion to the number of "marks." Who counts the marks on the patients? Interested persons; and consequently when the marks are obliterated by the disease, the partisans of the poisoning theory give their fallacy the benefit of the doubt, and generally register the patients as "unvaccinated."

The failure of vaccination as a protection, led to the newer fallacy of "re-vaccination." The "protection for life" theory having worn out, the process of vaccination must be renewed every few years, the oftener the better—for the doctor's pocket. It was confidently asserted for some time that no re-vaccinated person ever had small-pox. This fallacy has been disproved with fatal frequency.

It is a gross fallacy to base arguments upon figures compiled without regard to age, health, and other conditions. The law exempts sickly children from the operation. When these sickly ones succumb, they are said to die because they are not vaccinated. Can anything be more illogical and unfair?

Whether vaccination be good or evil, Dr. Jenner was not the first to practise it. Jenner made his first experiment on the 14th May, 1796. Twenty-two years before that date, vaccination from the cow was practised by a man named Benjamin Jesty, as is proved by the following inscription upon his tombstone in the churchyard, at Worth, in Dorsetshire:—

"Sacred to the memory of Benjamin Jesty, aged 79 years. He was an upright, honest man, particularly noted for having been the first person known that introduced cow-pox by inoculation, and who, from his great strength of mind, made the experiment from the cow upon his wife and two sons in the year 1774."

The record is silent as to whether Jesty's wife and two sons were better or worse for their vaccination. When Jenner petitioned Parliament for a national reward, Jesty's claim was mentioned; but he lacked friends at court.

The College of Physicians opposed vaccination on its introduction, and called Jenner a "quack"; but the endowment of the fallacy by the State made it fashionable, and the compulsory law has given the doctors a vested interest in the propagation of disease. We cannot therefore expect the doctors to take a leading part in exposing the vaccination fallacy, as is being done by medical men in the United States, where there is no compulsory law. Let the people of England agitate for the repeal of the Vaccination Acts, and then the fall of this monstrous fallacy will be speedy and complete.

HENRY PITMAN.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN, M.P.

At the conclusion of an address to his constituents at Newcastle-on-Tyne on 8th November, Mr. Cowen spoke as follows—

"My friend Mr. Procter has forwarded me a question, and anything Mr. Procter asks is entitled to respectful consideration. A more upright Liberal politician I do not know, and I am willing to give his question the fullest consideration. It is—Considering the admissions of very eminent advocates of vaccination that horrible diseases are transmitted by it, and knowing that thousands of vaccinated cases of small-pox have been treated in the small-pox hospitals in the last ten years, and that no improvement in the death-rate can be traced to vaccination, will you do everything in reason to prevent the further expenditure of public money upon vaccination, and support every bill which aims at the mitigation or repeal of the compulsory laws?—A man cannot have a definite opinion on all subjects, and my opinion about vaccination is in a state of solution. I have not gone into it with any detail. It is a question for experts and for medical men. My views on it are of no value. I only say, so far as I know—

I am not so well versed as Mr. Procter—my belief is that vaccination has, in its operation, tended to mitigate the severity and prevent the spread of small-pox. I may be wrong. But as to whether vaccination should be compulsory or not, I am not quite clear. I can quite realize the feeling with which the subject is discussed by some people. They have had healthy children seriously injured by it. Some, I know, trace the death of their children to it. And it is but natural that a man who thinks this has been the case should fight strongly against the practice. I confess I regard compulsion under such circumstances as a very harsh if not unjustifiable proceeding. I am entirely opposed to the system of cumulative penalties. We know men who have been called upon not only to pay one fine, but to pay a dozen fines. I have always supported Mr. Peter Taylor, Mr. Hopwood, and others in Parliament when they attempted to mitigate the severity of the opera-
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Professor Corfield

AND MR. WHEELER.

The following letters have been addressed to Professor Corfield, and no reader will be surprised at his silence. It is the way with these rabid vaccinators. Their words are full of defiance and insolence, but never one of them will face in fair fight a well-informed anti-vaccinator. Time will come when this attitude will have to be abandoned; meanwhile, secure in popular ignorance, it is easy to win some cheap applause by the delivery of great swelling words of vanity in glorification of Jenner. "Waving the flag" is a dodge as well understood on the scientific as on the political platform.

Darlington, 8th November, 1879.

To Dr. W. H. Corfield.

Sir,—On page 15 of your paper, entitled Sanitary Fallacies, which was read before the Croydon Congress, you "refer to the fallacies abroad in connection with small-pox and vaccination, and take special notice of the style of fallacious argument employed by those who try to persuade the people that vaccination is not a preventive of small-pox." You go on to say, "It is a style of argument well-known of old, and very powerful for mischief. Take the following for example—'The decrease in the mortality from small-pox in the latter part of the last century would have continued if vaccination had not been introduced, and would have been more marked than it has been.'"

The words you use in respect of this statement are—"The statement assumed to be true is the falsest of falsehoods."

As to the writer or speaker who used these words or where they are quoted from you do not say. Perhaps they are not mine, but I have often written something like them, and therefore I beg leave to demand of you that justification, which in the interest of truth, you will no doubt be as ready to give as I am to ask it.

Your address was delivered 23rd of October; in the London Chronicle of the 14th of the same month, in a letter of mine appeared these words—

"Dr. Farr is surely the best authority a pro-vaccinator need require, and in McCulloch's Statistical Account of the British Empire, is an account given by him of small-pox in the article, 'Vital Statistics, Epidemics.' But for inoculation no marked continuance of small-pox would have occurred, and even that agency
was on the decline when Jenner appeared with his 'discovery.' Dr Farr's words are, 'Small-pox attained its maximum mortality after inoculation was introduced. The annual deaths from small-pox were 2,328, 1760-79; in the next 20 years they declined to 1,740; this disease therefore, began to grow less fatal before vaccination was discovered; indicating together with the diminution of fever, the general improvement in health then taking place."

Before me lies M'Culloch, and in his pages is full statistical justification for these words of our greatest authority on Vital Statistics. These words I understand you to denounce. Your words were used where soberness and care are taken for granted; yet you declare that the words, "the decrease in the mortality from small-pox towards the latter end of the last century" is "The falsest of falsehoods."

No one can correct an impression before the people originally spoken to, so as to leave their minds unbiased, but if possible some amends should be made.

As to the special year you name, 1796, you must be aware that inoculation had much to answer for in its case, and that of others near it. This Dr. Jenner, Dr. Moore, Dr. Lettsom, and others of Jenner's supporters well knew and acknowledged. But the years noted were all known to Dr. Farr when he penned the words I have quoted. You are therefore clearly in error if, as I assume, he is correct.

ALEXANDER WHEELER.

Darlington, 16th November, 1879.

To Dr. W. H. Corfield.

Sirs,—I conclude, though you have not replied to mine of the 8th, it has been received by you; and that you prefer to treat it silently.

I regret this not for the sake of myself, but because science must seriously suffer by the unscientific and unkind action you have exhibited in the matter whereof I wrote.

I now proceed to remark upon another statement made by you at Croydon. You say—

"We are told that, in spite of sanitary improvements, the death-rate remains the same, without considering that the mortality of the City of London was at the rate of 80 per 1000 in the latter half of the 17th century, and 50 in the 18th against 24 in the present day."—Farr (Sanitary Fallacies, p. 17.)

Now, although this is not strictly connected with vaccination on page 17 of your tract, yet it immediately follows it, and it is an argument I have often used myself in combating vaccination. You are perfectly aware, of course, that as regards the periods quoted by you, Dr Farr prefaces his statements with a qualification. This qualification you entirely ignore; yet your hearers would need reminding of it. Without this qualification, no scientific man should use the words you use, for they are most misleading. Dr. Farr says of the tables quoted by you—"The first and most difficult step here was to determine the absolute rate of mortality in the six periods." This the "most difficult" step is in the tract ignored; it is positively declared that the mortality was so; while no one can positively state what it was; and we can only guess it. The estimate of Dr. Farr is only an estimate. Dr. Greenhow's are estimates, in which the data for the calculation are most difficult to ascertain. Christenings and burials cannot give correct data for birth and death-rates, nor for population. Great numbers of births were not included in the christenings; many and many more would be missed in the christenings than the burials. This would give a declining population on paper, when in reality the population might be growing. Again, we know something of the fearful state of London in those days—a condition which introduced the plague. Yet not a word of this inspires; nor is it pointed out that the heavy mortalities you quote are made, by using London for the plague periods, and ignoring the condition of the country generally.

If vaccination has been of any use in reducing the death-rate, it must have reduced it since 1888. For in 1888 no compulsion had been enacted; and no one can say that many were vaccinated; and yet, by our Registrar-General's Returns, you cannot show any improvement as resulting from vaccination. The death-rate is practically the same since that date. Nor do you show, as you should do, that Dr. Farr's table, which gives 50 and 80 per 1000 for 17th century, gives "29-20 for 1801-10" and "32-00 for 1881-85," showing an increase in the latter years.

Science will advance in spite of professors. But its advocates prevent its acceptance and triumph, when, instead of unprejudiced facts, they give versions of them to suit the dominant and often false theories of their day.

ALEXANDER WHEELER.

To the Electors of Malton.—Remember that an M.P. who cannot discriminate between law and a travestie of law is a public danger as great as a pestilence.—W. GIBSON WARD.
THE VACCINATION INQUISITION.

AMERICAN PRESS.

American editors are either much less careful than English of the morals of their readers, or have more confidence in their ability to take care of themselves. An English editor is usually so jealous for the reputation of vaccination that he will not suffer anything to be said against it, whilst statements in its favour, however absurd, are published and commended to the attention of anti-vaccinating fools and fanatics. As an instance of the greater liberality of the American press, we may mention that the report of the anti-vaccination meeting held in New York, at which Mr. Tebb was present, has been reproduced at length by many newspapers, north and south, and with editorial comments of the most impartial character.

THE CALF-LYMPHERS.

The Calf-Lymphers are intent on business. Dr. Warlomont, Dr. Jansens, the Chief of the Bureau Hygiénique of the city of Brussels, and Dr. Pietra Santa, of Paris, are coming over to explain to a committee of the British Medical Association the working of the bureaux of animal vaccination in Belgium, Holland, France, and Italy; and Dr. Cameron, M.P. for Glasgow, will, at the same time, submit to the meeting the bill which was so dexterously edged out of Parliament last session.

Commenting on this news the Pall Mall Gazette observes—

"It is satisfactory to learn that a further effort is to be made to put vaccination from the calf, and not from human beings, at the disposal of all who prefer to go to the fountain-head. We pointed out when Sir Thomas Watson's article on the subject appeared that such an option is indispensable to the permanent retention of compulsory vaccination. When a physician of such authority says that, though he is an ardent advocate of compulsory vaccination, he cannot deny that the worst of infections may be imparted by lymph taken from human subjects, the question is decided. You may compel a parent to protect his child against small-pox for the sake of the community, but you cannot in the long run compel a parent to expose his child to the risk of worse disease for the sake of the community. Vaccination direct from the calf puts an end to all danger upon this head, and thus does away with the one ground on which it is possible to found a reasonable opposition to the Vaccination Acts. Of course this change would have no influence on the fanatical opposi-

nents of the present law. But the danger really lies not in the fanatical opponents, but in those who get a firm hold of the one rational element in the resistance, and who until that is disposed of refuse to listen to any further argument."

The fanatical opponents of vaccination are well able to take care of themselves. Meanwhile the Calf-Lymphers and their friends are reckoning without their host. At present they appear to be having their own way in the newspapers, but the existing interests in vaccination, whenever seriously threatened, will show fight, and the Calf-Lymphers will find the contest far from a light one with victory at its close. Anyhow, so that the discussion of vaccination is raised, we are content; for if once effectually raised, the issue is certain.

HOW SMALL-POX WAS TREATED.

In 1640 the hot or sweating system of treating fevers had attained its acme. We have a splendid picture of this practice in the writings of Diemerbroeck, a Dutch physician and professor. "Keep the patient," says he, "in a chamber close shut. If it be winter, let the air be corrected by large fires. Take care that no cold gets to the patient's bed. Cover him over with blankets. Red blankets have always been preferred, not that the colour is material, but because, in the time of our ancestors, all the best, thickest, and warmest blankets, were dyed red. Never shift the patient's linen till after the fourteenth day, for fear of striking in the pock, to the irrecoverable ruin of the patient. Far better is it to let the patient bear with the stench, than to let him change his linen, and thus be the cause of his own death. Nevertheless, if a change be absolutely necessary, be sure that he puts on the foul linen that he put off before he fell sick, and, above all things, take care that this supply of semi-clean linen be well warmed. Sudorific expulsives are, in the meantime, to be given plentifully, such as treacle, pears, and saffron."

VACCINATION FEES IN IRELAND.—The Act of Parliament, by which the fee for a successful vaccination has been increased from one shilling to double that amount, has, as was expected, created considerable dissatisfaction among numerous Boards of Guardians in Ireland. Recently at Sligo, Galway, and Waterford, the Guardians have shown their dislike of the increased fee, and have proposed to reduce the salaries of their dispensary medical officers in proportion.—British Medical Journal, 20th September.
AN ANSWER REQUIRED.

In the City Press W. T. writes—

"Your correspondent, Mr. W. F. Jebb, Clerk to the Metropolitan Asylum Board, furnishes some startling statistics, which cannot fail to arrest the attention of those who are interested in the well-being of society. He states the mortality of unvaccinated patients at the various Metropolitan Hospitals in the last small-pox epidemic to be 44 4 per cent! Now, setting the vexed question of vaccination aside, I find that Ree's Cyclopaedia quotes the mortality of hospital small-pox cases in 1779, at 18 0 per cent; and Jurin, a recognised authority, gives his per centage in 1728 at 16 6. Both these records were prior to Jenner's discovery, when all were alike unvaccinated; and the fact that the small-pox mortality is now, according to this latest return, with all the advantages of improved sanitary appliances, with better drainage and ventilation, nearly three times as great as it was a century ago is no less than astounding, and calls for searching inquiry. Has the medical treatment of small-pox retrograded, or has Mr. Jebb, in order to uphold a popular medical theory, overstated his case?"

SIR THOMAS WATSON.

In the Pall Mall Gazette of 8th November appeared the following communication—

"Several letters have lately appeared in the Times newspaper respecting what is called animal vaccination. In one of the numbers of the Nineteenth Century vaccination on and from the calf was earnestly advocated by me as carrying with it the potential extinction of the only valid objection that can be alleged against vaccination in general, and justifying, therefore, the needful compulsion of vaccination by force of law. The anti-vaccination party have attempted to enrol me among the writers who have adopted their views. I ask leave, therefore, to inform you and your readers that my sole object has been, and is, to prove that by vaccination, properly and universally effected, the hideous, disfiguring, dangerous, and, in a great majority of cases, fatal distemper small-pox may with certainty be extirpated from this country; I might say from this world."

"THOMAS WATSON, M.D.

"16 Henrietta Street, W., Nov. 4."

Sir Thomas is misinformed. Anti-vaccinators everywhere know him for a zealous calf-lympher, and nowhere gave him credit for greater good sense. In asserting the safety of calf-lymph, and the danger of syphilis lurking in the miscellaneous stuffs now used for public vaccination, Sir Thomas thus expressed himself in the Nineteenth Century—

"I can readily sympathise with, and even applaud, a father who, with the presumed dread and misgiving in his mind, is willing to submit to multiplied judicial penalties rather than expose his child to the risk of an infection so ghastly."

This passage has been used over and over again for their justification by persecuted anti-vaccinators, and they will continue to use it until calf-lymph has prevailed over other forms of pollution.

As for Sir Thomas's prophecy, we shall mercifully overlook it. It is a mere repetition of Jenner's soothing, which has been disproved so widely and so thoroughly, that were Sir Thomas a younger man, we might employ an emphatic phrase to characterize it.

AN IRISH ANTI-VACCINATOR.—At the Kinseal Petty Sessions on 16th November, Mr. John Savage, sheriff's officer, and the hero of sixteen vaccination prosecutions, was summoned again on account of his daughter, Helena. He produced a certificate from Dr. Vickery that she was unfit for vaccination, over which the Bench was dubious, but made an order for vaccination within nine weeks, contingent on the production of another certificate that she was still unfit. Dr. Dorman, the vaccination officer, has been paid £6 on account of the Savage prosecutions out of the poor-rate.

STEREOTYPED FABLES.—The managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District have issued a statement for the renewed confusion of anti-vaccinators. It seems that since the autumn of 1876 there have been 15,171 small-pox patients received into the Hospitals of the Board, of whom 11,412 were vaccinated and 3,759 unvaccinated. 2,677 died, of whom 1,006 were vaccinated and 1,669 unvaccinated. It is needless to say that no one entered the Hospitals who had been "efficiently vaccinated and successfully re-vaccinated": if any one had, why then he could not have been efficiently vaccinated and successfuely re-vaccinated. Again, the nurses and servants connected with the Hospitals enjoyed complete immunity from infection; a few did not, but by some means or other they had escaped re-vaccination. The fables are artless but sufficient for a credulous public.
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PROFESSOR NEWMAN ON BINGLEY JUSTICE.

Mr. W. Ferrand appears to be a magistrate of most arbitrary temper. Sitting on the Bingley bench on 29th October, he sentenced Levi Phillips, Jonathan Wood, Edward Johnson, Brown Lee, and Benjamin Johnson to fines of 20s. and costs, or fourteen days imprisonment, and would not hear a word in their defence. In one case he added "with hard labour," but the clerk pointed out that such extra malice was beyond his discretion. Edward and Benjamin Johnson and Brown Lee elected to go to prison rather than pay their fines; and on Brown Lee's release on 11th Nov. he was met at Bingley station by a torchlight procession, and conducted in triumph in a carriage to the Oddfellows' Hall where an enthusiastic anti-vaccination meeting was held. The following letter from Professor Newman was read—

"Weston-super-Mare, "November 7, 1879.

"To Mr. George Kidson,—Sir,—You send me a copy of the Keighley Herald of October 31, 1879, with a column marked, and you desire from me some comments on the conduct of the magistrates towards persons who refuse to allow their infants to be vaccinated. Of course I am forced to assume the newspaper report to be correct. Any remarks of mine may be superfluous or injurious if I proceed on an erroneous representation of the magistrates' conduct. But if the representations are correct as matter of fact, I lift up my voice as an Englishman in vehement indignation. Not in surprise, for other magistrates elsewhere, alas! I am equally unjust, equally stupid, equally bent on holding up the Bench to reprobation and contempt. One clause of the Act most distinctly gives to the magistrates discretionary power thereunder. The magistrates are told what they may do, and what they must do. They are allowed, even after they have summoned a father and he has appeared before them, to dismiss the case if there be reasonable excuse. It is for them to judge what is reasonable, and they cannot do so without having the parent's reasons. The chairman at the Bingley petty sessions hectors against and browbeats honest men, and says he sits only to enforce the law when he is in fact refusing to do what the law implies, viz., to hear the men whom he has evidently made up his mind to punish. He even threatens hard labour, and has to be reminded by the clerk that he is uttering an illegal threat. Men in a little brief power are free to scold and threaten; and we of the commonalty must be silent in court. But we will not be silent out of court. Lord Clarendon, in his history of the uprising of the nation against Charles I. (which cost that king his head), lays stress on the great mischief done by the judges declaring in the matter of ship money that to be lawful which all men of common sense knew to be unlawful. I and you can understand a paragraph of an Act of Parliament (when it happens to be good English) as well as a magistrate or his clerk; and we know that the Act does not compel a magistrate to be haughty, overbearing, unreasonable, unrighteous, and tyrannical, as the report of the Keighley Herald represents Mr. W. Ferrand to be, but only permits him to act, and approves of his listening to reason. The magistrates, by their violent and fanatical use of power, will damage their whole class irretrievably. I account it execrable tyranny if a magistrate do not regard it as a reasonable excuse to give (against the filthy practice falsely called vaccination) that the parent has already had one child killed by, or made permanently ill by, or has seen other children so damaged, ruined, or killed. The doctors infamously, for some twenty years, denied what they now confess, that their vile process of arm-to-arm mixing of blood may and does communicate disease. Their error and false confidence misled Parliament. The magistrates are bound to know this, and in all common sense and humanity (if they have any spark of either) ought to sympathise with parents who are bound before God in the court of conscience to shield their infants, and they ought rather to resign their office as magistrates if cruelty and injustice were commanded. The least we can demand of them is to use to the utmost their legal power of leaving faithful parents unmolested. I beg to congratulate the faithful parents on their sturdy refusal to damage their children's health in deference to a stupid and usurping law.

"F. W. Newman."

"I should certainly vote for the repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Laws."—Thomas Burt, M.P.

Miss Chandos Leigh Hunt gave a lecture on Vaccination at Walworth on 18th November, and dwelt strongly on the physiological ignorance of the young medical men who acted as public vaccinators. The Rev. H. Pickering, who occupied the chair, condemned compulsory vaccination as an unwarrantable interference between parents and children.
Calf Lymphing in Amsterdam.

Dr. Charles R. Drysdale in the Times of 23rd October wrote—

"When in Amsterdam in September I had the advantage of visiting the general hospital at the hour when vaccination from the calf was going on. The room was full of mothers, with their infants ready to be vaccinated direct from the calf, which reclin'd comfortably on a table, while the physician performed the little operation of transferring lymph from the animal direct to the arm of the infant. I was informed [untruly, we believe] that three-fourths of all the vaccinations in Amsterdam are now performed direct from the calf in this way.

"Dr. Warlomont of Brussels informed me that he intends coming to London this winter to endeavour to make our public authorities take up animal vaccination; and I submit that they ought to do so—

"1.—Because in times when small-pox is epidemic, a quite unlimited supply of calf lymph can be obtained in about five days, while human lymph at such times is often quite insufficient."

Dr. Warlomont has a different story to tell as to the ease with which a supply of calf lymph can be procured; and Dr. Wyld and Dr. Wilson likewise.

"2.—Because when we (as I believe we have a right to do) force parents to vaccinate their children, we ought to give them the choice between human and animal vaccine. Vaccination being the greatest triumph of hygienic science, should be made as popular as possible."

Vaccination the greatest triumph of hygienic science! Such extravagance leads one to suppose that Dr. Drysdale writes in the spirit of Jonathan Wild's advice, "When you're at it, go it."

MR. MANSFIELD

AND THE ST. PANCRAS GUARDIANS.

Mr. Mansfield, being anxious to ascertain the reason which determined the St. Pancras Guardians to desist from his prosecution, applied to the Local Government Board for copies of the letters addressed to the Guardians. The letters contain nothing new, are warily written, and merely re-affirm the policy set forth in the well-known instructions to the Evesham Guardians on 17th September, 1875—

"The Board are prepared to admit that, when in a particular case repeated prosecutions have failed in their object, it becomes necessary to carefully consider the question whether the

continuance of a fruitless contest with the parent may not have a tendency to produce mischievous results, by exciting sympathy with the person prosecuted, and thus creating a more extended opposition to the law."

There was no doubt that Mr. Mansfield's case was covered by this instruction, and the Guardians had the good sense to accept the advice.

HATRED OF THE LIGHT.

Army Medical Department Library,
Royal Victoria Hospital, Netley,
Southampton, 24th November, 1879.

Sir,—A work entitled Vaccination Tracts has been received from you. I am desired by the Library Committee to return it.—Yours truly,

W. J. Martin, Secretary.

To Mr. Wm. Young,
8 Neeld Terrace, Harrow Road, W.

AN INSTRUCTIVE ADMISSION.—In the circular of the Association for the Supply of Pure Vaccine Lymph, established at 8 Hemmings Row, Charing Cross, we read—"When our office was opened in 1877, duly qualified medical gentlemen of the greatest experience and standing as public vaccinators were alone invited to supply the Association with the very best Vaccine-Lymph they could possibly procure. A microscopical examination of the samples sent in reply showed that no less than 88½ per cent. of the whole was unfit for use. This must prove beyond a doubt that the use of a large percentage of the Vaccine-Lymph, which under ordinary circumstances is supplied to the medical profession, may be attended by very grave consequences."

A LOVER OF FEES.—In the Lancet of 22nd November, appears this note—"Allow me to suggest the formation of a Public Vaccinators' Association for the purpose of the issue of circulars to counteract the poison so actively disseminated by the Anti-Vaccinators; the obtaining of the Government award for all cases of primary vaccination instead of those only under six months of age, the compulsion of re-vaccination, etc.—William Woodward, M.D.

Public Vaccinator to the Worcester Union."

In the Lancet of October 34th An English Surgeon wishes to know "if vaccination has ever been performed by hypodermic injection, and whether such a method would be superior to the ordinary one."
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.
CHAPTER X.

AS TO THE PREVALENCE OF SMALL-POX IN THE 18TH CENTURY.

The exact truth as to the prevalence of small-pox in the 18th Century is not attainable; vital statistics were undeveloped; and in the absence of precision the imaginative novelist, M.D.'s and M.P.'s shut their eyes, tilt their noses skyward, and prophesy concerning the frightful ravages, and the salvation wrought by the revered and immortal Jenner. Any extravagance, as to the ravages, or as to the salvation, is accepted as laudable zeal for humanity. "Decimation" is a favourite word in this connection without any sense of its definite meaning. "What family before 1800 ever escaped decimation from small-pox?" asks Dr. Granville. "Small-pox decimated Chavasse; it ravaged like a plague, whilst inoculation wild-fire; it was the greatest cause of our increasing population." In the same temper, Lord Chief Justice Cockburn described an unvaccinated infant as "centre of contagion;" and as the folly of the electors of Marylebone, that "A person not vaccinated is like a flaming fire-brand among the people." Thus the infants of last century were "flaming fire-brands;" the adults were "decimated" with small-pox diffused like wild-fire by inoculation. What a picture of 18th Century England painted by Rant and illuminated by Delirium!

The tendency of excess one side is to provoke to excess on the other, but the extravagance of these popular fables ought to put us in love with honesty matter-of-fact—wherein indeed is the true extreme to these frantic inventions. What was the extent of small-pox in England last century? is the question. With accuracy we do not know. The common estimates (when not evolved from inner consciousness) are based upon the London bills of mortality, and when these bills are scrutinised we find nothing to justify the opinion that the community was harassed and devastated by small-pox over other ailments. In the first place we have to remark, that the exact population of the metropolis was unknown. Some say it was 500,000 in 1701, and others 700,000. In 1751 it was generally reckoned at 750,000, and in 1801 it was said to be 358,863. Then we have to consider that the increase, whatever it might be, is only partially within the bills of mortality; for the rising quarters of St. Pancras and Marylebone were outside the boundary. In presence of these uncertain elements, it would be unwise to argue too confidently from the data of these bills; yet, such as they are, we have nothing else to appeal to. The variations of mortality from year to year were of wide irregularity; and whatever influence small-pox might have had, it does not appear to have had much in magnifying the annual totals. Let us take a dozen years when small-pox was heaviest from the last seventy years of the century, and observe its relation to the entire mortality, and to that from fevers—
Again, let us take twelve years from the same period when the death-rate from small-pox was at its lowest. Here they are—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burials from all Diseases</th>
<th>From Small Pox</th>
<th>From Fevers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>27,581</td>
<td>3014</td>
<td>3861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>38,011</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>4063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>38,157</td>
<td>3326</td>
<td>4187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>26,616</td>
<td>2925</td>
<td>4458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>20,485</td>
<td>3398</td>
<td>2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>21,313</td>
<td>3296</td>
<td>2664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>26,325</td>
<td>2743</td>
<td>3742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>36,148</td>
<td>3582</td>
<td>3414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>33,689</td>
<td>3028</td>
<td>3536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>26,058</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>3207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>19,298</td>
<td>3548</td>
<td>1547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

296,021 38,827 38,936

We thus see that in twelve years when the death-rate from small-pox was highest, as many died of fevers as of small-pox; and in twelve years when the death-rate from small-pox was lowest there died three as many of fevers as of small-pox. Again, we have to remark, that, on an average of all the years, small-pox was accountable for something less than a tenth of the total mortality. Also we have to note, that the mortality from small-pox was in great part infant mortality, and that there is reason to believe that in numerous cases measles was confounded with small-pox. The infant mortality of London in last century was prodigious. Rarely a year passed in which a fourth of the deaths was not set down to Convulsions—that is, to babies killed by improper feeding. In 1772 (the worst small-pox year of the century) when 8,992 died, there were, 6,605 ascribed to convulsions, the total mortality being 26,035.

Now we have no wish to minimise the London small-pox of last century, nor even to set 1797, when 522 died, against 1796, when 8548 died. We yield to none in detestation of small-pox as a preventible and therefore disgraceful affliction. Let so much pass for granted; but do not let us in any access of sanitary fury lose alike eyes and reason and raving maniacs. If small-pox was bad, fevers were worse, and as both had a common origin, why should we make a wanton and unscientific distinction between them?

That small-pox should have been constantly present in London throughout last century was in nowise surprising. The citizens lived in a manner to invite and maintain fevers. We shall refer to their food and drink presently, and would now call attention to the fact that they were a stay-at-home generation almost beyond present-day belief. Cowper did not violate credibility when he sang—

"John Gilpin's spouse said to her dear,  
'Though wedded we have been  
These two ten tedious years, yet we  
No holiday have seen.'"

They had no ready means of locomotion, and indeed did not think of fresh air and exercise. An apprentice or maid from the country entered London and was there immersed as in a prison. We know how the lower orders in our own time huddle together like pigs, unless restrained by lodging-house law, but middle-class Londoners a century ago utilised their apartments, with more decency perhaps, but with equal ignorance of the virtue of free oxygen. They were a densely compacted community, and at night the streets and lanes of the city were almost as thickly tenanted as a man-of-war, but without benefit of sea-air. A Quaker told me that he served his apprenticeship to a grocer in Cheapside between 1786 and 1793, that the shop was opened at seven in the morning and closed at ten at night, that he slept under the counter, that his abatements were limited to his countenance, and that he never went out except to meeting on First Days; adding, that he had no sense of being hardly dealt with; it was the custom of the time, and he was as his fellows. Memoirs of the 18th Century prove that he spoke the simple truth. Bishop Wilson of Calcutta records that he served in the house of a silk merchant in Milk Street from 1792 to 1797, that he was occupied from six or seven in the morning till eight at night; that there was supper at 8.30 followed by prayers, and that all went to bed at ten. An apprentice in the same house said that he never put on his hat for weeks together, and that more than three years elapsed before his first holiday was granted. William Cobbett in 1788 got into a lawyer's office in Gray's Inn where he relates, "I worked like a galley-slave from five in the morning till eight or nine at night, and sometimes all night long. I never quitted this gloomy recess except on Sundays when I usually
A course was pursued with other fevers, and the
effluvia of the sick-room was overpowering.
Take this instance from Jenner's own house-
hold. His nephew, Henry, and a maid-servant,
were seized with typhus, and Jenner writes—
"The stench from the poor girl is so great as
to fill the house with putrid vapour; and I shall
remove Henry this morning, by means of a
sedan chair, to an adjacent cottage."  *

Indeed, the cleanliness and ventilation we
consider so salutary were sedulously avoided.
Cold air was accounted specially pernicious, and
occasionally when the poor, afflicted with small-
pox, were exposed to the weather, wonder was
expressed that recovery instead of death was
the issue. It is related in Hutchinson's History
of Dorset that Blandford was burnt down in
1791, and several patients in small-pox were
lain under the arches of the bridge as a place
of refuge, and, to the general surprise, all got
well, although many had died in their beds
before the fire. John Birch, a London surgeon
of high repute, writing in 1814, sums up the case
for us on this head in saying—
"I consider the natural small-pox a mild
disease, and only rendered malignant by mis-
takes in nursing, in diet, and in medicine, and
by want of cleanliness, which last is the fomies
of hospital fevers, and all camp and contagious
disorders.
"

It would hardly be too bold to say, that the
fatal treatment of this disease, for two centuries,
by warming the chamber, and by stimulating
and heating cordials, was the cause of two-thirds
of the mortality which ensued."  *

We now come to an interesting question. If
the reader refers to the list of twelve years of
greatest small-pox, and to the list of twelve years
of least small-pox in London, it will be observed
that the years of least small-pox predominate in
the last quarter of the century, and this in spite
of the diffusion of the disease by inoculation.
The inoculators when charged with increasing
small-pox appealed to the London bills of
mortality. Let us, they said, take the last
ninety years of the century, and we shall find
that there died in London of small-pox in the
thirty years—

From 1711 to 1740 inclusive 65,883
1741 to 1770 68,808
1771 to 1800 57,268

Here we see, that the number of deaths was
greater in the first thirty years by 2075 than in
the second thirty years during which inoculation
had acquired some stability, and greater by 8115
than in the last thirty years, during which in-
oculation was the established practice of most
prudent families. We are therefore unjustly
accused. These figures leave no doubt that
small-pox is decreasing, and we claim that the
decrease is due to our practice.

The decrease was certain, but we cannot allow
that it was due to inoculation; on the contrary
we assume that the decrease would have been
greater but for the culture of the disease by
the inoculators. The fact is extremely distress-
ing to the more rabid vaccinators, and Dr. Cor-
field tries to curse it out of existence as "the
falsest of falsehoods," but there it abides. It
is hard for those who represent Jenner as the
saviour of mankind from small-pox to have it
shown that Londoners, at least, were in process
of salvation before his intervention; but facts,
alsi are cruelly unkind to theorists, sentimen-
talists, and quacks of all sorts. In the words of
Dr. Farr—
"Small pox attained its maximum mortality
after inoculation was introduced. The annual
deaths from small-pox from 1780 to 1779 were
on an average—

2,828.

In the next twenty years, 1780 to 1799 they
declined to—

1740.

The disease, therefore, began to grow less fatal
before vaccination was discovered; indicating,
together with the diminution of fevers, the
general improvement of health then taking
place."  †

The decrease of small-pox towards the close of
the century, says Dr. Farr, was due to "the
general improvement of health then taking
place;" but to what was that improvement due?
No marked improvement had been effected in
the sanitary arrangements of London—why then
this change for the better? The answer is, that
a great alteration was in progress in the popular
diet.

Dr. George Cheyne, in his famous Essay of
Health and Long Life, published in 1724, says—
"There is no chronic distemper whatever
more universal, more obstinate, and more fatal
in Britain, than the Scurvey taken in its general
extent."

* Dr. Adams in Medical Journal, 1810, p. 81. Dr. Gregory
in his treatise on Brucosis Fevers, 1843, cites and endorse
this argument.
† An Appeal to the Public on Vaccination. By John Birch.
‡ Article, "Vital Statistics: Epidemics" in McCallum's 4th
Statistical Account of the British Empire.
And more than fifty years afterwards, in 1788, we have Dr. Buchan bearing similar testimony—

"The disease most common to this country is the Scurvy. One finds a dash of it in almost every family, and in some the taint is very deep."

It is scarcely worth while citing authority for what was so generally known and confessed; but in this question of small-pox and vaccination we have to deal with many who appear to be destitute of any historic sense; who argue as if what Englishmen are to-day, they always were; and contend that as there was more small-pox in London before Jenner than since Jenner, therefore Jenner must be the cause of the diminution. It is necessary to condescend to such feeble folk.

The cause of the general scorbatic habit of the people was widely recognised by medical men, and Buchan merely repeated their common opinion in saying—

"A disease so general must have a general cause, and there is none so obvious as the great quantity of animal food devoured by the natives of this island. As a proof that Scurvy arises from this cause, we are in possession of no remedy for that disease equal to the free use of vegetables."

Cheyne said much the same at the earlier date. He complained that the upper classes gorged themselves with animal food, and slaked their thirst with wine, "which is now, 1724, become common as water, and the better sort scarce ever dilute their food with any other liquor." Beer replaced wine among the middle and lower orders. In the words of Buchan—

"The English labourer lives chiefly on bread, which being accompanied with other dry, and then salt, food, fires his blood and excites an unendurable thirst, so that his perpetual cry is for drink."

He adds—

"If men will live on dry bread, poor cheese, salt butter, broiled bacon, and such like parching food, they will find their way to the alehouse— the bane of the lower orders, and the source of half the beggary in the nation."

Were we to say that the diet of the English for the greater part of last century consisted of bread, beef, and beer, we should not go far wrong. The London bread was then, as now, poor stuff; "spoiled," says Buchan, "to please the eye, artificially whitened, yet what most prefer, and the poorer sort will eat no other." Whenever it could be obtained, beer was the beverage that went with bread, and was drunk by young and old. Salt beef and mutton, bacon, salt fish, and butchers' offal completed the dietary of the multitude. The feeding of the poor in hard seasons exercised the beneficent severely, for the baker's bill often went far to exhaust the working-man's earnings.

It was easy to recommend the rich to get rid of their scurvy by a resort to vegetable food, but to the poor with their obstinate prejudices, shiftlessness, and ignorance, such a recommendation was a sort of mockery. Deliverance, however, came in a form recommended by pleasantness and economy, namely, in the potato. It is true the tuber had been known long before, but not as an article of free and ordinary consumption. Towards the middle of the century it was discovered that potatoes could be grown cheaply in large quantities, and supply and demand developed together. Women and children especially rejoiced in the new food, whilst the benevolent exulted in the liberal accession to the poor man's fare. It became a point of duty with Lord and Lady Bountiful to recommend the culture and eating of potatoes everywhere; and to see how far the substitution of potatoes for bread had extended early in the nineteen century, we need only refer to the pages of Cobbett, who denounced the change with unabated virulence as a degradation of humanity. Certainly potatoes are inferior to bread in nutritive value, but in food we look for more than mere nourishment; and the general use of the potato went far to fortify and ameliorate the blood of the English people.

Nor was the change in the people's diet limited to the introduction of the potato: with it came tea. Of course we know that tea was drunk in England long ere George III. was King, but it was in his days that tea came into use among the multitude. Here again we may refer to Buchan, who was strongly opposed to the innovation. He wrote—

"It is said the inhabitants of Great Britain consume more tea than all the other nations of Europe together. The higher ranks use tea as a luxury, while the lower orders make a diet of it. The lowest woman in England must have her tea, and the children generally share it with her. The mischiefs occasioned by tea arise chiefly from its being substituted for solid food, and had I time to spare, I think it could not be better employed than in writing against the destructive drug. Its use will induce a total
change in the constitutions of the people of this country. Indeed, it has gone a great way towards effecting that evil already."

What Buchan had not time to do, Cobbett subsequently did, and some of his most racy patches of vituperation were applied to tea and tea-drinkers. In Bacon, Bread and Beer, according to Cobbett, consisted the strength of the English working-man, whilst tea and potatoes were his utter abomination.

To this partial substitution of potatoes and tea for salted animal food and malt liquor, we may justly attribute the reduction of the scrobutic habit of the people, and that improvement of health which were coincident with the close of last century and were continued into the present. What every student of vital statistics has to remember is, that conditions have to be identical to yield identical results. The lives of the majority of the English people last century, and notably so in London, were hard, mean and sordid to a degree which in these times might be thought incredible. Their sanitary conditions we have indicated, and would now enforce the observation, that they were ill fed and poorly fed; consequently their diseases were malignant, and small-pox not uncommonly scarred deeply its scrobutic victims. Wherefore to run a parallel between the Londoners of the 18th Century and the English of the 19th in the matter of small-pox, and to ascribe any difference between them to Jenner's specific, is to display ignorance that is contemptible, or craft audacious and unscrupulous.

Having cleared our way so far, we shall now proceed to deal with that great and good man, Edward Jenner, the immortal benefactor of mankind.

---

ANTI-VACCINATION
IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.
NOTES OF A RECENT TOUR.

By William Tebb.

CHAPTER III.—Anti-Vaccination in Montreal.—Dr. J. E. Codere's Experience—Vaccination the Propagator of Small Pox—The French and English Canadian Press—A Pro-Vaccinating Mayor and Compulsory Legislation—Determined and Successful Resistance by the People—Visit to the Hotel Dieu—An Anti-Vaccination Nun—Mr. H. C. St. Pierre's Prosecution—Dr. Codere's Letter.

When in Montreal I had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of Dr. J. Emery Codere, a physician of high standing and the leader of the Anti-Vaccination party in Canada. Dr. Codere belongs to the orthodox school of medicine; he has been connected with the Hotel Dieu of Montreal for thirty years, and is professor of Materia Medica in the Victoria University of Montreal. Being a close observer of the results of various methods of treatment and practice, he early saw the mischiefs arising out of Vaccination. On one occasion he vaccinated seven children with the same virus: six died, one of them being his own child. This induced further inquiry, and after most careful investigation he discovered that not only was the Jennerian rite attended in scores and hundreds of cases with most serious consequences, inducing horrible diseases, but he found that, instead of preventing small-pox, vaccination was the means of rendering the person vaccinated more susceptible to it, and that, in short, it is the propagator of the pest it is supposed to avert. Several cases of abscesses and gangrenous eruptions produced by vaccination, which came under his observation at the Hotel Dieu and elsewhere, he had photographed, coloured, and published. His colleagues remonstrated with him over this unprofessional mode of procedure, and accused him of bringing a sanitary measure into reproach. In 1872 he read a paper on Vaccination before the Medical Society of Montreal at three successive meetings, wherein he described fully his investigations and conclusions. The paper was published as a pamphlet, and has been the means of exciting attention to the question throughout Canada.

Dr. Codere's professional practice has suffered in consequence of his position as anti-vaccinator, and he has been severely censured in the Montreal press for his heresy. The French portion of the Montreal newspapers, to their honour be it said, have freely opened their columns to vaccinators and anti-vaccinators, and the opposition to Vaccination among the French Canadians, under this enlightened policy, has increased year by year. The English newspapers, on the contrary, though boasting of greater freedom, have given the anti-vaccinators only a very reluctant and occasional hearing; and some organs, imitating the one-sided partiality of the leading journals in England, have persistently refused to insert anything condemnatory of the popular superstition. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that while the reading portion of the French citizens have become strong anti-vaccinators, the English, Irish, and Scotch Canadians are ignorant of the subject, and take but little interest in it. Dr. Craik, a well-known English physician, has publicly announced that, for the more effectual prevention of small-pox, he vaccinates himself
every third year, as he considered that the protection conferred by the operation is exhausted in that time, and needs renewing. If the worthy doctor could persuade his 160,000 fellow-citizens to follow his example, and induce the municipal authorities to pass the Compulsory Vaccination Law, for which he and his medical colleagues have been so long striving, he would add largely to their incomes, particularly in the increase of practice arising out of the treatment of inoculable diseases.

In 1876 a medical man was elected Mayor of the city, and wishing to signalise his term of office, and at the same time conciliate his medical confrères, devoted himself to what he called the promotion of sanitary measures, the chief of which was an attempt to induce the Municipal Council to pass an Act for the Compulsory Vaccination of all children. Previous to this, the Board of Health had, upon every outbreak of small-pox, illegally sent vaccinators from house to house, until, in the language of my informant, "No people in the American continent had been so well vaccinated. They were vaccinated, re-vaccinated, and vaccinated again, and were in fact full of vaccine." At the same time, the more the people were vaccinated, the more frequent and severe were the outbreaks of small-pox. The medical officer, believing in and advocating vaccination, made no effort to cleanse or properly drain the old and dense districts of the city where these outbreaks were so frequent, and further eruptions of the disease may be anticipated.

The attorney to the Board of Health prepared a by-law enacting most stringent compulsory Vaccination. Unlike the English vaccination law, which was passed in a thin House by a weary Parliament in the small hours of the morning, the proposed measure was printed and discussed in the public journals, and when the City Council assembled as they supposed for legislation, they found themselves surrounded in the City Hall by eight or ten thousand citizens who threatened, if their parental rights were violated, to "know the reason why." The Council offered to adjourn, but the people demanded the withdrawal of the unwrapping Act at once and for ever, and failing to obtain this assurance, took up stones and smashed every window in the building, and would have torn it down rather than submit to such medical and municipal tyranny. Montreal has the singular distinction of being the only city in North America which has successfully resisted the imposition of compulsory Vaccination Acts; and had it not been for the municipal regulation which requires ample publicity preparatory to passing any law, successful resistance might have been impossible. Patrick Henry, the American revolutionary orator, well said—"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Dr. Coderre says the people of Montreal are ripe for further information on Vaccination, and he hopes that some lecturer like Dr. Pearce, Mr. W. Gibson Ward, Mr. W. Hume-Bothery, Mr. Alexander Wheeler, Mr. Thomas Baker, or Mr. John Pickering, may be inspired to go out and enlighten them still further.

Dr. Coderre's daughter, an intellectual young lady, and an accomplished musician (having obtained the first prize at the Quebec Conservatory of Music) takes a deep interest in the vaccination question. She translates into French for her father, and for publication in Montreal articles from the Vaccination Inquirer and the Reporter; also extracts from the works of Dr. Garth Wilkinson, Dr. Pearce, and others. Miss Coderre was kind enough to take me over the Hotel Dieu, one of the oldest and finest hospitals on the American continent, of which the citizens are justly proud. A religious order, the Black Nuns, comprising ladies from the first families of Canada, reside in the hospital as nurses, and devote their lives to this noble charity. Miss Coderre mentioned to the sister who acted as our guide, that I was opposed to vaccination, and I found she was a warm supporter of Dr. Coderre's opinions. She had had evidence in the hospital of disease induced by vaccination, and had heard of many other cases, adding that few parents, if left to their instincts, would submit their children to such a practice. It was all a money question: doctors in Montreal were reluctant to surrender a system that brought them many fees, but Dr. Coderre was an honourable exception. The worthy priest who officiated as chaplain listened to my remarks on vaccination, and said, "I believe you are not far wrong."

The medical profession in Montreal are about equally divided in their opinions as to the utility of Vaccination. The French doctors, with few exceptions, are either indifferent to, or wholly opposed to the practice, whilst the English vigorously maintain it. The latter admit the increase of small-pox concurrently with the increase of vaccination; for probably no city in the world, with the possible exception of Berlin, has been so thoroughly vaccinated, and re-vaccinated as Montreal; and since 1872, when the futile attempt was made to enforce vaccination, there
has been a much greater openness of mind as to the possible injuries attendant on the operation.

Miss Coderre introduced me to Mr. H. C. St. Pierre, who has sympathised deeply with the struggles of the French Canadians for medical freedom. He is one of the leading barristers of Montreal, a man of great intelligence, marked with all the finest characteristics of the Frenchman. He received me cordially, and led me into his library, where I was introduced to Madame St. Pierre and an unvaccinated baby—a bright-eyed, laughing, and robust son and heir. "I think," said my host with paternal pride, "we had better leave him as God made him, for I question if vaccination would improve him."

For the part M. St. Pierre took in opposing the Compulsory Vaccination Act he was indicted and tried for inciting the citizens to riot and breach of the peace. Though himself an accomplished and experienced advocate, and eloquent speaker, he entrusted his defence to a professional colleague, who argued and demonstrated that the riot had been brought about by the faculty of the Mayor and the Board of Health. The presiding judge summed up strongly against him, but the jury, appreciating the true state of affairs, brought in a verdict of acquittal, and the party of freedom was again victorious.

The enlightened public opinion, which has sustained this resistance to most odious oppression, is largely due to the devotion of one eminent medical man, whose example cannot fail to encourage those who are struggling against vaccination tyranny in England and the United States. The following is a translation of a letter recently received from Dr. Coderre referring to the episode I have described—

**Montreal, 20th Sept., 1879.**

**To Mr. William Tebb, New York.**

**My Dear Sir,**

I write to let you know that I shall forward you, as soon as possible, full details relating to the disturbance of 1876. It was contrary to law for the City Council to impose Compulsory Vaccination. I have already written to papers in England, which contained articles on this disturbance, explaining the circumstances. It has been reckoned that there were more than 10,000 rioters. If the regulation had been enacted, the results would have been disastrous. Members of the Council would have been killed. The excitement was so great that a word imprudently spoken would have produced a catastrophe. The mob was armed with sticks, stones, and ropes, ready to deal with the councillors and the officers of health. The chandeliers of the Council Chamber were broken, and the greater part of the glass of the windows, by stones thrown from outside. Mr. St. Pierre fortunately succeeded in calming the minds of the councillors during the meeting. The result of the disturbance was the entire withdrawal of the regulation concerning Compulsory Vaccination. Violence was the only means of opposition against this unrighteous measure. Even now, it may be said, violence alone can deliver us from the monstrous practice.

For ten years the opposition which I, as a physician, have made against this disgraceful practice has cost me much. My practice has suffered on account of it. Some doctors, not being able to fight me fairly, have taken a few of my medical preparations and used them as grounds of libel against me, having no other aim than that of avenging vaccination, as one of the proprietors of the *Evening Post*, whom I have prosecuted for libel, confessed to me. Anything is good against opponents of vaccination.

Please accept the tokens of my great esteem, and believe me,

Yours very sincerely,

J. EMERY CODERRE.

**THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.**

For a good many years, at intervals, I have had correspondence with the Bishop of Manchester on the subject of vaccination; and it might be well to record some of his utterances in the *Vaccination Inquirer*.

In 1870 the Bishop wrote—"You, properly, are prepared to argue the vaccination question, on the simple basis of ascertained facts. According to the preponderance of these, one way or the other, so let the conclusion be."

This is a fair proposal; and we have always taken our stand upon "facts," the facts of the Registrar-General, and the facts published in Parliamentary Returns. These statistical facts, when fairly and thoroughly examined by competent persons, condemn vaccination as a medical delusion, which is bolstered up by those who have a vested interest in abuses; and thus vaccination becomes a national crime, because it is practised in opposition to the teachings of experience.

In another letter, the Bishop wrote—"The vaccination question has become one of primary sanitary importance, if the facts alleged can be
THE VACCINATION INQUERER.

The Bishop is guarded in his language. He says that the "benefits" of vaccination "seem" to be established by overwhelming evidence. This "seeming" arises from the one-sided, biased, and "doctored" nature of the evidence as ordinarily presented in the newspapers and medical journals. Those who go to first hand evidence and examine it for themselves, become convinced that the "overwhelming evidence" is against vaccination.

The Bishop frankly admits that the "vaccine-lymph is often poisoned," and that then "it must be mischievous, and may be fatally mischievous."

It was the knowledge of the fact that the vaccine-lymph is often "poisoned," and may be "fatally mischievous," that led Sir Thomas Watson, M.D.—himself a pro-vaccinator—to write—"I can readily sympathise with and applaud a father who is willing to submit to multiplied penalties rather than expose his child to the risk of an infection so ghastly."

Mr. Simon states that 85 per cent. of the diseases of infancy are of syphilitic origin. Every one of these syphilitic children may have supplied poisoned lymph to taint the blood of many more. Medical men used to deny that syphilis could be conveyed by vaccination; and they only admitted the "ghastly" fact when the abundant proofs of the terrible contagion could be no longer ignored or denied.

In 1871, the Bishop of Manchester was announced to preside at the annual meeting of the Hospital for Sick Children. This appeared an appropriate occasion for calling his lordship's attention once more to the subject of vaccination, especially as the officers of the institution had referred to the matter in their report. The Bishop, speaking from the chair, said—"The strong feeling against vaccination which exists, and even seems to grow, is due in a great measure to removable causes. It commends itself to one's common sense that limiting the period within which vaccination is compulsory to twelve weeks from the birth of the infant, is putting a most injudicious, and in many cases what may be a most mischievous limit upon what otherwise might be a beneficial operation. A legitimate extension of time would possibly remove a great deal of the prejudice which exists against vaccination. It would be extremely desirable if something like an accurate statistical inquiry could be instituted to see to what extent so-called vaccination has been properly conducted."

The suggestion of the Bishop for an extension of time, was based upon the following passage in the report of the medical officers—"The excitable glandular system of a child so young, may be (and sometimes is) so affected by the irritation and effects of the operation (vaccination) as to leave results which are, to say the least, undesirable, and which might be avoided if a longer period were allowed."

Medical men who know that injury is done to infants because the law allows no discretion as to extension of time for the dangerous operation of vaccination, must be held responsible for these ill effects, so long as they do not agitate for an alteration of the law. England is the only country in which this perilous use of the poisoned lancet is imperative at the early age of three months.

One more extract from the Bishop's letters—"My own opinion is not changed upon the subject of the prophylactic effects of vaccination when properly administered, nor as regards the necessity of the proper conditions being observed in the administration, namely, that the lymph is procured from a healthy subject, and that the child is in a proper state to receive it into his system."

I wrote in reply—"It is just because the 'proper conditions' you mention cannot possibly be observed that we object altogether to vaccination. Your first requirement is that the lymph shall be procured from a 'healthy subject.' You will admit that there is no such thing as a perfectly healthy human being. There may be no gross hereditary taint, but every child has some impurity in the blood, and when vaccinated, this morbid matter comes out with the virus, and forms those sickening sores which Jenner depicts in his book. This is the result when the child vaccinated is strong and of fair health. That is to say, Nature tries to get rid of the intruder, and hence the formation of the pustules. In the case of weak and sickly children—and they form the majority—there is not sufficient vital force and purity to expel the poison; it then remains in the system, and predisposes to all manner of ailments, which are often fatal, and though directly caused by vaccination, are never so registered. Mr. Ayrton, a member of Mr. Gladstone's Government, when we waited upon him as a deputation, admitted that 'deaths
caused by vaccination are not unfrequently certified as accruing from other causes.' My position, therefore, is, that every vaccinated child or adult is necessarily for the time being unhealthy; and how any one can imagine that the corrupt matter from a sore can be of use in warding off a possible disease, amazes me. As for your Lordship's second condition, that the child should be 'in a proper state to receive it,'—here, again, I heartily say 'Amen.' I am sure the mothers of Manchester will agree with me when I say that no child is 'in a proper state to receive' this shock to the system at the tender age of three months.'"

When the Bishop of Manchester can find time to make an original and thorough research into the history of the 'Great Delusion' of vaccination, I have no doubt he will be found on the right side, namely, the side of bodily purity and parental freedom.

HENRY PITMAN.

THE CALF LYMPHERS' CONFERENCE.

ANTI-VACCINATORS have much cause for congratulation over the Conference on Animal Vaccination held by the British Medical Association on 4th and 18th December, and adjourned on the motion of Dr. Crisp, seconded by Mr. Thomas Baker. The Calf Lymphers have made many of the facts urged against Vaccination their own, and by force of their position and control of the press have diffused them far and wide. The readers of sympathetic and influential newspapers may have imagined that the Local Government Board would accept the advice of such men as Sir Thomas Watson, but those who knew the strength of the interests vested in the existing practice were well aware that a battle remained to be fought of which the issue was more than questionable.

Dr. Warlomont, efficiently interpreted by Mr. Ernest Hart, recited his Belgian experiences very nicely, and was supported with much goodwill by Dr. Cameron, but the Government, represented by Dr. Stevens and Dr. Ballard, offered a resistance of a most depressing character to the enthusiastic Calf Lymphers. A Government Department under trial always shows itself faultless—so it has been and will be world without end. When Rowland Hill proposed to reform the post-office, it was demon strated by the officials that it was impossible to improve the service in any way to which they were unequal: they knew a great deal better what to do, and how to do it, than ignorant and presumptuous outsiders. And thus with Dr. Stevens and Dr. Ballard. The existing system of Vaccination was faultless, or if not quite faultless, they and Dr. Seaton were the men to amend it. They had no sort of objection to Animal Vaccination; the Board had looked into it, and did not like it; they would look into it again, and so far as practicable might adopt it to some extent, but to give the vulgar a choice between two sorts of lymph, as provided in Dr. Cameron's bill, was simply nonsense.

Dr. Haughton, at the conclusion of the first meeting of the Conference, pointed out that there was a manifest difference among the speakers as to what animal vaccine was. Sir Thomas Watson proposed to inoculate calves with pure lymph, but failed to specify where the pure lymph was to come from. What he wished to ascertain was the difference between calf lymph and human lymph. The law did not define what vaccination was, but left it to the caprice of every practitioner. What the doctor said was vaccination was vaccination. There was much variolous lymph in circulation, and they had heard its use admitted and commended, although the Dublin authorities had pronounced against it as a disseminator of small-pox. They were revolving in a circle of hopeless contradictions.

The speech of real mark at the Conference was delivered by Professor J. B. Simonds, Principal of the Royal Veterinary College, Camden Town. It was a speech cogent with real knowledge, and singularly perspicuous. His contention was, that the existence of cow-pox had to be proved: it never had been proved. Jenner's account of the disease was an illusion. In his experience among animals for forty years, he had never seen a case of cow-pox, and he did not believe that any form of variola belonged to the bovine race. Sheep were afflicted with pox, but not cattle. We heard of cow-pox, but who ever heard of bull-pox? And was it credible that a disease should be confined to cows and never attack bulls and steers? Let any one point out an affection of females that did not extend to the males of the same species. What was called cow-pox, he suspected, was small-pox conveyed to the cow by contact with humanity; that it was a parasite, and not indigenous to the animal; and if it were so, then the lymph raised by Mr. Ceely and Mr. Badcock by inoculating cows with small-pox was the veritable Jennerian specific, and the claim of the Animal Vaccinators to the possession of something different and better than the Ceely and Badcock lymph, now in
common use, was mere phantasy. At any rate
it was for them to clear up the origin and
generation of their vaunted lymph, over which
hung a strange darkness.

The controversy is a most hopeful one, and we
pray that it may go forward. As has been often
said, Vaccination was begotten in ignorance, and
has lived by indifference; and thorough discussion
will be its destruction. Nearly every debater
at the Conference took for granted that the vac-
cine rite saved the ritualists from small-pox, and
the strife was limited to the forms of the rite.
Not until the question is raised, Is there any
virtue in the rite whatever? can the public
mind enter into light and freedom. The ques-
tion is to many a sort of blasphemy, which it is
a good man's duty to suppress, but the blasphemy
will by-and-by become irrepressible.

—

ERYSIPELAS: AFTER AND FROM
VACCINATION.

At a meeting of the Medical Society of Islington,
says the Lancet of 1st November, “Dr.
Ballard insisted on the importance of distin-
guishing between erysipelas after vaccination
and erysipelas from vaccination. He related
cases in which erysipelas occurred after vacci-
nation as part of a general prevalence of erysipelas
in a neighbourhood, and cases in which it was
 traced to sanitary defects in the home of the
patient, while admitting the possibility of insert-
ing septic material by neglecting the cleansing
of instruments, or by careless ways of preserving
lymph, as in carrying it between square pieces
of glass and using it day after day. He regarded
the occurrence of erysipelas as a very rare event,
considering the number of vaccinated children—
very much rarer than the occurrence of erysi-
pelas after small-pox in bygone times, which are
too apt to be forgotten by superficial objectors.
The rarity of the event was testified to by
various practitioners of large experience; one of
whom in forty years had not seen a case;
another in sixty years had seen two; another
with a very large experience had seen one.

Thus (continues the Lancet), those who fear
erysipelas may gather from discussions, such as
that at Islington, how deeply medical men are
interested in thoroughly investigating every in-
stance of accident after vaccination with the
view of making this benign operation as safe as
any human operation can be.”

Let me observe that talk at a meeting is not
investigation, and I am too familiar with in-
stances where investigation has been openly
refused to be blinded by talk. The hearsay
evidence of three “practitioners” is not to be
set against the positive evidence existing in the
Registrar-General's Reports. Moreover, is the
Lancet forgetful of the Misterton cases? Never
was a more childish attempt made to evade
manifest facts. One of the causes actually
assigned was, that a mother in carrying her
child from the vaccine station passed the house of
a person suffering from erysipelas, which
house was at some distance from the road!

But why all this talk about erysipelas? It
must arise from the increasing acknowledgment
of its frequent origin in vaccination. Dr. Martin,
the Boston calf-vaccinator, says that erysipelas
is the “invariable concomitant of arm-to-arm
vaccination.” Other calf virus advocates con-
fess that it is very general; and the recommenda-
tion of calf, as opposed to arm-to-arm virus, is
its assumed exemption from the risk of exciting
erysipelas.

But the Islington discussion is said to have
been waged on “the relation of small-pox to
vaccination,” as to which some information
would have been welcome. If vaccine can be
so used as to prevent small-pox there might be
some sense in facing the risk of erysipelas. But
if, as is the fact, vaccine cannot prevent, miti-
gate or cure small-pox, why should any one
incur the peril of erysipelas?

The very best case which vaccinators at this
day try to make out is, that in a given number
of small-pox patients, those who are vaccinated
in a special manner are better off than those
who are not so vaccinated. I do not know of a
single eminent pro-vaccinator who now affirms
that vaccination is itself any prevention of
small-pox. It is only affirmed in a most un-
scientific manner that it exerts a "mitigating
influence."

But we show continually that no more small-
pox patients recover with the aid of vaccine than
recovered before Jenner was heard of. Where
then is the advantage? where the mitigation?

Vaccination, therefore, is no benign operation,
but a foolish and superstitious rite, disgraceful
alike to our claims as men of science and as en-
lightened legislators.

ALEX. WHEELER.

COW-POX NON-EXISTENT.—It is now manifest
that the editors of the Veterinarian, in advertis-
ing for cow-pox, are asking for what they do not
expect to find, and of which they question the
existence. Poor Jenner!
THE STAVLEY CASE.

It will be remembered that Mr. Joseph Stavley of Bingley was convicted under vaccination law and sentenced to fourteen days' imprisonment with hard labour on 3rd July, 1878; that he had his hair cropped, was stripped naked, and then dressed in prison clothes, was set to pick oakum, and, in short, treated as a criminal—all which beyond imprisonment was illegal, as the Home Secretary informed the local authorities at the time.

An action for damages against the convicting magistrate, Mr. Cockerham, was instituted, and came on for trial on 9th December, in the Exchequer Division of the High Court of Justice at Westminster. Baron Huddleston was judge, and by his demeanour and remarks during the trial, and by his summing up, did all in his power to influence the jury unfavourably to the plaintiff. Out of much prevaporation and assertions of misunderstanding and 'twas all a mistake, the facts alleged by the prosecution were clearly established, but legality was no match for prejudice. The feeling of the court appeared to be that Stavley as an anti-vaccinator was a sort of outlaw, that he got no more than he deserved, and "served him right." The jury found that the plaintiff had not suffered the sentence with hard labour, but were of opinion that he had been harshly treated. The judge thereupon gave judgment for the defendant.

A verbatim report of the trial was taken, and it will, we hope, be published as evidence of how truth, conscience and liberty fared at the hands of law in this realm of England, 1878-79. Cordial thanks are due to Mr. George Kidson of Keighley for his unwearied labour in getting up and conducting the case. Outwardly defeated, the inward and real victory is his, as time will prove.

There were some comments in the newspapers on the case, but tainted with pity for Stavley as a misguided creature. The Echo observed—

"The case illustrates in a significant way the different methods in which, under the Home Secretary, prisoners sentenced to imprisonment without hard labour may be treated under different circumstances. When Mr. Valentine Baker was qualifying in Horsemonger-lane Gaol for the post of moral reformer a la Beaconsfield in Asia Minor, he was, as we all know, allowed to receive his friends, to read what books he chose, and to live luxuriously every day. When Mr. Stavley—having, as he said, a daughter who had suffered ten years' illness through improper vaccination—refused to have any more done, he was sent to prison. Inadvertently the magistrate imposed 'hard labour,' but, as the governor of the gaol found this mistake out directly Mr. Stavley got to Wakefield, it was ascertained that Mr. Stavley did not get hard labour, but only the ordinary treatment of prisoners who are sentenced to imprisonment without hard labour. However, he was stripped stark naked twice in the presence of other prisoners; he was compelled to wear prison clothes; he was made to pick oakum ten hours a day; he was fed on coarse bread and water, and his beard was cut off. Perhaps Mr. Cross can explain why imprisonment without hard labour means one thing at Wakefield and another thing in Horsemonger-lane."

Perhaps working-men will by-and-by pluck up courage and insist that when they go to prison they shall be treated as gentlemen, or that their "betters" be treated as themselves. At present rank is of as much account in Newgate as in St. Paul's Cathedral.

THE NEW VACCINE POLICY.

A remarkable development of the vaccine creed, now in progress, deserves public attention. The Times incessantly urges re-vaccination. The Metropolitan Asylums Board insists upon its necessity. The press laments at regulated intervals the neglect of this great safeguard; and the Local Government Board, in its official report, informs us that the re-vaccination of the young at puberty is essential. Meanwhile the enormous majority of adult Englishmen are steadily and sturdily setting their faces like a flint against the proffered boon. Under these circumstances a meeting of foreign and domestic supporters of vaccination has been held in London, at which the use of lymph from the calf was strongly recommended by strenuous and influential believers in vaccine compulsion. At this meeting Dr. Cameron, M.P. for Glasgow, openly admitted the validity of the objections to the existing arm-to-arm system, on the ground of the possibility of thereby transmitting dangerous diseases, and he told the assembly that "when our Queen recently resolved to have herself re-vaccinated, she sent to Brussels for animal lymph." "If her Majesty," said the doctor, "surrounded by the ablest of her medical counsellors, was not superior to what some might call a prejudice, how could one expect her subjects to be so?"

All this sounds very incongruously with the assertions of the Local Government Board to the Leicester Board of Guardians, in July last, that they "were not aware that there has been
any change whatever of general medical opinion in regard to the safety of humanised (vaccine) lymph since 1871," and "that their close and habitual inquiries have not made them acquainted with a single instance of disease communicated by the vaccine lymph employed." The fact that the Queen, surrounded by the ablest of her medical counsellors, selects Belgo animal lymph in preference to the arm-to-arm supply of these islands, shows that there is an unsettled state of medical opinion between her Majesty's medical advisers and those of the Local Government Board; and it is very evident that the Queen's medical advisers do not habitually submit to be guided by the gentlemen who advise the Local Government Board. Doubtless the precautions taken for the prince might fairly be claimed for the peasant; but we must here observe that the whole controversy is a complete justification of the action of the Leicester Board of Guardians and of the very important questions put by them to the Local Government Board which have as yet remained unanswered.

—H. D. DUDERSON in Midland Free Press.

MR. GLANDSTONE ON SUPPRESSED EVIDENCE.

In reply to a communication from Mr. Thomas Baker of Kingscote, barrister-at-law, pointing out that all public utterances, official documents and Parliamentary Returns (including the Registrar General's Report, entitled Vaccination Mortality No. 488, session 1877) adverse to vaccination, are uniformly suppressed by the metropolitan press. Mr. Gladstone writes as follows—

"Sir,—I highly disapprove the enforced silence on the subject of Vaccination which you describe, while I own myself unable to appreciate the frame of mind in which no other subject is deemed worthy of notice by a Voter who, after all, is responsible for giving his vote, as on the whole he may think it best for truth and justice.

"W. E. GLADSTONE.

"12th December, 1879."

SIR THOMAS WATSON ON BRIGHTON LYMHP.

The following note from Sir Thomas Watson appeared in the Pall Mall Gazette of 8th December—

"Forty years ago at least, if not sooner, a sad mistake was made by some whose names I refrain from recording here—the mistake of sup-
his cottage. Before the assembled women at a Mothers’ Meeting, she threatened Mrs. Jones that unless the child were vaccinated, she should be expelled from the Meeting, and from the Clothing Club, and that, if ill, neither bit nor drop should she have from her house.

This was too much for the poor woman. She began to see that she was only a serf, had no rights over her children, and must bend and bear the yoke of bondage. She told her husband; they wept at their helplessness; and he said, Take the child to the vaccination-station tomorrow.

She did so; but the doctor refused to vaccinate the child, and said she must carry it to Ledbury, nine miles off; and the woman pregnant! She went back and told her husband. He said, Then it shall not be vaccinated, come what will, come what may!

So this woman Kyrie may carry out her threats; but if she does, the world shall know it. She has yet to learn that the God of heaven and earth is a God of retribution, defending the poor, and humbling the tyrants who oppress them. She may yet learn that in trampling on a mother’s feelings and trying to upset a father’s right, she is only preparing a curse for her own children.

WILLIAM GISSON WARD.

HOME RULE IN VACCINATION.—Dr. Ballard at the Conference on Animal Vaccination disowned any responsibility on the part of the Local Government Board for the action of the Irish Board in forbidding the inoculation of a calf with small-pox at Galway in order to raise a stock of lymph for vaccination, on the ground that such lymph would diffuse instead of prevent small-pox. Dr. Cameron thereon observed, “I was not aware that Home Rule had been established in the matter of vaccination.”

DR. ALFRED CARPENTER, of Croydon, is an amusing character. He thinks anti-vaccinators fools because they do not know that vaccine is vegetable and not animal matter, and can therefore do no possible harm. At the Calf-Lymphers’ Conference he repeated his short and easy way with anti-vaccinators. He would not fine them: he would order the police to seize their infants, and have them vaccinated in spite of their silly parents. He forgets that such policy would result in frequent cases of justifiable homicide, and public vaccinators might provide themselves with coffins in advance.

NEW YORK “HERALD OF HEALTH.”—Our readers who wish to see what is doing in hygiene in America cannot do better than subscribe for this excellent monthly at 5s. per an., published at 15 Laight St., N.Y. The editor, Dr. Holbrook, is an opponent of vaccination, and will report upon the anti-vaccination movement recently inaugurated in the United States. We look for news of the New York Anti-Vaccination League.

MEDICAL OBSCURANTISM.—We have been advertising the Inquirer in several London journals, and it has been instructive to observe the suspicion with which our announcement has been regarded as something dangerous or treasonable. The British Medical Journal has declined its insertion, lest, we suppose, the faith of the British Medical Association should suffer injury. It might have been conjectured that those who thrive by vaccination would be robust enough to endure criticism, but experience is always correcting conjecture.

WILSON AND CAVENDISH.—The Shipley and Saltaire Anti-Vaccination Society have had an interview with Sir Matthew Wilson and Lord Frederick Cavendish. Both M.P.’s professed their willingness to vote for option as to the use of calf-lymph—so ready are men to accept anything on a show of authority. It is questionable whether calf-lymph from cow-pox is not a phrase for the non-existent! Sir Matthew Wilson said it was seventy-seven years since he was vaccinated, and he had never had small-pox. According to the re-vaccinators, he has been living for seventy years wholly unprotected—and the old gentleman does not know it!

THE NURSE PARBLE.—Dr. Collins was rudely contradicted at the Calf-Lymph Conference when he stated that the nurses at small-pox hospitals frequently entered as patients. It is conveniently forgotten that when the late Mr. Marson, resident medical officer at the Highgate Small-pox Hospital, was before the Select Committee of 1871, he told them, in answer to Question 4226, “We never had so many employed as nurses as we have at this time who came in as patients, for in consequence of the want of nurses at other large hospitals, we have not had the facility of getting nurses, and we have employed those who have come in as patients and who are willing to stay.” He also stated that his head nurse was a retained small-pox patient.
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XI.

JENNER’S EARLIER YEARS.

The competent biographer, it is said, must be an admirer of his subject, for only so far as we sympathise can we understand. Tout comprendre est tout pardonner. But I neither propose to write a Life of Jenner, nor do I believe it essential to insight or justice to admire or sympathise where we are compelled to repudiate. In Jenner’s case, however, we have to deal with a name rather than with a vigorously personified evil, so that it would be mere waste of energy to attack him in force. It was his fate to have a happy (or unhappy) thought, adapted to the humour and practice of his time, which was immediately caught up and carried to world-wide issues. In himself, he was as ordinary a character as was ever thrust into greatness. For the mischief of his thought, many of his contemporaries were equally responsible with himself—some, indeed, much more blameworthy. With Bishop Butler we may ask, “Why may not communities be seized with fits of insanity, as individuals?” and with him aver, “Nothing but this can account for a great part of what we read in history.” The common sense passes at times into unwholesome conditions, wherein the awful words of Paul stand true, “For this cause shall God send them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie.”

Edward Jenner, the son of a clergyman, was born at the vicarage, Berkeley, Gloucestershire, on 17th May, 1749. After the usual education of youth of his class, he was apprenticed to Mr. Hadlow, a surgeon and apothecary, of Sodbury, Bristol; and on the completion of his
that while young members of the medical profession generally deal in a great variety of remedies, they commonly discard the greater number of them as they grow older, until at last their treatment of diseases becomes almost as simple as that of my Asclepius of Little Newport Street."

Hunter's name is often used as a sort of consecration of Jenner, but for no obvious reason. Hunter confirmed, if he did not beget in Jenner a strong liking for natural history; and when Jenner was settled in the country, he often availed himself of his services as observer and collector, writing to him for information about the habits of the cuckoo, the breeding of toads and frogs, and the sexes of eels; for cuckoos' stomachs, crows and magpies' nests, for bats, hedgehogs, blackbirds, lizards, hares, and fossils; for a cock salmon, for salmon spawn and fry, for a large porpoise, "for love or money;" for the arm of a certain patient when he dies; suggesting horrible experiments on hedgehogs, bats, and dogs, and describing one of special atrocity upon an ass. The most serious proposition in their correspondence was that Jenner should come to London as a teacher of natural history, but Hunter threw out the suggestion with hesitation, and no urgency, whilst the qualification for the appointment was 1000 guineas down. Jenner had improved, or supposed he had improved, the preparation of tartar emetic, and Hunter wrote—

"Dear Jenner,—I am puffing off your tartar as the tartar of all tarts, and have given it to several physicians to make trial of, but as yet have had no account of their success. Had you not better let a bookseller have it to sell, as Glass of Oxford did his magnesia? Let it be called Jenner's Tartar Emetic, or anybody's else you please."

Hunter died in 1798, and there is no evidence that Jenner submitted to his judgment the question of vaccination, if even we allow that anterior to that date the project had occurred to Jenner himself. It is said that he had mentioned to Hunter that country folk believed that to catch cow-pox was to be secure from small-pox, and that Hunter repeated the fact in his conversation and lectures; but it is odd that there is no reference to the matter in Hunter's correspondence. If Hunter had been consulted, it is probable he would have exhibited little favour for the project; for in his opinion—

"The introduction by inoculation of mineral or vegetable poisons into the blood is hazardous, and in certain quantities may be destructive; but the introduction of animal products from another living body, be it man, cow, or ass, is infinitely more pernicious, because allied to the blood in being vitalised."

It is the habit of Jenner's admirers to represent him as a patient investigator through many years, to whom a great thought dawned in boyhood, which was brought forth in the maturity of life. In conformity with the legend, it is related that when an apprentice at Sidbury, a young woman came to his master's surgery, and small-pox being mentioned, she said, "I cannot take that disease, for I have had cow-pox;" and that her observation was thenceforth pondered in his heart; whereon Dr. Baron, his biographer, eulogistically launches forth—

"Newton had unfolded his doctrine of light and colours before he was twenty: Bacon wrote his Temporis Partus Maximus before he attained that age: Montesquieu had sketched his Spirit of Laws at an equally early period of life: and Jenner, when he was still younger, contemplated the possibility of removing from among the list of human diseases one of the most mortal that ever scourged our race. The hope of doing this great good never deserted him, though he met with many discouragements; his notions having been treated with scorn and ridicule by some, and with indifference by almost all."

Against such a paragraph we may safely write, Sheer romance! Jenner was by no means reticent, and that small-pox with its cure was for any length of time the burden of his soul, nowhere appears. The romance was invented after date in order to make much of little, and to justify payment in cash and reputation. For, taking Vaccination at the utmost, it was a slight advance upon existing knowledge and practice. In the first place, it was the notorious belief of many in dairy districts, that to contract cow-pox in milking was equivalent to small-pox in averting a subsequent attack of small-pox. In the second place, inoculation with small-pox was the custom of the time; and if infection with cow-pox prevented small-pox, why should not inoculation with cow-pox do so as effectually as inoculation with small-pox? The intelligence requisite to reach a conclusion so obvious was not great, and therefore it was no cause for surprise that when Jenner's claim as originator of Vaccination was brought forward, his priority should be disputed from several quarters; as by Benjamin Jeesty of Yetminster, who inoculated his wife and sons with cow-pox in 1774, by Nash of Shaftesbury, Mrs. Bendall, and others. Jenner was not insensible to the force of these claims, but, as we shall see, evaded them under the plea that
there was cow-pox and cow-pox, and that he
alone had discovered and defined the right sort,
and the time at which the virus was effective—
a limited and fair claim, but how far true, and
how far recognised as true at this day, we shall
in due course ascertain. What I wish now to
make clear is, that the question of priority as to
 inoculation with cow-pox was essentially trivial,
and however decided can neither make nor mar
Jenner, nor any one else, and need give us no
concern.

In parts of Holstein, too, cow-pox was re-
arded as good against small-pox, and on more
than one occasion was deliberately employed for
the purpose. Plett, a village schoolmaster, near
Kiel, inoculated three children with the disease
in 1791, who were afterwards credited with
resisting variolous infection in consequence of
their vaccination.*

How thoroughly the asserted prophylactic
virtue of cow-pox was known, Jenner himself
was accustomed to bear witness. He was a
member of two clubs, the Medico-Convivial
which met at Bodborough, and the Convivio-
medical which met at Alveston; and he used to
bring cow-pox so persistently under discussion,
that, he said, he was threatened with expulsion
if he did not desist. “We know,” said the jolly
doctors, “that an attack of cow-pox is reputed
to prevent small-pox, but we know that it does
not, and that should end the matter.”†

In pursuance of the tactics that would repre-
sent Vaccination as the outcome of the labour
of many years, we have the following extra-
ordinary narrative from Baron, Jenner’s biog-
grapher—

“It was not till 1780 that Jenner was enabled,
after much study and inquiry, to unravel many
of the perplexing obstructions and contradictions
with which the question of cow-pox was
enveloped, and which had impressed those who
knew the traditions of the country with the
opinion that it defied all accurate and satisfactory
ascertainment. In the month of May of the year
just mentioned, 1780, he first disclosed his hopes
and his fears, respecting the great object of his
pursuit, to his friend Edward Gardner. By this
time Jenner’s mind had caught a glimpse of
the reputation which awaited him, but it was
still clouded by doubts and difficulties. He then
seemed to feel that it might, in God’s good
providence, be his lot to stand between the living
and the dead, and that through him a plague
might be stayed. On the other side, the dread
of disappointment, and the probability of failing
to accomplish his purpose, restrained that
eagerness which otherwise would have prompted
him prematurely to publish the result of his
inquiries, and thereby, probably, by convey-
ing insufficient knowledge, blight forever his
favourite hope.”‡

Many are the marvellous relations in ancient
and modern history, but in all the records of the
supernatural it is questionable if there be any-
things to match the preceding. Painters are
fond of depicting the runaway apprentice listen-
ing on Highgate to the bells as they pealed,
“Turn again Whittington, twice Lord Mayor of
London,” but they might find a finer subject in
the young Gloucestershire surgeon, aged 81,
habited “in blue coat and yellow buttons,
buckskins, well polished jockey boots with hand-
some silver spurs, a smart whip with silver
handle, and hair done up in a club under a
broad-brimmed hat”)† with eye fixed in vision,
contemplating his glorious destiny, through
clouds of doubt and difficulty, full twenty years
ahead; standing like another Aaron, censor in
hand, between the living and the dead until the
plague was stayed! Verily, we do not see
miracles, because we do not choose to see them.

But the chapter of the wonderful is not ex-
hausted; yet greater things remain. Says
Baron, and recollect the year was 1780 and
Jenner aged 81—

“Jenner was riding with Gardner, on the
road between Gloucester and Bristol, near
Newport, when the conversation passed of which
I have made mention. He went over the nat-
ural history of cow-pox; stated his opinion as to
the origin of this affection from the heel of the
horse; specified the different sorts of disease
which attacked the milkers when they handled
infected cows; dwelt upon the variety which
afforded protection against small-pox; and with
deep and anxious emotion mentioned his hope
of being able to propagate that variety from one
human being to another, till he had dissemina-
ted the practice all over the globe, to the total
extinction of small-pox”—

Which is to say, that in 1780, Jenner, aged
81, had arrived at the conclusions which he
offered to the world in 1798 at the mature age
of 49; and in the meanwhile that he allowed
mankind to perish from small-pox; he having
their salvation in his hands!

* Simon’s Papers on Vaccination, p. xii.
‡ Thus described by Gardner. Ib. p. 15.
The miraculous conversation, says Baron, was concluded by Jenner in words to the following effect—

"Gardner, I have entrusted a most important matter to you, which I firmly believe will prove of essential benefit to the human race. I know you, and should not wish what I have stated to be brought into conversation; for should anything untoward turn up in my experiments I should be made, particularly by my medical brethren, the subject of ridicule—for I am the mark they all shoot at."

Gardner, Jenner’s friend, who played the part of alter ego in the secession of an early date for Vaccination, was a wine and spirit merchant. Charity believe all things, but even charity would exhibit a sceptical countenance when what it is a man’s interest to prove and have placed to his credit, is in itself improbable; which, if true, might be proved by documents and witnesses; but which is merely supported by his own word and that of a friend. Let me repeat, there was never a vestige of evidence adduced for the revelations of 1780 beyond the bare assertion of Jenner and Gardner.

The next date to which we come is 1787, in which year Jenner is represented as having taken his nephew, George, into the stable to look at a horse with diseased heels—

"There," said he, pointing to the horse’s heels, "is the source of small-pox. I have much to say on that subject, which I hope in due time to give to the world."†

Baron gives no authority for this anecdote, and, the chances are, it is ante-dated six or seven years.

In 1788 Jenner married Catherine Kingscote; and here we may note that in his social and domestic relations Jenner was a man of kindly disposition, intelligent, well informed, and fertile in suggestion, yet without much force or depth of character. He was, as the phrase ran, a good hand at a “copy of verses,” and one of these, “Signs of Rain,” commencing—

"The hollow winds begin to blow,

The clouds look black, the glass is low”—

has a place in nearly all poetical collections. In 1792 he applied to the University of St. Andrews for the degree of Doctor of Physic. It cost Jenner £15, and nothing more.

Hunter used to say to speculative pupils, "Don’t think, but try; be patient, be accurate; and Jenner, in relation to cow-pox, required the advice; for, by his own account, he was content to think of cow-pox for at least a quarter of a century, whilst he knew by intuition its origin, powers, and future development without any trial. His first experiment was made in Nov., 1789, upon his son Edward, his first-born, an infant of eighteen months.

He was inoculated with cow-pox?

O, no!

Then with grease from a horse’s heels?

Not at all!

With what then?

Why, with swine-pox; and it answered!

The child sickened on the eighth day; a few pustules appeared; they were late and slow in their progress, and small, but they proved sufficient. The poor child was then put through the various tests: not once or twice, but five or six times at various intervals, he was inoculated with small-pox without other obvious effect than local inflammation and erysipelas. Nothing claimed for cow-pox turned out more satisfactorily than this experiment with swine-pox—if we may trust Jenner.

Arguing from the records (and we have nothing else to argue from) it was not until about 1795 that Jenner turned his attention with any serious purpose to cow-pox. This Baron allows, saying—

"Many years elapsed before Jenner had an opportunity of completing his projected experiments in Vaccination, and he encountered numerous difficulties in carrying on the preliminary part of his inquiry."

But Baron fails to specify what were the projected experiments, or the difficulties which hindered their performance. It is a common nuisance in “sympathetic” biographies to have unlimited drafts made upon one’s credulity. The evidence of example would go to prove that Jenner placed his trust in swine-pox rather than cow-pox, at least so late as 1789.

In April, 1795, a general inoculation took place at Berkeley on Dimsdale’s plan, that is to say, all in the district who had not had small-pox were inoculated with the disease, so that they might sicken together and do no mischief. Among the Berkeleyans was one Joseph Merret, who, in 1770, had attended horses with greasy heels and at the same time milked cows, and from the cows had contracted cow-pox. Jenner—got hold of him on this occasion, and inoculated him repeatedly with small-pox, but with no—

---

† Ib. p. 135.
effect; whence he concluded that the attack of cow-pox in 1770 had maintained Merret secure from small-pox for five-and-twenty years."* 

Jenner’s aim was now directed to demonstrate that the common faith in cow-pox as a defence against small-pox was well-founded; and to do so it was necessary to clear away two objections—

First, That some who had caught cow-pox had subsequently suffered small-pox.

To which he answered—

Various eruptions occur on the teats of cows, which are confounded with cow-pox, and infect the milkers; and these, I admit, do not protect from small-pox.

In a letter to Edward Gardner in 1798 he remarked—

"The true has many imitations by the false on the cow’s udder and nipples; and all is called cow-pox whether on the cow or communicated to the human." †

Second, That some who had contracted true cow-pox had nevertheless fallen victims to small-pox.

To which he answered—

Admitted: but then the milker had not received infection from the cow at the proper time, but at a stage of the eruption too early or too late. The disorder caught at the right moment is an infallible preservative from small-pox.

If the reader will take the pains to set these points clearly before him, he will have the true measure of Jenner’s claim. It was a claim to define the truth there was in a popular belief—not to make an independent discovery.

Jenner at this juncture would have been much more disposed to stake his hope on the identification of horse-grease with cow-pox than upon the humbler definition of cow-pox. In this identification he appears to have been original, and he strongly asserted his accuracy. Writing in 1794 he said—

"At our last meeting our friend treated my discovery of the origin of the cow-pox as chimerical. Further investigation has convinced me of the truth of my assertion beyond the possibility of a denial." †

Challenged to produce direct evidence that grease from the horse produced pox in the cow, he met with considerable difficulty, so that on 22nd August, 1797, he had to write—

"The simple experiment of applying the matter from the heel of the horse, in its proper state, to the nipples of the cows, when they are in a proper state to be infected by it, is not so easily made as at first sight may be imagined. After waiting with impatience for months in my own neighbourhood, without effect, I sent a messenger to Bristol, in vain, to procure the true virus. I even procured a young horse, kept him constantly in the stable, and fed him with beans in order to make his heels swell, but to no purpose."**

In the matter of horse-grease, however, it is not to be forgotten, as Dr. Mason Good informs us, "that for ages blacksmiths and farriers, who had been infected with grease, were considered as generally unsusceptible of variolous contagion." † Wherefore, to Jenner is not to be ascribed the discovery of horse-grease as good against small-pox; but merely that he held it to be the cause of cow-pox, and one with cow-pox, and thus endeavoured to unite the tradition of the stable with that of the dairy.

It was not until 1796 that Jenner made any experiment with cow-pox—up to that date, whatever his visions, he was in Hunter’s phrase a thinker, not a trier. On 14th May of that year, he took matter from the hand of Sarah Nelmes, who had been infected by her master’s cows, and inserted it by two incisions in the arms of James Phipps, a child of eight years of age. The boy went through the disease in a regular manner, and on the 1st July was inoculated with small-pox without effect, to Jenner’s intense satisfaction. He communicated the event to Gardner in the following letter—

"Berkeley, 19th July, 1796.

"Dear Gardner,—As I promised to let you know how I proceeded in my inquiry into the nature of that singular disease the Cow-pox, and being fully satisfied how much you feel interested in its success, you will be gratified in hearing that I have at length accomplished what I have been so long waiting for, the passing of the Vaccine Virus from one human being to another by the ordinary mode of inoculation.

"A boy of the name of Phipps was inoculated in the arm from the pustule on the hand of a young woman who was infected by her master’s cows. Having never seen the disease but in its usual way before, that is when communicated from the cow to the hand of the milker, I was astonished at the close resemblance of the pustules, in some of their stages to the various pustules.

* Jenner’s Inquiry, Case I., p. 9.
"But now listen to the most delightful part of my story. The boy has since been inoculated for the small-pox, which, as I ventured to predict, produced no effect. I shall now pursue my experiments with redoubled ardour."¹

But the experiments could not be pursued, for, from July, 1796 till the spring of 1798, Cow-pox disappeared from the dairies around Berkeley, and, as we have seen, horse-grease was also unattainable. Jenner had, however, resolved on publication. Life was advancing; he had made no mark in the world; and, as he wrote to Gardner—

"Added to all my other cares, I am touched hard with the reigning epidemic—Impecuniosity."

At first he proposed to embody his views in a paper for the Royal Society, but on second thoughts determined to issue a pamphlet. Having read his manuscript to Dr. Worthington, Mr. Paytherus, and Mr. H. Hicks, assembled round the table of Mr. Thomas Westfaling, at Rudhall, near Ross, Herefordshire, and having secured their approval, the matter was put to press, and about the end of June, 1798, appeared—

An Inquiry
Into the Causes and Effects of
The Variola Vaccina,
a Disease discovered in
Some of the Western Counties of England,
Particularly Gloucestershire,
and known by the name of
The Cow Pox—
a pamphlet of 70 pages quarto, dedicated to Dr. Parry of Bath.

Into the character and scope of this Inquiry we shall now inquire.

JOSEPH COWEN, M.P.

Mr. Joseph Cowen, M.P. for Newcastle-on-Tyne, having been written to by Mr. Edmund Procter, one of his constituents, asking him to preside at an anti-vaccination meeting, replied that he was so overwhelmed with engagements it was quite impossible for him to accede to the request. "If I had been at liberty I would have had no objection whatever to have presided at a meeting such as you invite me to, as I should like to hear the case against the vaccination laws fully stated. Your agitation against the compulsory law has my entire sympathy.—Yours truly, Joseph Cowen."
cise, admirably drawn up, and were afterwards adopted by the meeting with scarcely an alteration. At half-past seven, accompanied by my esteemed friend, the venerable John M. Spear, who has spent half a century in prison, social, and other reforms, we set out by the favourite transatlantic mode of conveyance—the street cars—and, at eight o’clock, found ourselves in front of the building of the Medical Association, where our meeting was to be held. On our arrival, I saw before me a spacious hall crowded to suffocation—the street cars were opened, to furnish the ventilation necessary for such a large assemblage. This was a hopeful sign, and I thought that in America at any rate this question will receive the attention it deserves. Very soon I was undeceived, as I discovered that this crowd had come to hear a popular orator hold forth on a popular subject.

The Hall of the Medical Association was situated on the second floor of the same building, on reaching which the doctor recognised a few earnest sympathisers with the object we had in view, some of whom had come long distances in order to be present. I was reminded of some of the earlier meetings of the Anti-Slavery Society in America and of the Anti-Corn Law League in England. This was the humble beginning of a great movement, destined to end in the abolition of a medical practice more injurious than venesection (which was practised in Europe for three centuries), and scarcely less mortal than inoculation, now a penal offence.

The object is the emancipation of the American people from a medical despotism which, by enforcing a medical theory, usurps parental rights and deprives the most thoughtful and intelligent parents, who object to Vaccination of the use of the public schools for their children, which the State compels them to support—medical interference being carried so far in some States of America, that the children are vaccinated at school, contrary to the wish and without the knowledge of the parents.

Amongst those present at the meeting were Dr. Alexander Wilder, Professor B. A. Gunn, Dr. J. E. Briggs, Dr. M. L. Holbrook, Dr. Thomas A. Granger, Mr. John M. Spear, Mr. J. W. Nickles, and Mr. Ormsby. Dr. Wilder was called to the chair, and delivered an admirable inaugural address on the Vaccination question. He had always been opposed to the popular practice. It was, he argued, ill sense to attempt to prevent one disease by imposing another, and when the integrity of the constitution is once invaded, it becomes more liable to take on other diseases, even small-pox itself. In those parts of America where there is most vaccination, consumption is most prevalent. As to its being a prophylactic against small-pox, the idea is preposterous; the experience of all nations is against it, and its uselessness was confirmed by his own personal observations.

At the close of the Chairman’s address (which I am sorry to find has been so imperfectly reported), he called upon me to address the meeting, which I did at some length. I mentioned the particular circumstance that first directed my attention to the subject. My wife took my second daughter to a well-known physician in London, the first attempt to vaccinate her having failed. The doctor said, “Madam, I would advise you not to have this child vaccinated; it will not prevent small-pox, and may do the child an injury.” From which I concluded that the Faculty knew more about Vaccination than they usually chose to reveal, which incited me to further inquiry. The result was in my case, as in every other where the inquirer possesses the courage of his convictions, that no more Vaccination was done in my family. When my third daughter, Beatrice, was born, the Vaccination Officer in due course sent his notice and made his appearance, followed by the intrusion of the policeman, serving in succession thirteen summonses; my oft-repeated appearance at the Police Court in company with thieves, wife-beaters, garrotters, drunkards, and disturbers of Her Majesty’s peace, to defend my child from the empoisoned lancet of the Vaccinator; giving some particulars of my fruitless appeal to the High Court of Judicature, and of the atrocious doctrine enunciated by the daily press, that every unvaccinated baby is a perpetual nuisance. In spite of all, the child still remained unvaccinated, and the authorities abandoned their harassing and tyrannical persecution after four years of persistency. With myself and others who are able to pay the fines and costs, the law can only worry and torment; but with the poor, the case is different. A poor man is fined, and if the fine is not paid forthwith, he is imprisoned, and, while imprisoned, his wife and children are sometimes compelled to go to the workhouse, and the children are there vaccinated by force. Washington Nye, of Chatham, has undergone imprisonment nine times, because (having had two children slain by Vaccination) he refused to yield his other children to the like deadly risk. I quoted the the Registrar-General’s Returns demonstrating the increase of small-pox with the enforcement
of Vaccination, and shewed from the Parliamentary Return (No. 488, Session 1877), entitled "Vaccination Mortality," that 26,000 children were annually slaughtered by diseases induced or excited by Vaccination. I gave some information as to the progress of the Anti-Vaccination movement in England, alluding to the two organs, the Vaccination Inquirer and Anti-Compulsory Vaccination Reporter, with the vast literature on the subject (which Mr. Gladstone said "made the tables of hon. members groan under its weight"), and paid a warm tribute of praise to the earnest men and noble women who, amidst the slanders of the press and the vituperation of the medical profession (whose reputation and interests they were accused of assailing), concluded by congratulating the friends in New York, and America generally, on the initiation of a practical movement against the disease-engendering superstition.

I ventured to hope the organisation would, by means of tractets, lectures, and discussion, soon create a public sentiment strong enough to obtain the repeal of all bye-laws relating to Compulsory Vaccination enacted by the State Legislatures and Boards of Health throughout the Republic. The movement would be hailed with delight in England, and would animate and afford moral support to the thousands who were there suffering under the cruel and wicked Vaccination tyranny.

Professor Robt. A. Gunn said that the bovine virus in use in the United States had not the slightest effect in arresting or mitigating smallpox. Just previous to the serious epidemic of 1874, the New York Board of Health issued a report stating that New York was perfectly vaccinated, and small-pox destroyed. The epidemic of 1872, which for a time carried off 300 per week from New York City alone, furnished the New York Medical Times with an extraordinary argument in favour of frequent Vaccination. Referring to the report of the Small-Pox Hospital on Blackwell's Island, it said—"One of the most interesting facts brought out by the hospital cases is the value of Vaccination as a preventive. The Vaccination of childhood is of no value unless repeated at intervals of three years. This is proved by the fact that all, or nearly all, the cases have good pock marks."

A report of the meeting appeared in the New York Sun for the 11th October, which was transferred to the November Vaccination Inquirer. The reporter has credited me with saying that * Mr. John Bright, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. W. E. Forster were opposed to Vaccination. This is an error. Mr. Bright has expressed himself in the strongest manner against the "monstrous" tyranny of the Vaccination Acts, and Mr. Gladstone has spoken energetically against the cumulative penalties in those Acts, and reprobated the silence of the press as to all public utterances and official documents opposed to Vaccination, but they have gone no further.

The day following the publication of the proceedings of the League, the New York journals sent a corps of reporters in quest of the officers of the new organisation, to obtain further information as to its aims and objects. One medical opponent of Vaccination was occupied the greater part of a day with these persevering interviewers. Letters have been received from various sections of the United States, asking for tracts and publications, and for the address of the Secretary of the League (Mr. J. R. Nickles, 697 Broadway, New York). I have before me a letter from Alameda, California, the writer of which says one of his children has been injured by Vaccination, and he knows of two other cases, in one of which the child died through the operation—the doctor making the very rare confession that the child "died from the effects of impure virus." He vows that, if blessed with more children, none shall ever be vaccinated, and concludes by asking for information, that "I may talk understandingly to my friends." Numerous papers, containing accounts of the League, and copies of the Graphic's interview with myself, with editorial comments and letters from correspondents on the subject, have come to hand from all sections of the country between Massachusetts in the North, and Louisiana in the South, including the chief cities of these widely separated States. It is to be hoped, says one editor, "that similar leagues may be formed all over the country." Another widely-circulating journal gives a leading article of a column and a half against Vaccination. The scientific papers are about equally divided in their opinions. The Scientific American of November 15th says—"The coming of an English gentleman with a craze against Vaccination has been made the occasion of an attempt to stir up opposition to the practices of our American physicians and Boards of Health. By parading a pretentious array of figures to which I lent him, and hastily concluded that they were opposed to Vaccination altogether. This error was copied by the Sun's reporter from the Graphic, and not from my observations.

* The mistake originated in the Graphic's reporter having seen the utterances of these eminent Statesmen in a tract
show that Vaccination does not prevent small-pox, and does entail a vast amount of disease through blood contamination, not a little feeling has been aroused." The writer goes on to say "that, owing to the radically different methods of obtaining and using vaccine virus here and in Europe, no argument based on European results can have any application here," and warns the American newspapers against lending themselves to the propagation of Anti-Vaccination nonsense. The Scientific News takes a more reasonable view, and deferentially asks the American doctors, in view of the vast array of statistics quoted against Vaccination, "to look into the matter if only for the sake of the little ones." The medical journals, like the Ephesian silver-smiths of old, have taken the alarm, and with the exception of the New York Medical Tribune (which has a long and favourable account of the League and its object), are as bitterly hostile to the movement, as the British Medical Journal and Lancet on this side. The New York Medical Journal is confident that "the League shall be short-lived." The Philadelphia Medical Reporter called attention to the League with the remark that "the fools are not all dead." "He, the editor, ought to know," says a correspondent, "as he feels his own pulse and looks in the glass regularly."

The League has started well, and every opponent of Vaccination in England—and they are legion—will wish it God-speed. It is, indeed, encouraging to vituperate, persecuted, and harassed anti-vaccinators on this side the Atlantic, to have the moral support of those who have witnessed the mischief induced by medical blood-poisoning on the other. Here the opposition began amongst the parents of the poorest class, who were the first to perceive the dire results of Vaccination on the bodies of their offspring. In the United States and in Canada, the crusade is commenced by medical men who have had ample opportunity in both private and hospital practice of observing the wrecked constitutions produced by the disease-engendering rite. Dr. Codere, the leader of the anti-vaccination movement in Montreal, has had thirty years experience as physician at the Hotel Dieu, Montreal. The Committee of the New York League is composed of members of the same profession. The Chairman is co-editor of the Medical Tribune, and Lecturer at the United States Medical College. Medical men in all parts of the country have expressed their sympathy with the movement, and are prepared to support it. This is encouraging but I would not have the League underestimate the strength of the opposition. There are thousands of the orthodox school of practitioners who, like their brethren in England, think it sacrilege to touch the Jennerian ark, rotten though its timbers be; and as the League puts into circulation its tracts and manifestoes, and sends forth its lecturers to enlighten the public mind, they must be prepared to submit to the reproaches and slanders, and, it may be, to proscription and persecution, which is the heritage of all who attack powerful vested interests. In this country, as every defender of Vaccination knows, there are able writers, eloquent lecturers, and clear-headed statist by the score, ready and eager to assail and expose all the false statistics, cooked hospital reports and misleading statements made by the doctors to bolster up the Vaccination imposture, and a similar array of force will, no doubt, soon be at the disposal of the American League to carry on the important work they have undertaken. If Vaccination had any scientific basis of truth, no compulsory enactments would be needed to compel its adoption. True hygiene commends itself to the judgment of reasonable men by its own inherent persuasiveness. False pathology alone needs the machinery of the law, the exclusion from the privileges of public schools, and inquisitorial house-to-house visitation, to uphold it in America; and in England, ruinous fines and costs, the policeman and the prison. Such a system is condemned already.

Mr. Robert Cerly, of Aylesbury, stoutly maintains that he is misrepresented by Sir Thomas Watson as to the manner in which he took small-pox from cows as cow-pox. He writes—"I beg to assure Sir Thomas Watson that no such egregious blunder was then and there committed as he states and apprehends. On the contrary, such abortive pimpls as he describes, when they did occur, were left untouched, being deemed a failure in the operation. It was only when decided vesicles appeared, exhibiting the normal type of those casually developed in the animal, that lymph could be or was abstracted. This lymph, when transferred to the human subject, exhibited all the phenomena in its course and effect of that obtained from the casual vesicles of the disease now so rarely met with. It proved to be as active as any primary lymph I had ever seen, and was unattended by any abnormal secondary eruptions. And no proof to the contrary has ever been produced, or ever will be."
THE CALF LYMPHERS’ CONFERENCE.

The Conference on Animal Vaccination has been of signal advantage to the truth we seek to promote. The Chairman, Mr. Ernest Hart, in summing up, observed that “the result of the Conference has been to show unmistakably how strongly the feeling of the leading authorities of the profession is in favour of some means of recourse to animal vaccination; and it will be for the parliamentary committee to consider in what way this evident feeling of the profession can be best furthered.” It is difficult to understand how he reaches this conclusion, for there was nothing so apparent throughout the Conference as the hopeless divergence of opinion (save as to any tolerance of resistance to vaccination), and the utter inability of the Calf Lymphers to make good their contention. Indeed, considering their assumption, nothing could be more contemptible than their evidence. As for proof that calf-lymph was more effective than other lymph in averting small-pox, none was attempted, nor apparently supposed requisite; all was bare assertion and audacity. Not to mince matters, we may at once say plainly, the Calf Lymphers are amateurs, and have to learn the rudiments of their business. We have good reason to suspect that even Sir Thomas Watson did not know what was the origin of the lymph in common use when the Conference began; and certainly he and many other Calf Lymphers would stand bewildered if required to define the source and differentia of the virus they so recklessly recommend. We listened to every speech at the three meetings, and the experience and authority of the Conference were to our mind unquestionably on the side of the existing practice. All practically conversant with the art and mystery of vaccination, admitted that lymph from the cow was derived from pox on the man, and that anything better or more effective was unattainable. In this contention, we re-assert, lay the real strength of the Conference, against which it is idle to set the names of men, who whatever their other distinctions, are novices as concerns vaccination. The policy of the Local Government Board, as represented by Dr. Stevens and Dr. Ballard, in the discussion was eminently judicious, as Sir Pertinax Macsycophant would say. For the moment the Calf Lymphers have the ear of the public and the press, and it would imperil the safety of the vaccinator’s craft to offer open resistance; wherefore they assume to yield whilst all the while damming with faint praise. The present system of vaccination, they say, is faultless, so far as anything human can be faultless, but there is no harm in animal vaccination. It appears to be a popular fad, and if the public persist in crying for it, the Government will consider whether they cannot be satisfied. This, we take it, is the sum of concession offered by the Local Government Board, wherein nothing of good-will can be discerned to Dr. Cameron’s Bill, but a settled purpose to make an end of it unless popular pressure prove too strong.

Mr. Thomas Baker attempted to speak at the third meeting of the Conference on 81st Dec., but was suppressed as “not a medical man.” How opposition to vaccination fared appears from the following—

SPEECH OF DR. COLLINS.

There are, perhaps, few subjects in connection with medicine, considering the vested interests at stake, and the legal machinery to enforce, that require more cautious or delicate handling than the one before us.

But, sir, facts are stubborn things, and this, in my opinion, is a question of fact, and one that wants ventilating. It is not my wish or interest to condemn a practice that has been in vogue for the last eighty years, but simply to give you the result of my experience from actual observation, and to elicit a fair and impartial consideration of this so-called protection. As a public vaccinator of twenty years’ experience in the heart of London, I have had every opportunity of watching the progress and effects of Vaccination, and of putting to every possible test the prophylactic properties that have been so loudly claimed for it; and after careful investigation and due consideration, I have abandoned the practice for the following reasons.

First—That there is no certainty in the action of the vaccine virus, and that it often imparts or calls into activity diseases that would otherwise remain dormant, by debilitating the system and weakening the powers of vitality.

Second—That the alarming frequency of small-pox epidemics is due, not to imperfect or neglected Vaccination, but to overcrowding, imperfect ventilation, and the neglect of sanitary measures generally; and

Third—That the true vaccinia of Jenner, "pure lymph," so-called, is the product of a diseased animal—the consumptive or gliandered horse—and—

The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Collins is not entitled to make an anti-vaccination speech; the subject before us is calf-lymph.

Dr. Collins.—I will come to the calf pre-
sently, in the meantime I don't intend to be
cowed, and I will conclude by taking the bull
by the horns. (Applause.) Mr. Lee spoke of
vaccino-syphilis, I suppose I shall be in order
in following him?

Drs. Cameron and Warlomont have made
known the fact that Vaccination, as now prac-
tised, is only too often the means of conveying
syphilitic contamination. I notice, however,
that with a view to palliate the gravity of cases
of vaccino-syphilis, and to remove the stigma
from the lymph and place it on the careless-
ness of the operator, many medical men, and
numerous surgical text-books, in ignorance of
fact and defiance of physiology, have stated
that it is only when blood is admixed with the
lymph that any danger of inoculating syphilis
exists. Now, sir, the merest tyro in physiology
could tell us that the lymph comes from, and is
part of, the blood; nothing separates the two
but the thin film of a capillary wall through
which corpuscles and serum pass with the
greatest facility, and with them any virus, ani-
mal, vegetable, or mineral. (Applause.) Again,
granting that it is only through the medium of
the blood that syphilis is conveyed, how are we
to account for a syphilitic father infecting the
mother and the mother the child? In neither of
which cases is there any interchange of blood.
The whole theory is untenable, and as unsound
as it is unscientific. (Applause.)

Dr. Cameron has wisely said that the small-
pox statistics prove either that the prophylactic
properties of vaccination are mythical, or the vac-
cine lymph has deteriorated. Now, it has been
abundantly shown by Drs. Stevens, Ballard, Cory,
Warlomont, and Brislowe, that no deterioration of
the lymph has taken place; such as it was, such
it is, and we are therefore bound to adopt the
other alternative, and declare that the prophyl-
actic properties of Vaccination are, and always
have been, mythical. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Collins is again out of
order.

DR. COLLINS.—I was never in better order.
The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Collins cannot be heard.
He will not be reported.

DR. COLLINS.—I'll move a resolution, perhaps
that will be in order.

The CHAIRMAN.—I will tell you when I
hear it.

DR. COLLINS read—"That, having regard to
the fact that Vaccination has in no way miti-
gated the severity, nor lessened the frequency
of small-pox epidemics; and farther, that it
has, on several occasions, been the means of
extensively propagating syphilis, as shown by
Drs. Warlomont and Cameron. —Resolved—
That this Conference condemn the present sys-
tem of Vaccination as mischievous in its results,
and inoperative as a prophylactic against the
disease it was designed to suppress."

The CHAIRMAN.—It is quite out of order.
You cannot be reported.

DR. COLLINS.—I don't want to be reported.
I know as much about Vaccination as any man.
(Order.)

The CHAIRMAN.—You cannot be heard.

DR. COLLINS.—You remind me of the chair-
man of the packed Committee of 1871. This is
a disgraceful proceeding. (Order.)

Dr. Collins left the room in disgust, followed
by several other gentlemen.

SPEECH OF MR. E. ROBINSON OF DUCKFIELD.

Mr. Robinson said he was a general practi-
cioner, and one of that large body of the profes-
sion who had to stand between the public on the
one hand, and a penal Act of Parliament on the
other. He did not wish to say to people merely,
"You must be vaccinated because it is the law
of the land," but to give them a rational explana-
tion. He had read in the Times the letters of
Dr. Cameron on the subject; and, the subject
having been introduced in that non-professional
manner, the present discussion, although only
in the presence of medical men, belonged to a
wider circle than theirs. So long as the pro-
fession thought it fit or consistent to have one of
its remedies enforced upon the population by
penal enactments, it must submit to public
criticism. Dr. Cameron charged the present
system of vaccination with three serious faults,
viz. —1st, That it was not protecting the pub-
lic against small-pox. 2nd, That the arm-to-
arm method was attended by the danger of
transferring constitutional diseases from child
to child: and 3rd, That as a mere authority,
apart from principle, the profession was not a
safe guide to Parliament. He (Mr. Robinson)
came to this conference anxious to see and hear
how these three charges were met, first, by
leading men of the profession, and secondly by
the official medical men in connection with the
government department. He listened to Dr.
Ballard, with respect to Dr. Cameron's charge
that during the seven years since 1867 small-
pox mortality had increased coincidently with
more vigorous vaccination as compared with the
previous fourteen years, and he was sorry
to say that Dr. Ballard, in attempting to
answer it, answered it in what was a somewhat
imperfect way, for he said—"If you leave out the mortality of epidemic years and reckon only the mortality of the other years, then I shall show you that vaccination is diminishing small-pox." That would not satisfy the public. Up in the North such an answer would be termed childish. If they were to be protected, and if they were to undergo punishment and danger, surely they ought to be able to be told that small-pox was being actually diminished in the country; not that they must leave out the epidemic years and reckon only the non-epidemic and mild years. He was not satisfied with the way Dr. Ballard met the charge of Dr. Cameron's figures, which seemed to be untouched. With respect to the second point, which had been dwelt upon fully by Mr. Lee and others, that the present method was attended by constitutional defects transmitted from child to child, as he read Dr. Cameron's letter, it seemed that the Bill was to do away with the method; because, if they were to use the calf only as a store, or means of replenishing from time to time the stocks of lymph, there were just the same means of transferring from child to child constitutional defects under the calf arrangement as under the old system. He could not see how Dr. Cameron found it consistent with his letter to the Times to sanction a sort of mongrel method. Dr. Cameron, to be consistent, must say that no child should be vaccinated from another child, because, the moment you return to the present method, you have the danger of transferring constitutional defects; and therefore he could not see the soundness of the scheme that the calf was to be simply the mode of supplying from time to time the diminished stocks of lymph. It had been said that, with the exception of two or three cases of transferring constitutional diseases from child to child by means of the arm-to-arm method, there had been none. He must remind Dr. Ballard and Dr. Stevens that Mr. Hutchinson, in his classical work on this subject, page 188, stated that "amongst the best means by which we may hope to prevent the occurrence of these lamentable accidents in the future, he would put as the foremost, the diffusion of the knowledge amongst the profession that such accidents are possible. Until my original papers were published, almost the whole British profession was incredulous on this point; and in spite of the publicity which was then given to the facts, there still remain, I believe, some who are either uninformed or unconvincing." Drs. Ballard and Stevens were still unconvincing; he could hardly suppose they were uninformed. But he would remind these gentlemen that Mr. Simon, in 1871, heard Mr. Hutchinson read his paper, "and frankly admitted that Mr. Hutchinson had proved his case." He preferred the authority of Mr. Simon, who was then the medical adviser of the Government, to his successors at Whitehall. Dr. Cameron admitted that so long as there was a danger of transmitting syphilis, the public had to be satisfied. But if they went to the calf, what authority was there to say there was no danger? He (Mr. Robinson) turned to his British Medical Journal of October 18th, 1877, and found the editor (and the chairman of this meeting) writing as follows—"It is said that, by using vaccine derived from the calf, we shall get rid of one of the objections to vaccination as at present performed. Even if this practice be carried out, the objection may still be raised that we might at the same time inoculate other diseases. Why not syphilis? And certainly why not foot-and-mouth disease—a disease which is said to show itself in man with a vesicular eruption, or even some of the more serious forms of disease (e.g., malignant pustule) so fatal amongst cattle?" To a general practitioner, who places unbounded confidence in his Journal, such a definite opinion is very assuring. But when he reads the following, by the same editor, in the same journal of Nov. 29th, 1879—"That animal vaccination may be the means of communicating other animal diseases than that which it is intended to communicate, is an exploded bugbear grounded on nothing,"—then he is puzzled, until he again consulted his journal of two weeks later, dated December 16th, 1879, and there he finds Mr. Simon saying that "vaccine lymph of the syphilitic infant may possibly contain the syphilitic contagion in full vigour, even at moments when the patient who thus shows himself infective, has not on his own person any outward activity of syphilis." If he (Mr. Robinson) now said that he could not justify the enforcement of an opinion formed in such a way by penal enactment, surely he was not unreasonable; and it was an unfair thing, on the part of Dr. Cameron, to go to Parliament and say that the calf-lymph would be free from the danger of the present lymph. This brought him to the third point, the objection that the authority of the profession, apart from a definite principle, had been greatly at fault. There was no denying the fact that no other remedy had been so long before the profession as that of using a living element of animal disease for protecting
human beings against small-pox. The profession for seventy years sanctioned inoculation; but it had its fall, and now inoculation was a mis-

demeanour. The profession in Jenner’s time was warned that inoculation diffused small-pox.
It was warned seventy years ago that syphilis and other diseases would be transferred by
vaccination. The arm-to-arm method had no sooner sprung up, than the instinctive objection of
the common people was put into terse English by Cobbett in 1806. He said, “Who is to collect
this genuine matter, and whence is it to come? Who shall tell whether he inoculate with the
cow-pox or the King’s Evil? or with many other disorders, one of which I will not name, but which, I do hope, that fathers and mothers who have given their children that greatest of
blessings, a pure stream of blood, will not forget when they are about to cause that blood to be
impregnated with the matter taken from the ulcrous bodies of others. The small-pox is liable
to no such fatal consequence. The disorder is so well-known as never to be mistaken; and as to a little risk, what is a little risk of
death, compared with a great risk of that which must render life a continual burden?”
These words were almost prophetic: when we read now what he said, he seemed to be a prophet. In 1858, vaccination was made compulsory, and in 1866 the objection to it came so strongly that the question was put to the profession, “Have you, from your information, ever seen
or known syphilis transferred from child to child by a true Jennerian vessel?” They said “No.”
Six hundred of the most eminent men were appealed to—1st, public vaccinators; 2nd, men
intimately acquainted with syphilis; and, lastly, the great leaders of the profession. Dr. Seaton’s
own description of these eminent men is too im-
portant to be lost. He says, in his Handbook of Vaccination, p. 306—“And though the great
leaders of our profession—Chomel, or Rostan, or
Bright, or Latham, or Watson, or Brodie, or
Joseph Henry Green—may have had little or no
experience in the mere practice of vaccination, and some of them probably little to do specially
with syphilis, their vast and intimate knowledge of the nature of diseased processes and the laws
by which such processes are propagated in the human subject, gives immense weight to the opinion they unreservedly express, that the
specific infection of the one disease cannot con-
voy with it the other.” “The suggestion of its
being possible,” says Latham, in his own forcible
way, “amazes me.” “I apprehend that persons
entertaining such opinions,” says Joseph Henry
Green, “can be only those who are ignorant of
the circumstances under which diseases are
ordinarily propagated.” Hutchinson’s inquiries
in 1871 demonstrated the utter falsity of these
pretentious opinions; and Sir Thomas Watson
admitted, in his paper in the Nineteenth Century,
that the transfer of syphilis must be recognised
as a fact. With this history of the blundering of medical authority in connection with a penal
Act of Parliament, how can Dr. Cameron go to
the Commons and claim that the public should
have enforced upon them another of its opinions
by penal enactment with respect to vaccination?
It was an unreasonable claim; and he would
say to those who were present, apparently
honestly believing that a living element of
animal disease could protect humanity against
small-pox, whether the time had not come when
they might safely say, “We will not depend on
compulsion any longer.” Another argument,
said Mr. Robinson, against compulsion is the
influence which a penal Act of Parliament has
upon the improvement of a remedy. In England
compulsion is carried out to an extreme degree.
In Belgium and the United States there is no
compulsion. Why have we to send to Belgium
for Dr. Warlomont to enlighten us as to the
latest knowledge of cow-pock vaccination? How
is it that Dr. Martin in the United States is
referred to by English surgeons as a leading
authority? Why are not our medical officials
at Whitehall able to give us the latest informa-
tion? The reason is this—if you stereotype in
a penal Act of Parliament a medical remedy,
and associate with its promotion a well-paid
officialism, you kill that vitality, which enables
a remedy under the fierce competition of medical
men to develop new powers and qualities; and
this is why Dr. Warlomont begs of Dr. Stevens
to break through the trammels of “routine.”
The public are far better protected by a free
remedy than by one fixed by the routine of a
penal Act of Parliament. He (Mr. Robinson) was
not satisfied to condemn vaccination on negative
grounds only. He was anxious to find a positive
principle by which he could be guided on this
question. The researches of Professor Burdon
Sanderson, referred to by Mr. Simon in the
Public Health Reports, No. 2, 1874, provided
him with a scientific principle. Professor Burdon
Sanderson performed an experiment of this kind
—he took a chemical irritant (strong ammonia),
using a chemical substance, that no animal
disease might be introduced into his experiment
from without, and applied it to the skin, produc-
ing an inflammation. The lymph from this was
successively inoculated several times, and was found to have developed into a tremendous animal poison capable of producing death by acute blood-poisoning. A slower and more insidious effect could also be produced, resulting in constitutional diseases. He (Mr. Robinson) gave Mr. Simon’s own words, p. 16—"I would particularly wish to connect that subject a reference to our growing scientific knowledge in the matter of the ‘common’ septic ferment. The pathological studies of late years, including especially certain very instructive researches which Prof. Sanderson has conducted under my Lords of the Council, have clearly shown that in the ‘common’ septic ferment, or some ferment or ferments not hitherto to be separated from it, there reside powers of disease-production as positive, though not hitherto as exactly defined, as those which reside in the variolous (small-pox), and syphilitic contagia. Experimentally we know of this ferment, that when it is enabled by artificial inoculations to act in the most effective way on the animal body, and even more when it has received a curious increment of strength which its first propagation within the living body seems to bestow on it, it shows itself one of the most tremendous of zymotic poisons. It rapidly, in one animal body, develops disease which then is communicable to another," etc. "And a further, perhaps still more instructive, teaching of the artificial infection is this—that the ‘common’ ferment, which in its stronger actions quickly destroys life by septisemia, can in slighter actions start in the infected body chronic processes which will eventuate in general tubercular disease."

He (Mr. Robinson) took these facts as his guide in ascertaining whether it was a wise or safe practice to diffuse in a populous community, by means of inoculation, a living element of animal disease. Whether the lymph used was that of cow-pox or the present lymph did not matter. They each of them contained, at the least, the ‘common ferment’ described by Mr. Simon, and therefore he was not surprised to find, after 20 years of compulsory vaccination, such a result as that described by Dr. Seaton in the Public Health Reports, No. 4, 1875, p. 51—“The epidemic of small-pox, which began in England towards the close of 1870, and terminated in the second quarter of 1873, was part of a general epidemic outbreak of that disease, of world-wide diffusion, marked wherever it occurred by an intensity and malignancy unequalled by any previous epidemic of the disease within living memory. In every country attacked, so far as our information extends, the peculiar intensity of this epidemic was manifested by the extreme diffusiveness of the disease; by its attacking, in unusual proportion, persons who were regarded as protected against the disease, whether by previous small-pox or by vaccination, and by the occurrence with quite remarkable frequency of cases of a malignant and hemorrhagic type, and a consequent unusually high ratio of deaths to attacks.” He (Mr. Robinson) respectfully submitted that this result was consistent with a system of transferring from child to child living disease matter, and, that being the case, the time had gone by when vaccination should be enforced by penal enactment.

Dr. Haughton also succeeded in pointing out the prevalent darkness as to the origin and character of the various lymphs recommended for vaccination. They had heard it openly avowed, and accepted by Dr. Stevens and Dr. Ballard, that the method to procure lymph was to inoculate the cow with small-pox—a method that was denounced by the Irish Board as a sure means of diffusing small-pox! Where were they? Who was right? Where were they to find the lymph which like Cæsar’s wife was above suspicion?

What Next?—In 1871 the Select Committee on Vaccination were assured by doctors in authority that the remarkably efficient Irish Vaccination System, had banished the small-pox from Ireland. But the system remains the same, and an epidemic of unusual severity ensues. What then? See the Lancet of Oct. 18th, for the reason why this banished plague returns. It is not because vaccination has been either abandoned or altered, but because “the provisions of the law in force in England are not extended to Ireland!”—A. W.

Dr. Abrath on Vaccination.—There was a large audience at Sunderland on 6th January to hear Dr. Abrath lecture. Col. Gourley, M.P., occupied the chair, and said he had come for information, and that he should like to see a Royal Commission appointed to inquire and report to Parliament. A letter was read from Lord Clifton announcing his intention to find a seat in the House of Commons, from which he would claim a hearing for anti-vaccinators. Dr. Abrath’s lecture was illustrated with drawings and bristled with statistics, and was occasionally rather beyond popular apprehension, but the audience was patient, and received much valuable instruction.
entered into the matter much more thoroughly, and was convinced that there was no remedy short of the absolute repeal of the Compulsory Acts. Nevertheless, he was not prepared to make of Vaccination a parliamentary test. It was fair enough to catechise candidates for Parliament as to their views upon Vaccination, but it would be exceedingly unwise to throw over a sound Liberal because unsound on such a detail. The repeal of the Compulsory Acts was of great importance, but the question at issue at the next election was of infinitely greater importance; and they should not for the sake of a crotchet imperil the unity of the party to which they belonged. Personally he was a man of crotchets, but he would set them all aside so that they might get rid of Lord Beaconsfield and his government.

**Gloucester Cases.**—On 29th December Mr. George Newman was summoned before the Gloucester bench for refusing to have his child vaccinated, and his arguments were met with the customary evasion, that magistrates sat to administer, not to make law. However, he so far prevailed as to be let off with a fine of 2s. 6d. and costs. Mr. Bateman who followed had a like penalty imposed, but Mr. Smart had his fine doubled (6s.) for no apparent reason.

**Persecution in Liverpool.**—Some magistrates on the Lancashire bench evidently require a hint from the Local Government Board with a copy of the letter to the Evesham Guardians. On 26th November, Mr. Henry Pride, engraver, of Upton Baker, Liverpool, was summoned before Mr. E. Gibbon and Mr. C. Langton, for not having two of his children vaccinated. For one he had been summoned twenty times, and for the other seven times, with fines of 20s. and costs on each information. Mr. Thomas Jackson, provision dealer, of 86 Everton-road, was also summoned for refusing to have his child vaccinated, having been previously convicted four times. Mr. B. V. Scott, herbalist, of 121 Kensington, was likewise summoned, for the nineteenth time. These worthy men, steadfast confessors of a great principle, were each fined 30s. and costs. In presence of such monstrous oppression, why should Mr. Gladstone feel himself “unable to appreciate the frame of mind” of those who make of compulsory vaccination a crucial parliamentary question? It is foolish to look for a philosophical appreciation of political questions in the sufferers and witnesses of such merciless injustice, and no statesman worthy of the name will hesitate to promise to put an end to it.
SMALL-POX IN CEARÁ.

Mr. James Ashbury, M.P., has been in his yacht to the West Indies and Brazil, and has sent a letter to the *Brighton Daily Post*, which he hopes may make an end of troublesome anti-vaccinators among his constituents. He has discovered that an epidemic of small-pox has been raging in the Brazilian province of Ceará, and that in Ceará, the chief town of the province, no fewer than 40,000 died of all diseases, but chiefly small-pox, between August 1878 and June 1879, out of a population of 70,000. Admitting the accuracy of the figures (an extravagant admission) we do not see what they prove for or against vaccination. No anti-vaccinator doubts that zymotic disease occasionally assumes a highly fatal form as small-pox, just as it did as measles in Fiji a few years ago. The remedy for such frightful afflictions is to be found in sanitary measures, which apply to all forms of zymotic diseases, and by no means to a magical rite like vaccination, which applies to one form only, and over that form is demonstrably impotent. Mr. Ashbury must try again.

On this subject we have received the following interesting communication—

ALLEGED DEVASTATIONS OF THE HUMAN RACE
BY SMALL-POX.

Mr. James Ashbury in order to show the great danger any nation incurs which does not vaccinate, says, that in less than a year the deaths from small-pox in the sea-port town of Ceará were 40,000 out of a population of 70,000. In the first place this leaves little or no room for deaths from other diseases, such as yellow fever, which surely was present. Next we observe that if this be the natural and normal death-rate from small-pox in unvaccinated nations, it would be shown in China, which does not vaccinate, and which is, according to all travellers, as free from small-pox mortality as England. A gentleman, once on the staff of the *Leicester Daily Post*, but now in Hong Kong, writes—

"Among the population of 100,000 natives in this town, there is no vaccination, and small-pox is extremely rare." This alone is a sufficient answer to Mr. Ashbury's great fears; but I will give the reason why the Brazils suffer from small-pox, while the 400 millions of unvaccinated Chinese men are as safe as vaccinated England. I will quote one old writer and several modern ones. Sir John Barrow in 1793, says—"The swarms of vermin at Rio de Janeiro, may be attributed rather to the extreme filthiness of the people than to the heat of the climate. Many have leprosy, and elephantiasis is common." Herbert Smith, in a late number of *Scriblerus*, says of Para, "In many of the houses there are filthy courts, the receptacles of garbage and rottenness of every kind. It is a wonder that people can live within range of their stench. Typhoid is common; yellow fever appears nearly every year, but milder in form than at Rio de Janeiro." Another writer says that Rio de Janeiro is the most stinking place he has visited. Mr. Waring, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for December, says—"The opinion is widespread in North America that the reason why southern cities are so devastated by yellow fever is that they are not kept clean. On the contrary, the southerners believe that it is always the result of importation and contagion. They do not attach so much importance as the northerners to cleanliness and good drainage. Southern physicians have failed to appreciate, as we do, the importance of municipal and domestic cleanliness." The American National Board of Health in its circular of July last, says it is prudent to assume that yellow fever is connected with the presence of filth, in the sanitary sense of that word, including decaying organic matters, as well as of heat. We advise (they continue) that all cities, towns, and villages be at once made clean, in a sanitary point of view. The sanitary inspector of Mobile, lately visited with yellow fever, mentions the horrid filthiness of the pits or cesspools, and says, "Things are very unsanitary here. When I approached the authorities upon the subject, they said that yellow fever will come whether you are clean or not." All these statements are equally applicable to the closely-allied disease of small-pox.

Captain Burton, in his *Travels in Brazil*, says that leprosy is common, ending with mortification of members and decay of bones. Agues, typhus, marsh fever, ophthalmia, palsy, and goitre prevail. The climate has a bad name, but the blame attaches to the dirty habits of the people, who are dirty, not in person, but in lodgings. Of one district he says, "Drainage is unknown; the worst sites are preferred because most handy; the houses are impure to the last degree. The pig lives in the parlour. Intramural sepulture survives." Again, "São Romão is afflicted with fevers and ague, fomented by extreme filth, not of person, but of habitation. They seem to have borrowed from the indigenes, who bathed several times a day, but allowed themselves to be littered out of their wigwams.
by mountainous collections of filth. On one of
the islands there are terrible fevers, cutaneous eruptions, and the full benefit of a large swamp." Admiral Jurien de la Graviere mentions the terrible mortality among the French soldiers and the sailors under his command on the swampy banks of the San Juan in the Mexican expedition.

The place mentioned by Mr. Ashbury is a seaport, and it is the South American seaports and tidal towns which are so devastated by syphilitic disease. The tide rolls the sewage backwards and forwards on their wharves. They disbelieve the anti-vaccine theory of the cause of syphilitic disease, and therefore they vaccinate and therefore they suffer. Why did not Mr. Ashbury tell them to wash and be clean? A municipal wash, in the extended sense of a purification of their sewers, is the one thing needful. In South America the houses are unclean, and the inhabitants clean. To a certain extent the reverse is said to obtain in China, at least among its lower orders. Hence its comparative freedom from the syphilitic devastations common among populations who are incautiously misled by vaccinating theories.

H. D. DUDGER.

Quorn, January 19th, 1880.

P.S.—If Mr. Ashbury has obtained correct figures, we perceive that even if the whole population of Ceará were attacked in that year, the deaths must have reached 57 per cent., the highest rate yet given to the unvaccinated by vaccinal writers. Yet Mr. Ashbury admits that some were vaccinated, and would perhaps admit that there were also some deaths from other diseases—all within the period. These admissions would make the unvaccinated death-rate from small-pox far higher than 57 per cent. He may well avoid discussion.

Mr. W. Gibbon Ward.—We had an agreeable surprise, better than any Christmas-box, in finding a vigorous letter from Mr. Ward in the Times of Christmas morning; wherein he dealt with a variety of popular fallacies in reference to small-pox, showing that when small-pox is possible, it is a natural effort to throw off impurities from the blood, and that if by any means the outbreak is arrested, the impurities merely take another turn, and appear in equivalent forms of disease such as cancer and consumption. Some day we shall have a learned treatise on the transmutations of energy in disease.

THE CABBY AND THE VACCINATOR.

The jaunty way in which what are called "accidents" in Vaccination were treated in the Conference on Animal Vaccination is aptly illustrated by a passage in a very interesting article entitled "A Night in a London Hospital," communicated to the Graphic of December 27th, by Mr. L. Arnold—

"At the present day we hear a great deal of accidents in the public streets, and there is reason to believe that reckless driving is on the increase. I remember sitting outside an omnibus or cab, and remonstrating with the driver on the subject of his carelessness. I told him of the tremendous number of street accidents. He did not believe that there were any accidents. 'Because I have never seen any' was the answer. I found that it was hopeless to argue with him about evidence and averages." G. S. G.

F. W. Newman on

THE VACCINATION CONFERENCE.

Professor F. W. Newman in a letter addressed to Mr. Wm. Tobb, dated 28th Dec. 1879, says—

"With me the medical question and medical opinion is a pernicious impertinence. Medical men urged Parliament to a usurpation of power and in a secret hour carried it. To attack a perfectly healthy child under pretence of public health is a tyrannical usurpation which no medical theory can defend. I have no ability to contend with medical men on anything so superfluous to the controversy as their statistics. Even on the statistical question I believe they are wholly wrong, but I am not the man for that argument, and I will not enter it. Sufficient it to say that the medical faculty, as such, has proclaimed its own folly by contending for twenty years together that vaccination (so-called) could not communicate blood diseases; they are now forced to admit that it can: therefore the present members of it ought rather to hide their faces with shame than expect to be listened to with deference. Also, it is a public fact that small-pox has been far more fatal since vaccination was compulsory. If medical men do not see that these facts confute them, I despair of their intellects. Certainly, all detailed statistics that contradict broad facts are simply contemptible. But, as I said at first, whatever statistics may suggest, the guilt remains inexorable of poisoning healthy blood under pretence of public health, and forbidding infants to grow up with blood unpolluted. The guilt rests on every legislator who maintains the law, on every surgeon, and on every magistrate who executes it."
THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

There are signs that the subject of Vaccination is being considered by men of mark. They have not voluntarily taken up the inquiry; it has been forced upon them by the importance of the people. For more than two generations the people of England, with few exceptions, had no opinion of their own upon this vital question; they put faith in the dictum of the doctors, who have proved blind leaders of the blind.

Amongst the notable men who have felt compelled to investigate the subject of Vaccination is that intellectual and physical giant, the Archbishop of York. In 1878 I wrote to his Grace, who replied as follows—

"Bishopthorpe,
York, May 16th, 1878.

"Dear Sir,—I own I am not with you in this matter. I trust no one is more disposed to regard with jealousy any attempt to interfere with personal freedom; but having read, as far as I have been able, the evidence on this great question, I find nothing to shake the opinion so long held, that vaccination has been the means of combating that dire scourge the small-pox; and that neglect of it, wherever occurring, causes a recrudescence, great or small, of that pest. If that be true, then I hold that the State has a right to impose the obligation of being vaccinated.

"When I was a boy it was the commonest thing to meet with faces utterly marred and disfigured by small-pox. This phenomenon is now very rare. What has been the cause here? Is it, or is it not, vaccination? This is the focus of the whole matter.

"The names you have secured to your cause make it desirable, or even necessary, that the evidence on the subject should be restated. It is most undesirable that there should be an interference with personal liberty for an object which only some pronounce to be good and reasonable, whilst the rest deny it. Should any opportunity occur for promoting a fresh inquiry of this kind, I should do what I could to promote it. A public meeting is not the best for such an inquiry.

"I perceive the name of Mr. John Bright among your supporters; but I think that the peculiar line he has taken is really against you, for he thinks that a man may be fined once but not repeatedly for not obeying the law. But this would seem to mean that a man who was rich enough to stand a penalty might afterwards defy the law and be a danger to his neighbours, whilst the poor who could not afford a penalty would have to obey from the first. That view does not recommend itself to me. If vaccination is for the public good, I would deny to rich and poor alike the power of being a danger and a nuisance to the public. If it is not for the public good, if the opinion that it has worn out has not been refuted, then one penalty is as cruel as twenty, because it is not founded in truth.—I am, yours truly,

"W. Ebor.

"H. Pitman, Esq."

In my reply I endeavoured to show that, instead of vaccination checking small-pox, it implanted that disease, by the use of small-pox matter, as admitted by Dr. Cameron, M.P., and other medical men; and I pointed out that it was unjust and unconstitutional to enforce an operation that was always of doubtful efficacy, often proved dangerous, and sometimes fatal. An answer to the objection about pock-marked faces will be found in the Vaccination Inquirer for June, 1879, p. 35.

The Archbishop admits that there is ground for further inquiry. He is right in objecting to the limitation of fines. Mr. Pease's Bill was founded upon the vicious principle of granting immunity to law-breakers after they have broken the law a given number of times.

Respecting the proposal for a Royal Commission of Inquiry, the Archbishop wrote—

"My dear Sir,—I thank you for your courteous reply. I venture to take advantage of your offer to send me fuller information. If you will do so, I will take some steps to ventilate the subject of a Royal Commission. Your letter confirms me in the impression that this is the proper course. If persons of intelligence and education are at issue about the actual effects of a means of prevention which certainly involves a strong interference with the liberty of the subject, then the evidence should be reviewed. I must add that I am still of opinion that we owe much to the enforcement of vaccination, but it is clear that you will not be with me in that view.—I am, yours truly,

"W. Ebor."

A Royal Commission, moving from town to town, would gather valuable information from both sides. The necessity for an authoritative national inquiry is shown by the recent Conference in London, which exhibited in a ludicrous light the muddle amongst medical men respecting vaccination. Who shall decide when doctors differ? Let the people decide; at least hear their evidence.

Henry Pitman.
SIR THOMAS WATSON DEFINES HIS POSITION.

In a letter to the British Medical Journal, Sir Thomas says—

"Believing that much error is afloat in respect to the relations of cow-pox and human small-pox, I am desirous of making some remarks upon it.

"That the vaccine—or rather the equine—disease owed its virtue and efficacy in vaccination to the fact that it was really small-pox in another form, was an opinion that I had considerately adopted. I have since done what I could to make known my reasons for abandoning that belief, which I fancy is no uncommon belief. A little consideration will suffice to show that the vaccine disease is *sui generis*. In no sense does it owe its origin to small-pox. There is no such relation between the two as that of parent and offspring. The true attitude of cow-pox towards small-pox is an attitude of antagonism. Cow-pox is a preventative cause against, not an effect of, pre-existing small-pox. All this is equally true of all the disorders properly called *syphotic*, including small-pox itself.

"It follows that the attempts made forty years ago to procure fresh lymph for vaccination purposes, by inoculating the cow with the virus of human small-pox, were a mistake. The cow so treated underwent no fever or constitutional affection, and presented no local phenomena beyond some pimplies containing no fluid around the incised spot. The ensuing so-called vaccination was, therefore, performed by taking matter from the original incision on the cow and inserting it into the vaccinated person, who, in fact, was not vaccinated at all, but inoculated with small-pox: the very process which, in years gone by, was voluntarily submitted to by thousands of unprotected persons, of whom I was myself one, whereby we obtained great individual advantage and safety, while the community at large was seriously injured in consequence of the introduction of the poison of small-pox into multitudes of places to which otherwise it might never have come.

"There must have been—there probably still is—a vast amount of mitigated small-pox thus spread about; and hence some of the strange apparent anomalies of our vaccination statistics.

—I am, sir, your faithful servant,

"THOMAS WATSON.

"16 Henrietta Street, Cavendish Square, January 14th, 1880."

Whereon the Editor observes—

"The main reasons alleged for believing that cow-pox is in fact small-pox inoculated in the cow, and not a special and different disease, are, as we understand them: (1) That it is always 'cow-pox,' and never 'bull-pox'; and that analogies fail of symptomatic or infective diseases proper to a race or species which affect only the male; (2) That, whereas what was described as 'cow-pox' was a very common disease when small-pox was prevalent among milkers, and abounded in Jenner's time, it is now so rare that large rewards, offered for a considerable space of time, fail to produce examples; (3) That cow-pox is a disease of the udder, which is the part handled by the milkers; (4) That the matter taken from the vesicles of a cow successfully inoculated with small-pox matter (and then infected with human small-pox) produces, when vaccinated into the human subject, pustules on the arm (and there only) indistinguishable in character, course, and effect, from those of Jennerian vaccination. We are not aware whether Sir Thomas Watson traverses these propositions, or how he deals with them. It would be a matter of great interest if he would restate his argument in respect to them."

AN ENCOURAGING CERTAINTY.—One thing is certain, namely, the question of Vaccination is being lifted out of the hands of the medical profession, who have too long had it under their exclusive charge. Nothing under the dominion of man has been more subject to change than the principles and practices of medical men. Medical science, if it can be called a science, undergoes one revolution at least in a generation, and it is no good augury for the perpetuity of Vaccination that it is now so firmly held by the great medical trades union.—The Echo, 9th January, 1880.

SMALL-POX IN BATH.—Bath is suffering from a small-pox scare—a serious matter in a community where the letting of lodgings is an important interest. With a few exceptions the cases have occurred in the worst houses and among the poorest part of the population, and the mortality has, as usual, been chiefly confined to children. The panic is "good for the doctors," as re-vaccination is energetically encouraged, whilst folly stops her ears to any whisper of good sense. The Bath Chronicle says to W. H. H., "We decline your letter because we hold the utility of vaccination to be established by experience and beyond argument. Any attempt to question it can only be mischievous."
DR. CAMERON AT BAY.

Dr. Cameron finding himself pressed hard by the orthodox vaccinators, thus turns upon them at the end of a long letter on Vaccine Lymph in the Lancet of 17th January—

"I am not a dogmatist, and am content to leave humanised lymph to those who prefer it. I, for many reasons, prefer animal lymph, and claim the same facilities for its use for myself which, until we have amply tested both, I am willing to accord to others in respect of the article of their choice. But when my opponents turn round and attempt to choke me off with peddling arguments about cost of calves, proportion of vesicles to punctures, and so on, I hardly care to waste time in confuting them with the experience of other countries on these points of detail. I answer boldly, cow-pock lymph direct from the calf protects against small-pox, as the lymph used by the early vaccinators protected against small-pox. Your lymph protects against small-pox, and against death by small-pox, to an infinitely smaller extent. You don’t even know what an indeterminably large portion of your lymph-stock is—whether it is not small-pox pure and simple, or whether, if modified so as to be innocuous to the general community, it is not utterly fallacious as a protection against small-pox. What we have to aim at is, not a mass of petty details which the early vaccinators cared nothing about, but the results obtained by them in the first ten or fifteen years of the present century. In those days the work was performed in what we should now consider an utterly inefficient manner, and often by unskilled men; but they worked with good lymph. The result was that for long post-vaccinal small-pox was of the rarest occurrence, and when it did occur the death-rate, instead of being one in every ten or eleven persons attacked, as has been the case in the epidemics of the decade just concluded, was for many years less than one in every hundred."

Dr. Cameron has made so much progress in the past, that we have good hope for him in the future; and would, if he would listen to us, earnestly entreat him to examine the evidences for the successes of the early vaccinators, whereon he lays so much stress. He will find them, if we are not much mistaken, wholly mythical, and that the decrease of small-pox, during the early years of the present century, was due to causes altogether apart from vaccination, which indeed had as yet left the great mass of the population untouched.

MR. HASKER AND MR. ELLISON.

Mr. Walter Hasker of Peckham, a member of Mr. Spargeon’s congregation, was summoned on 19th December, before Mr. Ellison of the Lambeth Police Court for refusing to have his children vaccinated. Mr. Hasker is a lawyer, and the magistrate, on a former occasion, seeing that he had to deal with what he called “a reasonable man,” promised him a special hearing, a promise that he did not keep; for when Mr. Hasker’s case came on, he complained that he was occupying too much time, for there were twenty-seven other summonses to hear. Mr. Hasker maintained that the discretion of the magistrate set forth in Sec. 31 of the Act, “if he see fit,” is an absolute discretion, as was allowed in the recent case of Regina v. the Bishop of Oxford, and that in the exercise of that discretion the magistrate is entitled to hear every sort of objection to vaccination, and to exercise his private judgment in the administration of the law. He urged that to “vaccinate” his children with virus that was confessedly not cow-pox, but small-pox passed through a cow, was to compel him to transgress the law as set forth in Sec. 32 of the Act forbidding inoculation with small-pox. He also called Dr. Haughton to attest that, within his personal knowledge, vaccination had produced syphilis, scrofula, eczema, and other foul diseases. As so often happens, the better the defence, the severer the penalty. The Bench resents the affront of good sense. Consequently Mr. Ellison sentenced Mr. Hasker to pay 20s. and 2s. in the first, and 4s. in the second case, and a present of 21s. to the vaccination officer, in all £2 7s., or in default fourteen days. The gift of a guinea to the vaccination officer, who has his pay from the parish, was a special act of magisterial displeasure. Mr. Hasker applied for a case for the opinion of a superior court, and was refused.

SMALL-POX IN CABUL.—A correspondent of the British Medical Journal writes from Cabul, 2nd December, 1879, “A few cases of small-pox of very mild type have occurred among our native fellows [vaccinated, and probably re-vaccinated], due to the disease being prevalent among the inhabitants of the neighbouring villages. As compared with India, it is remarkable how few Afghans are disfigured or pitted with the disease. In India, the disease appears to be of a much severer type, causing destruction of the cornea and deep scars on the face.”
MR. LEWIN'S FAITH.

MR. WALTER LEWIN, in his Papers for the Times, says, in relation to Mr. Young's Vaccination Tracts—

"I am at one with Mr. Young and his co-workers in regard to the serious evils of public vaccination. Here, as usual, what Government takes in hand is done badly. If the law makes vaccination compulsory, and appoints officers to attend to it, it should at least guarantee that diseases worse than small-pox shall not be disseminated by its machinery. Unless some much more satisfactory arrangement can be made (which I do not believe); unless, for example, lymph from the calf direct can be used in all cases, it is clear that compulsory vaccination ought to be abolished, and in that part of their agitation, I wish the anti-vaccinators all success."

Which is so far to Mr. Lewin's credit, but why his faith "in lymph direct from the calf"? He ought to be aware that in taking up the Calf-Lymphers' cry he is merely shouting with a mob which will presently dissolve under the conviction of ignorance and absurdity. Then Mr. Lewin says, "Perhaps I am wrong, but I confess that I still believe in vaccination," which is just what every M.P. does—until the wind of public opinion shall veer. Our demand is, Why do you believe? Mr. Lewin knows how easy is the confession of faith, and how hard the Why.

VACCINIA GANGRENOSA.—At the ordinary meeting of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, held on the 9th December, 1879, Mr. Hutchinson described a case of Vaccinia Gangrenosa, and exhibited the body of the infant, who had been vaccinated three months before death, from the arm of a healthy child. Three other children vaccinated at the same time from the same source took no harm. On the eighth day after vaccination, a papular and vesicular rash appeared over the trunk, which rapidly assumed a sloughing character. The eruption was at first taken for small-pox, and when death took place, a fortnight later, an inquest was held on the case, for it was then thought to be syphilis. But Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that its evolution as well as its character were not those of syphilitic infection, and he considered it to be a true case of vaccinia passing on to a gangrenous condition—a condition he had sometimes observed to take place in variola. The vaccine marks in the arm were natural.—The Lancet, 18th Dec., 1879, p. 378.

VACCINATION FROM THE CALF.

Extract from letter of Rektor Siljestrom, of Stockholm, to Dr. Garth Wilkinson, Dec. 12th, 1879.

Thanks for letter and Vaccination Tracts. Notwithstanding the seriousness of the matter, I have laughed immoderately at the ingenuity of medical orthodoxy, as represented by Sir Thomas Watson, retreating decently through the calf's abdomen. Calf indeed!—for what other animal would swallow the vaccination theory? and if, in its natural way, said theory makes its exit through the aft end of the calf, it will certainly be "none the worse" for the passage. Don't you think it a most admirable manure for vaccinating the soil, may be "morbidly," yet not the less "beneficially"?

After all it is evident that the days of vaccination are reckoned. The falling back upon the calf cannot keep it long alive. If we live some years hence, we are pretty sure to see another wonder, not less wondrous than the former adoration of Jenner and his vaccination, or the present infatuation, stolidity, and blindness to facts among your brethren, the doctors, namely, the orthodox doctors craving for themselves the honour of having liberated humanity from vaccination! Quo vivam terram.

LONDON ANTI-VACCINATION SOCIETY.

It is intended to form a London Anti-Vaccination Society for—

The repeal of laws enforcing vaccination; and the diffusion of knowledge concerning vaccination.

A preparatory Conference will be held in the course of the present month; and sympathisers with the aims of the Society are requested to forward their names to—

Mr. Wm. Young, 8 Neele Terrace, Harrow Road, W., or
Mr. Wm. White, 4 Kemplay Road, Hampstead, N.W.

THE VACCINATION INQUISITOR.—Those of our readers who wish to accelerate the growing public opinion against Compulsory Vaccination can hardly do so more effectually, or with less expense, than by subscribing for a few extra copies to send to the Reading Rooms of Clubs, Mechanics' Institutes, Hydropathic Establishments, or Hotels, to supply which special terms are quoted in our advertisement.
BADCOCK’S BRIGHTON LYMPH.

In a letter in the Pall Mall Gazette of 23rd January, Mr. John Badcock thus vindicates himself from the charges of Sir Thomas Watson, and explains how he converted small-pox into cow-pox, and what good, he thinks, it has done—

"I must observe that no charge has ever been officially made against the lymph supplied by me, but, on the contrary, I have during the last forty years had the countenance and encouragement of large numbers of the medical profession (including many of the very highest authorities on this subject); and Sir Thomas Watson himself, in a published lecture some years since, refers to me as ‘deserving praise for having worked out, by careful and repeated experiments, an important truth.’ What I had done to elicit this favourable recognition was this:—I had, ‘by careful and repeated experiments,’ produced, by the inoculation of the cow with small-pox, a benign lymph of a non-infectious and highly protective character. The experiments, of which this was the result, were conducted by me during eighteen years with extreme care at a great sacrifice of time and money, and with important results. My lymph has now been in use at Brighton for forty years, and is, at the present time, the principal stock of lymph employed there, being that exclusively used by the public vaccinators. Not a single case has ever been brought to my knowledge in Brighton, or elsewhere, of its having been the means of conveying infection to others, and its protective power has been absolute.

"It appears to me that it would have been more philosophical in the face of these facts if, instead of raising apprehension in the public mind, inquiries had been instituted in Brighton as to the results of vaccination in that place, where for two generations this so-called infectious virus has been constantly and chiefly used. I will venture to say, with some confidence, that if the death-rate from small-pox in Brighton for the last forty years were referred to, it would show that during the many small-pox epidemics occurring in that period Brighton has, for the whole of that time, been more exempt from small-pox than any other town of the same number of inhabitants in the country, notwithstanding its peculiar liability to receive infection from visitors."

"If the ingenuity of hon. members could devise some way of mitigating the evils attending the operation of the present Vaccination Law, I should be glad to consider it."—Right Hon. Sclater-Booth.

MR. JOSHUA JACOB.—The Limerick magistrates had Mr. Jacob again before them on the 19th December, and imposed the full penalty of 30s. and costs. The Daily Express of Dublin (Conservative) observes, ‘Mr. Jacob has now been so often fined that the law may fairly be said to have been vindicated in his case, and if a discretion does exist in the matter of prosecution, he ought to be allowed a long interval of rest.’

COMPULSORY AND FREE.—Mr. Wood, when addressing the Liberal Club, communicated the astounding news that "Vaccination was compulsory and free." I deny both propositions: it is neither compulsory nor free. If it is compulsory, how comes it to pass that whole families, including my own, remain unvaccinated, and always will, in spite of so-called "compulsion." It is only "compulsory" in the case of poor weak-minded people. As to "Vaccination being free" it is nothing of the kind: our two "public vaccinators" are paid for each and every case of vaccination out of the poor rate of Leicester. The doctors who vaccinate at the public stations, instead of performing the operation free, are paid twice over. They are not only paid out of the rates, but a bribe is now and again sent from Government to the extent of more than one hundred guineas in a lump.—Amos Booth in Midland Free Press.

CURIOUS VACCINATION CASE.—In the Norfolk News of 18th Dec., we read as follows—Hunstanton Petty Sessions. (Before H. L'Estrange, Esq.) George and Elizabeth Andrews, of Der- singham, were summoned for refusing to allow the Medical Officer to take lymph from their child. Dr. G. H. Parry stated that he vaccinated the child of the defendants, and attended, according to law, to take lymph from the arm. The mother let him see the child, but refused to allow him to take the lymph. George Andrews pleaded guilty, but said his child was very unhealthy, and was not fit for other children to be vaccinated from. The magistrate said there were two opinions about that, and he must consider what the doctor said. Defendant replied that the doctor knew nothing about his child's diseases. He repeated that the child would poison the town, as it was full of disease. He was fined 6d. and costs 11s., or fourteen days' imprisonment.

Mr. Theodore Fry hopes to represent Darlington in Parliament, and is prepared to vote for Mr. Pease's Bill for the abolition of cumulative penalties in vaccination cases. He says he believes vaccination is good for the public health, but that he would not press compulsion to the verge of persecution.
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THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XII.

JENNER'S "INQUIRY."

The curious tradition among the dairy folk of Gloucestershire, that persons who had suffered from cow-pox were thereby rendered insusceptible of small-pox, was made known to Edward Jenner when a doctor's apprentice, and was never afterwards absent from his mind. Thirty years elapsed before the fruit was born to the public; but incessantly he thought, and worked, and experimented on the subject, and the work in which at length he recorded the incomparable results of his labour may well have commanded the confidence of reflecting persons.

Little would ever be heard of objections to Vaccination, if all who undertake the responsibility of its performance, and all who feel disposed to resist its adoption, would but thoroughly study that masterpiece of medical induction, and imitate the patience and caution and modesty with which Jenner laid the foundations of every statement he advanced.

In the first Inquiry into the Causes and Effects of the Fecund Vaccine (1796), Jenner set on a scientific basis the popular belief to which I have referred; and the close of the 18th Century, which had much to darken it, will be remembered till the end of human history for the greatest physical good ever yet given by science to the world.—Papers relating to the History and Practice of Vaccination. Pp. xi. and xii. London: 1867.

These are the words of Mr. John Simon, and in them we have the Jennerian legend with the morsel of fact to the mass of fable which characterises legendary matter, ancient and contemporary. The recommendation to "study thoroughly that masterpiece of medical induction," Jenner's Inquiry, is a mere flourish of panegyric; for, as Mr. Simon was well aware, the book had been out of print for half a century, and is practically inaccessible; whilst its reproduction has usually been considered undesirable in the interests of vaccination, as much as it is anything but a masterpiece, and reveals more than is expedient for common knowledge.

An idol that is good to swear by is always fortified by a convenient obscurity.

The Inquiry is a quarto of less than seventy pages in large type, set in broad margins in the grand style of the period, and illustrated with four coloured plates of pox. There are eight pages of introductory matter, followed by thirty-four pages of cases, concluding with twenty-six pages of general observations.

It is to the Cases, as the ground of the argument, that we should first direct our attention. They are twenty-three, and may be thus assorted—

13 of Cow-pox communicated by accident, and afterwards inoculated with Small-pox.
8 of Horse Grease communicated by accident and inoculated by design.
6 of Cow-pox inoculated by design and transferred from arm to arm.

It may be tedious, but I should like to go with the reader over these Cases, for they are highly instructive. Let us take the twelve of Cow-pox communicated by accident.

I.—JOSEPH MERRETT, gardener. In 1770 attended to horses, milked cows, and caught cow-pox. In 1795 was repeatedly inoculated with small-pox, and exposed to contagion without effect.

II.—SARAH PORTLOCK, farm servant. In 1771 had cow-pox. In 1792 nursed her child in small-pox "conceiving herself secure," and was at the same time inoculated with small-pox in both arms without effect.

III.—JOHN PHILIPS, tradesman. Had cow-pox when nine years old. Was inoculated with small-pox by Jenner at the age of 62 without effect.

IV.—MARY BARGE, farm servant. In 1767 had cow-pox. In 1791 was inoculated with small-pox without effect. Had also acted as
nurse to small-pox patients without ill consequences.

V.—Mrs. H., gentlewoman. Had cow-pox when very young, contracted by handling dairy utensils. Was subsequently exposed to small-pox, and in 1778 was inoculated with small-pox by Jenner without effect.

VI.—Sarah Wynne, dairy-maid. In 1796 had cow-pox in May. On 28th March, 1797, was inoculated with small-pox by Jenner without effect.

Under this case Jenner observes, that “among our dairy farmers those who have had small-pox either escape cow-pox, or are disposed to have it slightly; and as soon as the complaint shows itself among cattle, assistants are procured, if possible, who are thus rendered less susceptible of it, otherwise the business of the farm could scarcely go forward.”

VII.—Wm. Rodway, dairyman. In 1796 had cow-pox. In 1797 inoculated with small-pox by Jenner without effect.

VIII.—Elizabeth Wynne, dairy-maid. In 1759 had cow-pox slightly. In 1797 inoculated with small-pox by Jenner without effect. Had cow-pox again, 1798.

IX.—Wm. Smith, farm servant. In 1780, when attending to horses with sore heels, he conveyed the virus to cows, and from the cows caught cow-pox. Had cow-pox again in 1791, and again in 1794. Was twice inoculated with small-pox in 1795, and exposed to small-pox without effect.

X.—Simon Nichols, farm servant. In 1793 had cow-pox. Inoculated with small-pox by Jenner some years afterwards without effect.

XI.—Wm. Stinchcombe, follow-servant with Nichols. In 1782 had cow-pox badly. In 1792 inoculated with small-pox without effect.

XII.—Hester Walkley. In 1782 had cow-pox. In 1795 she, and seven other pauper women of Torkworth, who also had had cow-pox, were inoculated with small-pox by Henry Jenner without effect.

Mark the assumption, that if these people had not had cow-pox they would have received small-pox by inoculation, whilst nothing was so frequently charged against small-pox inoculation as its uncertainty, especially in persons over thirty-five years of age, as were the subjects of these experiments, with the possible exceptions of VI. and VII. The reason given by Jenner for the production of these Cases is, that he wished to “show that the change produced in the constitution by cow-pox is not affected by time”—a point which most vaccinators now freely surrender, insisting on the necessity of re-vaccination to maintain “the benign influence.” To have made such experiments approximately conclusive would have required the inoculation with small-pox of subjects of corresponding ages and temperaments who had not passed through cow-pox; and the probability is that the results would not have been dissimilar.

We have also to observe that cow-pox itself did not prevent the recurrence of cow-pox, as shown in Cases VIII. and IX.; nor does Jenner even attempt to explain its inefficiency in this respect, whilst allowing small-pox to be a protection from cow-pox, as under Case VI. Such obvious difficulties and inconsistencies did not disturb his easy philosophy.

We must not, however, go farther until cow-pox is described; and for that purpose we cannot do better than cite Jenner himself. He writes—

“Cow-pox appears on the nipples of the cows in the form of irregular pustules. At their first appearance they are commonly of a palish blue, or rather of a colour somewhat approaching to livid, and are surrounded by an inflammation. These pustules, unless a timely remedy be applied, frequently degenerate into phagedenic [spreading] ulcers, which prove extremely troublesome. The animals become indisposed, and the secretion of milk is much lessened.

“Inflected spots now begin to appear on different parts of the hands of the domestics employed in milking, and sometimes on the wrists, which run on to suppuration, first assuming the appearance of the small vesications produced by a burn. Most commonly they appear about the joints of the fingers, and at their extremities; but whatever parts are affected, if the situation will admit, these superficial suppurations put on a circular form, with their edges more elevated than their centres, and of a colour distantly approaching to blue. Absorption takes place, and tumours appear in each axilla [arm-pit].

“The system becomes affected, the pulse is quickened; shiverings, succeeded by heat, general lassitude and pains about the loins and limbs, with vomiting, come on. The head is painful, and the patient is now and then even affected with delirium;” and, Jenner might have added, with convulsions.

Having drawn this alarming picture of the effects of cow-pox, he interposes—

Such timely remedies were solutions of sulphate of zinc or sulphate of copper—a hint for those in quest of antidotes for vaccination.
"It will appear in the sequel that these symptoms arise principally from the irritation of the sores, and not from the primary action of the vaccine virus upon the constitution."

If cow-pox meant all this, some might prefer, at least, the risk of small-pox; hence the judicious explanation—the irritation of the sores, not the poison in the blood, is the cause of the distressing symptoms! Jenner proceeds—

"These symptoms, varying in their degrees of violence, generally continue from one day to three or four, leaving ulcerated sores about the hands, which, from the sensibility of the parts, are very troublesome, and commonly heal slowly, frequently becoming phagedenic, like those from whence they sprang. During the progress of the disease, the lips, nostrils, eyelids, and other parts of the body, are sometimes affected with sores; but these evidently arise [how evidently?] from their being heedlessly rubbed or scratched with the patient's infected fingers."

It was this serious disease, this communicative cow-pox, which the subjects of the foregoing Cases had passed through; and Jenner, in conformity with popular opinion, held that they were thereby rendered proof against small-pox. Whilst the twelve Cases adduced make a show of inquiry, they cover a very narrow area of personal research. In the general small-pox inoculations then prevalent, subjects of cow-pox were "cut" indiscriminately with their neighbours—as, in Case XII., were the eight cow-poxed paupers of Torkworth; for the argument ran, that if the pox did not "take" it could not hurt. Yet Jenner was at no pains to collect and exhibit the testimony of other Gloucestershire practitioners, who, in the mere course of duty, must have known at least as much as himself, and might have set scores of Cases alongside his dozen.

We now come to the cases of Horse-Grease—

for not only were farm-folk reputed secure from small-pox by reason of cow-pox, but farriers, likewise, through poisoning with horse-grease. Here follows evidence—

XIII.—Thomas Pearce, son of a farrier. In consequence of dressing horses with sore heels at his father's when a lad, had sores on his fingers which suppurred, and occasioned pretty severe indisposition. Six years afterwards, Jenner inoculated him repeatedly with small-pox, but only produced slight inflammation, and exposed him to the contagion of small-pox without effect.

On this case Jenner remarks—

"It is a remarkable fact, and well-known to many, that we are frequently foiled in our endeavours to communicate small-pox by inoculation to blacksmiths, who in the country are farriers."

XIV.—James Cole, farmer. Had horse-grease in the same way as Pearce. Some years afterwards was inoculated with small-pox, but only a few eruptions appeared on his forehead, which passed away without maturation.

XIV.—Abraham Riddiford, farmer. Was affected with very painful sores in both hands, tumours in each arm-pit, and severe and general indisposition, in consequence of dressing a mare that had sore heels. He was attended by a surgeon who assured him that he was now safe from small-pox, but, twenty years afterwards, he caught the disease, which ran its regular course. From this case Jenner draws the conclusion—

"Although the absorption of matter from sores on the heels of horses, secures, or nearly secures, the system from variolous infection, yet it is possible that this cannot be entirely relied upon, until a disease has been generated by the morbid matter from the horse on the nipple of the cow, and passed through that medium to the human subject."

So far the cases set forth describe no more than ordinary Gloucestershire experience; but now we come upon the ground which is regarded as peculiarly Jennerian.

XVI.—Sarah Nelmess, dairy-maid. In 1796 had cow-pox, receiving the virus on a part of her hand scratched by a thorn. From the large pustulous sore on her hand Jenner, on 14th May, inoculated—

XVII.—James Phillips, a healthy boy, eight years of age, in the arm by two superficial incisions half an inch long. The inoculation "took," and was followed by chill, loss of appetite, headache, and restless sleep. On 1st July, the poor lad was inoculated with smallpox, and again several months afterwards, it is said, without effect.

"Here," says Jenner, "my researches were interrupted till the spring of the year 1798, when, from the wetness of the early part of the season, many of the farmers' horses were affected with sore heels, in consequence of which cow-pox broke out among several of our dairy, which afforded me an opportunity of making further observations upon the curious disease."

About the latter end of February, 1798, Wm. Haynes and Thomas Virgoe having to wash a mare with sore heels, were infected with the
grease, and described their sensations as much the same as when they were inoculated with small-pox. Their infection proved that if grease was good against small-pox, small-pox was not good against grease. Haynes was employed as a milkman, and pox broke out among his master's cows about ten days after he had first assisted in washing the mare's heels. The cows' nipples became sore in the usual way, but as remedies were speedily applied, they did not ulcerate to any extent.*

XVIII.—John Baker, five years old. Inoculated, 16th March, 1798, with matter taken from a pustule on the hand of the aforesaid Thomas Virgoe poisoned with grease from the mare's heels. "He became ill on the sixth day with symptoms similar to those excited by cow-pox, and on the eighth was free from indisposition."

Upon this case Jenner observes—

"We have seen that the virus from the horse is not to be relied upon as rendering the system secure from variolous infection, but that the matter produced by it on the nipple of the cow is perfectly so. Whether the virus passing from the horse through the human constitution, as in the present instance, will produce a similar effect remains to be decided. This would have been effected, but the boy was rendered unfit for small-pox inoculation from having felt the effects of a contagious fever in a work-house soon after this experiment was made."

Such was Jenner's method of induction! How could he leave the question undecided? Why not have waited until little Baker recovered from his fever? or why not have inoculated another workhouse child with horse-grease? The true sone of science do not rush into print in such shameless desability.

XIX.—William Summers, five years and a half old. Inoculated, 16th March, 1798, from the nipple of one of the cows infected with horse-grease by Haynes. Subsequently inoculated with small-pox without effect.

XX.—William Pead, eight years old. Inoculated, 28th March, from Summers. Subsequently inoculated with small-pox without effect.

XXI.—Hannah Excell, aged seven, and several children and adults were inoculated from the arm of Pead on 6th April. "The greater part of them sicknessed on the sixth day, and were well on the seventh; but in three of the number a secondary indisposition arose in consequence of an extensive erysipelatous inflammation which appeared on the inoculated arms. By the application of mercurial ointment to the inflamed parts (a treatment recommended under similar circumstances in the inoculated small-pox) the complaint subsided without giving much trouble."

Excull was inoculated in three places on her arm. "This," says Jenner, "was not done intentionally, but from the accidental touch of the lancet, one puncture being always sufficient."

The resulting pustules so much resembled those arising from inoculation with small-pox, "that an experienced inoculator would scarcely have discovered a shade of difference."

XXII.—On 12th April virus was taken from Hannah Excull and inserted in the arms of—

Robert F. Jenner, aged 11 months,
John Marklove, 18
Mary Pead, 5 years,
Mary James, 6
R. F. Jenner did not "take." The arms of the others inflamed, and Jenner fearing erysipelas, as in the preceding cases, applied a caustic of soap and quicklime to Marklove and James, "which," he says, "effectually answered my intention in preventing erysipelas." The disease was suffered to take its course in Pead, and no erysipelas appeared.

XXIII.—John Bargy, seven years old. Inoculated from Mary Pead, and successfully. Was subsequently inoculated with small-pox without effect.

"These experiments," says Jenner, "afforded me much satisfaction; they proved that the matter in passing from one human subject to another, through five gradations, lost none of its original properties, John Barge being the fifth who received the infection successively from William Summers, the boy to whom it was communicated from the cow."

These are Jenner's Cases—the ground of his "master-piece of medical induction!" and I do not think that anyone seriously interested in the vaccination question will grudge the trouble of their examination. Let us carefully remark the dates. Until 1798, when he operated on Phipps, he never made an experiment in vaccination; and not until the middle of March, 1798, a few weeks before going to press with the Inquiry, did he repeat the experiment; and though his later cases were complicated with erysipelas, he did not stay to dispose of the difficulty and alarm thereby excited. He got
together his scratch lot of cases, as if under some over-mastering compulsion, and consigned the concern, crude, and incomplete, to the public. By-and-by the hasty performance came to be spoken of as the fruit of thirty years of patient research, of incessant thought, of unwearied labour; but there is nothing too great for credulity when we are in the humour of belief. In Jenner’s story we have the advantage of witnessing the development of myth in the light of our own age under our own eyes.

Taking Jenner’s Inquiry at the utmost, What was it? A suggestion to substitute cow-pox for small-pox in inoculation. That was all. Beyond this there was no practical point of novelty. Some have credited Jenner with originating the transfer of virus from arm to arm; but in this respect he followed the example of many inoculators. There was a mild form of small-pox occasionally prevalent in London called “pearly pox,” and Dr. Adams and others employed it for inoculation, and kept it going from patient to patient; and the virus from the arm of a healthy child was in constant request by timid folk, who fancied the virulence of the original infection was abated in course of transmission.

So much for Jenner’s data: now for a few words about his speculations.

He considered that some of the diseases which afflict men are derived from their domestication of animals; and that several diseases might have a common origin. “For example,” he asks, “is it difficult to imagine that the measles, the scarlet fever, and the ulcerous sore throat with a spotted skin, have all sprung from the same source?”

This speculation was designed to cover his contention that cow-pox was bred from horse-grease and small-pox from cow-pox.

For the derivation of cow-pox from horse-grease, he had a plausible case, which was thus stated—

“...there is a disease to which the horse, from his state of domestication, is frequently subject. The farmers have termed it the Grease. It is an inflammation and swelling in the heel, accompanied in its commencement with small cracks or fissures, from which issues a limpid fluid, possessing properties of a peculiar kind.

“In this dairy country a great number of cows are kept, and the office of milking is performed indiscriminately by men and maid-servants. One of the former in applying dressings to the heels of a horse, and not paying due attention to cleanliness, incautiously bears his part in milking the cows, with some particles of the infectious matter adhering to his fingers. When this is the case, it frequently happens that a disease is communicated to the cows, and from the cows to the dairy-maids, which spreads through the farm until most of the cattle and domestics feel its unpleasant consequences. This disease has obtained the name of the Cow-Pox.”

Whether Jenner was the first to assign cow-pox to infection with horse-grease, or whether he merely repeated Gloucestershire opinion, he does not state; but at any rate he had no doubt that cow-pox was thus begotten, saying—

“I feel no room for hesitation, being well convinced that the disease never appears among cows unless they have been milked by some one who, at the same time, has the care of a horse with diseased heels.”

The other wing of Jenner’s doctrine, that small-pox was derived from horse-grease through cow-pox, had nothing to justify it. He adduced no evidence to connect outbreaks of small-pox with cow-pox, nor did he even suggest that dairy-maids caught small-pox from cows, or farriers from horses. His solitary identification of the diseases was the close resemblance of the cow-pox to the small-pox pustule. This resemblance, however, served his turn, and out of his narrow and indifferent experience he boldly affirmed the equivalence of the diseases, saying—

“It is curious to observe that the virus should invariably and completely possess those specific properties which induce in the human constitution symptoms similar to those of the various fever, and effect in it that peculiar change which for ever renders it unsusceptible of the various contagion.”

Jenner’s expectation from the issue of the Inquiry had nothing of the prophetic character described by his enthusiastic biographers. In the first place he regarded the continued existence of cow-pox as far from certain, saying—

“A knowledge of the source of infection [horse-grease] is new in the minds of most of the farmers in this neighbourhood [Berkeley], but has at length produced good consequences; and it seems probable from the precautions they are now disposed to adopt, that the appearance of the cow-pox here may either be entirely extinguished or become extremely rare.”

At the same time he throws out the suggestion that other affections than grease on the horse may beget pox on the cow; and relates how some milkers who dressed an erysipelasous inflammation on the thigh of a sucking colt were the means of infecting twenty-four cows
with pox, and themselves in turn; “the active quality of the virus being greatly increased after it has acted on the nipples of the cow.”

When Jenner was writing, the English people were committed to small-pox inoculation, or more accurately small-pox culture, and it was in competition with small-pox that he advanced cow-pox. “If asked,” he says, “whether his investigation be matter of mere curiosity, or whether it tend to any beneficial purpose,” he replies by setting forth the draw-backs to the existing practice, and contrasting them with the advantages of his own.

“Incubation,” he says, “not very frequently produces deformity of the skin, and sometimes, under the best management, proves fatal.

“I have never known fatal effects arise from cow-pox even when impressed in the most unfavourable manner, producing extensive inflammations and suppurations of the hands; and as it clearly appears that this disease leaves the constitution in a state of perfect security from the infection of small-pox, may we not infer that a mode of inoculation may be introduced preferable to that at present adopted, especially among families predisposed to have the disease unfavourably?”

He goes on to claim that cow-pox produces no pasteties, and that the disease is not infectious, “so that a single individual of a family might receive it at any time without the risk of infecting the rest, or of spreading a distemper that fills a country with terror.”

He adds, “in constitutions disposed to scrofula, how frequently we see inoculated small-pox rouse into activity that distressful malady!”

but he happily had the grace to refrain from explicitly asserting that cow-pox was exempt from a similar hazard.

Nevertheless, with characteristic inconsistency, he was disposed to advance a claim for cow-pox as an expulsive irritant, saying—

“As we have seen [though he never showed] that the constitution may at any time be made to feel the febrile attack of cow-pox, might it not, in many chronic diseases, be introduced into the system, with the probability of affording relief, upon well-known physiological principles?”

Finally, he adduces the uncertainty of small-pox inoculation—

“There are many, who from some peculiarity of habit, resist the common effects of variolous matter inserted into the skin, and who in consequence are haunted through life with the distressing idea of being insecure from subsequent

infection. A ready mode of dissipating anxiety from such a cause must now appear obvious” —

How obvious, he failed to show. He made no pretence to demonstrate that everybody could be inoculated with cow-pox any more than everybody with small-pox.

In short, the Inquiry in nowise bears out the character claimed for it as the outcome of the observation and meditation of many years. On the contrary, the dates of the cases, with the ill-reasoned and imperfect conclusions, plainly show that it was a hasty adventure; and to describe it as “a master-piece of medical induction” is to exhibit a strange incapacity for accurate and serious criticism.

[I should have added some observations on the illusory nature of Jenner’s variolous test, or the inoculation of small-pox after that of cow-pox, but must reserve the matter until next month.—W.W.]

MR. ERNEST HART’S LECTURE.

It was with much satisfaction that I heard that Mr. Hart was going to make an end of the anti-vaccinators at the request of the National Health Society. We who have everything to gain from free discussion and the publicity of truth, receive cheerily threats of defeat and annihilation. Moreover, whilst I cannot say I like Mr. Hart, yet was I pleased to make his further acquaintance. I sat out the Animal Vaccination Conference, and in its tedious course relieved my mind in observing Mr. Hart’s demeanour as chairman, for which function he exhibited not a few Napoleonic qualifications. In the first place, he knew his own mind, and was resolved that the deliberations of the assembly should issue in a verdict favourable to calf-lymph. Any doubts tending to discredit vaccination he put down summarily. He would listen to no anti-vaccination on any pretext whatever; although in Mr. E. Robinson he encountered tactics that were more than a match for his tyranny. An efficient chairman should have a spice of the deep, but in that respect Mr. Hart is decidedly over-spiced. He knows the power of blister, and when Dr. Wyld began to indiscretely reveal some of the perils of vaccination, Hart brought his hand down upon him, and he collapsed as offensively as an opera hat. But stronger men know blister, and disregard it; and thus when a similar attempt was made on Professor Simonds, it was Hart that collapsed.

Considering Mr. Hart’s position in the medical world, and as editor of the British Medical
Journal, I resorted to the hall of the Society of Arts in the fog of 27th January with the reasonable expectation of hearing something fresh in favour of vaccination—to have, at least, old fallacies set in new light, and to be amused, perhaps, with abuse that was not stale. The chair was occupied by Dr. Andrew Clark, whose frank address was altogether admirable—an incitement to candour, patience, and good-sense.

Mr. Hart had not read more than a few minutes when I discovered that I was what is called "sold"—that I was "in" for the recital of a tedious piece of hack-work—what our forefathers would have called an essay from Grub Street. So aggrieved was Dr. Collins that he rather rudely intervened to inquire whether Mr. Hart was not treating us to a reading from Mr. Simon's well-known Blue Book. Mr. Hart is a busy man, with little leisure for original composition, probably knowing nothing of vaccination outside books, and was selected by the National Health Society as lecturer on the supposition that his name might "draw." There was nothing whatever in the lecture with which anti-vaccinators are not familiar, and it is not to be supposed that the outer world is going to read what they may find in better form elsewhere. The only point wherein Mr. Hart distinguished himself was in his scorn and contempt for anti-vaccinators. Their ignorance, their fanaticism, and their falsehoods were little short of indescribable. He forgets that anti-vaccinators have so long found their element in such abuse that it has ceased to hurt them, whilst its extravagance is beginning to work a reaction. One of his specially outrageous remarks was, that anti-vaccinators disregard statistics, and have no sense of their value! when there never was a popular movement wherein so much was staked as on the study and correct appreciation of statistics! Why, Mr. Hart's own associate, Dr. Cameron, M.P., wrote to the Times and testified—

"From a return laid before the House of Commons on August 14th, 1877 (Table 16), it appears that while in seven years prior to the Vaccination Act the mortality from small-pox in England and Wales mounted to 0'0392 per cent. of the population, in the following 14 years, when vaccination was obligatory, but the obligation, owing to defective machinery, was not enforced, it fell to 0'0189. But in the following eight years, when the defective machinery was rectified, and the national system of vaccination was greatly improved and extended, the mortality rose to 0'0397. The great increase in the
Robinson was equal to the occasion. He had Dr. Warlomont's lecture at hand and read the very words incriminated to the confusion of his arrogant censor. The Chairman then called for some one to speak in defence of vaccination, and in response Mr. Bartlett aired some notions on the microscopic characteristics of vaccine virus. Lastly, Mr. Emery delivered a vigorous speech in which he roughly disposed of some of the lecturer's more audacious assertions as to the immunity of hospital nurses from small-pox, and the value of many vaccination marks; adding, as personal experience, that his wife, who was the only re-vaccinated member of his household, took small-pox, whilst her unvaccinated infant escaped. An observation, that considering the money doctors got by vaccination, it was natural they should fight for it, called forth an indignant rebuke from the Chairman, who held that the profession were altogether superior to lucrative considerations.

Thus the meeting intended for our confusion ended otherwise. "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off." I turned to my British Medical Journal to see what face Dr. Ernest Hart put upon the transaction, and there read that "a rather noisy discussion by anti-vaccinators followed the lecture, in which, however, no attempt was even made to meet the figures brought forward." Such is truthful reporting! and such is Mr. Ernest Hart—the noisiest person in the room!

St. Kentigern.

WM. WHITE TO DR. ANDREW CLARK.
Kemplay Road, Hampstead, N.W.,
27th January, 1880.

To ANDREW CLARK, Esq., M.D.

Sir,—I cannot help thanking you cordially for your impartial conduct in the chair at Mr. Ernest Hart's lecture, and for the manner in which you indicated the grand fallacy that vitiated his discourse. The sanitary improvements and changes in habit and diet which have reduced symptomatic disease have also reduced small-pox; but our rabid vaccinators assert that these improvements and changes have had little or no influence on small-pox, and that the reduction is chiefly due to vaccination. This Dr. Seaton maintained in his Report for 1874—the highest water-mark, perhaps, of vaccinating fanaticism.

You asked, and Mr. Hart asked, why we did not answer his statistics; but Mr. Hart made no attempt to answer Dr. Pearce's. The truth is, statistics cannot be answered off-hand, and any one can secure an easy triumph by roaring out figures which his adversaries have no instant means of checking.

Mr. Hart, and you too, wished to know how we accounted for the extraordinary mortality in hospitals among the unvaccinated. We reply, the mortality, as stated, is incredible, and is greater by far than the mortality from small-pox in ante-vaccination days. At the same time, I would ask, Who are the unvaccinated? and reply, They are the waifs and strays of our civilisation, the children of vagabonds, with feeble constitutions to start with, the victims of every form of disease. The unvaccinated are also the unbaptised, and the lack of baptism is as likely to have contributed to their deaths as the lack of vaccination. If the inquiry were made, it would be found, I have no doubt, that the unvaccinated in hospitals die at a higher rate than the vaccinated of pneumonia and scarlet fever.

You were a little hard on our friend Emery for his ascription of mercenary motives to medical men. I admit the imputation is injudicious, and in innumerable cases untrue; but at the same time human nature is human nature, and we need not be so romantic as to suppose that the gains of vaccination have no influence on the maintenance of vaccination. How many clergymen of the Irish Church favoured Gladstone's measure of disendowment? and are not parsons and doctors much the same the world over?—Yours faithfully,

WM. WHITE.

16 Cavendish Square, W.,
31st January, 1880.

To WM. WHITE, Esq.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your incisive and able letter, and to express my regret that the pressure of work entitled to precedence prevents me from entering into that consideration of it which otherwise I should gladly have given.—Faithfully yours,

ANDREW CLARK.

"Each (small-pox) epidemic, since Jenner's system, had been more severe than the preceding one."—Right Hon. Earl Percy.

"The President of the Local Government Board cannot deny that children die under the operation of the Vaccination Acts in a wholesale way."—J. W. Pease, M.P.
MR. DUDGEON ON MR. HART’S LECTURE.

The following comments on Mr. Hart’s lecture have been sent to us by Mr. Dudgeon, and have appeared in the *Echo*.

Mr. Hart’s letter is another illustration of the heating nature of the vaccine controversy even on minds naturally cool and collected. The speaker no sooner gets warmed by his theme than he launches out into sharp invective against those who differ from him on this question. The anti-vaccine publications, he says, consist of surprising misstatements, misquotations, and absurd descriptions of physiological phenomena. As vaccinators themselves acknowledge their inability to explain the physiological phenomena of small-pox and its vaccine preventive, this unpleasing language might well have been spared.

Mr. Hart tells us that “a thoroughly vaccinated person has only one-seventieth of the chances of catching the small-pox that an unvaccinated person has”; but as a person who catches the small-pox is invariably declared by our opponents to be *ipso facto* a person not thoroughly vaccinated, the argument is not a forcible one. The Chinese are an unvaccinated nation, but surely they are not seventy times more liable to small-pox than our vaccinated friends, neither are they fifty times more liable to death from it when attacked. As a matter of fact, there is every reason to believe that China is more free from this disease than vaccinated Europe.

Mr. Hart attaches much importance to the fatal cases in the family of King William the Third. Let me remind him that Pepys tells us that the Queen’s Portuguese ladies in London, twenty-six years before King William’s reign, “complained much of the lack of good water to drink.” As with the water so with the air. The stench and filth of London did not, as vaccinators ignorantly pretend, cease with the great fire in 1668. As late as 1740 a speech was delivered in the House of Commons which clearly explains to us the cause of the small-pox and plague of those days. Lord Viscount Tyrconnell said—

“The most disgusting part of the character given by travellers of the most savage nations is their neglect of cleanliness, of which, perhaps, no part of the world affords more proof than the streets of the British capital, which abound with such heaps of filth as a savage would look on with amusement. The passenger is everywhere offended and obstructed by mountains of filth.

No magistrate has power to remedy it. If that be allowed which is generally believed, that putrefaction and stench are the cause of pestilential distempers, I solicit the House to unite with me to avert the greatest and most dreadful of calamities.”

Lord Gage supported the Viscount’s Bill for cleansing the streets. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Sandys) angrily opposed it. The advantages of street cleanliness were “shadowy.” He “should not be surprised to hear the wisest man declare rather for a pestilence than an increase of officers.” He “did not think the grievance insupportable.” The Bill was consequently lost by 142 against 109. Have these words, of surpassing interest to the calm and judicial inquirer, ever been made use of by any defender of vaccination? Yet they are of the highest historic value to those who wish for truth.

It is the old battle of cleanliness against mysticism which is still raging. In 1740 it was cleanliness *versus* inoculation. It is now cleanliness (municipal cleanliness) *versus* vaccination.

If Mr. Hart wishes to weaken our hold upon the public mind, it is upon this line that the battle must be fought.

Our anti-vaccine theory, that zymotic disease is the natural result of municipal filth, is making great strides in the United States. One of the best writers in the *Atlantic Monthly*, of December, says that public opinion in the North believes that the yellow fever is caused by the filthy state of the Southern cities; while, on the contrary, the controlling opinion of the South is that the disease never originates *de novo*, but is due to importation from abroad; and that the effectual safeguard is not municipal cleanliness, but quarantine and isolation. For instance, the medical inspector of Mobile has lately reported that “things are very unsanitary here. When I have approached the authorities upon the subject [municipal filth], they have said that yellow-fever will come whether you are clean or not.”

Quorn.

---

MR. HART AND MR. DUDGEON.

Mr. Dudgeon was good enough to refer to Mr. Hart as a person of cool and collected mind: fortunately he reserved any compliment as to his accuracy. Mr. Dudgeon said truly—

“A person who catches the small-pox is invariably declared by our opponents to be *ipso facto* a person not thoroughly vaccinated.”

Mr. Hart thereon wrote to the *Echo*—
"There is only one part of the letter signed 'Henry D. Dudgeon' which seems to me to call for any reply, and that is the sentence in which the writer states that—

"'A person who catches the small-pox is irrevocably described by our opponents to be ipso facto not vaccinated.'"

Mark the omission of the word **thoroughly**. Mr. Dudgeon did not say "a person not vaccinated": he said "a person not thoroughly vaccinated"; which, as all know, is a common-place of vaccinators' logic. Having stuck up his man of straw, Mr. Hart proceeds to fire away in this fashion—

"Of course if this were true, all statistics on the subject would be valueless. It is, however, as Henry D. Dudgeon should know, absolutely and entirely untrue. The proof of vaccination is derived from the presence on the arm of marks of vaccination, and nothing else. If the opponents of vaccination have no other reply to the overwhelming evidence afforded by an immense experience of the immunity of well-vaccinated persons from attacks of small-pox, and of the very light mortality among those who, being well-vaccinated, are attacked, we may fairly consider that they have no case at all, and that is, I can say, the true state of facts."

We have seen something in our time of mendacious quackery, but scarcely anything to match the foregoing; and now we clearly see what sort of character we have to deal with when Mr. Ernest Hart is our antagonist.

In a letter to the *Echo*, of 11th February, Mr. Dudgeon observes—

Thorough vaccination either means vaccination which produces the intended effect, or it does not; and, in the latter case, what meaning can we possibly attach to the word in this controversy? Of course I am aware that the whole profession are compelled to acknowledge the deaths of many thousands of vaccinated persons from small-pox in the last ten years. But why does Mr. Hart speak of the "overwhelming evidence afforded by an immense experience of the immunity of well-vaccinated persons from attacks of small-pox"? And does not every one know that the sufferings of the vaccinated from small-pox are constantly attributed to the inefficiency of the vaccination, the limited number of marks, the deterioration of the lymph, and the improper methods employed; in a word, to the want of "thoroughness" or suitability of the means to the end?

Mr. Hart makes a statement which reaches far. He says—"The proof of vaccination is derived from the presence on the arm of marks of vaccination, and nothing else." In this event, patients who enter hospitals, in the confluent stage, with the marks of vaccination hidden by the eruption, would necessarily, should death ensue, be registered with the unvaccinated. "C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre!"

JOSHUA JACOB AND LORD EMLY.

**Lord Emly**, as Mr. William Monsell, was Postmaster under Mr. Gladstone’s administration, and now sits as Chairman of the Limerick Board of Guardians, actively co-operating in the persecution of Mr. Joshua Jacob and other Limerick anti-vaccinators. Personally, we believe, Lord Emly is kindly and well-meaning, and in a moment of weakness ventured to write to Mr. Jacob, explaining why he should submit to the law, forgetting that authority should never condescend to argue. Mr. Jacob, good Friend as he is, was not slow to perceive his advantage, and thus dealt with his adversary—

Friend,—I am favoured with thy letter in reply to one from me, in which I complained of the action of the Board of Guardians in continuing a fruitless contest with me by harsh, cruel, and repeated prosecutions, in the carrying out of which my property has been seized by force of police and put up to public auction in this city, where I have endeavoured to live peaceably these many years.

The letter before me, as well as thy several public speeches on the subject, having contributed to the revival of these cruelties, I think it my duty to address to thee a public reply, in which I shall endeavour to convince thee that the 600 Limerick defaulters, with myself, have truth, justice, and common sense on their side.

It is true that some of the Guardians profess to believe that they must carry out the law, and that the Act is against me. To this weak apology I answer, that a bad Act of Parliament can never be justified by the mere argument of its own existence. There once was a law under which "Quakers" were cruelly persecuted for refusing to swear; and will it be credited that four of that peaceable people were hanged at Boston in the time of Charles II., under no graver charge than that they were "Quakers." In Ireland there was at one time a law which offered a reward for a priest’s head, and made it a penal offence for a man of the Roman Catholic faith
to own a horse of the value of £5. These were bad laws, and yet men were found who carried them out, and tried to screen themselves by saying the law was against the owner of the horse, and that by Act of Parliament they must behead the priest. Prosecutors and executioners were not wanting, and all sheltered themselves behind the existing statutes. The Limerick Guardians seem to think they are under a necessity to prosecute me indefinitely. Is this the spirit of the Act? assuredly not. The Local Government Board (England), in reply to a question put by the Caister Board of Guardians (1877)—"Are we obliged to prosecute vaccination defaulters more than once?" answered, "In the Board's opinion, sec. 5, art. 16, of the Order of 21st October, 1874, leaves a discretion to the Guardians, whether, after proceedings have been taken in any case, under sec. 31 of the Vaccination Act, 1867, further proceedings should be taken in the same case, if the default continues." Now, inasmuch as the Irish law on this subject has lately been assimilated to the English, I have a right to claim the benefit of this opinion."

To thy statement that "Thirty years before vaccination was introduced, the number of deaths in England from small-pox was 3000 a year per million of the population," I answer that this is an estimate merely, put forward by a medical officer of the Privy Council, who reduced it to 2500 when examined before the Commons Committee in 1871, and was derived from an estimate of Dr. Lettsom, who lived last century, and who assumed that figure to represent the mortality all over England, from the circumstance that it represented the mortality in and around London at a certain period! Figures are indeed figurative, as I shall prove by reminding thee that in vaccinated Dublin in 1873, the small-pox death-rate rose to 7500 per million—a complete and crushing answer to thy English estimate. By parity of reasoning, we might, with equal propriety, assume that 7500 per million was the small-pox mortality for all Ireland. . . .

Baron Emily, let me appeal to thy well-known intelligence to decide whether that indefinite thing called vaccine lymph is drawn from one source, as tea from a chest. No man can or dare deny that it comes from a thousand and one sources. Since the days of Jenner millions of human bodies have been tapped to furnish supplies of this admittedly dangerous virus, and these specimens of human matter (glossed over with the innocent name "cow-pock") charged in many instances with various hateful and horrible diseases, have been inserted, by force of an inhuman law, into tens of millions of other human bodies. It is in vain for Drs. O'Farrell, Hayes, and O'Shaugnnessy to deny what is openly admitted by great leaders in their own profession. The Lancet and British Medical Journal admit that the foulest disorders have been transmitted by vaccination. Dr. Huchinson, the eminent London surgeon, reported to the Medical Association, a case within his own experience where thirteen vaccinations were made from a healthy-looking child, the result being that eleven children were ruined by syphilis, that ghastly disease which originates in the immorality of mankind.

To thy remark to the Guardians that I had obtained the opinion of a "quack" on these points, I answer that Dr. Haughton, who gave evidence in court for me, is the son of the late chairman of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company. He is a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, England, and is a Doctor of Medicine; and in addition to these diplomas he has obtained a gold medal in Trinity College, Dublin, of which College he is Senior Moderator in Experimental and Natural Science.

I now proceed to the examination of thy Scottish figures, which were quoted as follows—Scotland—Compulsory Act introduced 1865.

Deaths from small-pox in
1864—1741 1867—100
1865—388 1868—15
1866—201 1869—1

These statistics were put forward by thee with the remark, "There is no getting over such facts;" and the Board responded by ordering another prosecution. I am bound, Baron Emily, to put the best possible construction upon men's words; but seeing that I am a great sufferer, I ask thee, in the face of the whole country, to tell me how thou hast been led into the error of selecting just those figures which appear to favour your action, and of suppressing further statistical evidence from Scotland which would condemn you and justify me. The items chosen are from the returns of the Scottish Registrar-General, and are correct, with the exception of that for 1869, which is erroneously given as 1 instead of 64. But, in justice, why stop at the year 1869? The returns of the Registrar-General go on to state:

Deaths from small-pox in Scotland
1870—114 1872—2448
1871—1442 1873—1126
THE VACCINATION INQUERER.

Now, if the prevalence of vaccination caused the abatement of small-pox from 1864 to 1869, as we are invited to believe, to what must we attribute the great increase in 1871, '72, and '73?

As regards thy Dublin statistics, art thou aware that Dr. Kenny and the Guardians of the South Dublin Union have officially reported that the vaccination laws are thoroughly and stringently enforced? Though, in the face of that fact, as if in mockery of it, we have the intelligence that the worst small-pox epidemic for the century is still unabated!

Thy statement that there has been a mortality of 69 to 80 per cent. amongst unvaccinated small-pox patients, is a self-refuted statistic. Last century, before vaccination was known, or sanitary science had begun to be studied, the estimated mortality was put down at an average of 11 and a maximum of 20 per cent. And yet we are now asked to believe that amongst unvaccinated patients there is, notwithstanding the vast improvements in sanitary science, a mortality of 69 to 80 per cent! With great respect to thee, the statement is incredible; for Dr. Seaton, in his _Handbook of Vaccination_, asserts that, "We have no reason to believe that small-pox is more fatal in this century than the last."

To draw towards a conclusion, may I remind thee that some of the most learned and foremost men in the present House of Commons are opposed to compulsory vaccination, amongst whom I may name William E. Gladstone and John Bright, I believe brother cabinet ministers of thine own. . . .

Having regard to the present state of this country, I wish to be found amongst its law-abiding inhabitants, and to uphold the power of the civil magistrate, but I cannot consent to the vaccination of my child. You may still further prosecute, so as to multiply penalties which might end in my imprisonment or exile; but you shall never succeed in depriving me of a father's natural prerogative to protect his child from what he believes may be injurious to her moral condition as well as physical health.

May I remind thee and the Guardians, that, considering my fixed determination to carry out the dictates of my own conscience, further prosecutions would only inflict pain, and would tend to bring the administration of law into disrepute, and lessen you in public estimation. Above all, they would provoke the displeasure of the Divine Parent of mankind, who still teaches that "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy."

Thy respectful friend,

JOSUA JACOB.

Rockspring, near Limerick, the 5th of the 2nd month (called February), 1880.

---

OFFICIAL OFFICIOUSNESS.

The Vaccination Acts are not law, but a mockery of law. They are injustice by Act of Parliament. Wrong cannot be made right by Parliamentary majorities. Laws, real laws, harmonise man with man, never punish virtuous men, but only protect them, and curb the vicious. The Vaccination Acts are a disgrace to our civilisation, and hideous must be the injustice which causes public bodies, naturally conservative, to interpose and obstruct the course of legislation.

Boards of Guardians in enlightened districts like Dewsbury, for instance, are ashamed to assume the task of persecuting for conscience' sake, and trampling upon the rights of parents; and issue eloquent protests against the infamous Acts whereof they are expected to be the degraded instruments. The Dewsbury Guardians have argued out the subject with the Local Government Board, and have so piled reason on fact and fact on reason, that the Board seem as impotent to render an answer as if they were so many graveldiggers or parish beadle. They fall back on the usual argument of tyranny—their authority and their power; but they cannot long expect Englishmen of the 19th century to bow to what is void of reason and justice, which, moreover, prays to be left untouched, lest it collapse altogether.

The Leicester Guardians likewise ventured to remonstrate with the Local Government Board upon the impropriety of burdening them (an unpaid body already heavily burdened) with the unpleasant responsibility of initiating the prosecution of most intelligent and conscientious neighbours in order to compel them to pollute their children.

Here, too, the Local Government Board were smitten with impotence. They could not defend the vaccination fraud. They could only fall back on authority, and on what they call law.

The Leicester Guardians have always carried out the Vaccination Acts as leniently as possible. They have only allowed their vaccination officer to prosecute a parent once for one child. That is, they have never allowed Section 81 of the Acts to be put in force. They defend their
practice as in strict accordance with the spirit and intention of the Acts, if not with the letter. The magistrates of Leicester act with the same thoughtfulness and moderation, and in all cases award no more than half of the full fines.

This thoughtfulness and moderation are highly distasteful to a Jack in office, named Dr. Ballard. He would show no indulgence to anti-vaccinators. He would prosecute them to the uttermost. He would run all risks, would goad to fury a too patient people, and never mind what happened.

This Jack in office (it appears from the newspaper report) has, however, ventured beyond his tether, as if emulation of the beggar on horseback who rode farther than he intended. He went to the Leicester vaccination officer and ordered him to do his duty under the 81st Section of the Acts. What right had he to interfere? His duty was limited to inspection, and to reporting faithfully to his superiors at the Local Government Board. If the Board thought fit to intervene, they would communicate with the Guardians.

The Guardians were, however, equal to the occasion. They directed the vaccination officer to do as he had done hitherto, and to pay no attention to Dr. Ballard.

Mr. Lennard, one of the Guardians, made an admirable speech, moving that the vaccination officer proceed as usual, which motion was carried unanimously. Mr. Lennard, after some preliminary remarks, observed—

"That we may arrive at a just conclusion, I would point out a few facts in relation to the law. You may remember that in 1871 an inquiry into the question of vaccination was conducted by a Committee of the House of Commons, and a Report was presented to the House, in which Report the Committee recommended 'that whenever in any case two penalties, or one full penalty, have been imposed upon a parent, the magistrates should not impose any further penalty in respect of the same child.' Further, Mr. Candlish, who was one of the framers of the Vaccination Acts, and who gave evidence before the Committee of 1871, said it never entered the thoughts of those who were responsible for the promotion of the measure that there should be repeated penalties for disobeying its provisions. After the Report of the Committee of 1871 was presented to the House of Commons, Mr. Forster introduced a Bill based upon its recommendations, and including the following clause—"

"After the commencement of the Act, no parent of a child shall be liable to be convicted for neglecting to take, or cause to be taken, such child to be vaccinated, or for disobedience to any order directing such child to be vaccinated, if either he has been previously adjudged to pay the full penalty of 30s. for any such offences with respect to such child, or he has been previously twice adjudged to pay any penalty for any such offences in respect of such child."

"That clause, as part of the Bill, passed the House of Commons by a large majority. I believe the majority was 58 to 12. The measure went up to the House of Lords, where the clause which I have just read was struck out by a majority of one (the voting being eight against it and seven in its favour), and I am sorry to say that the odd vote was that of a Bishop. That one vote in the House of Lords perpetuates the cumulative penalties which are now on the Statute Book. When the Bill went back to the House of Commons, a day before the prorogation of Parliament, Mr. Forster, despairing of getting it passed if he stuck to the clause, as the House would have done, let it drop, and the Bill became law. That is how it has become possible that people may be fined any number of times for the same offence. When the Vaccination Act Amendment Bill was introduced in the House of Lords in 1871 by Lord Walsingham, his lordship remarked that it was in no way contemplated by the framers of the Bill to encourage prosecutions to the extent of persecution, but to leave a fair discretion to be exercised in cases of conscientious objections. That is sufficient to show what the spirit of the Acts was intended to be, and what the ideas of those who drew them up really were. But how came it to pass that there were two sections under which a person might be summoned, Section 29 and Section 81? I will explain. When the Vaccination Acts were made further compulsory in 1887, a good many children were then living who were under 14 years of age, and who had never come under the operation of the Compulsory Acts of 1883 at all, and so to catch all the children who had been born within the 14 years, the Legislature made two clauses; but it was never intended that a person should be summoned under both Sections in respect of the same child. The 29th Section was intended to deal with children under three months old, and Section 81 with children over that age and under 14; and if, therefore, we take action against one man in respect of one child under both Sections, we should be doing that which the Legislature never intended us to do."
There is much more in Mr. Lennard’s speech that I should like to see reprinted, but I fear that I have already exceeded the space intended for me. I cannot refrain from expressing a wish that a Mr. Lennard was on every Board of Guardians in England, and that all Boards of Guardians would act as independently and as wisely as the Leicester Board of Guardians.

W. G. Ward, F.R.H.S.

THE CALF-LYMPHERS BEFORE GOVERNMENT.

A deputation from the British Medical Association, consisting of Dr. Cameron, M.P., Mr. Ernest Hart, Dr. Alfred Carpenter, Dr. Norman Kerr, Dr. Bristow, Dr. Ransome (Manchester), and Dr. Green (Birmingham), had an interview on 9th February with Mr. Selater-Booth (with whom was Mr. Salt, M.P.), at Whitehall, to ask the Government to introduce a bill this session making it lawful for persons to demand vaccination with pure lymph from the calf. The grounds urged for the change were, that it would prevent the outrages of the Anti-Vaccinators having any effect; that it would remove the fears of the public respecting the conveyance of disease by arm-to-arm vaccination; that a supply of calf-lymph could be easily obtained and its freshness secured; whilst under the system of vaccination in force, lymph was frequently allowed to remain so long on hand as to deteriorate in quality and efficiency.

Mr. Selater-Booth in reply observed the Board had no objection to the substitution of a better for a worse form of lymph, but he had to deal with the question practically, and the deputation had submitted to him two or three contradictory propositions. It was said they did not wish to interfere with the present arm-to-arm system, and yet it was that very system they attacked and undermined in their recommendation of calf-lymph! They allowed that if the whole population were vaccinated, that a larger portion must submit to vaccination from arm-to-arm, and he would ask them as reasonable men, how the Board could ever be expected to maintain and to answer for a first and second class order of vaccination? It was said there was no confidence in the lymph that now issues from the Board, but how was confidence to arise when various sorts of lymph were issued? As to the Anti-Vaccinators, he could say confidently from his experience at the Board, that their resistance would not be mitigated in the slightest degree by the substitution of one sort of lymph for another. The Board was responsible for about 500,000 vaccinations annually, leaving about 250,000 to private practice; and if the public were crying out for calf-lymph as represented, why not introduce it among those who can pay for their choice? He begged therefore that they would not attempt to force the hand of Government prematurely; for they would only produce confusion, and probably the entire collapse of the existing system of Vaccination, which all admit is extremely difficult to work as it is.

One question Mr. Selater-Booth neglected to ask, namely, the authority under which the Deputation approached him. They professed to represent the British Medical Association, which consists of several thousand members; and we make bold to say the majority would repudiate any responsibility for those who thus adventured to speak in their name. The Conference of the Association in Chandos-street left not a doubt that the profession generally had no confidence in calf-lymph over human lymph; and the discussion revealed the fact that some of the loudest advocates of animal vaccination had not mastered the very elements of their craft.

WHERE WE HAVE GOTTEN TO.

(From Pall Mall Gazette, of 10th Feb.)

Whether vaccination from the calf is preferable on the whole to arm-to-arm vaccination may be doubtful; at all events, there does not seem as yet to be that assured conviction on the subject which ought to precede compulsory legislation. But there is one specific point on which the superiority of animal vaccination is marked, and that is its immunity from the taint of subtle disease. For a long time it was vehemently denied that this taint could possibly be conveyed by arm-to-arm vaccination. Now this is denied no longer. The cases may be of very rare occurrence, but the highest medical authorities are of opinion that they may and do occur. It is obvious that this admission alters the whole position of the anti-vaccinators. Instead of having to rely on semi-theological declamation or semi-medical ignorance, they can call Sir Thomas Watson as a witness, and quote his declaration that the most telling of their objec-

* Here is assumed what has to be proved. The origin of cow-pox is in question, and until animal vaccinators can exhibit the pedigree of their "pure calf lymph," and explain how it started pure, how it has been kept pure, and how it is to be kept pure, they are unlikely "to come over" the Local Government Board or the House of Commons.—Ed.
VACCINATION A VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS.

The Constitution of Massachusetts declares that the end and purpose of government is to secure to individuals who compose the body-politic "the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights and the blessings of life." Good health (if one is so fortunate as to possess it) is a "natural right." What right is more inherent in, or more essential to, a man, than good health? Which of the "blessings of life" is more valuable? The Constitution also declares that if "the property of an individual should be appropriated to public uses, he shall receive a reasonable compensation therefor." A man's good health is as precious to him as his property. It is a species of property which enables him to obtain a livelihood, and yield support and honour to the State. Shall his good health (through enforced vaccination) be imperilled, or, possibly, sacrificed to the pet theory (established by law) of vaccination doctors, and he be remediless?

I regard the vaccination statute, which operates to implant cow-pox into all children, both the healthy and unhealthy ones, before or after they attain the age of two years, and periodically afterwards into the rest of the inhabitants of the State, as an outrage upon the nearest and dearest natural rights of mankind, and as a violation of the Constitution of Massachusetts.

ALFRED E. GILES.

Hyde Park, Massachusetts, Feb. 10th, 1880.

THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

A meeting for the formation of this much desired and much required Society was held on 13th February at 76 Chancery Lane, Mr. Wm. Tebb occupying the chair. After discussing various suggestions, it was determined to assume the title of The London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination; and the objects of the Society were defined as follows—

1. The Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.
2. The Diffusion of Knowledge concerning Vaccination.
3. The maintenance in London of an Office for the publication of Literature relating to Vaccination, and as a Centre of Information.

The minimum annual subscription, constituting membership, to be 2s 6d.

A provisional executive committee was constituted of the following gentlemen—

WALTER HASLER.
EDWARD HAUGHTON, M.D.
J. M. NEWHAM.
J. A. PARKER, Treasurer.
A. C. SWINTON.
WILLIAM TEBB, Chairman.
WILLIAM YOUNG.
WILLIAM WHITE, Secretary.

One of the first duties of the Committee will be to obtain a suitable office in a central situation. A shop in a leading thoroughfare in which books and periodicals might be exposed for sale, and tracts and hand-bills distributed, would be preferable; but whether the requisite means for the enterprise are available remains to be seen. The Committee earnestly invite the advice and assistance of their friends in and out of London. In whatever is done, they hope to have the support and sympathy of the general body of anti-vaccinators.

Several letters were read at the Meeting from which extracts are subjoined.

From Mr. W. Hume-Rothery.

As there has been a South London A.C.V. League for some considerable time, and as there is an A.C.V. Society at Bermondsey, would it not be right and considerate towards these Societies for the Society, I am glad to hear you are about to form, to take a distinctive London name, which would not ignore the existing Leagues, and which would encourage the establishment of other Leagues in London, where there ought to be at least twenty Leagues.
From the Darlington Anti-Vaccination League.

At no time has there been greater need for organised effort against the barbarism with which we contend. For, while the activity of the pro-vaccinators is intense, it is in no small measure due to the fact that it is acknowledged by them, that some new departure is necessary in order to draw away attention from the failure of primary vaccination.

This failure can be brought home to them with tremendous effect while primary vaccination only is compulsory. But should some new departure be by law established, it would be some time ere we could obtain evidence from a sufficient area, and facts sufficiently numerous, to prove its uselessness.

It therefore seems to us that every effort should be made to arrest any development of the existing mode of vaccination. If the present system is not sufficient, surely the nation has gone far enough in giving it scope wherein to prove itself! Our hope is that the London Society will, by public meetings and personal private appeals to Members of Parliament, endeavour to show that Vaccination is a failure and entitled to national condemnation.

From Mr. George Kidson, Keighley.

I am happy to hear of your intended London Society. We require organisation and a centre. There are many anti-vaccinators who are willing to work, and only wait for leadership and direction.

From the Rev. Charles H. Collyns, M.A.

I rejoice greatly at this new sign of life, and heartily pray for your success.

From Mr. Wm. Thurlow, Sudbury.

I trust the London Society may succeed through good service. Had Liberals been true to their creed, vaccination could not have been forced upon the people. Bastiat declares, “The one thing which inspires confidence in Government is that justice is secured by the action of the State. Now a large part of justice is the sense that the personality of the individual is respected. Not only must property and political rights be secure, but a man’s own self must be left to its own development. It must not be put into a mould, nor constrained to a shape which is not natural to it. It must not be hampered or fettered by laws or regulations which deprive it of its individuality.” In these principles is my strength. Vaccination is an infringement of the liberty of the subject; and this is the point to urge, and it must ultimately prevail.

A Vaccinated Editor.

[From the Baltimore Sunday News of 25th January, 1880.]

There is a widespread and growing opposition to vaccination, and the anti-vaccinators are becoming louder and firmer in their denunciation of the practice. It is claimed by these evidently sincere people that vaccination is not a protection against small-pox, that it is a fertile source of disease, that it does more to injure human health than to protect it, that it spreads erysipelas, scrofula, rinderpest, and what not; and they also aver that the lists of mortality have increased with each small-pox epidemic, illustrating that vaccination does more harm than good.

The denouncers of vaccination plausibly urge a large quantity of statistics in support of their arguments, and we know an individual who is about half a convert to their doctrines. Indeed, he is more than half converted, and, if his arm gets much worse, he will not only be wholly convinced, but will feel it his pious duty to put a head on the man who put such an arm on him.

For ourselves, we are inclined to lean to the side of the anti-vaccinators—providing we do not have to lean on the left arm. For the staunchest advocates of Jenner’s theory cannot claim that vaccination is a sure and certain preventive to small-pox. They merely urge that it will mitigate the attack of the genuine epidemic should you contract the disease. And, heaven knows, it ought to. Now, we are practically convinced that vaccination itself is as bad as one attack of small-pox, and, if you have varioloid afterwards, small-pox has had the best of you with the varioloid thrown in to boot.

It strikes us (and pretty badly too) that it is no worse to have small-pox, distributed naturally and even over the whole body, than to have it entirely in one spot; that one had better be sick with the fever a few weeks than to carry around an arm as big as a pumpkin, with every infernal jackass one meets cleverly slapping it, and every object one passes bumping it. We do not believe there is as much actual and poignant suffering in nine cases of the genuine disease as there is in one volcanic arm in active eruption. Therefore, if one is to undergo all the agonies of a beautiful vaccination and then have varioloid besides, he is shamefully cheated in the speculation, and the vaccinated man, instead of being asked if “it has taken” should rather be asked if he has not “been taken in.”

We have had our faith in vaccination con-
considerably diminished of late, and it appears to be diminishing at every throb. If one adds up all the suffering of the day, and is compelled to contemplate it all night, he will certainly come to the conclusion that he had better have taken his chance of small-pox with the captivating probability of being able to exult over his timid and vaccinated neighbour. And then there are all the doubts and fears, that the virus with which he was inoculated might have been impure, and the dread that some hideous disease may have been smuggled into his system to torment his future days. We have unanimously resolved that we will not be vaccinated again, no matter how pressing the sense of duty may be to concede something to public opinion or public safety. Better a nose full of dents and contentment therewith, than an arm like a barrel with a whole torchlight procession therein.

MRS. BELL AT NANTWICH.

At the Nantwich Petty Sessions, on the 12th January, Mr. J. H. Bell, of Nantwich, was charged with refusing to obey an order to have his son Rupert vaccinated.

Mrs. Bell appeared, and asked the Bench to inflict a nominal fine, as no amount of persecution would induce them to submit their children to the disgusting operation. Her husband had already suffered fourteen days' imprisonment, a few months since, for the non-vaccination of another child; and unless the magistrates would deal leniently, he would have to take the alternative of imprisonment again, and in that case would lose his employment.

Mr. Boote (one of the magistrates) asked Mrs. Bell if she was not aware that it is the law of the land that every child shall be vaccinated, and that it was her duty to obey the law?

Mrs. Bell—I am aware that such is the law, but it is unjust, a disgrace to the Statute Book of England, and will be abolished; and I do not believe it to be my duty to obey a law that is in direct opposition to my duty to God and my children.

Mr. Boote—Does not your medical man tell you better?

Mrs. Bell—My medical adviser advocates vaccination, but he commends me for the course I am taking, and says that if he believed as I do, that vaccination is worthless and injurious, he would oppose it as I do.

Mr. Boote—Do you not know that you may be proceeded against repeatedly, and that it will be the duty of the vaccination officer to prosecute you if you still disobey?

Mrs. Bell—I know these prosecutions may be repeated, but the Local Government Board do not advise that course to be pursued when there is no likelihood of a compliance with the law, and no power on earth will ever induce me to allow our children to be vaccinated.

A MAGISTRATE—Vaccination is considered to be a great blessing to mankind.

Mrs. Bell—Eminent medical men differ as to that, and indeed public opinion generally may be said to be veering round. The Conference that has been sitting in London upon Vaccination came to the conclusion that some alteration in the practice is absolutely necessary. After some further remarks, a fine of 5s. and costs was inflicted.

Mrs. Bell thereupon demurred, and made a further defence, urging upon the Bench that as fines of 2s. 6d., 1s., and even in some instances 6d., had been inflicted in many places, they need not be more at Nantwich.

Ultimately a fine of 1s. and costs was imposed.

Mr. Wm. Fedley, of Bradwell, Sandwich, was then charged with a like offence. Mr. Fedley did not appear, but had requested Mrs. Bell to represent him.

Mrs. Bell urged the Bench to take into consideration the fact that Mr. Fedley also was acting from conscientious motives, and that he had been fined several times. The Bench, however, imposed a fine of 20s. and costs—a lesson in equity a l'Anglais.

VACCINATION IN QUEENSLAND.

"An Old Practitioner," writing to the Queenslander, gives a curious account of the state of vaccination in the colony. He affirms, as matter of common notoriety, that the practice of vaccination there has fallen into disuse, "the difficulties attending the operation being nearly insuperable." The supply of lymph for the colony is usually obtained from vessels arriving with immigrants, and is often unreliable after a long voyage. When vaccination has been started the greatest difficulty is met in maintaining it from the irregularity of attendance of mothers, and their unwillingness to have their children's arms operated on. Moreover, the summer of the colony is, "An Old Practitioner" says, too hot to admit of the operation being successful, and the winter too dry! What then, he asks, is to be done? To which he answers, "Let well alone." In other words, small-pox for Brisbane
is a foreign disease, and has not been known in the colony for the last fifty years, and quarantine arrangements may be relied upon to keep it out.

Over this Australian revelation, the Lancet is struck with astonishment. "Quarantine," says the editor, "will prove a very fallacious protection against small-pox. In view of the terrible results which too often accompany the progress of small-pox among populations partly or wholly unprotected by vaccination, Queensland would do well to place her public vaccination arrangements upon a sound basis, and endeavour to carry out systematically and continuously the vaccination of her people. Vaccination, to be done effectually, must be done carefully, slowly, and regularly."

"There's nothing like leather!" said the tanner. Let the Queenslanders hold on in the good way wherein they walk; and if they require assurance, let them refer to our English experience, in which they will discover that the more there is of vaccination the more there is of small-pox, along with a fearful destruction of infant life from vaccine fever and various diseases induced thereby.

REV. GEORGE LITTEM.
PRIMITIVE METHODIST, BRIDGWORTH.

Much interest has been excited in Wilthshire by the refusal of Mr. Litten to have his children vaccinated, or to pay the fines and costs imposed by the Malmsbury bench. Mr. Litten has vindicated his position in the North Wilts Herald and in a tract wherein he sets forth "a few reasons why he cannot allow the doctor to pollute his children by the cruel and unnatural practice of vaccination." The duty of obedience to the law is an ever ready argument wherewith to constrain "a minister of the Gospel," but Mr. Litten replies—

"I can obey the laws of my country only so far as they are in harmony with the laws of God, and when any law interferes with my duty to my family or my God, I feel no longer compelled to obey it; and this law of compulsory vaccination unquestionably comes into collision with both."

Herein is Mr. Litten justified to the uttermost, and we trust that his good example may be widely contagious. It is only through persistent and inflexible resistance that the evil law can be overthrown, and we spare no pains to excite and encourage such resistance. It was against the conscience of the Quakers to take oaths, and they would have been swearing to this day had they been content to protest meekly, "We think it wrong to swear, but as the law says we must, we submit, and await a better time and a wiser mind in those set over us."

The appeal to law, however, is hypocritical, and those who make it would instantly repudiate it if it happened to conflict with their own habits and convictions.

THE RIOTS IN MONTREAL.

The recently published Memoirs of Dr. Philip P. Carpenter contain an account of the anti-vaccination riots in Montreal in 1875, where he was in his latter years resident. Philip Carpenter was a thorough sanitarian, excepting for his belief in vaccination. He says—"I have never looked upon vaccination as a Heaven-sent remedy; but simply as a lesser evil accepted to cure a greater. Almost all the remedies used by both allopathic and homoeopathic doctors are of the same nature: they are poisons introduced into the system in hopes of countervailing the effect of worse poisons." Russell Lant Carpenter, his brother and editor, adds this note—"These poisons, however, are not given to persons in health."* The editor also says—"He candidly allowed that he had not been aware that the Anti-Vaccinators (among whom, in England, were his friend Professor Newman and others) had so much to urge." Philip Carpenter wrote—"One sentence in Dr. Codrille's letter I heartily endorse, and believe that true cleanliness, within and without, will produce more beneficial results than the lyme has ever done. If we breathed purer air, drank (and washed over daily with) purer water, ate pure food, allowed none but pure thoughts and chants actions: if the poisons of alcohol, tobacco, drugs, dead bodies of pigs, and other corrupt food, of rotten vegetable and animal matters, and of corrupting lusts in heart and life, were put far from us, we should have no further need of vile remedies for a hundred-fold viler diseases. We would then gladly pay our doctors, as we do our clergy, to teach us the right way of living; and the festering pollutions which now battle our best attempts at cure, would give place to the Spirit of Health, of Power, and of Holy and Useful Life."

* Nor are they put into the blood.—En.
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THE DUTY BEFORE US.

The dissolution of Parliament came unexpectedly upon us, or we might have spoken more fully of the duties and opportunities of such a crisis. Nevertheless there is cause for congratulation over much that has been achieved. Under instruction and pressure many candidates have declared themselves more or less decisively against the Vaccination Acts. Indeed the irregularity with which these Acts are enforced, with vindictive severity by one set of magistrates and with kindly laxity by another set, is so flagrantly unjust that few have the temerity requisite for their defence. There are a few who would remove this irregularity by a more stringent enactment; who would not accept any number of fines as the price of disobedience; but would have every child vaccinated, if not with the parents’ consent, then without their consent. So think Dr. Alfred Carpenter and Sir William Gull: they would call in the policeman to assist the vaccinator.

Such is the true logic of compulsion; but, as we are always hearing, Englishmen are not governed by logic; and the logic of Carpenter and Gull reduced to practice would speedily convey to us all that as anti-vaccinators we demand. It was the Fugitive Slave Law, the logical triumph of the slave-holder, that overthrew American slavery. In the event of the return of the Liberal party to power, it is not improbable that repeated prosecutions for non-vaccination will be abolished—that persecution after a single fine and conviction will cease. Such was the intention of Mr. Pease’s bill in 1878, and the Conservatives, as represented by Mr. Selater-Booth, would have passed the measure had not an unlooked for resistance developed among the Commons, ignorant of the difficulties with which the Local Government Board has to contend. We do not allow that Mr. Pease’s bill would have been a satisfactory solution: it would have been a mere palliation of injustice: and believing vaccination to be an unmitigated mischief, we have no anxiety to make easy its administration. The more irritation the Acts excite, the more surely shall we have generated the indignation and inquiry essential to the extinction of the pernicious practice. This the prudent order of vaccinators plainly discern; and they would therefore willingly remove from compulsion those accidents which are most grossly offensive and scandalous.

There are others with aith in vaccination who think it should be provided by Government, but would leave its acceptance or rejection, like the baptism of the Established Church, to private judgment; and there are others, again, who would surrender it wholly to such support as it might receive from the voluntary confidence of the public. By-and-by a party may arise whose sense of the evils of vaccination shall be so strong, that they will call upon Government to suppress the practice with the pains and penalties now used to enforce it.

For ourselves, our confidence is in liberty. We are satisfied that vaccination is not only useless for the end designed, but is most prejudicial to health; yet it is far better that men should be free to go wrong, and learn what is right through intelligence conceived in the pains of experience, than to be kept right with the inanimate docility of a flock of sheep. What we object to in the matter of vaccination is the compulsion to go wrong, or the payment of license in the shape of fines for freedom to maintain our integrity.

How affairs will shape themselves in the new Parliament it would be idle to conjecture. In the meanwhile electors cannot do more wisely than to draw the attention of candidates and members to the iniquity of the existing Acts, and to ply them persistently with facts, argu-
ments, and instances of outrage and oppression. Let us not forget that we do not suffer as anti-vaccinators from any innate depravity or wanton malignity on the part of our legislators, but chiefly from their mis-information. They have been bred to think vaccination such a good thing that all ought to have it whatever their dislike. It is for us to replace this darkness with light, and to conduct ourselves with the courage of those who know the power of truth. It is prejudice begotten in ignorance we have to overcome. Said a metropolitan candidate to an elector with whom he had sought an interview, "Until I had this talk with you, I never had a doubt that vaccination was wholesome as soap and water, and that Anti-Vaccinators were kindred with Fenians and Nihilists." It is largely to this condition of mind that we have to address ourselves.

TO THE ELECTORS OF MARYLEBONE.

In a recent speech in Marylebone, Mr. Gladstone mentions "Vaccination, Vivisection, and the Contagious Diseases Acts," as three things to be put aside by the Voters in the impending Election, in the interest of Mr. Gladstone's main issue, Whether the present Government shall not be turned out, and a "Liberal Government" be installed in its place.

This is a question for the voter's conscience, over which Mr. Gladstone is not dictator; and I for one, though entirely and with full trust approving of the Foreign Policy of the Beaconfield Government, yet in my conscience believe the Anti-Vaccination cause to be more important for me to plead, than the carrying out of any general Policy whatever. And accordingly I am compelled, against my subordinate wish, to record my vote for Sir Thomas Chambers, because he is an Advocate for the Repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Laws.

The question of Anti-Vaccination looks deceptively insignificant contrasted with the affairs of Great States, and the movement of armies. Yet it is bigger than those things, because it involves for our own country alone the blood-poisoning and body-mixing of every Briton and Irishman born into the world: and it involves for the world outside us the fatal force of our bad example. It also means tyranny over, and violation of, every parent and home that disapproves of the Vaccination-compulsion. It ensures the weakening of the whole State bodily, and the breaking of its conscience and its affections in their tenderest parts. For these plain reasons the stand against Vaccination is more pressing in importance for Anti-Vaccinators than the stand against Russia, which latter however is an object of urgent need, and has my fullest sympathy.

Accordingly I discard the leading of Mr. Gladstone's conscience, and claim to know that Vaccination, Vivisection, and the Contagious Diseases Acts, are subjects of more importance than any difference between Lord Beaconsfield and the Liberal Party. Had Mr. Gladstone had the candour and unpolitical honesty to attend to these questions, often brought under his notice, earlier,—had he not relegated such things to Royal Commissions, but cherished a man's heart and mind about them,—they would not now have been difficulties in his conscience, and brambles in his path.

It would be a good thing for the United Kingdom if several Candidates were elected on the sole basis of opposition to Vaccination, Vivisection, and the Contagious Diseases Acts, and devoted their unwaried and exclusive attention to those grievous wrongs; as Mr. Plimsoll spends his Membership in saving Sailors from their destroyers. Such men of "Light and Leading" would be beyond the Parliamentary "Whip,"—the advocates of Righteousness, not the creatures of a minister's policy. This would be a "representation of minorities," not regarded from the point of view of numbers, which is not worth much; but of minorities pleading the rights of the weak against the strong, of "the little ones" against the Herods, and becoming the guardians of a Liberty, Humanity, and Decency, which have at present no personal representation in general politics.

J. J. GARTH WILKINSON.

In Marylebone there seems a curious desire amongst many of the voters to bring the vaccination question into force. Whether in this particular neighbourhood there may be more people injured by mistakes than there are in other places I do not pretend to say, but on inquiry I found that pledges are likely to be demanded of the candidates by a very considerable number of people. I do not think that the Conservatives will be greatly embarrassed by the crochet, as the Liberals are mostly said to be affected by it. What views the candidates may take of this matter I cannot, of course, pretend to say. But there is little doubt that they will be questioned about it pretty frequently at the meetings announced for the next fortnight.—Daily Telegraph, 16th March.
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MR. B. SAMUELSON’S AMENDMENT.

Dr. Cameron for various reasons, but chiefly from the entreaties of those who feared the discredit it would inflict on the existing system, withdrew his Bill in favour of Animal Vaccination. Sorry should we be if through Dr. Cameron’s exertions the cruel imposture obtained the benefit of a new cloak, yet we regret that the discussion did not come on. Truth has everything to gain from agitation. There was some effective opposition in readiness, and Mr. B. Samuelson, M.P. for Banbury, had placed the following amendment on record—

“That, inasmuch as it has been shown that Vaccination, as performed by certain public Vaccinators, has caused the propagation of other diseases; as the reliance on Vaccination as a protection against small-pox has been diminished by differences of opinion amongst medical authoritaries; and as the penalties for noncompliance with the Law have in some cases been enforced in an oppressive manner, it is desirable that an inquiry into the whole subject by a Royal Commission should precede any further legislation.”

DR. CAMERON, M.P.
To C. Cameron, Esq., M.P.
40 Judd Street, W.C. 15th March, 1880.

SIR,—Seeing that you have withdrawn your Calf Lymph Bill, I should like to know whether you are prepared to do away with repeated prosecutions under the existing vaccination law. I have been summoned nine times in this parish.—Yours obediently,

James Mansfield.

To Mr. James Mansfield.
80 St. George’s Square, S.W.,
17th March, 1880.

Dear Sir,—I have always voted against repeated prosecutions in vaccination cases, believing them to be productive of much mischief.—Yours very truly,

Charles Cameron.

Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P.—Mr. Morley writes to Mr. Thomas Baker—
18 Wood Street, London,
10th March, 1880.

Dear Sir,—I have really never favoured a compulsory vaccination law, and shall vote for its repeal when I have the opportunity.—Yours faithfully,

S. Morley.

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XIII.

The Variolous Test.—Jenner in 1798.

What was called the Variolous Test worked wonderfully for Jenner; and, as we shall have to refer to it repeatedly, it may be well to describe and dispose of it at once.

As we have seen, it was asserted that none who had suffered from cow-pox could contract small-pox, nor receive small-pox by inoculation. It was replied, that some who had suffered from cow-pox had contracted small-pox, and that others had received the disease by inoculation; to which Jenner’s summary answer was, “There must have been some mistake about the cow-pox; for no one can have genuine cow-pox and subsequently incur small-pox, either by infection or inoculation”; and when the Test came to be applied in a new way, the futility of Jenner’s original assertion was allowed to pass out of sight.

Cow-pox was inoculated and propagated from arm to arm; and, in proof that the constitutions of the vaccinated were fortified against small-pox, it was common to inoculate them with small-pox, which usually did not “take”; whereon the operator exclaimed, “Behold! our patients are insusceptible of small-pox for ever!”

Such was the Variolous Test. It was to multitudes absolutely conclusive; and to question its validity was to exhibit a contentious and unphilosophic disposition.

What shall we now say concerning it?

First, that failures were numerous in variolous inoculation apart from vaccination, and that it was not supposed that when a patient did not “take,” he was therefore insusceptible of small-pox; nor even when he did “take,” that he was thereby rendered proof against small-pox. So many of the successfully inoculated did subsequently fall victims to small-pox, that inoculators at the end of last century were compelled to argue (like vaccinators at the end of this) that inoculation was a guard, but not an absolute guard; and that when it did not altogether avert small-pox, it modified and mitigated the attack. The excuse for failure was as artful as the motive was urgent: inoculation was too good a trade to be imperilled for lack of a little ingenuity.

Nevertheless, if we make full allowance on the score of frequent incapacity to receive small-pox by inoculation, we have yet to explain, on a candid view of the whole evidence, how it was that in numerous cases inoculation with small-
pox was ineffective after inoculation with cow-pox.

"What can you urge against the Variolous Test?" was a frequent and imperious demand.

The explanation in general lay in the fact, that inoculation with small-pox was attempted before the complete subsidence of the vaccine fever. The inoculation with cow-pox had set up a serious constitutional disturbance, and during that disturbance the small-pox virus could not develop its malign energy. Let me show what I mean from the testimony of Jenner himself.

On 16th March, 1800, the Duke of York requested Jenner to proceed to Colchester to vaccinate the 85th Regiment. Jenner was unable to go, and sent his nephew, George, instead, who had to report a complete failure. The reason of the failure was, that the entire Regiment, with women and children, had the itch! Jenner was then driven to the conclusion which, says Baron, "he adopted and invariably maintained to the last hour of his life, namely, that any cutaneous disease, however slight in appearance, was capable of interfering with the regular course of the cow-pox and of preventing it from exercising its full protecting influence."

Just so: and mark how the same logic applies to the Variolous Test, which "nobody could get over." If any cutaneous disorder, however slight, could nullify cow-pox, was it not equally probable that the cutaneous disorder induced by inoculated cow-pox would nullify inoculated small-pox until the effects of the cow-pox had time to abate? When the itch at Colchester was cured, then vaccination was found to be practicable.

Thus worthless was the Variolous Test on Jenner's own principle; yet with such evidence under his eyes and among his fingers, he failed to discern its significance. Nor apparently did he inquire whether the influence of cow-pox was perpetuated over specified periods of six months, nine months, one year, two years, and so on. As trader and adventurer, it suited better to be not over inquisitive, and to avow boldly that his specific conferred life-long immunity from small-pox.

Vaccinators at this day rarely refer to the once famous Variolous Test: to do so would be absurd. The fact of re-vaccination, of vaccination after vaccination at short intervals, proves, that whatever the influence of the operation, it is transient and not permanent; and the cases of small-pox after vaccination, and of small-pox in its most malignant forms after re-vaccination, as if induced thereby, leave the Variolous Test, which so widely impressed and imposed upon our forefathers, an exploded piece of jugglery.

Jenner, with his wife and daughter, left Berkeley for London on 24th April, 1798, in order to see the Inquiry through the press. He remained in London until 14th July, and failed, if he tried, to induce any inoculator to substitute cow-pox for small-pox. In the Jenner legend, it is usual to find some touching remarks on this trip to town: genius unrecognised; truth turned from every door: the great soul abiding in patience and courage invincible. Dates, however, are again merciless. The Inquiry was not in the booksellers' hands until the end of June, and, within a fortnight after publication, Jenner was on his way to Berkeley. There was no occasion for the supernatural virtues specified.

Among Jenner's acquaintance was Henry Cline, teacher of surgery in St. Thomas's Hospital; and with Cline he left some virus in a quill that he had taken from the arm of Hannah Croll, vaccinated at Berkeley on 9th April. Cline had a patient, a child named Richard Weller, with an affection of the hip-joint, and intending to create an issue by way of counter-irritation, he inoculated the hip with Croll's virus, and thus described the experiment in a letter to Jenner—

"Lincoln's Inn Fields,
3rd August, 1798.

"The cow-pox experiment has succeeded admirably. The child sickened on the seventh day; and the fever, which was moderate, subsided on the eleventh day. The inflammation extended to about four inches diameter, and then gradually subsided without having been attended with pain or other inconvenience. The ulcer was not large enough to contain a pea; therefore, I have not converted it into an issue as I intended. I have since inoculated him with small-pox in three places, which were slightly inflamed on the third day, and then subsided.

"Dr. Lister, who was formerly physician to the Small-Pox Hospital, attended the child with me, and he is convinced that it is not possible to give him the small-pox.

"I think the substituting of cow-pox poison for the small-pox promises to be one of the greatest improvements that has ever been made in medicine: for it is not only so safe in itself, but also does not endanger others by contagion, in which way the small-pox has done infinite mischief. The more I think on the subject, the more I am impressed with its importance."

Cline then attempted to vaccinate with virus taken from Weller's hip, but failed. He wrote to Jenner—

---
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"LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, 18th August, 1798.

"Seven days since, I inoculated three children with cow-pox matter, and I have the mortification of finding that the infection has not taken, and I fear I shall be entirely disappointed unless you can contrive to send me some fresh matter. I think it might come in a quill in a letter, or enclosed in a bit of tin-foil."

Jenner was unable to comply with Cline's request: he had no cow-pox to transmit: and readers of the Inquiry who addressed to him similar requests had to submit to similar disappointments, out of which some suspicion and derision were naturally developed. The recommendation of a remedy whereof there was no available supply was not a passport to confidence.

Baron relates, that "Mr. Cline perceiving at once from the success of his first trial, what inestimable blessings were connected with the diffusion of the new practice, immediately advised Jenner to quit the country, and to take a house in Grosvenor Square, and promised him £10,000 per annum as the result of his practice: in which opinion Mr. Cline was supported by Sir W. Farquhar; but that all these splendid prospects of wealth and distinction could not move Jenner."*

The story is either an invention, or it does little credit to Cline's judgment. Jenner had neither the means for a house in Grosvenor Square, nor at the time was there any likelihood of his earning £10,000 a year by cow-pox. Nevertheless it would appear that at this juncture some one was advising him to try London (one's vanity is never without a prompter), and Jenner replied—

"CHELTENHAM, 29th September.

"My perplexity really amounts to agitation. On the one hand, unwilling to come to town myself for the sake of practice, and on the other, fearful that the practice I have recommended may fall into the hands of those who are incapable of conducting it, I am thrown into a state that was not at first perceptible as likely to happen to me; for, believe me, I am not callous to all the feelings of those wounds which, from misrepresentation, might fall on my reputation; on the contrary, no nerves could feel more acutely; and they now are actually in a tremor from anticipation.

"How very few are capable of conducting physiological experiments! I am fearful that before we thoroughly understand what is cow-pox matter, and what is not, some confusion may arise, for which I shall, unjustly, be made answerable."†

If his correspondent had been a man of sense, he might have replied—

"Why so much ado about nothing! You recommend that cow-pox be substituted for small-pox in cases of inoculation. It is a simple prescription, easily determined, altogether apart from you, and there is no reason why you should work yourself into such a flutter."

But Jenner was not the unimpassioned man of science, who can leave truth to take care of itself, and submit when truth contradicts his prepossessions. Dr. Ingenhousz, a distinguished German physician, having read the Inquiry, and being on a visit to the Marquis of Lansdowne at his seat in Wilts, addressed Jenner as follows—

"BOWOOD PARK, 12th October, 1798.

"As soon as I arrived at Bowood, I thought it my duty to inquire concerning the extraordinary doctrines contained in your publication, as I knew the cow-pox was well known in this county.

"The first gentleman to whom I addressed myself was Mr. Allop, an eminent practitioner at Calne, who made me acquainted with Mr. Henry Stiles, a respectable farmer at Whitley, who, thirty years ago, bought a cow at a fair, which he found to be infected with what he called the cow-pox. This cow soon infected the whole dairy; and he himself, by milking the infected cow, caught the disease which you describe, and that in a very severe way, accompanied with pain, stiffness, and swelling of the axillary glands. Having recovered from the disease, and all the sores dried, he was inoculated with small-pox by Mr. Allop. The disease took place: a great many pox came out, and he communicated the infection to his father, who died of it.

"This being an incontrovertible fact cannot fail to make some impression on your mind, and excite you to inquire further on the subject before you venture finally to decide in favour of a doctrine, which may do great mischief should it prove erroneous."

The impression made on Jenner's mind was simply one of annoyance. He fell back on the assertion that all was not cow-pox that was supposed to be cow-pox, and that Farmer Stiles could not have had the genuine distemper, or he would not have received small-pox by inoculation. It did not even occur to him that it was necessary to investigate and account for the evidence adduced by Ingenhousz, which was every whit as valid as much of his own. He was content to protest—

"In the course of my Inquiry not a single instance occurred of any one having the disease, either casually or from inoculation, who on subsequent exposure to various contagion received the infection of small-pox. . . . Should it appear in the present instance that I have been led into error, fond as I may appear of the of—

spring of my labours, I had rather strangle it at once than suffer it to exist, and do a public injury. At present I have not the most distant doubt that any person, who has once felt the influence of perfect cow-pox matter, would ever be susceptible of that of the small-pox.”

Could universal conclusion be educed from more questionable premises? and this, too, by one who had just whimsically exclaimed, “How very few are capable of conducting physiological experiments!” Always, as we shall see, ungenerous and malicious toward those who questioned his assertions, Jenner wrote to his friend, Gardner—

“This man, Ingenhousz, knows no more of the real nature of the cow-pox than Master Selwyn does of Greek: yet he is among philosophers what Johnson was among the literati, and, by the way, not unlike him in figure”—

When, in fact, what provoked him was that Ingenhousz knew too much about cow-pox, and had laid his finger on the point of error at the outset. Inquiry on the part of Ingenhousz brought to light several other instances of small-pox after cow-pox; and Dr. Fulteney of Blandford reported that Dorsetshire inoculators were quite familiar with the one sort of pox after the other sort. Jenner’s constant answer to such objections was, “Yes; but it could not have been true cow-pox to start with”—a style of argument maintained to this day with parrot-like persistency when small-pox follows vaccinations. “Ah!” it is said, “there must have been some mistake about the vaccination; for no one can be thoroughly vaccinated and have small-pox.”

Looking back on the final years of last century, it is much to be regretted that more pains were not taken to hold Jenner fast to his position that small-pox never followed cow-pox, and to demonstrate beyond contention that it was not true. It certainly was not true, but few were disposed to follow Ingenhousz into the West of England and search for the requisite evidence. Presently Jenner managed to have the contention shifted from the experience of the dairies to artificial vaccination and the illusory various test, and the advantage of a decision at the springs of fallacy was lost. In the general confusion which ensued Jenner came to be taken for a discoverer, and he posed diligently in the character, when he was nothing more than the advertiser of the vulgar opinion of his neighbourhood. The fact is so clear, that it would not be worth repetition, were it not so systematically treated as unseen. How distinctly it was at first recognised appears in a letter of thanks for a copy of the Inquiry addressed to Jenner by Francis Knight, a London surgeon, wherein he observes—

“Clefford Street, 10th September, 1798.

“I have read your publication with much satisfaction; and, from a long residence in the dairy part of Wiltshire as well as in Gloucestershire, know the facts to be well supported; at least it was a general opinion among the dairy-men that those who had received the cow-pox were not susceptible of the variolous disease. The cow-pox pustule is very familiar to my eye, and I am quite charmed with the delineation of it in your plates. You have opened to the world a very curious field of investigation, and it is too interesting a subject to die with the day.”

In these remarks of Knight, we have Jenner’s position accurately defined. He made himself responsible for “the general opinion among the dairy-men”; and had some one at the time shown in perspicuous and emphatic fashion that the dairy-men were wrong, Jenner would have been summarily disposed of. Vain, however, are such regrets; and we may find comfort in the reflection that there is an order in the world which in the long run converts every misfortune into means for greater and rarer good.

Another letter to Jenner from Dr. Hicks contains these remarks—

“Bristol, 3rd October, 1798.

“I wish you had been able to have communicated the cow-pox to the cow by means of inoculation from a greasy horse’s heel, for your work would then have been more complete and satisfactory.

“I do not see that you need hesitate to accept the invitation given you to inoculate with the cow-pox, convinced as you are that it will secure the persons so inoculated from ever being infected with the small-pox.”

Everlasting security from small-pox! Such was the unqualified promise, and with how little warrant! In presence of a Socratic inquirer with his persistent, How do you know? Jenner must have stood convicted and confounded.

A letter to Jenner from Dr. Percival, also contains some remarks worth notice. He wrote—

“Manchester, 30th November, 1798.

“The facts you have adduced incontestably prove the existence of the cow-pox and its ready communication to the human species. But a larger induction is yet necessary to evidence that the virus of the Variolae Vaccines renders the person who has been affected with it secure during the whole of life from the infection of the small-pox.

“Mr. Simmons, an ingenious surgeon of this town, has inoculated a human subject with the ichor issuing from what is termed the grease in horses; but the fluid introduced, though eight punctures were made, neither occasioned inflam-
mation nor eruption; yet the same child was soon afterwards inoculated with success for the small-pox. Mr. Simmons has now engaged a herd of cows, and is busily employed in making such experiments as your publication has suggested.

"It is very remarkable, that the cow-pox has been hitherto unnoticed in Cheshire, which is not less a dairy county than Gloucestershire, and where the office of milking is performed also by men and maid servants indiscriminately."

The frequent statement that Jenner's Inquiry was at first received with indifference or suspicion is entirely untrue: on the contrary, it was read with interest and sympathy from the outset, and the only check he met with was due to his inability to supply the immediate demands of correspondents for samples of the precious virus. Cow-pox was absent for awhile from the dairies, and great was his relief and delight when toward the end of 1798 some matter was obtained from a farm at Stonehouse wherewith on the 27th November he vaccinated the children of his friend, Henry Hicks of Eastington; "the first gentleman," says Baron, "who had the merit of submitting his own children to the new practice."

Ere 1798 had passed away, Jenner had secured an ally and pamphleteer in Dr. George Pearson, who was destined to give him much annoyance. Without any acquaintance with cow-pox, Pearson asserted its efficacy, criticised Jenner's observations, and by and by persuaded himself that he had as much to do with the introduction of vaccination as Jenner himself. Constituting himself a sort of partner in Jenner's project he wrote to him—

"LEICESTER SQUARE, 8th November, 1798.

"Your name will live in the memory of mankind as long as men possess gratitude for services and respect for benefactors; and if I can but get matter, I am much mistaken if I do not make you live for ever."

And in a more decided strain on 18th November—

"I wish you could secure me matter for inoculation, because, depend upon it, a thousand inaccurate but imposing cases will be published against the specific nature of the disease by persons who want to send their names abroad about anything, and who will think you and me fair game."

In the same letter he told Jenner what some were saying about the suggested practice—

"You cannot imagine how fastidious the people are with regard to this business of the cow-pox. One says it is very filthy and nasty to derive it from the sores heels of horses. Another, that we shall introduce the diseases of animals among us, and that we have already too many of our own. A third sapient set say it is a strange odd kind of business, and they know not what to think of it. All this I hear very quietly, and recollect that a still more unfavourable reception was given to inoculation for the small-pox."

Such observations were natural and to be expected. Jenner wrote to Gardner that “brick-bats and hostile weapons of every sort were flying thick around him,” but they were chiefly imaginary. His revelation was communicated to a ready world. It was no revolutionary project, but a seductive modification of existing practice. Inoculation with small-pox was the order of the day among all respectable people. The operation was troublesome and uncertain, perilous to patients and to those in contact with them; and, when all was done, it afforded no unquestionable security against the disease it was designed to avert. To a community thus harassed and anxious, came Jenner with his prescription and his promise—Substitute cow-pox for small-pox and you will escape from this distress, danger, doubt. You will have a harmless fever without pustules and without risk of infection, and the security from small-pox will be absolute and perpetual. What wonder that in such circumstances Jenner’s message was heard gladly and accepted with grateful enthusiasm. That he should have encountered some resistance was inevitable, for what change is ever effected without opposition and ominous prediction? But the change Jenner proposed was the slightest of changes with the largest prospects of advantage. Unless these conditions are borne in mind, we shall never rightly understand the reception accorded by our forefathers to vaccination.

PATERNAL GOVERNMENT.—It is useless to attempt to disguise from ourselves that the government of England has entered on a paternal phase, and that paternal government, that is, in plain words, meddlesome tyranny, is ever increasing. Our rulers seem to assume that we are not to think or act for ourselves, but to be cared for like children by the Government, who are to be our guides, philosophers, and providence. At a meeting in 1877 Mr. Chadwick actually expressed a wish for the enactment of compulsory ordinances for regular tubbing, as he called it! Thus we may see how far some advocates of paternal government would go if they could, and how much it believes us in the interest of freedom to combine without delay for the purpose of preventing the introduction of any more paternal government and inquisition, and getting rid of that under which we are already—

ARTHUR OWEN.
ANTI-VACCINATION
IN THE UNITED STATES.

From a Letter to Mr. Wm. Tobb from the President of the American Anti-Vaccination League.

We have not been idle in the cause of Health against Pestilence. Immediately upon the appearance of the ukase in the Scientific American directing the press to keep silent about vaccination, I addressed a remonstrance to the editor, which of course was not published. At the same time I sent a communication to the Sun which appeared under the title, "A Blast against Vaccination." The Sun is the second paper in circulation in New York, and has more than a million readers. I received numerous letters thanking me for writing it. Next, I offered Mr. Butts, the philosophical publisher, a paper entitled "The Crime of Vaccination," which he printed in each of his journals—Man, the Scientific Man, and the Evolution. You perceive also that the Medical Tribune does not neglect the vaccination question.

We had a terrific case of vaccine poisoning in the Twelfth Ward of New York. The tale was frightful, and required much careful smoothing to keep the flames from bursting forth.

Dr. R. E. Kunze of 606 Third Avenue some time ago encountered a case of toxemia. The child had been vaccinated three weeks before by the public vaccinator. Areolar inflammation ensued, terminating abruptly after nine days' suffering. Then came an eruption on the lips and about the mouth; the lips, nostrils, and chin were postulated. This yielded to treatment, but the neck and back of the head were attacked. Healing in one place was followed by breaking out in another. Eventually erysipelas supervened; the glands became suppurated, and death completed the work of the public vaccinator.

Dr. Kunze reported the case as vaccinia spuria resulting in toxemia. Four doctors were secretly sent by the Board of Health to inspect the case—the physician being carefully kept from knowing of their mission. They unlawfully made out a new certificate of death; but the father persisted that the infant was poisoned by vaccine virus. Thus the truth was hidden by the ministers of the law.

You correct my statement that there is no Compulsory Vaccination Law in the United States. I am ashamed of the fact that Massachusetts has the bad eminence of a statute of that character. She was far less red-handed when she hanged Quakers on Boston Common. Our friend, Mr. Alfred E. Giles of Hyde Park in that State, is exercising the legislature on the question; and Mr. Luther Colby, of Montgomery Place, Boston, is an old soldier in resistance to blood-poisoning by statute.

The real peril here just now is from the Doctors' conspiracy to procure the creation of Medical Boards in the several States. About twenty have produced their miserable abortions. So many Old School practitioners cannot live by their profession that they are bescreening the legislature for monopoly and offices.

The fright in the ranks of the blood-poisoners in consequence of our attack on vaccination has been pretty general. Some who are especially spiteful are vendors of "pure vaccine virus," whatever the filthy stuff may be. Then there are the "public vaccinators" who eke out a living by the murderous business. After these come the host of family physicians—a class whose motto is Obsta Principiis.

The Popular Science Monthly recently printed an article on vaccination in New York by Dr. Warren—an endeavour to show that small-pox had given way to the public vaccinator. I took no trouble to answer the article, because there is little free speech in these so-called Liberal periodicals. Youmans, the editor, is as bigoted as a Torquemada or a Jeffries.

In this country we need outrage to excite public attention. We would never have abolished slavery if slavery had not thrust itself into our faces. We do not originate many ideas here; and we try to suppress those we have. Our medical practice is exotic; and when you overthrow vaccination, we shall follow. I shall never be cool or indifferent in this matter. I abhor the practice, and consider it criminal, but I have not the means to proclaim or lead a crusade. What I can do, I shall do gladly. I know the cost—proscription, loss of business, persecution. The Old School medical profession is organised against humanity by a compact, rigid, merciless, devilish; and there is more cause for revolt against them than against any other caste in Christendom.

ALEXANDER WILDER, M.D.
567 Orange Street, Newark, New Jersey.
9th February, 1880.

DR. ARBUTH has been lecturing on vaccination at Durham with Mr. Herschel, M.P., and at South Shields with Mr. Stevenson, M.P., for chairmen. It is much to be desired that M.P.'s generally were brought under such effective instruction.
MR. HERBERT SPENCER.

Mr. Tebb addressed the following letter to Mr. Herbert Spencer—

7 Albert Road, Regent’s Park, 24th February, 1880.

Now that a Bill is before Parliament (Dr. Cameron’s Animal Vaccination Bill) to impose another medical dogma upon the public, I take the liberty, for the sake of the thousands of little ones who are annually slain by this rite (see Parliamentary Return, Vaccination Mortality, No. 483, 1877, enclosed), to ask you as a leader of public opinion, who, I am informed, refuses to believe either in vaccination or its enforcement, to give me your testimony against it. Having myself resisted thirteen prosecutions, and unsuccessfully appealed to the Court of Queen’s Bench in order to preserve the blood of one child uncorrupted by the empoisoned lancet of the State doctor, I am in a position to estimate the misery of those anxious parents who, unable to pay the fines and costs, and knowing that imprisonment would entail the loss of their means of livelihood, are cowed into the adoption of this mischievous medical superstition. With upwards of 1800 vaccination prosecutions yearly I hope you will not consider me intrusive in preferring this request.

WILLIAM TEBB.

Here is Mr. Spencer’s reply—

87 Queen’s-gardens, Bayswater, 26th February, 1880.

DEAR SIR,—On the annexed leaf you will find the reasons which compel me to refrain from entering at any length on the question you put. I cannot now do more than say that I am strongly opposed to compulsory vaccination.

HERBERT SPENCER.

Mr. Spencer’s reasons apply to all questions (apart from his immediate scientific and literary work) to which his time and strength are unequal.

“‘I AM OPEN TO CONVICTION.’

Lord Derby used these wise words in a letter to me on the subject of vaccination; adding that it was several years since he had considered the question, and that if I would send him some papers on the subject he would read them. I have reason to hope that Lord Derby will advocate the repeal of the Compulsory Clauses of the Vaccination Acts when they are arraigned before the new Parliament.

To be “open to conviction” is the right state of mind upon every subject which experience can prove or disprove, such as vaccination.

On the eve of a General Election, Members of Parliament are likely to be “open to conviction,” if persistently questioned and judiciously educated by their constituents. The best mode of appealing to them will have to be decided by circumstances. Ofttimes “that which is best administered is best.”

Every Parliamentary Candidate should be questioned and supplied with suitable literature, such as a set of the Vaccination Inquirer and Tracts on Vaccination, the perusal of which ought to convince every unprejudiced person that vaccination is a medical delusion, and compulsory vaccination a political blunder.

Now is the time for the people, who are the masters and makers of Parliament, to enlighten their representatives upon this vital question. The mass of the people understand the vaccination question, and have a perfect hatred of the vile practice. It is the so-called “educated classes” who are prejudiced and ignorant, and therefore “open to conviction.” Their conversion must be left to time and the logic of events.

Many prejudiced believers in vaccination are the victims of misplaced confidence in their medical advisers, who stifle inquiry by the absurd dictum that it is “purely a medical question.” Vaccination is something more than a medical question when the people are taxed to support this State-endowed doctor-craft. Taxation implies representation, and the people demand to be heard upon this question. It is something more than a medical question when parents are fined and imprisoned for defending their children from blood-poisoning by Act of Parliament. It is a medical question, inasmuch as it violates every principle of physiology; and it has an amusing medical aspect when doctors differ about the cause and cure of small-pox.

When men influence the legislature to enforce their nostrum, it becomes a political question. If the mothers of England had votes, the Vaccination Laws would be repealed in the next Parliament.

HENRY PITMAN.

ONE LAW FOR RICH AND ANOTHER FOR POOR.

—It is no secret that Mr. Jacob Bright, Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. Leatham and other Members of Parliament, have unvaccinated children, not from any oversight or neglect, but because they hate the unnatural and dangerous operation; yet we don’t hear of non-vaccinating Members of Parliament being sent to prison. Truly there is one law for the rich and another for the poor.—Prison Thoughts by Henry Pitman.
SMALL-POX IN PEKING.

It would be interesting to have the truth about small-pox in China, but China is an immense country containing a third of the human race, and what is true of one city or province may not be true of other cities and provinces; and for many a year we shall probably have to rest satisfied with partial evidences.

Mr. Owen has directed my attention to a work by D. F. Rennie, M.D., entitled Peking and the Pekingese during the first year of the British Embassy at Peking, published by Mr. Murray in 1865. It consists of Dr. Rennie’s journal for 1861-62 whilst acting as medical officer to the British Embassy. The volumes are full of information set forth with perspicuity, and with a temper of respect for the Chinaman, which to my mind is exceedingly grateful. There is nothing more hateful than the conceit which sets up the English Christian as the standard of all excellence and treats with contempt or condemnation all variations therefrom. But it is not my purpose to enlarge on Dr. Rennie’s merits as a traveller, but to draw attention to his observations on small-pox in Peking.

First, the disease does not appear to excite dread. Thus we read—

5th Feb., 1862.—In one of the streets to-day a poor man was seen endeavouring to excite sympathy by exhibiting a dead child that was covered with the eruption of small-pox. His object in doing this was to show the public that he was without the means of burying it, and thus induce the charitable to give him the necessary pecuniary aid, as the Chinese like to bury their own children.

Then we have these most suggestive particulars—

28th May, 1861.—I had a long conversation to-day with the clerk Tscoon through Mr. Wade on the subject of small-pox. He seems to be a remarkably well-informed man, and to know a good deal about the disease as it prevails in this part of China. From what he states, small-pox has been unusually prevalent in Peking for the last two months, but only children are affected by it. The unhealthiness of the present season is attributed to the scarcity of snow during the winter, and to the consequent predominance of the wan-chee, or material influences. The increase of sickness, which is usually observed about this period of the year, he also states is attributed to the annual opening of the drains before the rains commence. It would appear that small-pox periodically assumes an epidemic character; and the disease is generally observed to be most prevalent in the years that the Examinations take place, which usually bring an influx of about 40,000 people into the town, the candidates for competitive honours being accompanied by large numbers of friends and relations, who avail themselves of the opportunity for visiting the capital. Since 1890 vaccination (introduced from Canton) has been practised to a limited extent amongst the population—probably one-fifth may be vaccinated. At one time it was believed to afford protection, small-pox not having been so common immediately after its introduction. Of recent years, however, confidence in it has considerably diminished, owing to the frequency with which those are attacked who have been vaccinated. Prior to the introduction of vaccination, which originated in the translation into Chinese of Dr. Pearson’s work by Sir George Stamton (whose name the Chinese suppressed, and published the work as one of their own), a rude species of inoculation was much in vogue; namely, the introduction of pulverised scabs of the true small-pox into the children’s nostrils. The operation was always performed by a medical man, and a high sum charged for its supposed protective virtues. If Tscoon’s information is correct, small-pox would seem to be almost essentially a disease of the young in this part of China. He states that it is most prevalent among children below ten years of age, not common among those over fourteen, and hardly ever occurs among those above twenty. When it attacks one member of a family, it generally spreads through the others. It has not been so prevalent as it has been lately since the year 1857.

The description of small-pox as an infantile disease accords exactly with what was true of Scotland and the North of England before the introduction of Vaccination. A case of small-pox used to be as uncommon as one of whooping-cough after adolescence.

Tscoon made the remark that although the prevalence of small-pox was ascribed to overcrowding, it could scarcely be so then, 1861, as there were fewer people than usual in Peking; whereon Dr. Rennie proceeds to observe—

This fact, combined with others that have come under my own observation, lead to me to believe that there has been an epidemic constitution of the atmosphere, characterised by a remarkable tendency to light up suppurative disease in those predisposed to it. . . . At Hong Kong in 1854, while small-pox was prevailing, a lady, well known there, had herself vaccinated; but, in place of its taking in the ordinary way, it produced an attack of the worst form of small-pox, which proved fatal. Almost coincident with this, the same consequences took place in an infant; and these two fatal occurrences made a strong impression on the minds of the Hong Kong public against the practice of vaccination during the prevalence of small-pox. From cases such as these, which I may state are much more numerous than is supposed, it would seem as if the vaccine matter, in periods when the atmosphere has assumed an acrid constitution favouring suppurative disease, acts as a true germinating influence when introduced into systems at the
time affected with what may be termed the small-pox habit of body.

Here we have the probable explanation of the frequent obvious mischief of vaccination and re-vaccination during small-pox epidemics—the imaginary prophylactic starting and aggravating the disease. Unconscious and unbiased testimony like that of Dr. Rennie is of great value, and should be carefully recorded for use in the vaccination controversy.

——

"THERE'S A GOOD TIME COMING, BOYS."

By HENRY STRICKLAND CONSTABLE.

Doctors of each period of time are certain that they have at length arrived at truth; and though men have lived on the earth hundreds of thousands of years, according to our geologists, it is not one hundred years ago that decoction of turmeric was prescribed for jaundice, because both are yellow, decoction of red roses for loss of blood, because roses and blood are both red, and scarlet bed-curtains for scarlet fever, because both are scarlet; and the men of that day were convinced they had reached truth at last. Vaccination and inoculation—that is, giving a person a disease in order to prevent him from taking it—belong to the days of turmeric for jaundice, roses for loss of blood, and scarlet curtains for scarlet fever; and now these astonishing doctors are looking forward to some operation analogous to vaccination for each of the other forms of zymotic disease. "There's a good time coming, boys." Dr. Ross in so many words, expresses a hope that we shall shortly have inoculation from some animal for scarlatina. Well, perhaps we shall. We go to a cow to save us from small-pox, what animal shall we go to for charms against scarlatina? How about a fox? It is a red animal. It will, perhaps do, for measles too. Whooping-cough is like a dog's bark, so I should think a dog will do for that complaint. The name chicken-pox speaks for himself. Typhus and typhoid begin with T, so perhaps a tom cat would do; and frogs puff out their cheeks, so they must surely be made for mumps. All this will be called folly, but the doctors began it by going to turmeric to cure jaundice, to scarlet bed-curtains to cure scarlatina, and to cows and glandered horses to save us from small-pox, and after that nothing can be folly. Herod might be out-Heroded, but I cannot pretend to out-Herod the doctors.—Fashions of the Day.

THE REV. CHARLES VOYSEY.

Mr. Voysey has addressed the following note to Mr. William Tebb—

Camden House, Dulwich, S.E.,
24th February, 1880.

Sir,—I have given long and patient consideration to the arguments for and against Vaccination.

My opinion, as an unprofessional man, is that Vaccination should be compulsory, but always from the calf and never from one human subject to another.—I am, sir, yours truly,

CHARLES VOYSEY.

In the meanwhile, Mr. Voysey should state what is to be done. It is an evasion of the question to assert he is in favour of compulsory vaccination from the calf; for there is neither probability nor, we may say, possibility of the Government providing such vaccination for the people. Mr. Voysey distrusts the established system of arm-to-arm vaccination, and ought therefore to indicate how those who share his distrust are to conduct themselves. It is idle to try to dispose of an immediate question by a reference to a system that is no more than a vain expectation.

——

DR. SCHIEFFERDECKER'S CONCLUSIONS.

The late Dr. Schiefferdecker of New York, in a monograph which he prepared upon the subject, came to certain conclusions in which Dr. Wm. H. Weaber perfectly coincides, and prints in the memorial volume of the Twelfth Class of the Eclectic Medical College of the City of New York, published in 1875. Those results were—

1. That it is not true that vaccination is a preventive of small-pox.
2. That cow-pox virus is as decided a poison as that taken from the small-pox patient.
3. That vaccination propagates a variety of other diseases more fatal than small-pox, such as scarlet fever, croup, typhoid fever, scrofula, consumption, syphilis, cancer, tuberculous formations, diphtheria, etc.
4. That small-pox as well as other diseases when they fasten upon people who have been vaccinated, are more malignant and difficult to cure, than when they attack persons who have not had their blood thus corrupted.
5. That longevity has diminished since the introduction of vaccination.

ALFRED E. GILES.

Hyde Park, Mass., U.S.,
Feb. 1st, 1880.
AN IMPUDENT MANIFESTO.

The walls of St. Pancras were plastered over with the following poster in large letters until election placards made an end of the imposture.

ST. PANCRAS, MIDDLESEX.

SMALL-POX AND VACCINATION.

There is still Small-Pox in the Metropolis. Many of the deaths which occur from Small-pox would be prevented if all persons were THOROUGHLY VACCINATED.

If every one were PROPERLY VACCINATED there would be little Small-Pox or none at all; but if after Vaccination any persons should catch small-pox they would be almost sure to get well without scars on their faces.

Anyone who has not had Small-Pox, or who is not Vaccinated, or who has NO MARK OF VACCINATION on his arm, is very likely to take Small-Pox, and have it severely. Any person with only one or two marks on his arm is not so safe from Small-Pox as if he had three or four; and if the marks are so slight as not to be easily seen, such a person is liable to take the disease.

LOOK TO YOUR OWN ARMS AND YOUR CHILDREN’S ARMS, and remember that it is in your own power and it is your own duty to protect yourselves from the terrible disease of SMALL-POX.

All persons who have been Vaccinated in infancy should, as they approach Adult Life, be again vaccinated. Generally the best time of life for Re-vaccination is from 15 to 18 years of age; but during an Epidemic of Small-Pox the age of 15 should not be waited for, especially by persons whose marks of early Vaccination are unsatisfactory.

The Law demands that every one should be Vaccinated, and does not allow anyone to expose his Children to the danger of catching Small-Pox. The great means whereby Small-Pox may be wholly Exterminated is UNIVERSAL VACCINATION.

[Then come the address and hours of the public vaccinator.]

This warning is issued by the Vaccination Committee. By order, DANIEL FILDEW, Clerk to the Guardians.

It would be superfluous to expose this tissue of falsehood; and we would merely draw attention to the manner in which the Vaccinated are distinguished from the Thoroughly Vaccinated. We should like to know who are responsible for the imperfectly vaccinated, and whether practitioners who vaccinate, but do not thoroughly vaccinate, and take money for their sham work, ought not to be prosecuted like vendors of adulterated articles. Medical men resent the intrusion of the laity into their mysteries, but here all and sundry are invited to act as inspectors of vaccination.

SMALL-POX IN ST. PANCRAS.

As the theory is that small-pox originates nowhere, but always comes from somewhere, it was asserted in St. Pancras that the disease was introduced from Islington, and that the medium of conveyance was an anti-vaccinator’s family. Whether it is fair to describe those who happen to be unvaccinated as opponents of vaccination, I shall not argue, but proceed to observe, that of the family of five children two were vaccinated, and that the three who were first affected and conveyed to the hospital comprised the two who had been fortified with the Jennerian rite.

Moreover, the unvaccinated child was the first to get well, and was discharged with scarcely a spot on her face, whilst her vaccinated brother was covered with marks, and Dr. Murphy’s attention was drawn to the difference between them. The third child was the last to leave the hospital, having made the slowest recovery.

The remaining two, who were unvaccinated, took small-pox fourteen days after the others, and neither was severely affected. In the hospital one got well, but caught scarlet fever, and died there. Certificate of death—Scarlet Fever. The other, aged 2½, had been suffering from bronchitis, and was attended by Dr. Smith, who considered it would be dangerous to remove the child to the hospital; but just when it was getting over the small-pox, Dr. Murphy intervened, and said to the hospital it must go. So to the hospital the poor child was taken, and died there next morning. Certificate of death—Bronchitis.

The story of this family has been hawked about St. Pancras as evidence of the folly of anti-vaccinators; and it is another instance of the rubbish that passes current as “facts” in favour of vaccination. Wherever such “facts” are investigated they turn out fictions. It cannot be otherwise. It is not in the nature of things that disease can prevent disease, or mitigate it.

The Sanitary Committee set on foot a house to house visitation, engaging medical students for the purpose, and paying them out of the parish funds. Of course none need submit to such inquisition, and it is to be hoped that many resisted the intrusion. The crowning absurdity on the part of those who believe that small-pox is always generated by contagion, was in driving families in which the disease existed to the vaccination station to be vaccinated or re-vaccinated; thus crowding the infected with the uninfected, and incurring the very risk they assume to be the only danger!
WHERE THE SMALL-POX BROKE OUT.

I am not going to discuss the goodness or badness of vaccination, but wish to draw attention to the court called Brunswick Grove, where the outbreak of small-pox in St. Pancras occurred. In the centre of the Grove is a pump, from which the inhabitants, consisting of from twenty to thirty families, draw their water for all purposes, including the flushing of their closets, to which no supply is laid on. By the side of the pump runs a drain, at a distance of 26 inches, connected with the common sewer, and within four feet is a brick dust-bin or midden, into which all the refuse of the residents of the Grove is thrown. I was informed that the tank from which the pump is supplied had not been cleaned out for several years until the other day, when several buckets of filth were removed and cast into the dust-bin. Surely in presence of such well-recognised conditions of syphilitic disease, it is absurd for doctors and sanitary committees to get up elaborate reports and frighten the public with shrieks of “Small-pox! small-pox! Hast! haste! and be vaccinated!”

The attempted panic was a failure. The small-pox did not spread; nothing really was done to prevent its spreading: the conditions of an epidemic were absent, but the Sanitary Committee none the less take credit for having stamped out a frightful outbreak. The chairman of the Committee indeed boldly avowed that ordinary sanitary measures have nothing to do with stopping small-pox. It is only vaccination and re-vaccination that are of any avail; save for which mercies we should probably be exterminated like certain tribes of American Indians.

A ST. PANCRA'S INSPECTOR.

THE DIALECTICAL SOCIETY.

It has been arranged that Mr. W. Gibson Ward shall address the Dialectical Society on the subject of Small-Pox and Vaccination on Wednesday evening, 7th April, at 8 o'clock, in Langham Hall, 48 Great Portland Street, Oxford Street. The rule is that visitors to the Society’s meetings sign their names on entrance, stating by which member they are introduced; and the Secretary on this occasion has kindly consented to allow Mr. Ward’s friends to use his name for the purpose. Many to whom Mr. Ward’s eminent public services are familiar will eagerly accept this opportunity of personal acquaintance, and of extending to him a hearty welcome. Discussion will follow Mr. Ward’s address.

THE ELEUSIS CLUB.

There is a well-known Club at Chelsea, chiefly of working-men, called the Eleusis, and desiring to learn something of Vaccination, the members have invited Mr. Alexander Wheeler, of Darlington, to give them a lecture on the subject. Mr. Wheeler has kindly consented, and on Sunday evening, 18th April, at 8 o’clock, he will address the Club in their hall, 180 King’s Road, Chelsea, upon What is the object and what is the result of vaccination? The nearest railway station is Sloane Square, and omnibuses are frequent along King’s Road. Those who heard Mr. Wheeler’s discussion with Dr. Wyld will not require any solicitation to hear him again, and a large meeting, and a lively discussion may be reckoned upon. Admission to the Eleusis lecture is free.

INOCULATION.

[Advt. from Cambridge Chronicle, 1771.]

“Mr. James Sutton, Surgeon, formerly of Hurley Hall, near Lincoln, informs the Public, that he continues to practise Inoculation for the Small-Pox, at Gainsborough, and Castor in Lincolnshire. To expiate here upon a Practice so universally approved, would be derogatory to the Merits thereof; nor is it necessary to recount the almost incredible Numbers of Thousands that have passed through the Small-Pox, under his Care. The Terms are from one to five guineas. Servants and small farmers are inoculated at half a guinea each.”

In another advertisement in the same journal in the same year, Mr. William Martin and Son, near Royston, state that they “have inoculated upwards of three thousand one hundred people within three years. The terms one guinea and a half the day of inoculation, and if he stays when the pock is put in, two guineas.”

DEFINITIONS.—I copy the following from Noah Webster’s Dictionary—

To Vaccinate is to inoculate with cow-pox, or a virus taken from cows called vaccine matter.

Cow-Pox is small-pox modified by the fact of its having been communicated to a cow. Virus is active or contagious matter of an ulcer, pustule, etc.; poison.

To Inoculate is to communicate a disease to a person in health by inserting contagious matter in his skin. This term is limited chiefly to the communication of small-pox.

The definitions are, I think, satisfactory.—

Marry Christina Terr.
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

FOLLY OF ESTABLISHED MEDICINE.—No science can flourish if it be enforced by the State. If Newton's astronomy were enforced, we would lose the means of knowing whether it were true. So of religion. In consequence, we all now understand that the State transgresses its limits if it enacts anything in science or in religion. Equally so as to medical art. I am not yet very old; yet I remember enormous change in medical practice. About forty years ago I had 290 leeches put on me in fever, and I believe my constitution has never recovered from it. Such was the practice of that day. Blood was in general taken copiously from the arm. Also in apoplexy, cupping on the temples or back of the head was used. What a horrid mischief it would have been if Parliament had enacted bleeding as compulsory, so as to sustain it when practitioners desired to disuse it! More recently, it was the rage to give wine in typhus fever; but the tide has turned. In Longford Fever Hospital, Ireland, and in Scottish and London hospitals, alcohol is now disused; and, as reported, with excellent result. How mischievous it would have been to pass a compulsory law twenty years ago, at the bidding of the then ascendant school of medicine, to command the giving of wine to fever patients! Evidently, as an astronomer and a theologian must be left free by Parliament, so must a physician. To enact a medical creed, or command a medical process, is usurpation—not legitimate legislation, even viewed from the scientific side.—Prof. F. W. Newman.

THE AIM OF THE VACCINATOR.—The aim of the vaccinator is to keep us all in permanent cow-pox. He confesses and proclaims that his poison is apt to be rejected by a powerful vitality; therefore he recommends a renewal of the poisonous process so quickly as to keep us in permanent disease. His panic about small-pox makes him overlook the total uncertainty what disease his beloved corrupt master (mismamed pure lymph) may infect, and the certainty that Jenner's confidence in vaccination was unfounded. Nay, it makes him careless in removing the causes of small-pox, because he fancies he can remove small-pox by vaccination. Common sense tells me that if he leaves the causes of small-pox untouched and, by tampering with the blood, hinders that disease from coming out in the blood, he can only drive the disease inwardly into some equally bad or worse disorder.—Prof. F. W. Newman.

HOW THEY CHANGE!—Although only a few years ago the leading London physician used to drench the sick in alcohol, some of his successors are now found to doubt whether even the healthy obtain any positive advantage from it. It is now the fashionable doctrine that some men are better without it altogether, and that many of those who take it freely are a good deal the worse.—Pall Mall Gazette, Mar. 13, 1880.

MR. WALTER HAMMER will deliver a lecture on the "Tyrrany of Compulsory Vaccination" in Quebec Hall, 25 Great Quebec Street, Marylebone Road, on Tuesday evening, 6th April, at 8.30. Mr. Tebb will occupy the chair. Admission free.

INOCULATED AND VACCINATED IN VAIN.—J.C.J. writes—"The father of a guest of mine was inoculated and vaccinated, and had small-pox as badly as possible, short of being confluent or fatal."

ABSENCE IN PERFECTION.—An M.D. seems to imagine that if he can make out a higher death rate from small-pox among the unvaccinated, he is entitled to take his neighbour by the throat and haul him away to prison, unless he forthwith consents to use whatever stuff may be offered him under the name of "pure vaccine-lymph." A medical candidate for representing the University of Edinburgh in Parliament is evidently of the same opinion, as he is in favour of compulsory vaccination "with perfectly pure and reliable lymph." As if to make the joke a little broader (so as to come within the comprehension of even country magistrates, whose education has been neglected), he adds, "the hardship of compelling anyone to submit otherwise is too obvious to require comment." What is to be said of the effrontery of this statement, from a man who knows well that the conditions in question are absolutely unattainable!—E. Haughton, M.D. in North Wiltshire Herald.

LEPROSY FROM VACCINATION.—A cautious observer, but a call-lympher, who has just returned from the Sandwich Islands writes—

"A Honolulu Doctor told me that he had no doubt leprosy had been spread by careless vaccination. It is horrible, but it does not affect the principle. It shows how desirable it is to get the matter from the cow."

Leprosy is common in Hawaii and affects the inhabitants with much concern as a cause of their diminishing numbers.

In Norwich in the year 1819, after vaccination had been pushed at public meetings by the interested zeal of medical men, by bribing the poor with public money to have their infants vaccinated, there was the severest epidemic ever known in England. Then the child, with the finest marks of vaccination possible, died of malignant small-pox, while in the same house the unvaccinated infant was smitten and recovered! Then, in the worst month of the epidemic, over twice as many died of small-pox as of all other causes.—W. Gibson Ward in North Wiltshire Herald.
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OUR POSITION IN PARLIAMENT.

VACCINATION is rapidly becoming a question on which everybody will have to pronounce judgment. The opposition to the practice is widespread and rapidly increasing. Letters and articles in newspapers, pamphlets, lectures, and discussions all bear witness to the change that is going on. Parliamentary candidates are closely interrogated as to their intentions. Anti-vaccinators have therefore good reason for satisfaction. The truth they have long struggled to assert is now before the world, and can no longer be suppressed. Mr. Ernest Hart has just published a lecture on Vaccination, which he delivered before the National Health Society, but the arguments he then produced were met and refuted by Dr. Pearce, Mr. E. Robinson, Dr. Haughton and others, yet he prints his lecture as truth undisputed and indisputable. Such tactics are certain to lead to discomfiture. We as anti-vaccinators ask for a fair field, day-light, and no favour. We are ready to hear Mr. Hart, and ready to answer him, but the answers we receive are commonly couched in contempt and abuse. There will however be a change in that respect presently.

Many are now curious as to the attitude of the new Parliament towards Vaccination. The Parliament which has just passed away was opposed to reforms of all kinds, and would hear nothing in our favour. Even the mild measure of Mr. Pease was scornfully rejected. Hundreds of petitions from those who had witnessed the injuries inflicted by vaccination were presented in vain. It is fair to hope for better things from the House of Commons now in course of formation. Candidates everywhere have been required to declare whether they were in favour of vaccination by force. Some get over the difficulty by promising to vote for a commission of inquiry. In Marylebone, as we read in the Daily Telegraph, vaccination has been a prominent question during the electoral canvass. Mr. Bompas some time ago told the electors of the borough that an unvaccinated person was like a flaming fire-brand among the people, and Marylebone dropped Mr. Bompas. I believe Mr. Bompas passes for a Liberal, and that he made a serious sacrifice at Cambridge because as a Baptist he could not submit to certain theological tests; but can anything be more grotesque than a conscientious religious dissenter maintaining that conscientious medical dissenters should be fined or hauled off to prison! In Sir Thomas Chambers as member for Marylebone we have a brave and outspoken advocate, and he has just received a coadjutor in Mr. Daniel Grant who promises to support him faithfully. Mr. F. S. Hunt, who was one of the Conservative candidates, encountered the question with surprise. Like so many others he had received Vaccination as matter of faith, which only the foolish and eccentric questioned; but he soon discovered in Marylebone that anti-vaccinators were neither foolish nor eccentric, but knew right well what they were about. It is to be said for Mr. Hunt that he exhibited so patient and so candid a temper, that, I have no doubt, had he been returned, he would have made those inquiries which, when seriously made, have commonly one issue, namely, conversion to our side of the question. Leaving Marylebone, I may mention Mr. E. Sammelson who has been again returned for Banbury. At first he would not listen to the anti-vaccinators among his constituents. They were, as Mr. Ernest Hart might say, beneath contempt. But they were not to be put down. By and by Mr. Sammelson looked into their case, saw it was a fair one, and if he is not altogether their convert, he is now ready to sustain their cause in Parliament. Dr. Cameron M.P. for Glasgow, the leading advocate of what is called animal vaccination has always been opposed to repeated prosecutions in vaccination cases, believing them
to be productive of much mischief; and Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P. for Bristol, goes farther, and says he was never in favour of a compulsory vaccination law, and will vote for its repeal whenever he has an opportunity. Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P. for Manchester, is not only opposed to compulsory vaccination, but to vaccination itself, and his children have been exempted from the rite. Mr. Slagg, who is now Mr. Bright’s colleague in Parliament, is prepared to assist in our movement. Then there is Mr. John Bright who says that the law which punishes parents again and again for not vaccinating their children is monstrous and ought to be repealed. When the question is fairly put before a constituency the result is continually in favour of the candidate who takes our side. Thus it was the other day at Rochester; and at Lincoln, where Mr. Chaplin declared he would maintain the Vaccination Acts, he was rejected for Mr. Hinde Palmer who promised to vote for their repeal. Mr. Hopwood, M.P. for Stockport, Mr. P. A. Taylor for Leicester, Mr. Thomas Burt for Morpeth, Mr. Passmore Edwards for Salisbury, and Mr. Otway for Rochester will all sustain our cause in the new House, and they will receive assistance from many whose minds are now opening to the tyranny and the folly of the law. We have therefore much to encourage us in our attack on the cruel superstition, which diffuses disease and destroys thousands of children annually, whilst effecting nothing against the malady it is imagined to prevent.

Mr. Tebb, in conclusion, observed that they had listened to an interesting lecture, whilst the lecturer himself was a praiseworthy example of his own doctrine. They should all do their utmost to make known the injurious character of the present system of vaccination. One of the results of the relentless prosecutions for non-vaccination in Marylebone was, that hundreds of children now grew up unregistered because through registration the vaccination officer obtained the clue to their existence.

Mr. Herbert Gladstone, in reply to Mr. Jameson, who wished to know how he stood affected to vaccination, replied, “I feel no one would wish me readily to give an opinion; at the same time I can assure you I think the subject a very important one; and my father, though he has not had the time to go thoroughly into it, has, as you probably know, much sympathy with your point of view.”

Hiatus Filled Up.—Mr. H. D. Dudgeon wrote in the Echo of 18th April,—“Mr. Ernest Hart has just published a pamphlet in which he says, ‘The number of attacks of persons efficiently vaccinated and successfully re-vaccinated is extremely small’ (Page 68). But Mr. Hart incan-tantly takes away all logical force from this statement by the remarkable confession, so grateful to the anti-vaccinator, that ‘at present there is no definition of what is a successful vaccination.’ May I presume to fill up the hiatus, and to supply the missing link? The proper and only practical definition of successful vaccination is ‘that which succeeds.’ If a person dies of small-pox, in what sense can the vaccination have been successful?”

MUCH VACCINATED M.P.’s.—Mr. A. Pell speaking at Loughborough on 24th March, said, “With regard to vaccination, I had a sensible mother, who had me vaccinated before I could raise any question on the subject, and I bear the marks of that indignity on my left arm. I am happy to say I have since been vaccinated upon every occasion I could get it done for nothing. I have been vaccinated three times in London workhouses. I like to get vaccinated there, because it is said the common people cannot get good and proper lymph in these places. I am guardian in St. John’s, East London, and have been twice vaccinated there by the parish surgeon. I was neither the better nor the worse for it, and I have not had small-pox.” Mr. W. U. Heygate followed in a similar strain, saying, “I am afraid I cannot promise to vote for the repeal of the Vaccination Laws. Like Mr. Pell, I have been vaccinated three times; twice since I have been in the House of Commons during small-pox panics when everybody went off and got vaccinated. If you only get good lymph, you may be sure vaccination will do you no harm.” Mr. Pell has been returned again for South Leicestershire, and Mr. Heygate has been rejected for Mr. Paget.
THE VACCINATION INQUIRY.

It is occasioned by the case. I have had,' writes Mr. Isaac Pennington, Camden, 16th Sept., 1798. 'Dr. Jenner took some weeks, and the particulars stated in it are really astonishment. I have made inquiries upon the subject at Cottamore and Wilmott, in which the particulars 850: much more are keys: one a great many horses of the rough-legged sort and much liable to the symptoms of pock were placed under the prompt, and the man much employed in marking. But I cannot find that any previous complaints on the part of the owners, or on the hands of the victoria, have ever been heard of.'

Considering that Pearson conducted his investigation from his seat in Leicester Square, and that at the time he had never seen cow-pox, his Inquiry must be pronounced an excellent piece of work, executed with notable dispatch and intelligence.

Another early and earnest examiner of Jenner's Inquiry was Dr. William Woodville, physician to the London Small-pox and Inoculation Hospitals. He was a Cumberland man: an ardent botanist: and he turned two acres of the ground around the Hospital at King's Cross into a botanic garden, which he maintained at his own expense. He died of a chronic pulmonary complaint in 1855, and in his last illness had himself removed from his house in Ely Place to the Hospital for the sake of the garden and the country air.

Woodville was eager to try cow-pox, but Jenner had no supply, nor could any be had elsewhere. He therefore resorted to horse-grease, but could make nothing of it. In his own words—

"Conceiving that the distemper might be produced by inoculating the nipples of cows with the matter of the grease of horses. I proceeded to try whether the cow-pox could be actually excited in this manner. Numerous experiments were made upon different cows with the matter of grease, taken in the various stages of that disease, but without producing the desired effect.

"Neither were inoculations with this matter, nor with several other morbid secretions in the horse, productive of any effects upon the human subject." *

Who were the human subjects upon whom these experiments were practised, Woodville does not state: they were probably the waifs and strays of London streets drifted to the Hospital doors. Several other attempts were made to raise pox on cows with horse-grease without result save malcontents on Jenner for originating such a troublesome quest.

Thus closed 1798 with many eager to try the new prescription whenever there was a chance. In the first of January of the new year, there was an entry in London. 'The found! His found!' In a fancy of 600 cows in Gray's Inn Lane the disease was discovered: and further hastened Sir Joseph Banks, President of the Royal Society, Lord Somerville, Sir William Watson, Dr. Pearson, Dr. Woodville, Dr. William and others. The symptoms on the cows' teats were exactly compared with the description and pictures in Jenner's Inquiry, and pronounced identical. Four days of the cows became infected, those not to milk escaping the disease; likewise some of the milkers, the first being Sarah Barre, who had undergone small-pox in childhood—a proof that small-pox did not prevent cow-pox, and a caution against over-dependence on Jenner, which unfortunately few were disposed to accept. "At the same time," records Dr. Pearson. "I received the agreeable intelligence that the disease was also raging in the largest stock of cows on the New Road, near Paddington, to which no one could gain admittance but myself.'

With cow-pox thus provided in abundance, Pearson and Woodville set to work—Woodville at his Hospital, and Pearson in private practice. How they got on appears from the following letter, enclosing vaccine threads, addressed by Pearson to 200 practitioners throughout the United Kingdom—

"LEICESTER SQUARE, 12th March, 1799.

"Sir,—I hope you will pardon me for taking the liberty to inform you by way of additional evidence to the testimonies I have published on the subject of the cow-pox: that upwards of 160 patients, from two weeks to forty years of age, principally infants, have been inoculated since the 30th January last by Dr. Woodville and myself, separately.

"Not one mortal case occurred.

"Not one of the patients was considered dangerously ill. . . .

"None of the patients, namely above 60, inoculated with the small-pox, subsequently to the vaccine disease, took the infection. . . .

"In many of the cases eruptions of the body appeared, some of which could not be distinguished from the small-pox.

"I have sent the matter of cow-pox pusules on the thread enclosed, in order, if you approve of the inquiry, to inoculate with it; and I entreat you to favour me with the results of your trials: but I must trouble you to apply the test of inoculating with various matter subsequently to the vaccine disorder.—Grosvenor Pearson, M.D., F.R.S.

"P.S.—I am happy to be able to state that at Berkeley Dr. Jenner has continued his trials of inoculation with vaccine matter sent from London with good success."

* Reports of a Series of Inoculations for the Variola Vaccine or Cow-Pox. London: 1799.
Jenner was of an indolent disposition, but the part Pearson was playing stung him to action. His nephew, Rev. G. C. Jenner, wrote to him from London, and thus roused his vanity—

"NORFOLK STREET, 11th March, 1799."

"After what Mr. Paytherus has written to you it will be needless for me to say anything to urge the necessity of your coming to town to wear the laurels you have gained, or to prevent their being placed on the brows of another. . .

"Dr. Pearson is going to send circular letters to medical gentlemen to let them know that he will supply them with cow-pox matter upon their application to him, by which means he will be the chief person known in the business, and consequently deprive you of that merit, or at least a great share of it, which is so justly your due. Dr. Pearson gave a public lecture on the Cow-Pox on Saturday, and adopted your opinions, except with regard to the probability of the disease originating in horses' heels. . .

All your friends agree that now is your time to establish your fame and fortune; but if you delay taking a personal active part any longer the opportunity will be lost for ever.—Your affectionate nephew, G. C. JENNER."

Jenner at once communicated the alarming intelligence to his friend Gardner with a sly suggestion for counter-action—

"BERKELEY, Wednesday."

"A letter just received from G. Jenner informs me that Dr. Pearson on Saturday last gave a public lecture on the Cow-Pox, and that it was publicly exhibited at Sir Joseph Banks's on Sunday evening. He has also given out that he will furnish any gentleman at a distance with the virus. . .

As this is probably done with the view of showing himself as the first man in the concern, should not some neatly drawn paragraphs appear from time to time in the public prints, by no means reflecting on the conduct of P., but just to keep the idea publicly alive that P. was not the author of the discovery—I mean of cow-pox inoculation.—Yours truly, E. J."

As human nature exists, it was not extraordinary that Jenner should feel anxious over the occupation of ground he considered his own; but at the same time it is obvious, that Pearson had done nothing wrong, nothing that was not allowable, nothing, indeed, that was not praiseworthy. He allowed Jenner full credit for having advertised the Gloucestershire faith in cow-pox, and for the production of certain evidence for that faith; but whilst Jenner had excited curiosity, he did nothing, or could do nothing, to satisfy it; and it was idle to expect the world to await his convenience; nor was Pearson the man to rest content where action was possible. As he said—

"From the time of the publication of the Inquiry in June, 1796, the author contributed no further inoculated cases to the end of that year; nor could I do more than investigate the history of the Cow-Pox principally by inquiries among provincial physicians and farmers, from whom I was enabled to confirm some of the facts in Dr. Jenner's book, and to render doubtful or disprove others, and to bring to light new observations."

Jenner was not slow to respond to his nephew's summons to London. He left Berkeley on the 21st of March, and remained in town until the 11th of June, visiting medical men, asserting his own claims, and counter-acting the operations of Pearson and Woodville.

In Dr. Pearson's circular, it will be observed, that he describes inoculation with cow-pox as attended with eruptions in some cases, which could not be distinguished from small-pox. So far as Pearson and Woodville were concerned, it was an unfortunate statement, and gave Jenner an advantage over them which he used unsparingly to their discredit and to the establishment of his own reputation.

Jenner's claim for inoculation with cow-pox was, that it excited a fever that was not infectious and was without pustular eruptions; and here was Dr. Pearson setting up as his critic, and Dr. Woodville assuming to develop his practice, and producing a disorder that was undistinguishable from small-pox! Such presumption and ignorance deserved to be hooted. What was the explanation? Simply this: that Dr. Woodville conducted some of his cow-pox inoculations in the various atmosphere of his Hospital, and that he thereby communicated small-pox and cow-pox simultaneously. In a scientific sense, the experience was valuable; it proved that it was possible to have cow-pox and small-pox at the same time—that neither disease superseded or nullified the other.

Woodville tried to vindicate himself, and in his failure magnified Jenner's triumph still further. Yet he had much that was reasonable to say for himself. For example, he had transmitted to Jenner some of the virus from one of the first of his cow-pox inoculations in January, and with it Jenner operated on twenty persons, reporting to Woodville—

"BERKELEY, February, 1799."

"The rise, progress, and termination of the pustules created by the virus were exactly that of the true cow-pox."

Nevertheless, wrote Woodville—

"This virus which Dr. Jenner declared to be perfectly pure and genuine was taken from the"
arm of an hospital patient who had 810 pustules, all of which suppurated."

Woodville also argued, that "cow-pox, as casually produced by milking infected cows, differs considerably from that which is the effect of inoculation"; and to this Jenner himself bore witness, saying—

"Four or five servants were inoculated at a farm contiguous to Berkeley last summer with matter just taken from an infected cow. A little inflammation appeared on all their arms, but died away without producing a pustule; yet all these servants caught the disease within a month afterwards from milking the infected cows, and some of them had it severely."

Others maintained that the cow-pox which saved milk-maids from small-pox was a much severer affection than that induced by Jenner's lancet, and that it was folly to assume their equivalence. There was force in the argument; for every one then knew how much the issue of small-pox inoculation depended on the mode of its performance. The infection when communicated through the skin was usually much less severe than when communicated by incision; and Jenner relates how a country inoculator, who liked to "cut deep enough to see a bit of fat," was the death of his patients on every side. The human body is of an infinite delicacy and complexity, and we are sure to find ourselves at fault when we deal with its mysteries according to our crude and inanimate logic.

Whatever might be the perils, immediate or remote, of inoculation with cow-pox, it was not attended with small-pox eruptions; and at last it became manifest to Woodville himself, that the virus he had used, and the virus he had distributed, which had produced such eruptions, was the virus of small-pox.

After much controversy and many experiments these conclusions were arrived at—

1. That when a person was inoculated with small-pox and cow-pox about the same time, both inoculations proved effective. There was a pustular eruption on the skin from the small-pox, and the cow-pox vesicle reached maturity in the usual number of days.

2. These effects took place, without much variation, in all cases where the interval between the two inoculations did not exceed a week; but—

3. When the small-pox matter was inserted on the ninth day after the inoculation with cow-pox, its action seemed to be wholly precluded.†

That is to say, for a time—until the influence of the vaccine fever had worn off. Some fancied that small-pox when inoculated with cow-pox generated a hybrid pox that was more efficacious than either, but it was a vain fancy. There was occasionally some interaction of the diseases, as of a subdued activity in each, but generally they proceeded together unaffected, the cow-pox maintaining its characteristics in the midst of a crop of small-pox.

One point of great significance in Woodville's experience was overlooked. He inoculated with cow-pox in the Small-Pox Hospital, and some of his patients there contracted small-pox, who certainly were not inoculated with small-pox, either accidentally or by design. The lesson of this experience was unperceived, and though it has been repeated again and again, is rarely acknowledged. Vaccination in presence of small-pox, or in an epidemic of small-pox, is often a means of inducing the disease it is intended to prevent. It lights the fire; and when the fire is lighted, it is said, "Ah! it must have been a light before." When we have a mind for an excuse, how easily do we deceive ourselves with our own sophistry!

Among Jenner's purposes in going to London in the spring of 1799 was the publication of a second treatise of 70 pages quarto entitled, Further Observations on the Variola Vaccina. It appears to have been produced with many pains and extraordinary apprehensions. He wrote to Gardner, 7th March, 1799—

"Every sentence must be again revised and weighed in the nicest balance that human intellect can invent. The eyes of the philosophic and medical critic, prejudiced most bitterly against the hypothesis, will penetrate its immost recesses, and discover the minutest flaw were it suffered to be present. Language I put out of the question: it is the matter I refer to."

These words betray excitement for which there was no warrant; and when we turn to the treatise, that was to be weighed sentence by sentence in the nicest of balances, we see clearly that its author was a weak-minded creature. It is little more than a gossip about cow-pox without any real advance upon the statements of the Inquiry. Indeed, he sets out with the admission that "it had not been in his power to extend the investigation into the causes and effects of the Variola Vaccina much beyond its original limits;" and excuses himself from seeking additional evidence for the protection afforded from small-pox by cow-pox because Dr. Pearson had done all that was requisite! Sometimes when it is objected that the facts adduced in the

*Further Observations on the Variola Vaccina, 1799.
Inquiry were hastily collected, meagre and inconclusive, it is replied, "Yes, but recollect, they were merely a selection from the author's stores"—a reply that is nothing save audacious; but Jenner here renders it baseless in recording—

"My late publication contains a relation of most of the facts which had come under my own inspection at the time it was written, interpersed with some conjectural observations."

He defines one of his aims in producing Further Observations as the definition of the diseases in cattle which simulate cow-pox; and, incredible as it may appear, this is his deliverance—

"To what length pustulous diseases of the udder and nipples of the cow may extend, it is not in my power to determine; but certain it is, that these parts of the animal are subject to some variety of maladies of this nature; and as many of these eruptions (probably all of them) are capable of giving a disease to the human body, would it not be discreet for those engaged in this investigation to suspend controversy and cavil until they can ascertain with precision what is, and what is not the genuine cow-pox?...

Until experience has determined which is the true cow-pox, and which is spurious, we view our object through a mist—"

Which was to say, that what was his business, he assigned to others, whilst he sat ready to appropriate the profit and the praise!

Another of his aims was "to enforce the precaution of subduing the inoculated pustule as soon as it has sufficiently produced its influence on the constitution." The inflammation and erysipelis resulting from inoculation with cow-pox, he considered it unnecessary to prolong—an opinion which Dr. Pearson contested.

He had also to vindicate his faith in the origin of cow-pox in horse-grease; which he did in this fashion—

"Firstly,—I conceived this was its source from observing that where the cow-pox had appeared among the dairies here [Berkeley] (unless it could be traced to the introduction of an infected cow or servant) it had been preceded at the farm by a horse diseased in the manner described, which horse had been attended by some of the milkers.

"Secondly,—From its being a popular opinion throughout this great dairy country, and from its being insisted on by those who here attend sick cattle.

"Thirdly,—From the total absence of the disease in those countries where the men servants are not employed in the dairies.

"Fourthly,—From having observed that morbid matter generated by the horse frequently communicates, in a casual way, a disease to the human subject so like the cow-pox, that in many cases it would be difficult to make the distinction between one and the other.

"Fifthly.—From being induced to suppose from experiments, that some of those who had been thus affected from the horse resisted the small-pox.

"Sixthly.—From the progress and general appearance of the pustule on the arm of the boy whom I inoculated with matter taken from the hand of a man infected by a horse; and from the similarity to the cow-pox of the general constitutional symptoms which followed."

Many who were willing to accept cow-pox would not hear of its origin in horse-grease; but Jenner's evidence for the one was as good as for the other: and facts are facts however disagreeable. To the inability of Woodville and Simmons of Manchester to inoculate cows with horse-grease, Jenner replied, "That even cow-pox virus itself when introduced into the sound nipples of cows by means of a lancet was found to produce no effect." Failure was no proof of impossibility.

A pamphlet like Further Observations, whilst it kept Jenner's name to the fore, was too feeble and inefficient to advance vaccine inoculation. Woodville and Pearson did the real work of publicity and promotion—Pearson especially. Within seven months, January to August, 1799, they performed 2000 vaccinations, and on every side the new practice was received with favour and dislike; but favour from the outset vastly predominated. In the Philosophical Journal, August, 1799, Pearson wrote—

"In Scotland the new inoculation has not been less successful. Dr. Anderson, of Leith, informs me that he has inoculated above 80 persons; that Dr. Duncan has begun the practice in Edinburgh; and that it has been introduced in Dundee, Paisley, and Dalkeith."

Nor did Pearson limit his efforts to his native land: he relates—

"In the course of the same year, 1799, I extended the dissemination of the vaccine matter to Germany, for the Princess Louisa at Berlin, Hanover, Vienna, Geneva, Lisbon, Paris, Boston, and into the British Army through Mr. Keats."

Jenner regarded much of this activity with a jealous eye: it did not sufficiently make for his glory. He was anxious, fretful, helpless. "It is impossible for me, single-handed, to combat all my adversaries," was his whine. "I am beset on all sides with snarling fellows, and so ignorant withal that they know no more of the disease they write about than the animals which generate it." It was perfectly true that he was unable to fight his own battle and maintain his position; and we shall see how he was assisted.
VACCINATION: ITS AIMS AND ENDS, OBJECTS AND RESULTS.

Under this title Mr. Alex. Wheeler, of Darlington, gave a lecture on the 18th of April in the hall of the Elysium Club, Chelsea, which was well filled. He was supported by Dr. Collins, Mr. Wm. Tebb, Dr. Nichols, Mr. White, and others.

Mr. Wheeler, after quoting Mr. Simon's declaration that "The close of the 18th century, which had much to darken it, will be remembered till the end of human history for the greatest physical good ever yet given by science to the world," showed that our public authorities were endorsing the odious untruth this sentence contained. That we were therefore fighting no chimera in waging war with even Jenner's own assertions, since they were to-day being circulated and sown broadcast at the national expense.

Jenner's objects were shown to be the "annihilation of small-pox." The rendering people "perfectly secure for life" from small-pox. The making of them "for ever insusceptible" to it. These were the grounds upon which he was supported, and these the objects that the Parliament he won over expected to see attained.

But to-day, although these are still used as if extant, they are virtually conceded to the opponents of vaccination. Modification of small-pox is the object aimed at ostensibly.

Dr. Seaton, in his Handbook, says (p. 209) "Our assertion is that, so far as is yet known, absolute protection is the rule and the occurrence of small-pox the exception in the vaccinated." And further, "Vaccination modifies the course of small-pox, or otherwise diminishes its danger in those in whom the protection has not been absolute" (p. 200).

Dr. Ballard says in his Prize Essay that "The practice of vaccination is worthy of confidence as a protection against attacks of small-pox" (p. 56). And the Select Committee of 1871 declared that "small-pox, unchecked by vaccination, is one of the most terrible and destructive of diseases, as regards the danger of infection, the proportion of deaths among those attacked, and the permanent injury to the survivors; and therefore it was the duty of the State to endeavour to secure the careful vaccination of the whole population."

If, said Mr. Wheeler, vaccination is anything it is the doctrine of assumptions, which are—

a. Every one must have small-pox.

b. That if all are vaccinated many will miss small-pox in consequence.

c. That those having small-pox after vaccination have it more favourably in consequence.

The case is thus stated from the vaccine aspect; vaccination is almost as universally adopted as possible in England. What are the results?

And here Mr. Wheeler remarked the difficulty he was placed in. That while the declarations of the authorities on the one hand were precise, their deductions were not few, and what was left after taking them into account was not easily formulated. For instance, as to Jenner's prophecy, Dr. Ceely speaking on the 18th of December last to the members of the British Medical Association, said "They would not be able to annihilate small-pox, and he defied any one to show that he had claimed such a result."

Dr. Gregory, after a great experience in reviewing a long series of epidemics of small-pox, said, "These historical details cannot be read without the conviction that all idea of banishing small-pox from the earth was vain and illusory" (Library of Medicine, 1840).

But the most extraordinary admission is that of Dr. Ballard, who says, after quoting Jenner's statement—"It now became too manifest to admit of controversy that the annihilation of small-pox must be the final result of the practice of vaccination"—goes on to say, "Dr. Jenner's sanguine hope has not been fulfilled. Experience has not verified his prediction. Small-pox has not been eradicated. Let me add," he continues, "that scientific observation and reasoning give no countenance to the belief that it ever will be eradicated, even from civilised communities" (Prize Essay, p. 36).

Mr. Wheeler said that he took these ample and extremely careful confessions as relieving him from the necessity of proof, that Edward Jenner was, as regarded his main object, an utterly deluded man. But if he was wrong as to "annihilation" of small-pox, does it remain that vaccination "modifies" small-pox?

Mr. Marson tells us that there are many degrees of severity in vaccinated small-pox, from the "slightest form in which there is hardly any eruption to the most severe confluent cases," and that "it also assumes the malignant and petechial type after vaccination just as in the vaccinated."—(Article in Reynolds' System of Medicine).

Innumerable failures have resulted in the modern doctrine that the protection is in proportion to the number of "marks" of vaccination; that is, the more marks the greater
protection. But the Metropolitan Hospitals—Stockwell, Homerton, Hampstead, Fulham, and Highgate, give no countenance to this novel doctrine. For out of 14,847 cases tabulated according to "marks" in these Hospitals, only 2,933 had no vaccine marks, while 6,253 had two, three, four, and more marks of vaccination. It would therefore appear that far fewer cases come under their care having no marks than have some or many marks. And if one may draw any conclusion from this form of putting the case, it would be that those with no marks will be the smallest number by far of the patients.

But if the presence of vaccine marks is no protection, will the "well marked" cases yield the fewest deaths? It is, however, most important to know how the observation as to marks is to be made. If it is on entering the hospital, it will be fallacious. The disease is the most eruptive of fevers, and the marks are covered by the eruption, if the patient comes in, as is very often the case, twenty-four hours before death. But even with this in favour of the "marks" selection, we find in the cases every possible percentage of death. And the most important point is that in any one class, say "four marks" cases, you find no two hospitals yield the same result. Four marks cases, at any age, in one hospital do not accord with the same cases in any other hospital. Thus, said Mr. Wheeler, we have waded about in this chasm long enough. There is no scientific clue. We get no uniformity of results, however large our basis of facts; the "discovery" cried up as so great a boon, is verily "a great delusion."

Yet the scientific clue has been all the time before us, but thrust aside and put away by the vaccine authorities. Dr. Thomas Sydenham described small-pox just as it exists to-day. Treating a large number of small-pox cases in the years soon following the great plague of London, he tells us that in the discrete sort there was "no danger," in the confluent great care and attention were required after the utmost skill could do little, and that when there was hemorrhage, or the blackening of the pocks, no skill could save the life of the patient. So also Dr. Wagstaffe who said, there was a kind the nurse could hardly kill, another a physician could hardly cure.

This classification, according to the eruption of small-pox, is the only scientific classification, and yields accurate results. Whether vaccinated or unvaccinated, whether in London Hospital, in Californian, or in Dublin Hospitals it is the same. Those having a slight eruption (and these, of course, will exhibit vaccine marks well if there are any) when there are few pustules will have little difficulty in rapidly overcoming the disease; very few will die, generally about one per cent. The confluent, especially if the eruption is continuous and the head one mass of pustules, will get through with difficulty, and need the greatest care and skill. And the malignant, oftenest found in battle-field hospitals, or in those given to excesses in life, are rarely recovered.

Before this classification vaccinia is forced to bow. No number of marks of vaccination, no certificate of its "success" is of avail. In the Homerton Hospital there were twenty-four vaccinated malignant cases and all died.

Here then we have the scientific clue; the eruption is the guide, not the marks of a foolish rite. Sydenham is the man of science, Jenner the empiric. The disease is, as it always has been since his day, unmodified and unaltered. The aims however good, the objects however praiseworthy, are not attained. In England, 116,000 persons have died since 1853 of small-pox; and during the years 1870-80 our hospitals treated 37,666 cases, of which no fewer than 28,408 were vaccinated. This is failure enough—it is a large enough experience.

Mr. Wheeler concluded by asking whether, supposing there were no laws about vaccination, he had not made out a case for abandoning it. I have, said he, shown its failure to be complete; but we are compelled, let experience be as opposed to the rite as it is, to support and endow the superstition. Jenner was a man who was no scientist. He hurried forward his empirical "discovery," forced it upon public attention, and obtained public money; but in after years he knew he had done wrong and that his rite was a failure.

How different was the case of Harvey!—he was a true scientist, who laboriously and patiently followed the clue to the discovery of the circulation of the blood, which he announced before he died. But he had not the satisfaction of seeing his discovery generally accepted, nor, indeed, of seeing it positively complete. But his honours, though posthumous, are real; and the gratitude of suffering humanity follows his name with ever-increasing respect. He was the true friend of suffering humanity, and his memory will live when the other has perished in oblivion.

A lively discussion followed Mr. Wheeler's lecture, in which Dr. Fisher stated his preference
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

Mr. W. Gibson Ward's Lecture.

Mr. Ward opened his lecture on Small-pox and Vaccination before the Dialectical Society on 7th April with the citation of various authorities, including Sydenham, to show that the malignity of small-pox in former times had been much exaggerated. He held that the disease was an effort of Nature to throw off corruptions of the blood induced by improper food and unwholesome conditions of life. The true remedy for small-pox was to be found in cleanliness, temperance, fresh air, and exercise. Those who fell into a various condition could not do better than submit to the purification which small-pox signifies. To try to avert or suppress small-pox by medical artifices was simply to compel an orderly process to assume worse forms such as cancer and consumption. He made a severe attack on Jenner as a man of feeble intelligence, who had no true faith in his own prescription. When he thought his son was in peril of infection, he did not inoculate him with cow-pox, but with small-pox. Whether from fear of Mr. Ward's controversial prowess, the discussion which followed the lecture was almost confined to anti-vaccinators. Dr. W. J. Collins made a speech that was listened to with extreme attention in which he narrated his experience as a public vaccinator, and how by the force of evidence in his own practice he came to the conclusion that vaccination was not only useless in the prevention of small-pox, but that it excited, inseedated, and propagated worse diseases in those subjected to the rite.

Earnest Anti-Vaccinators.

We have frequent cause to admire the sincerity and self-sacrifice wherewith many men and women in humble life strive to open the eyes of their comrades to the mischiefs of vaccination. We have now a letter before us, in which we read of a Halifax carpet-weaver, who is from home at work from 5.30 a.m. to 9 p.m.; but, in spite of weariness, makes opportunity for encouraging resistance to the pernicious practice; and he says, "Almost every person to whom I speak has something to tell of its evil results."

Kighley steadily disregards the Vaccination Acts as far as is practicable. At the meeting of Guardians on the 21st March the report of the vaccination officer was read, in which it was stated that during the winter months few persons had their children vaccinated. One hundred and fifty notices had been sent out. The officer, moreover, stated that he had received only one quarter's salary, and would be glad if the Board could see its way towards paying him. Some discussion followed, and it was finally determined that he should receive his salary for the past quarter.
At Ashton-under-Lyne.

The Liberal candidate for Ashton was Mr. Hugh Mason, and the Conservative, Mr. Coulthart. Mr. Mason was returned. Both were questioned as to the Vaccination Acts; and Mr. Mason at a public meeting replied—

"It is not the first time that I have been asked whether I am in favour of compulsory vaccination. I have a letter from a respectable and prosperous inhabitant of Ashton, who says, 'Kindly inform me if you are in favour of the abolition of the Vaccination Laws.' I wrote: 'Your question is an interesting one, and I have often talked it over with my friend Henry Pitman. I do not think medical science has yet got to a state of perfection, and I know there are able men of that profession who are seeking to amend the law of compulsory vaccination. I think the law is harshly administered in many cases. My information on the subject is by no means so strong as to entitle me in saying that the law ought to be abolished.'"

Mr. Mason exhibits a loose state of mind, which does little credit to his instruction by Mr. Pitman. What is he prepared to do? It is not necessary to disbelieve in vaccination in order to refrain from imposing it on others; and there are ameliorations of the law short of its abolition.

Mr. Coulthart was a hopeless subject. When asked at a meeting of his supporters, "Will you vote for the repeal of the Vaccination Acts?" there was an uproar, in the midst of which he applied for advice to Dr. Lees, who was heard to say, "Decidedly not, decided not." Thus fortified, he answered—

"I have no hesitation in saying, for I have had a great deal to do with the administration of the law, that the Acts are excellent; that vaccination has cured and saved the lives of thousands for every one that has died by it; and I assert most emphatically, that I will not vote for the repeal of the Acts." (Loud applause, and a voice, 'Are thy kids vaccinated?')"

The following clear and cogent letter from Mr. Enoch Robinson, M.R.C.S., appeared in the Ashton Reporter of 13th March—

"Mr. Coulthart is determined to enforce to the utmost possible extent the persecution clauses of the Vaccination Acts. Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, and other eminent statesmen have by their votes and writings condemned the system of prosecuting a man time after time for resisting the inoculation of his healthy child with a living element of animal disease that may at the time contain the taint of syphilis. Mr. Herbert Spencer in a letter dated February 6th, 1880, writes—'I am strongly opposed to compulsory vaccination.' What is the vaccination dogma? Sir William Gull said in his evidence in 1871—'I should say that vaccination was as protective as small-pox itself.' Is this dogma true or false when tested by statistics? Mr. Marson's evidence showed that of the 15,000 cases of small-pox admitted into the London hospitals from 1852 to 1867, only 1 per cent. had previously had small-pox, whilst 53 per cent. had been vaccinated. And later statistics, from the Metropolitan Asylums show that of 15,171 cases admitted from 1876 to November 1879, 11,412 had been previously vaccinated, or 78 per cent., whereas if vaccination protected to the same extent as an attack of small-pox, only 1 per cent. should have been vaccinated. The vaccination dogma is, therefore, false. But the kind of statistics upon which the persecuting vaccinator chiefly relies in these latter days for the justification of his cruel practice is as follows: 15,171 cases of small-pox occur in the hospitals, of which 11,412 have been vaccinated, and 3,759 have not been vaccinated. Of the vaccinated 1,008 die, or 8½ per cent., whilst of the unvaccinated 1,669 die, or 44½ per cent. Therefore, triumphantly exclaims the vaccinator, vaccination protects the vaccinated! Is this a rational conclusion? Two facts may occur coincidently, and not have the relation of cause and effect. The expression of the greater percentage mortality amongst the unvaccinated is as follows—97 per cent. of the London population is now vaccinated according to Dr. Seaton. Of what does the remaining 3 per cent. consist? Of two classes. First, those children whose constitutions are too delicate to enable them to undergo the operation and illness of vaccination; and 2nd, the utterly neglected portions of society, the street Arabs, whose filthy condition and surroundings make them an easy prey for infections disease. The 97 per cent. consist of the strong and healthy, and the best cared for of the community. When an epidemic of small-pox comes among these two divisions of the population—the vaccinated and unvaccinated—which division ought to experience, proportionally, the greatest mortality? Surely, that containing the weakly and the neglected portions of humanity. It would be a strange result if those with delicate constitutions and with surrounding circumstances of the most wretched character were able to resist even to an equal degree the ravages of an epidemic of small-pox, and therefore, instead of being surprised to find 44½ per cent. of them slain, the wonder is that the whole number of the 8,759 are not swept away. Mr. Coulthart, as a convicting magistrate, ought to answer this question—if vaccination be protective against small-pox, how comes it to pass that the 11,412 persons who had been vaccinated suffered from small-pox? And lest Mr. Coulthart should fall back upon the stereotyped excuse that the vaccination must have been imperfect, I give the opinion of Dr. Stevens, one of the most active of the Local Government Board Inspectors. Dr. Stevens thus spoke of himself at the Medical Conference in December—'He had seen more vaccinated children than any man, either alive or who had lived;' and as to the present system, he said, 'All his experience led him to the opinion that the arm-to-arm system practised in this country was as nearly perfect as a system could be made, and as efficacious as
could be desired." I hope the fathers and
mothers in Ashton-under-Lyne will, by their
votes and influence, show that the purity of
their children's blood is of too priceless a value
to be placed as the 'diseased' mercy of a cruel
Considerant.

FREQUENT RESULTS OF VACCINATION.
The following, from a chemist and associate of
the Pharmaceutical Society, is a specimen of
letters frequently received by me.

Kingstede, Wokingham. THOMAS BAKER.

"I have just had a very sad case, resulting
from vaccination, under my notice. A child suffe-
ring for years, requiring the closest care and atten-
tion, from a mass of running scabs and sores
nearly all over the back part of the body. Yet the
doctor said when vaccinating that the lymph
came from one of the healthiest children he had
seen; and the child vaccinated was, previous
to the lymph being inserted, a strong clear-
kinned little thing, and the parents both
healthy people. Now the poor thing is a
wreck!

"This is merely one case out of scores I have
witnessed. I constantly have children brought
to prescribe for, suffering from some vile disease,
or eruption, and almost invariably the reply to my
question, 'How long has the child had this,'
takes the form, 'Ever since it has been vacci-
nated, sir.'

"Vaccination is the vilest curse beneath the
sun, and I will do or undergo anything rather
than have my child's pure blood tainted with
the filthy poison.

W. H."

TYRANNY AND MARTYRDOM.—Even if cows
would kindly get cow-pox for our convenience,
so that each child might have the disease direct
from the cow, it would be tyranny for the law
to say to a parent—"You shall not keep your
child in perfect health: that is too dangerous a
course." When the parent replies by defiance of
the law, and is treated as a criminal, the law-
makers are (in my opinion) the real criminals
before God and man. Parents who become
martyrs by resisting the law, deserve a sympathy
akin to those who are martyrs of religion.—
F. W. NEWMAN.

Mr. SUMMERS returned as M.P. for Stalybridge,
said at a public meeting of the electors, "As you
are aware, there are differences of opinion among
medical men as to vaccination, and I wish they
could settle the question among themselves. The
Parliament is invited to make any sweeping
change in the law. I should like to see a
thorough inquiry instituted, and the results
submitted to the legislature. As to repeated
prosecutions for non-vaccination, I think the
law should be altered at once. These prosecu-
tions were never contemplated by Mr. Forster, and
were the result of an accidental division in the
House of Lords at the end of a session when there
was not time to consider and correct the
inadvertence."

SIR THOMAS WATSON'S SURRENDER.
The following communication was addressed to
the editor of the British Medical Journal——

"Sir.—A letter signed Frithiof, which ap-
ppeared in a recent number of your journal gave
me a clue to an important paper published by
Mr. Ceely in the 10th volume of the Transac-
tions of the Provincial Medical and Surgical
Association, of which paper I had no previous
knowledge. A careful study of it has convinced
me that I have been in error respecting the
mutual relations of small-pox and cow-pox.

"I hasten, as in duty and honour bound, to
acknowledge my mistake, and to apologise to
the gentlemen upon whose measures on this
subject I may have commented.

"Henceforward I promise not to burden your
pages with any further contributions personal to
myself.

"THOMAS WATSON.

"16 Henrietta Street, Cavendish Square,
"23rd February, 1880."

This letter is remarkable in many ways. For
some time past Sir Thomas Watson has been a
leader among the animal vaccinators, and has
repeatedly justified his position by asserting
that much of the lymph in common use was
small-pox put into cows and taken from them
without undergoing organic change. The
charge was so explicit that it bewildered some
who thought they knew otherwise. Mr. Ceely
and Mr. Badcock, who inoculated cows with
small-pox, did not consider the operation effec-
tive if they merely induced the local infamma-
tion, described by Sir Thomas, and failed to
excite fever and pusules, which they pronounced
cow-pox, and as such diffused throughout the
world.

Sir Thomas Watson says he discovered his
error in an obscure volume; but he might have
obtained the knowledge he stood in need of in a
dozen volumes in any medical library. His
position from first to last has been so extra-
ordinary, that only the indisputable facts them-
selves could render it credible.

It is now to be seen how the Calf-Lymphers
will conduct themselves, who have used the
authority of Sir Thomas Watson so freely to
cover their various absurdities.

We have often to observe how little is known
of vaccination by those who practise it, and how
untrue is the charge of ignorance applied to
anti-vaccinators, who, not unfrequently, are
exactly and deeply informed on the question
whereon their opinion is decided. Anyhow it
would be difficult to have known less, and testi-
fied more presumptuously than Sir Thomas
Watson, late President of the Royal College of
Physicians.—C. H.
FLAMING FIRE-BRAND BOMPAS.

It may be remembered that Mr. Bompas solemnly informed the electors of Marylebone that "a person not vaccinated is like a flaming fire-brand among the people." Mr. Bompas is anxious to find a seat in Parliament, but so far has been unsuccessful. Southampton would not have him. Ashton-under-Lyne preferred Mr. Hugh Mason; and now West Kent has rejected him. To an inquiring Kentish elector he wrote—

"3 Harcourt Buildings, Temple, "30th March, 1880.

"Dear Sir,—I cannot promise to vote for the repeal of the Vaccination Acts, or even for an inquiry into them.—Yours faithfully,

"Henry M. Bompas."

The flaming fire-brand was an indication of the quality of Mr. Bompas, which this note confirms. Occasionally an ignorant and implacable fanatic fancies himself a Liberal, and is taken by the unwary at his own estimate, but there need be no mistake about Bompas.

TRUTH AND MR. ERNEST HART.*

The Truth about Vaccination. It is a title that exacts too much. When we are specially invited to hear the truth about anything, we look out for something more than questionable. A cunning scamp took for his motto, "True as steel." We remember a shoemaker who described himself over his shop as "Honest John," and we heard with little surprise that there was not a greater rogue in the street. The Truth about Vaccination! A reader fresh from its perusal says the title should run—The Leading Lies about Vaccination set forth with Consummate Impudence. He forgets that he does not live in Dr. Johnson's days, and that we now do our vituperation in softer tones.

Mr. Hart's pamphlet is the work of a barrister for the defence, and as such it should be read. But the more artful order of counsel know that it is possible to make too good a case, and that it is politic to allow something to the other side as a foil to the strength of their own. Mr. Hart has nothing of this subtle art. His client, Vaccination, is one blaze of brazen perfection. Every charge made against it is utter trumpery. Small-pox devastated England before Jenner, and small-pox no longer devastates England because of Jenner. He concedes nothing to changes of diet and habits, nor to the vast sanitatory improvements effected throughout the land. All, all is due to Vaccination! We shall not do Mr. Hart the intellectual injustice to suppose he believes what he asserts for his client any more than does any other barrister. The question is whether it is for the advantage of the community that the practice of the law courts should be introduced into the domain of science without the protection of the judicial bench. It may be said, there have always been barristers in the world and always will be; that the Greek sophists were barristers, and that the Times confessedly aims at being John Bull's barrister—which is true; and if only the game were understood, it would sharpen the public wits and do no harm. But the game is not understood, nor confessed; and unconfessed barristers, like Mr. Ernest Hart, are continually taken for serious prophets by the simple-minded.

To an inquiring elector Mr. Coope wrote, "I am not prepared to vote for the repeal of the Vaccination Acts, but should be glad to take such measures as might secure the distribution of healthful lymph, and thus remove some of the objections to which you allude."

"The Truth about Vaccination."—We understand that Dr. G. Abrath, of Sunderland, who has given many years study to the vaccination question, and has had a large experience in treating cases of injury induced by vaccination, both in this country and on the Continent, has in hand a pamphlet in reply to Mr. Ernest Hart.

The Members for Middlesex.—I attended a meeting of the supporters of Lord George Hamilton, and Mr. O. Coope, and questioned them as to their attitude in reference to vaccination. They were both dead against anti-vaccinators, Mr. Coope saying that Jenner was like a saviour to this country; and Lord George agreeing with his friend, but adding that he would punish any doctor who used impure lymph!

—G. H. J., 81st March, 1880.

Mr. W. Grantham, M.P. for East Surrey, wrote to a constituent—"I should be against any compulsion as to vaccination where I saw any injury from it; but as I cannot but see so much direct benefit to the community itself, I cannot support any measure to alter the present law. I myself found the great benefit of vaccination when I had the small-pox. I know of no practical suggestion before Parliament as to the relief of conscientious objectors, but to such relief I do not say that I should object if I thought no harm to the community would ensue."—A gentleman who has been vaccinated, and has had small-pox, and yet confesses the great benefit he received from vaccination, might pass for a psychological curiosity. No doubt his doctor assured him he had the disease milder, but how severe it would have been otherwise, and how the doctor knew, were questions which did not occur to his credulous heart.

TWO CUMBERLAND M.P.'s.

Mr. Edward Waugh, now M.P. for Cockermouth, was waited upon on 5th March by a deputation of anti-vaccinators led by Mr. T. W. Johnson, and spoke to this effect—

"Well, gentlemen, I may tell you plainly that I am no persecutor, and I cannot approve, and never did approve of persecution. It seems to me that these Vaccination Acts are often made a means of persecution, and I think the time has arrived for a remedy. Your argument appears to be this; if vaccination is a protection, then those who are vaccinated are protected, and they need not therefore compel you to be vaccinated for their safety. At the same time, a great many think that the existing law is beneficial to the public health, and that it should be maintained. You hold an entirely opposite opinion, and wish to have the law repealed. I would not like to take a formal pledge to vote for its repeal, but you may depend upon this, that I will not go against you, and may vote in your favour when the question comes before Parliament. I hardly think the House of Commons is prepared to repeal the Acts, but I believe there is a disposition to reduce their oppression. I do not think any more than you do that it would meet the case to fine a parent once for refusing to have his children vaccinated, and then leave him alone. The law should either be enforced, or conscientious objections should be recognised and admitted. I think something like this might be done. Those who object to vaccination might be allowed to refuse it by appearing before a magistrate and making a formal declaration to that effect. I feel that I could recommend that such a relief should be provided under the Acts, but I would not like, as I have said, to take the strict pledge you propose. However, as I have promised, I shall not vote against you."

Mr. David Ainsworth, now M.P. for West Cumberland, was interviewed after a large public meeting at Maryport, but owing to circumstances, there was little opportunity for much conference. He said he could not enter into the question of the good or evil of vaccination, but as to compulsion, he thought something should be done to relieve those who were convinced that vaccination was injurious, but how to effect the relief was not clear to him. Mr. Johnson then put it to him whether he would not vote for such a conscience clause as Mr. Waugh had suggested, and he replied that they might take it for granted that he would.

Professor Rogers, M.P. for Southwark, wrote as follows to Mr. George Bone—"My dear Sir,
—You are quite right in thinking that I am of opinion that the working of at least of the Vaccination Acts is open to inquiry and examination. I have said so before, but as regards the principle, I am not so well informed on the subject to speak finally—I am faithfully, JAMES E. THOROLD ROGERS, 24th March, 1880.

"THE BRIGHTON ANT-VACCINATOR."—Our Brighton friends have set going a monthly paper, distributed gratis, and sustained by advertisements, which is filled with facts and arguments against vaccination. It is most gratifying to observe such manifestations of public spirit and enlightened opinion. Brighton, that has sent forth so much small-pox in the name of cowpox, is in the line of duty in making some reparation for Badcock's mischief.

WHAT HAPPENED AT ROCHESTER.—Sir Julian Goldsmith, the second "Liberal" candidate, said, "I will not be a delegate, and no matter what my constituents may think to the contrary, I believe vaccination to be a good thing, and I shall do my best to uphold the compulsory clauses of the Vaccination Acts." Mr. Roger Leigh, Conservative, said, "Individually I have faith in the performance of vaccination, but I do consider it to be at variance with the Rights of Man to enforce vaccination by law, and I would support a Bill to repeal the compulsory clauses of the Vaccination Acts."—The result was that Mr. Leigh was elected and Sir Julian rejected.

PERSECUTION OF MR. S. J. WEST.—There is not a more determined anti-vaccinator in existence than Mr. West, and to prosecute him is to render manifest the impotence of the law. He was brought before the Rochester magistrates on 17th April and charged with neglecting to have his child, Clifton Anti-Vaccinator West, vaccinated. Mr. West cited in his defence the evidence of Dr. Collins before the Parliamentary Committee of 1871, but the magistrates made the usual untrue excuse, that they had no discretion, and fined him 20s. and 9s. costs. Mr. West inquired why they fined Mr. Heath 10s. and he 20s. for the same offence, but got no answer. He then said he was not going to pay a tax for keeping his child healthy, and would go to prison rather than pay. The Bench then said they would issue a distress warrant, or, in default of effects, a month's imprisonment. Mr. West pointed out that under the new Act he could only have 14 days as the penalty, and not exceed 20s., but the clerk observed that with costs the penalty was 29s. "Very well," said Mr. West, "I can take the month as easy as the fortnight, and I wish you good morning." We would earnestly call the attention of Mr. Otway and Mr. Leigh, M.P.'s for Rochester, to this scandalous case. Mr. West's opinions are well known, and it is sheer stupidity or malignity that sets the law in action against him. The proceedings are wholly at variance with the advice of the Local Government Board to the Evesham Guardians, and more recently to those of St. Pancras.

A PHILADELPHIAN'S TESTIMONY.—My experience and observations in a practice of over thirty years have shown me the fallacy and enormous harm that has been done to mankind by the introduction of vaccination; and every year's experience confirms me and makes me stronger antagonist against it.—ADOLPHUS PELGER, M.D., Philadelphia, 20th March, 1880.
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Evasions of Duty.

We have been hearing much lately of the opinions of Members of Parliament on the vaccination question. As we survey those opinions their prevailing note is timidity. "We would if we could, but we are sorry that we can't," and so on. Few, in Lincoln's phrase, put down their feet. A favourite evasion is, "Ah, but it is a medical question, and therefore I cannot be expected to give judgment." If it is a medical question, how comes vaccination to constitute Acts of Parliament? It is M.P.'s and not M.D.'s who have to answer for such Acts. When it is said that vaccination is a medical question, it is meant that it is a technical question for which special training is requisite. There are such questions, but whenever they come within the scope of legislation, it is the business of legislators to "get them up" and understand them. It is nonsense, however, to try to range vaccination among questions that are difficult and abstruse. As to the rite itself, it is confessedly a mystery. There is a disease named small-pox, and another named cow-pox, and it is said that when cow-pox is put into a man's blood, small-pox is thenceforth for him impossible, or improbable, or mild, or—a number of other things. How and why cow-pox has this influence over small-pox, there are conjectures, but Sir Thomas Watson knows no more than does Sir Julian Goldsmid, who is ready to incur any number of defeats at the poll rather than forewear his right to harass unbelievers in the benefits of the mystery. Vaccination is therefore a mystery in one sense, but no mystery in another. It is a mystery to its priesthood, and it is no mystery inasmuch as everybody knows as much about it as anybody. On the other hand, the mystery is advanced and maintained under a claim which all may test and appreciate. It is said the observance of the rite stops small-pox. Does it stop small-pox? Let Charles Cameron, M.D. and M.P., answer. In a letter to the Times he says—

"It appears that in seven years prior to the Vaccination Act the mortality from small-pox in England and Wales amounted to 0.082 per cent. of the population. In the following fourteen years when vaccination was obligatory, but the obligation, owing to defective machinery was not enforced, it fell to 0.0189. But in the following eight years, when the defective machinery was rectified, and the national system of vaccination was greatly improved and extended, the mortality rose to 0.0597. It is all very well, as has been done, to explain this recrudescence of small-pox mortality by the occurrence of exceptional epidemics; but it seems reasonable to argue that in the course of the twenty-two years, during which vaccination has been compulsory, some impression should have been made upon epidemic as well as sporadic small-pox. The recurrence, therefore, in the latest period of a mortality almost as high as that experienced prior to the Vaccination Act shows either that the protective virtues of vaccination are mythical or that there is something radically wrong in our national system of vaccination."

Then there are Dr. Pearce's figures, which no one has ever questioned. Vaccination was made compulsory by Parliament in 1853; again in 1867, and still more stringent in 1871. Since 1853, we have had three epidemics of small-pox, each being more severe than the one preceding. Here are the results:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Deaths from Small-Pox</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st, 1857-58-59</td>
<td>14,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd, 1868-84-85</td>
<td>20,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd, 1870-71-72</td>
<td>44,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase of population from 1st to 2nd epidemic, 7 per cent.
Increase of Small-pox in the same period, nearly 50
Increase of population from 2nd to 3rd epidemic, 10
Increase of Small-pox in the same period, 120
Deaths from Small-pox in the first
ten years after the enforce-
ment of Vaccination—1864
to 1868, - - - - 83,515
In the second ten years—1864 to
1878, - - - - 70,458

This is evidence to which the most rudimen-
tary intelligence in the House of Commons may
be considered equal. The remedy for small-
pox does not stop small-pox. On the contrary
the more of the remedy the more of the malady.
It is vain to wriggle away from these statistics.
They are clear and conclusive, and whilst they
stand, it is folly to be dragged into side issues.

Oddly enough there are Radicals like Profes-
sor Rogers and Mr. Ashton Dilke who try to
evade responsibility under shelter of the
authority of the faculty, saying, the doctors
everywhere believe in vaccination. If it were
otherwise, they would be exceptional phenomena
in human nature. Prof. Rogers is an ardent
free-trader. Will he tell us how many English
corn-growers were in favour of the free import
of foreign grain? or if he anywhere in all his
researches ever discovered any company of men
willing to surrender means of emolument for the
public advantage? Mr. Ashton Dilke has not
the reading and experience of Professor Rogers,
but he has witnessed the whole body of licensed
victuallers vote with the Conservatives because
they fancied their interests were menaced by the
Liberals. Physicians and surgeons may not
relish the comparison, but they are of the same
flesh and blood as publicans; and we all know
that if either clergy or lawyers were threatened
in the same way, they would act precisely
in the same manner. There would be exceptions,
but they would be few. The mass would move
implicitly into line for the defence of their
interests. Vaccination is established and en-
dowed; the doctors believe in the practice; and
those who threaten it receive all the epithets
appropriate to anarchists and spoilers. So
much is matter of course, and goes for nothing
in proof of the validity of vaccination.

The order of events in the present session of
Parliament is regarded with some anxiety, but
we fear the stress of work and excitement will
leave no opportunity for raising the vaccination
question. For our own part we should fain see
Dr. Cameron’s resolution in favour of Calf
Lymph have precedence of any other motion
on the subject; not that we have any favour for
that last absurdity of bewildered vaccinators,
but because it would help to open the mind of
the House of Commons to the truth when set
forth by Mr. F. A. Taylor, Sir Thomas Chambers,
Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Jacob Bright, and others
who have not been persuaded that it is their
duty to take medical advice and ask no questions.

There is one concession the present Govern-
ment is bound to make, namely, the cessation
of repeated prosecutions for non-vaccination.
The scandal of these prosecutions is allowed by
all parties. No one can say it is right to fine
Joseph Abel £40 where others are let off for 6d.
or 1s. When Mr. Pease’s bill was before the House
in 1878, it found no more strenuous supporters
than Gladstone and Mr. Forster; and Mr.
Bright has denounced the existing law as “mon-
strous,” adding, that “the repeated penalties are
most unjust, and I wish the law were changed.”
It is for these gentlemen to prove their sincerity
out of office by their conduct in power.

Norwich Justice.—Mr. Ralph Lee Bliss and
Mr. E. J. Ellis were brought before the Norwich
bench on 29th April to answer for the non-
vaccination of their children. The vaccina-
tion officer admitted that there might be from 100
to 150 children on his list unvaccinated, and the
Bench wished to know on what principle he
selected Mr. Bliss for prosecution; but no clear
answer could they obtain. In the end Mr.
Simms Reeve, the chairman, made the stereo-
typed excuse that magistrates had merely to
eexecute the law, raising no questions, and made
a vaccination order in each case with 7s. 6d.
costs. Mr. Christie, another anti-vaccinator,
was summoned, and an order made, but with-
out costs, it being his first summons. If such
is justice in Norwich, what shall we say of justice
at Faringdon as concerns Mr. Abel, and at
Liverpool as concerns Mr. Scott?

A Scottish Cask.—The Rev. John F. Potts,
Eldon Villas, Mount Florida, was brought before
Sheriff Cowan at Paisley on 11th May to answer
for refusing to have his daughter vaccinated. He
had previously been fined for a similar main-
tenance of parental duty. The Sheriff, assuming
the pretence with which we are so painfully
familiar, said he had no alternative but to impose
a fine of 20s. with 25s. costs, or ten days’
imprisonment; and proceeded to lecture Mr.
Potts on the impropriety of a minister of the
Gospel setting himself in opposition to the law
of the land. We suppose it is impossible for a
Scottish man in authority to open his mouth with-
out moralising—he will talk nonsense rather than
forego preaching; else we might express surprise,
and ask Mr. Cowan where Presbyterianism
would have found itself if Presbyterians had
acted on his principle and taken the law of the
land under Charles II. as their standard of duty.
The Glasgow Evening Times had a leader on
the case and argued that vaccination must be
enforced at any cost to Mr. Potts’s conscience.
Such however is not the law. A parent may
be fined or imprisoned, but without his consent his
child cannot be vaccinated.
THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.
CHAPTER XV.
JENNER AND PEARSON.

In his zeal for vaccination, Dr. Pearson was the chief mover in the formation of—

The Institution for the Inoculation of the Vaccine Pock,
Warwick Street, Charing Cross.*
Founded 2nd December, 1799.

It was the first establishment of the kind in the world. In the prospectus of the Institution it was stated—

"Of above 4000 persons who have had the inoculated Cow-Pock one only has died. There is, however, good ground for believing that the proportional mortality will be even less than here stated.

"Not a single well-attested instance has been produced among more than 2000 inoculated with Cow-Pock, and subsequently with Small-Pox, of the Small-Pox being taken, although many were exposed to the infectious effluvia of that disease. Traditionally the fact is established from time immemorial that after Cow-Pox there is no Small-Pox.

"It may be fairly affirmed, that the inoculated Cow-Pock is generally a much slighter disease than the inoculated Small-Pox; and that the proportion of severe cases in the latter is to the former as at least ten to one.

"It does not appear that the genuine Vaccine Pock can be propagated like the Small-Pox by effluvia from persons labouring under it. Hence if the Vaccine Inoculation should be universally instituted in place of the Small-Pox, it is reasonable to conclude, that this most loathsome and fatal malady will be extinguished; and, like the sweating-sickness, the plague, certain forms of leprosy, etc., be known in this country only by name.

"It does not appear that the Vaccine Poison, like that of the Small-Pox, can be conveyed so as to produce the disease indirectly from diseased persons, by adhering to clothes, furniture, bedding, letters, etc. Hence no danger of its propagation in these channels is to be apprehended from the universal practice of the inoculation of the Cow-Pock.

"It has been found that a person, whose constitution has distinctly undergone the Vaccine Disease, is in future insusceptible of the same disorder. [Thus re-vaccination was pronounced impossible.]

"Experience shows, that there is no reason to apprehend the smallest chance of deformities of the skin from the Vaccine Inoculation.

"The extensive practice of the Vaccine Inoculation in the present year, and the accounts of the disease in the usual way do not show that any other disease will be excited subsequently.

*A further considerable public benefit expected is, that a stock of efficacious Vaccine Matter, free from contamination by the Small-Pox, will by this Institution be preserved for the use of the public."

These statements are interesting as showing how early the rollicking tunes were set to which at this day we are expected to dance. The last paragraph is noteworthy as a confession under Pearson's hand that vaccine poison had got confused with variolous, and that the mistake would be henceforth avoided. Jenner maliciously and persistently used this misapp, for which Woodville was responsible, to discredit Pearson and magnify his own pretensions; but, as Pearson observed, neither Jenner nor any one else knew that it was possible to have cow-pox and small-pox simultaneously; indeed, it was contrary to what they imagined was that order of nature wherein they placed the rationale of vaccination—that distinct diseases could not co-exist in the same blood. The mistake was made, however; and, as is the fortunate function of mistakes, fancy was corrected by fact and knowledge was enlarged. Pearson's behaviour in the matter was as creditable to him as Jenner's was otherwise.

The Vaccine Pock Institution was organised with a staff of physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries of the highest London respectability; and it was desired to have the benefit of Jenner's name—his active co-operation, as a resident in Gloucestershire, being out of the question. Pearson therefore wrote to him—

"LONDON, 10th December, 1799.

"We have made some progress in the institution of a charity for inoculating the Vaccine Pock. I do not know that I can confer any honour on you by proposing you (if I am able) to the directors of our establishment, nor do I well know what to propose to you. It occurs to me that it might not be disagreeable to you to be an extra corresponding physician.

"No expense will be attached to your situation except a guinea a year as a subscriber; and indeed I think you ought to be exempt from that, as you cannot send any patient; but you may depute some proxy in town.

"I confess I was surprised that you neither called nor sent for me for the last two months you were in town. However, if it was because you were too much occupied, I certainly excuse you."

The invitation was given stiffly, from duty more than inclination. Pearson knew very well why Jenner, furious with jealousy, had kept away from him; and he was thus answered as par un joueur enragé—
"Berkeley, 17th December, 1799.

"Sir,—I received your letter of the 10th inst., and confess I felt surprised at the information it conveys.

"It appears to me somewhat extraordinary that an Institution formed upon so large a scale, and that has for its object the inoculation of the Cow-Pox, should have been set on foot and almost completely organised without my receiving the most distant intimation of it. The Institution itself cannot, of course, but be highly flattering to me, as I am thereby convinced that the importance of the fact I imparted is acknowledged by men of the first abilities. But at the same time allow me to observe, that if Vaccine Inoculation, from unguarded conduct, should sink into disrepute (and you must admit, Sir, that in more than one instance has its reputation suffered) I alone must bear the odium. To you, or any other of the gentlemen whose names you mention as filling up the medical departments, it cannot possibly attach.

"At the present crisis I feel so sensibly the importance of the business that I shall certainly take an early opportunity of being in London. For the present I must beg leave to decline the honour intended me.—I remain, Sir, your obedient Servant,

E. Jenner."

The letter is thoroughly characteristic of the writer, displaying the temper and ruling motive of his life. Vaccine Inoculation might be good for mankind, but it was to be something better for Edward Jenner. There was not the least reason why he should not have congratulated Pearson on his enterprise and promised his assistance. As to claiming the guardianship of Vaccine Inoculation, it was preposterous, and especially so in reference to Pearson. It was Pearson's constant complaint that Jenner could not be got to do anything useful after the publication of the Inquiry. He left to others the discovery and distribution of virus and the labour and responsibility of experimenting, and only appeared on the scene when there was some dis-aster whereon he could play the part of superior person, whilst insisting that all supposed successes should be assigned to his credit.

Jenner is all-in-all in the vaccinators' hagiology, but he holds the place at the cost of justice to Pearson. To prove that we are not making a fanciful assertion, let us cite a piece of unprejudiced contemporary evidence. Dr. Paterson of Montrose in a communication to the Medical and Physical Journal, dated 25th May, 1801, observes—

"While we are irresistibly led to join the wondering, the grateful throng, in paying the just tribute of applause to Dr. Jenner, the immortal discoverer, we must, at the same time, confess how much we are indebted to the ingenious and benevolent Dr. Pearson for bringing, in such a handsome manner as he did, the business before the public, thereby exciting, all at once, an universal, an unparalled quest of investigation, and furnishing, by innumerable and satisfactory experiments, a complete confirmation of the noble discovery."

Here we have the relation of Jenner and Pearson accurately set forth amid the furore they excited.

To publish a pamphlet, and if possible to circumvent Pearson, Jenner left Berkeley for London on 28th January, 1800, taking Bath on his way, where the establishment of a Vaccine Pock Institution was in progress.

Early in 1800 appeared A Continuation of Facts and Observations relative to the Variola Vaccine—a quarto of forty pages, Jenner's third pamphlet, and the completion of what is humorously styled "His Works." It was mainly designed to manifest his advantage over Woodville, the blunderer who had confused cow-pox with small-pox.

First, Jenner expresses satisfaction over the interest of Europe in cow-pox inoculation, and the pleasure he had in seeing the feeble efforts of a few individuals to depreciate the new practice sinking fast into contempt beneath the immense mass of evidence which has risen up in support of it." He then defines the immense mass of evidence thus—

"Upwards of 600 persons have now been inoculated with the virus of cow-pox, and the far greater part of them have since been inoculated with that of small-pox, and exposed to its infection in every rational way that could be devised, without effect."

Any reader might suppose that he, Jenner, was entitled to the credit of the immense mass of evidence, namely, the 6000 inoculations; but he had little or nothing to do with them. They were mainly the operations of Woodville and Pearson—of Woodville to whom he was acting the part of thankless censor; of Pearson to whom his enmity was so intense that he does not mention his name throughout the pamphlet. Thus the men who were beyond all others the making of him were depreciated and passed by. His introductory reference to Woodville illustrates his tactics—

"It was very improbable that the investigation of a disease so analogous to small-pox should go forward without engaging the attention of the physician of the Small-Pox Hospital in London. Accordingly Dr. Woodville, who fills that appointment with so much respectability, took an early opportunity of instituting an inquiry into the nature of the Cow-Pox."
Dr. Woodville, whose investigation was as scores to one as compared with Jenner's, must have received this commendation from his country friend with some surprise, if not with a fierier sentiment. Jenner as an investigator was never of much account. He had suggested that what happened and was believed in Gloucestershire might be performed systematically and be believed universally. What he did, as related in his Inquiry, was done hastily, and was never developed and verified by himself. Naturally indolent, he had the craft to appropriate the researches of others, and had the luck to be accepted by the world at his own estimate. For example, the occurrence of Cow-Pox and Small-Pox simultaneously which he had never foreseen, whilst using as an instrument of lofty reprehension, he adroitly turned to his own advantage, saying, he had considered them forms of one disease from the outset—

"In my first publication I expressed an opinion that the Small-Pox and the Cow-Pox were the same disease under different modifications. In this opinion Dr. Woodville has concurred. The axiom of the immortal Hunter, that two diseased actions cannot take place at the same time in one and the same part, will not be injured by the admission of this theory."

Possibly Cow-Pox and Small-Pox are forms of the same disease; possibly they are not: possibly all diseases are forms of one disease: possibly they are not; but whatever the fact, Jenner had never an iota of evidence to adduce for his conjecture that pox in cows was identical with pox in men.

As we move in these early days of vaccination, nothing so stirs regret as what appears to have been the wilful shutting of men's eyes to facts—to notorious facts. It was well-known in Gloucestershire, that whilst the vulgar supposed that cow-pox prevented small-pox, it did not do so. In the Gloucester Journal of May 9th, 1799, Mr. C. Cooke wrote—

"I not only very much doubt that Cow-Pox is a permanent preventive of Small-Pox, but I am confirmed in this opinion by occurrences in my own practice, by conversing with many medical men upon the subject, and by Dr. Beddoes, who writes, 'I have a case where small-pox was taken after cow-pox had been twice gone through'."

Yet in presence of such testimonies, which were neither examined nor exploded, Jenner kept on prophesying in this strain—

"Some there are who suppose the security from the Small-Pox obtained through the Cow-Pox will be of a temporary nature only. This supposition is refuted, not only by analogy with respect to diseases of a similar nature, but by incontrovertible facts, which appear in great numbers against it. A person had the Cow-Pox 33 years before the Small-Pox was tried upon him, and as he completely resisted it, I conceive every reasonable mind must be satisfied that he was secure from the disease during the intervening time."

Iteration seems to have subdued contradiction and enforced credence, else it might have been urged that inoculation with small-pox was continually unsuccessful, without reference to cow-pox as cause of failure, and especially in the elderly who could exhibit long terms of immunity. It has however to be remarked, that when people are disposed to believe, any reasons appear to serve for their conviction, whilst they are blind as bats to the most obvious difficulties.

Cow-Pox and Small-Pox, said Jenner, were forms of the same disease; and Small-Pox, whether contracted or inoculated, was a well-known cause of scrofula. He was even inclined to consider it probable that "the general introduction of the Small-Pox into Europe had been among the most conducive means in exciting that formidable foe to health." Then, it might be said, Cow-Pox as a form of Small-Pox may be liable to the like objection? Not so argued our smooth-spoken adventurer. Out of an experience of three years this was his deliverance—

"Having attentively watched the effects of the Cow-pox in this respect, I am happy in being able to declare, that the disease does not appear to have the least tendency to produce this destructive malady."

Thus analogy may be worked any way. As in the matter of scrofula, so in the application of Cow-Pox, Jenner's claim had undergone development since 1798. In the Inquiry cow-pox was set forth as a useful alternative to small-pox inoculation, but in 1800 it had attained these dimensions—

"When scrutiny has taken place, not only among ourselves, but in the first professional circles in Europe, and when it has been uniformly found in such abundant instances, that the human frame when once it has felt the influence of the genuine cow-pox is never afterwards, at any period of its existence, assailable by the small-pox, may I not with perfect confidence congratulate my country and society at large on their beholding, in the mild form of the cow-pox, an antidote that is capable of extirpating from the earth a disease which is every hour
devouring its victims; a disease that has ever been considered as the severest scourge of the human race!"

It is unnecessary to discuss these wild words—it is sufficient to record them as evidence of what it was possible to assert and have believed in the year 1800.

The pamphlet published, Jenner’s other business in London was to undermine the Institution for Vaccine Pock Inoculation. He went about insinuating and protesting that its founders and officers neither knew what was true Variola Vaccine, nor how to use it; that not only were they ignorant, but perverse; and that the immeasurable blessing he had been the means of conveying to mankind would never be rightly enjoyed until there was an Institution with Edward Jenner for its guide and protector.

In playing this game Jenner had faculties and advantages. No one, not Pearson himself, contested his position as advertiser of Cow-Pox Inoculation. To the public he was the representative of the new practice. He had adventured nothing and had no mishaps to account for. These attached to Woodville and other credulous and active experimenters—to Woodville who in good faith suffered himself to be thrice inoculated with grease from the heels of diseased horses*—to Woodville over whose grave it was said, "Who that have felt the benefits of Vaccination will not teach their children, and their children’s children, to bless the name of Woodville when they bless the name of Jenner!"†

Moreover he had no awkward information to contend with in those he addressed—they listened, were informed, were convinced. Jenner’s conduct at this juncture, in relation to Pearson and Woodville, has been stigmatised as mean, thankless, desppicable. These be hard words. His tactics were the common tactics of men in whom self-love is predominant with ends to effect, and we have not strength for the use of the appropriate epithets with the frequency that experience in the world requires. It is tiresome to be often cursing.

The poor were the chief sufferers from small-pox, and under the name of the poor Jenner advanced his project. He drew up the following memorandum, which he submitted to the Earl of Egremont, and circulated privately—

"Proposal for a Public Institution for Vaccine Inoculation."

"Having now pursued the inquiry into the nature of the Cow-Pox to so great an extent as to be able positively to declare that those who have gone through this mild disease are rendered perfectly secure from the contagion of the small-pox; and being convinced from numberless instances that the occupations of the mechanic or the labourer will meet with no interruption during its progress, and the infected and uninfected may mingle together in the most perfect safety, I conceive that an Institution for the Gratuitous Inoculation of the lower classes of society in the Metropolis would be attended with the most beneficial consequences, and that it might be so constituted as to diffuse its benefits throughout every part of the British Empire, Edward Jenner.

"London, 16th March, 1800."

Then followed the scheme of the Institution, including "a Physician to be appointed to superintend the medical department."

Whether from Jenner’s practical inefficiency, or because the time was not ripe, or because those who were more actively interested in cow-pox were satisfied with Pearson's Institution, the project lay in abeyance till 1808. He took nothing ostensibly by his intrigue save the withdrawal of the names of the Duke of York and Lord Egremont from the patronage of the existing establishment.

Meanwhile Pearson continued to operate with unabated energy, and his Institution became a recognised centre of inquiry, advice, and supply. It was designed, as he wrote, "1st, to be useful to the poor; but it had other objects, to wit, 2ndly, to ascertain the laws of the new poison for the extinction of small-pox; and 3rdly, to serve as a public office for the supply of the world with virus until supplies should become unnecessary." One of the most flattering applications was received by Pearson from the French Consulate on 5th April, 1800. In a reply, dated 12th May, signed by the entire staff of the Institution, it was said—

"We are not surprised that you have not yet found the disease among the cows of France, it being on the whole a rare disease in England; nor are we surprised at your want of success with the matter sent to you, because from experience we know that it very frequently fails, unless used immediately from the subject.

"Vaccine matter may be conveyed in various ways: we have sent it to you in three, namely, on threads, on lancets, and on glass.

"If you try the matter sent on thirty patients immediately, we think you cannot fail to excite the disease in some of them, and then you will please to preserve the succession by inoculation.

* Stoet’s Cyclopædia, Vol. 38. London: 1819. The writer of the article himself inoculated Woodville with the grease.
† Mr. Highmore, Surgeon, in 1805.
as we do in England, having had no fresh matter from the cow since January and Feb-
uary of last year, 1799."

The Frenchmen failed again with this virus, but Dr. Woodville soon after went to Paris, and
affected what was desired.

Cow-Pox Dispensaries were opened in various
towns throughout England, Bath and Manches-
ter perhaps having the lead; and an Address to the
Poor was drawn up as a common form to be
issued from such Dispensaries. In a copy of
this Address, widely circulated throughout Man-
chester in 1800, we read—

"The experience of several years [two at the
outside] has fully proved that inoculation for
the Cow-Pox is a certain preservative against
the Small-Pox; and is, besides, so mild and safe
a disorder, when compared with the inoculated
Small-Pox, that it has been generally intro-
duced among the better informed and more
wealthy inhabitants, both of this kingdom and
of various parts of Europe. [About 6000 had
at that time been vaccinated, and chiefly among
the London poor.]

"Inoculation for the Cow-Pox has been prac-
tised for several years [less than three] with con-
stant success, in various parts of the kingdom.
"It has never failed to prevent the infection of
the natural Small-Pox.
"It may be communicated with safety to per-
sons of every age and sex, and at all times and
seasons of the year, with equal advantage.
"It does not produce eruptions, which scar
and disfigure the face; and it is seldom, if ever,
attended with any other marks of the disease
than what appear on the arms from inoculation.
"So far from proving hurtful, delicate and
sickly children are often improved in health by
having passed through this complaint.
"So rarely any remedies or attendance are
required for the Cow-Pox, nor is there any ne-
cessity for a course of physic before or after the
inoculation.
"The prejudices of the poor against inocula-
tion for the Small-Pox, by which thousands of
lives have been annually saved,* have been often
lamented; but if they suffer unjust prejudices
to prevent their laying hold of the advantages
now offered to them by the inoculation of the
Cow-Pox, they will neglect the performance of
a duty they owe to themselves, to their families,
and to society at large. For surely it is little
less than criminal to expose their helpless chil-
dren to the attack of so terrible and fatal a
malady as Small-Pox when it may be readily
avoided by the inoculation of so mild, simple,
and safe a disease as that of the Cow-Pox.
"N.B.—All poor persons, whose affection for
their families leads them to embrace this favour-
able opportunity, may have their children in-
oculated for the Cow-Pox at the hospital and
dispensaries every day in the week (Sunday
excepted) throughout the year. No time ought
to be lost by the poor in freeing their families
from the apprehension of the Small-Pox, which
daily increases in frequency and malignity
throughout this town."

This manifesto is an illustration of the un-
scrupulous and unwarrantable assertions with
which Vaccination was introduced to the world
—it might be said the downright lying. There
is no question, however, that many who were
active in circulating these mendacities did so
honestly, justified, as they thought, by medical
authority. What is marvellous is the survival
of the primitive fiction to the present day. It
is now well known that Vaccination is not sal-
vation from Small-Pox, yet it is constantly as-
serted that it is by all manner of well-informed
people with as much assurance as if the experi-
ence of fourcore years were non-existent. It
would seem that when the human mind ac-
quires a certain set, that something like a surgi-
cal operation is requisite to reverse it.

We shall now see how Vaccination obtained
this sudden popularity—a popularity so sudden
that opposition had not time to organise itself.
There were protests, and some raillery. In the
Gentleman’s Magazine for August, 1799, we
find a correspondent saying—

"There is a plan to mitigate Small-Pox in the
human species by passing it through a Cow.
Now as everyone is not in possession of a cow,
I propose to pass it through animals that most
people possess. I mean Cats; and I shall call
it the Cat-Pox. When my plan is matured, the
ingenious shall hear further concerning it."

And Pearson writing in 1802, when the suc-
cess of Cow-Pox appeared secure, observed—

"How the new practice was sneered at by
some; how it was reprobated as a gross and
mischievous imposition: how it was stigmatised
with the appellation of the Gloucestershire bub-
ble; and how the Inquirers were considered by
many persons as fit candidates for a certain asy-
lum: to say nothing of the villainous jests made
on the occasion, are recent in our memory."*

But opposition of a more vigorous character
arose at a later date, when the truth about Cow-
Pox Inoculation began to be found out.

* Examination of Report of Committee of House of Com-
THE TRUE CAUSES OF EPIDEMIC DISEASE.

Much has been written of late respecting the natural death-rate of small-pox. By vaccinal writers it has been estimated as high as 450 per thousand cases.

The result of my researches is, that there is no natural death-rate from small-pox, and that it is not naturally a severe or fatal complaint. The Creation is not so faulty as the wisdom of our legislators is apt to imagine. In proof, I annex a description of this disease and its usual consequences at the Cape of Good Hope and at Batavia in the beginning of the 18th century, extracted from the folio edition of the *Voyage to the Cape of P. Kold, or Kolben, Rector of Neustadt*, printed at Nuremberg in 1719, and therefore untainted by the miserable necessities of the inoculation and vaccination controversies.

Infantile diseases (says the ancient author) are not dangerous at the Cape. There are few stillborn children, and few deaths in the first year of life. Measles is a very slight disease and is not fatal. Parents give a little opening medicine to children attacked with it, and send them out to play. It is not the violent disease of Europe. It is much the same with small-pox. “Kinder-Blattern sind von keiner Consideration.” This disease causes no fear; very few eruptions appear on the skin; no physic is given to bring them out. It is difficult for a stranger to perceive that the children are unwell; they run laughing about the house as if nothing was the matter. Although this disease is so dangerous in Europe, it is here well known to be unattended with risk; an apple or other fruit is given the child, and it is sent out to play with its companions as usual. With children, as also with adults who have it for the first time, the small-pox simply causes headache; it hardly deserves the name of a disease. People go about their usual occupation; a cup of hot tea or coffee is all the medicine required.

Far otherwise is it in the sister colony of Batavia, where the measles and small-pox are exceedingly dangerous and deadly, not only to the inhabitants, but also to strangers, and especially to people who are born at the Cape; they are liable to attack soon after their arrival, and a very small per centage escapes death.

Of the epidemic [ansteckenden] diseases of Europe, it may be said (continues our author) that from the foundation of the Cape colony sixty years ago, till the present time, they have been known only by name to the Dutch colonists, with the exception of the outbreak among the Company’s slaves in 1710-11, in which a large number died. This epidemic had no particular name, but was accompanied by headache, giddiness, lassitude, and irrepressible thirst. The cause was not far to seek: it lay openly before our eyes. Six hundred slept in one room, not quite so large as a common barrack room for one hundred soldiers. High walls surrounded the building. When we add to this the fowlness of their usual food, their unchanged clothing, and the large collection of pigs close by, which rendered the air of their sleeping room permanently impure, the epidemic is easily accounted for.

In many countries (observes our voyager) the immoderate eating of fruit is deemed to be the cause of dysentery and other dangerous diseases. It is not so at the Cape: ripe fruit causes no disease here; it is eaten in great quantities, and is considered subservient to health. Even cucumbers may be safely eaten, of which the European proverb says, “Slice them carefully, mix them properly with oil and vinegar into a nice salad, and then throw them away.” In Europe a very small quantity is believed to cause bowel complaint; but here I have often eaten a plateful sliced and peppered in a salad of oil and vinegar, without the slightest injurious effect.

Now, why was the small-pox (as our author says) so very different in Batavia? The reply can be furnished from Sir Stamford Raffles’ *History of Java*. During the Napoleonic wars, the English took possession of the country and appointed Sir Stamford as governor. Like the Cape, Batavia was a Dutch colony, inhabited by Hollanders, natives, and slaves. The one was salubrious, the other was proverbially a place breathing fever and death. The mortality at times became alarming. The Dutch official inquiry in 1758 attributed the unhealthiness to effluvia from burial grounds, proximity of swamps, bad water, and filthy canals. Sir S. Raffles says—

“Batavia is built in a swamp and surrounded by marshes. During the heat of the day, exhalations are more diffused and comparatively innocuous; but when the sun withdraws its influence they become more condensed, and, amalgamating with the descending dew, form a morbid atmosphere around the houses of the inhabitants. A powerful cause of fever is the stagnant water of the canals—which in all directions intersect the city; they are filled with filth of every description; there is scarcely at any time any perceptible current in them to carry off that filth, and the sluices are frequently kept shut for the purpose of swelling the waters...”
above them to irrigate the fields, while those below which intersect the town become almost dry, leaving an extensive surface of mud and every kind of putrefied matter to be acted upon by the sun, raising the most pestilential vapours with which the atmosphere gets thoroughly impregnated. Another general cause of disease, especially of diarrhoea and dysentery, is the water. This is taken from the canals or from the wells, and is equally bad when passed through a filtering stone, and, if allowed to remain for some time in vessels, generates small animalcula."

What a wide difference between the common sense and wisdom of these remarks, and the fashionable and supercilious half-education of the present day! In a similar state of things we might now expect to be favoured with the following "scientific" explanation:—"Some stranger introduced the dreadful contagion of the small-pox, which seizes upon all who have not been protected from it or subjected to it within seven years, and kills 40 per cent. All the prevailing symptoms, including blindness, deafness, diarrhoea, etc., may be numbered among the probable sequels, or after-results, of a small-pox attack. Vaccination and re-vaccination, the only safeguards, have unfortunately been neither so perfect nor so successful as could be wished. Judging by the event, they have been insufficiently performed. This will be remedied in the future by the admirable increase of compulsion now in contemplation, and by the adoption of the truly English practice of pleasant pecuniary bonuses, which gives such amazing satisfaction to the medical recipients."—

H. D. DUDSON.

MR. ASHTON DILKE, M.P.

A DEPUTATION from the Northumberland and Durham Anti-Vaccination League waited upon Mr. Dilke on 1st May at Newcastle. The Deputation was introduced by Mr. Edmund Procter, and Mr. Dilke was addressed by Mr. G. S. Gibbs, Mr. Alex. Wheeler, and Dr. A. K. Barth.

Mr Dilke in reply said he agreed with them that the burden of proof rested upon the law, which, being compulsory, should be supported by clear proof that it was beneficial. He objected to paternal government. We were over-legislated, and the tendency required restriction. A good deal has been said about the attitude of the medical profession toward the vaccination question. It could not be denied that the great majority of the doctors were in favour of vaccination; but it was contended that doctors were often unable to see truths that were seen by outsiders. He did not think that such was the case. Many young doctors displayed an irreverent spirit towards the traditions of their profession, and he could not help thinking that if vaccination were unsound many of them would deny the utility of the vaccination laws. Regarding, however, the Acts from a legal point of view, two things ought to be done. There was no doubt that disease, and that in a very horrible form, could be transmitted by vaccination; and for that reason it was absolutely necessary that the utmost precaution should be exercised in selecting the subjects from which lymph was taken, and that option should be given for the use of calf-lymph. On the question of repeated penalties for non-vaccination, he was absolutely with them although he believed the Acts were on the whole beneficial. There was to him an enormous difference between a penalty imposed on a careless and negligent parent, and the repeated penalties imposed on a conscientious parent, who had studied vaccination and had decided against the practice. If such a parent was willing to enter a police-court and to testify to the sincerity of his conviction, one fine should suffice, and in no case ought to be repeated.

LORD CLIFTON addressed the following note to the Chatham and Rochester Observer—"Now that another senseless and useless prosecution of Samuel Joseph West has been recorded, for the 'crime' of not vaccinating his son Clifton West, whom he did me the honour to name after me; it may not be out of place to say that I, the godfather, civilly speaking, of this infant, have ceased to be one of the Magistrates for the County. I will not now touch upon the question of how far it may be useful to the interests of justice to appoint young men just of age to such an office, simply because they are the sons of peers and landed proprietors. My views on the question of the 'great unpaid' will be known quite soon enough. I heartily pray that it may never be my own fate to be tried by a 'drum-head court-martial' of generals, colonels, yeomanry officers, and parsons."—Each of us must act according to his inward light, but we wish Lord Clifton had seen it right to retain his position. It is by occupying and fulfilling our lot that we are commonly enabled to do good work in our generation.

We are glad to hear that Mr. Enoch Robinson, M.R.C.S., of Dukinfield, is preparing a reply to Mr. Ernest Hart's Truth about Vaccination.

OUR ROLL OF WITNESSES.—The return of prosecutions, fines, and imprisonments under the Vaccination Acts, moved for last year by Mr. O'Sway, was laid on the table of the House of Commons on 17th March, and is now being printed.
SMALL-POX IN THE METROPOLIS.

A REPORT on Small-Pox in the Hospitals of the Metropolis Asylums Board from 1876 to 1878, by Dr. Bridges, was published last month. It contains much interesting information, of which the following is a brief résumé—

The gross death-rate of small-pox cases which were treated amounted to 18.4 per cent., that is, just 86 per cent. in excess of the small-pox death-rate in pre-vaccination times (Vide Jurin, Rees, and DuVillard); and Dr. Bridges adds that it is "superficial to remark that small-pox in the present state of vaccination of our population is still a very formidable disease."

Dr. Bridges attempts to quiet the minds of the neighbours of the various Small-Pox Hospitals and states that "there is a vast mass of evidence to disprove that the poison of small-pox can be conveyed in the open air across a space of as much as 10 yards;" and seems to forget, as Mr. Wheeler lately pointed out, that in a recent official return a case of post-vaccinal erysipelas was accounted for by the fact that the returning from the vaccination station the child had been carried past the house of a butcher suffering from erysipelas, 8 yards removed from the road!

In both the epidemics dealt with the chief prevalence occurred, as might be expected, in notoriously insanitary localities of the East End—Shoreditch and Bethnal Green in 1871-72, and Stepney and Poplar in 1877-78, enjoying unenviable pre-eminence. Moreover, in Greenwhich, after an all but complete disappearance in 1876, the first case admitted in 1878 came from a "particular impoverished and over-crowded part of that Union, the neighbourhood of Deptford Creek." So that small-pox, as of old, still haunts by preference the spots where over-crowding, under-feeding, and sanitary neglect are most conspicuous.

A table showing the occupation of the male patients, it appears that nearly half of these were described as labourers, infants, waifs, and strays without occupation; no doubt the two latter classes furnished a large percentage of the unvaccinated cases.

"In the frequency with which the virulent forms of variola presented themselves this epidemic fully equalled its predecessor."

Dividing the cases into discrete, confluent, and malignant, it appears that the first "is an extremely mild disease even among unvaccinated persons." With the confluent variety there were 1,282 cases; but, curiously, in 85 of these the condition as to vaccination was unreported; of the remainder 727 were vaccinated and 550 unvaccinated, the death-rate among the former was 15.2 per cent., among the latter 51.1 per cent. Of the malignant form there were 101 cases—"all died but one—of whom 12 were well vaccinated, 17 moderately well, and 15 badly." So that here in vaccinated and unvaccinated alike the mortality was 100 per cent.

After stating his belief that 94 per cent. of the population of London is vaccinated, Dr. Bridges proceeds to calculate the relative death-rates of vaccinated and unvaccinated cases, but he invalidates his conclusions by excluding from the list "cases where vaccination is stated to have been performed but without any evidence of its performance." Now of cases of this kind there were no less than 846 at Homerton and Hampstead alone, of whom 283 died! Having selected his cases, 10,181 in number, he divides them thus:—7,674 vaccinated, and 2,507 unvaccinated, or about 75 per cent. vaccinated and 25 unvaccinated; but any conclusions from these must be fallacious, since they refer, not to the number of admissions, but only to particular cases.

Next follows a most remarkable paragraph, since it entirely overthrows the elaborate arguments of Mr. Marson, who maintained that the amount of protection afforded was directly proportional to the number of marks—"In estimating the degree of vaccination, the first rule to be observed is, that quality takes precedence of quantity. A well-pitted mark affords more protection than a larger number of indistinct ones. Many of these latter are undoubtedly mere scars, affording no more protection against small-pox than the application of a hot iron." Here follow some statistics, calculated to bear out this theory: but, on comparing the figures, we find great disparity between the Homerton and the Hampstead statistics, and no "scientific result" is obtained, thus—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Death-rate per 1000</th>
<th>Homerton</th>
<th>Hampstead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With four good marks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With three good marks</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With two good marks</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With one good mark</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again comparing Dr. Bridges’ figures of 1880 with those of Mr. Marson in 1871, we find similar irreconcilable variations, thus—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases of Small-pox classified according to number of vaccine cicatrices born by each patient</th>
<th>Number of Deaths per cent. in each class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marson, 1871</td>
<td>Bridges, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having 4 vaccine cicatrices</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 3 &quot;</td>
<td>1-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 2 &quot;</td>
<td>4-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 1 &quot;</td>
<td>7-73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It next appears that the "proportion of badly vaccinated to total admissions" at Homerton, which, from 1871 to 1877, had been 89-5 per cent., rose in 1878 to 45-8 per cent. notwithstanding the fact that on page 17 we are informed that there has been "an increase of care in the performance of the operation."

On page 16 Dr. Bridges makes the extraordinary statement, that not a third of the total number of children he examined were efficiently vaccinated, although "if his standard erred it was on the side of leniency rather than of rigour;" and this after 28 years of compulsory vaccination and the immense sum annually paid by the public to the profession for vaccination!
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.
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HART'S TRUTH.

As eminent physician writes to Mr. Tebb—
I have read Mr. Ernest Hart, and do not think the book will have any lasting effect against the increasing volume of the anti-vaccination agitation. When he quits statistics, and betakes himself to propositions at the end, he is caught in his own pit, and his impudence cannot save him. The whole force of the book is negative—what small-pox would have been but for vaccination. The only positive way to answer that, is, by stopping vaccination—and seeing. He raises one valuable point—Whether small-pox is as ferocious now as in former times; but here he deflects, because his whole argument is, that it is still terrible to the unvaccinated. But the unvaccinated are not a quantity, but a quality different from the vaccinated. There are plain reasons why any disease should be worse to them.—G. W.

CATTLE VACCINE VIRUS.—Mr. J. H. Bogle in the Lancet of 3rd April, gives two cases of "calf-lymph vaccination, in one of which erysipelas followed the operation." From the account it would appear to have been very severe, and Mr. Bogle says he has « never seen from ordinary lymph so severe an attack of erysipelas." Yet erysipelas is one of the things calf virus was to entirely obviate!—A. W.

Mr. WM. HARButT was before the Bath magistrates on 29th April for refusing to obey a vaccination order. He claimed the same right to keep his child's blood pure that they exercised in keeping the water of the city pure. Moreover, medical opinion as to the character and effects of vaccination was in a state of chaos; and, under the circumstances, if he were fined, it should be a trifle, such as magistrates at Bedford and elsewhere imposed. Mr. Gibbs, in reply, fell back on the stock argument that it was not for the bench to make law, but to enforce law; and proceeded to relate how dreadful small-pox was in former times, and to assert that vaccination was the cause of the improved state of affairs. He concluded with the Hibernian observation, that if Mr. Harbutt's child should take small-pox, it would be not only a sufferer itself, but might be, nay, probably would, be a means of infection to other innocent persons who had submitted to the requirements of the law in order to prevent their becoming sufferers! The Mayor supported Mr. Gibbs, but there being an evident reluctance to proceed to extremities with a gentleman so reasonable and well-informed as Mr. Harbutt, the case was adjourned for a month for re-consideration. On 21st May the case was again brought up, and, Mr. Harbutt persisting in his refusal, the Bench held they were "compelled" to inflict the extreme penalty of 20s. and costs. It is to be regretted that so few magistrates have the courage to say they rejoice in the law and apply it with all the severity within their discretion. Much as we dislike the law, it would be preferable without the false and nauseous apologies that so often accompany its most vindictive administration.

W. J. COLLINS, M.D.

Mr. A. M'ARTHUR, M.P. for Leicester, writing to Mr. Amos Booth, March, 1880, says—"Considering the differences of opinion which exist, even among medical men, respecting the necessity for, and efficacy of Vaccination, and the strong feeling of opposition to the practice manifested by many in some of our large towns, and sympathising as I sincerely do with those who suffer fine and imprisonment rather than submit to what they believe would be injurious to their children, I think a Royal Commission, or at least a Parliamentary Committee, should be appointed to investigate the whole question of Vaccination. ... I candidly acknowledge that my views are considerably modified and the subject shall have my most careful consideration."

Mr. BENJAMIN V. SCOTT, of 121 Kensington, Liverpool, is one of those who, like Mr. Abel, of Farington, and Mr. West, of Rochester, concentrate on their heads the vaccinating fury of guardians and magistrates. In 1876 he paid £6 4s. 6d. in fines; in 1877 £10 4s.; in 1878 £2 18s. 6d.; in 1879 £3 18s. 6d.; and this year £1 5s. 6d.; in all £25 7s. Mr. Scott is a poor man, and that those in local authority should find pleasure in the exercise of such persistent malignity shows human nature in a most despicable aspect. The excuse that they are merely fulfilling the law is the addition of hypocrisy to malice; for they very well know that the Local Government Board disavowances persecution in the name of zeal for vaccination, and that magistrates equally fulfill the law when they dismiss useless summonses with fines ranging from 6d. to 2s. 6d. It is not, however, for Englishmen to abide subject to the voluntary mercy of guardians and magistrates; and it is not for the honour of England that public justice should be let out to gratify the spite of any Tom, Dick, and Harry who happens to be on Board or Bench.
PROFESSOR KIRK ON VACCINATION.

(From Papers on Health.)

The subject of vaccination has taken a position in this country, especially in England, in which it is becoming daily of greater and greater importance. Men in considerable numbers are becoming prepared to go to prison, and, if it were required, even to the scaffold, rather than suffer their children to be inoculated with the cow-pox. These men are not lessening but increasing in numbers, and instead of being among the shamefully ignorant classes, as represented, we personally know those of them who are of very superior intelligence.

There are several aspects in which the controversy as to vaccination is one of deep interest. For instance, as a money matter it involves a very great sum annually. It is the men, who, as a class, receive this money who all but alone put the argument in favour of the practice before the public mind. The Act by which vaccination is enforced is virtually and indisputably an Act endowing the medical profession very largely, and taxing the nation for the purpose of that endowment. It is impossible to overlook the influence which this has on the consideration whether it is really well or ill that our offspring should be universally vaccinated. It is consequently of very great importance that this subject should be examined and discussed by persons who are not interested in it in a monetary point of view.

We are told that such and such a proportion of the people died of small-pox before Jenner discovered vaccination, and such and such a smaller proportion die of that disease now. But this is equally and even much more forcibly true of other diseases for which no such [supposed] remedy has been discovered. The time was, for example, when a vast proportion of the people died of the plague; now none die of that malady. The explanation of this is not found in anything but that sanitary improvement by which all such diseases have been so much lessened, neither in violence. It suits the advocates of medical endowment to overlook such a truth as this; but it cannot for a moment be allowed that it is not an argument of supreme importance in the case.

It is beyond dispute that vaccinated persons take the small-pox even as many as six and seven times over; and moreover, that vaccinated persons die of the disease. But it is said they do not die in such numbers. It is over-looked that persons who are vaccinated belong to a class, or classes, in which the conditions of health are favourable; while those who are not vaccinated belong to classes very differently situated.

But there are positive considerations of far greater force than these negative ones. It is beyond all dispute that vaccination means death to many a child. Cautious medical men continually act on this understanding, and refuse in certain cases to vaccinate.

It is also beyond dispute that vaccination to a still greater number of children means the loss of health for life, and in others for many years. It is not in the interest of medical men to report such cases, even if they know them. If they were truthfully reported, and made as much of as favourable cases are, it would surprise no one that men are willing even to die rather than let their children be touched by vaccine matter.

The truth regarding vaccination will come out if all the parliaments in the world set themselves to stifle it.

The principle upon which vaccination proceeds is that of exhausting the capacity for such diseased action as small-pox fever feeds on, by creating a milder form of such disease. It is, therefore, deliberately intended to make the child ill in vaccinating him. He is in more or less good health when the doctor comes with his vaccine virus, and that is introduced into his person for the express purpose of making him so unwell that the nervous system shall have one of its vital elements exhausted, or as nearly so as may be. Hence a fever is created in the tender frame. The little arm inflames and swells, and the cow-pox comes out upon it only as the result of considerable fever in the little one.

Should small-pox prevail in your neighbourhood, instead of vaccinating, clean effectually all skins in the house [and the house and surroundings also] and be at perfect ease as to the malady.

THE MEMBERS FOR SOUTHAMPTON.—An Elector writes, "The two Liberal M.P.'s for this borough, Messrs. Lee and Butt, are not prejudiced in favour of vaccination, but appeared puzzled to account for the authority with which the practice is supported. They promised a deputation that they would vote for an inquiry into the working of the Vaccination Acts and generally into the value of vaccination."

Mr. Gladstone, speaking in the House of Commons on 3rd April, 1878 in reference to Mr. Pease's bill for the cessation of repeated penalties for non-vaccination, observed—

"The dissatisfaction with the law was of an extremely acute character; its range did not appear to be diminishing; and the opponents of the Acts were not without their journal and their organisation. The tables of honourable members groaned under the weight of anti-vaccination papers and pamphlets. The question is in a state which I do not think this House can pass by."

NEWS FROM PARIS.—In the Voltaire Dr. Bremond takes credit for being the first to announce that there is now in Paris a diseased horse from whose legs may be taken pus just as efficacious for vaccinatory purposes as the lymph habitually used. This discovery is a mare's nest. No scientific fact is more certain than that Jenner's cows which accidentally vaccinated milkmaids themselves caught a disease from horseboys' hands after they had stroked down greasy-hooved horses. There is not to be found in the whole world a cow with natural cowpox. The owners of heifers in Paris who make a rich harvest by advertising vaccination direct from the cow, blind the fact that their beasts are all vaccinated from the more or less wholesome arms of children.—Daily News, 35th May, 1880.
FRANCE.

A Compulsory Vaccination Bill is before the French Chamber of Deputies. Will they make France by its means, as it is stated, “the best vaccinated country in the world.” And if they do, what good? For England is in that position now, as say some authorities, yet small-pox careth not and prevails regardless of the fact.

This is what is proposed. Vaccination must be performed in the first six months of existence. Re-vaccination to be compulsory every ten years, up to 50. Certificates of success as in England. Parents and guardians, as well as parents who fail to show certificates every ten years or a primary certificate, are liable to fines of one to a hundred francs. Defaulters to be reported every year, and offenders prosecuted.

Farewell all thought of personal freedom, if this is passed. “Disease, more disease; always disease.” What a cry for the “healing art!”

A. W.

MR. JOSEPH ABEL AGAIN.

Among the shameless outrages under the Vaccination Acts has been the prosecution of Mr. Joseph Abel, watchmaker, of Faringdon, Berks. It is well known that he will not have his children vaccinated, yet he is summoned and fined again and again until now his score amounts to £41 16s. 6d. Words are wasted in denouncing such malicious tyranny. Even compulsory vaccinators admit the folly of such a prostitution of justice and the demonstrated impotence of their law.

On 27th April Mr. Abel appeared before the Faringdon bench, consisting of Mr. D. Bennett, Mr. T. L. Goodlake, and Mr. W. Dundas, in answer to three summonses. To the first charge respecting his child, John Henry, he pleaded not guilty; and Wright, the vaccination officer, was sworn to prove the case, and was cross-examined as follows:

Mr. Abel.—Are these proceedings taken by the special instructions of the Board of Guardians?

Officer.—Yes.

Mr. Abel.—Is it the unanimous wish of the Board or the malice of a few?

Officer.—By a majority of the Board.

Mr. Abel.—Are you aware that a child in this town of respectable parents, not many hundred yards from this Court, has suffered for months from the effects of the vaccine poison?

Officer.—Yes; I believe so.

Mr. Abel.—Do you know that the head—one side of the face and neck, has been a mass of scabs, and that the little one has been a pitiable object for more than six months?

Officer.—Yes; I have heard so.

Mr. Abel.—Does not the father of the child say that prior to vaccination the child’s skin was spotless and clear?

Officer.—Yes.

Mr. Abel.—But since vaccination it has been as I have described, and that as soon as a scab comes off, the fluid under it runs and makes another sore?

Officer.—Well; not quite so bad as you say.

The Bench said they had no other course than to fine Mr. Abel 10s. 6d. and costs 9s. 6d. Mr. Bennett and Mr. Goodlake at this point left the bench, and Mr. Dundas heard the remaining charges alone.

Mr. Abel then urged that as he had been convicted in one case, the other charges might be withdrawn, especially as he had shown good and reasonable grounds for not obeying the Acts.

Mr. Dundas refused to make the concession, whereon Mr. Abel pleaded for an extension of time as this was his 50th summons exclusive of the other cases. Finally Mr. Dundas gave orders in each case for the children to be vaccinated within six months, hoping that Mr. Abel would before then see his way clear to have them vaccinated.

The costs in these cases were 9s. 6d. each, and the whole were paid by defendant’s brother, Mr. E. Abel.

We can do no more than thank Mr. Abel averse for his persistent resistance to the iniquitous law, and trust that many may be encouraged to follow his example.

OUR LEGISLATORS ON THE VACCINATION QUESTION.—A pamphlet is now in the press containing the opinions and utterances of Members of Parliament on Vaccination during a period of nearly eighty years, 1802 to 1880. It will show that Vaccination was not accepted on its own merits, but as an escape from the greater evil of Inoculation; that there never was a time when the dangers and injurious effects of the practice were unknown; and that it has been forced upon the nation by assumptions and assertions of the most extraordinary character dictated by interested medical cliques.

THE MOTHER CANNOT BE DECEIVED.—I have referred to the way doctors have of explaining away deaths and injuries from vaccination; and no doubt they often succeed in convincing people that black is white, and so getting themselves out of the vaccination scrapes that are so common. An ingenious eel will wriggle itself out of anything. However hard put to it there is always “a shuffle left,” as Cobbett said. But there is one person they cannot deceive. They cannot deceive the mother, for she knows. The public is deceived and the legislators are deceived, but the doctors cannot take in the mother who has watched each symptom and traced every change from the first infusion of the poison to the death of her child. They may practise their ingenuity upon her with the rhetoric of a Demosthenes, the ratiocination of a chief justice, and the heartlessness of a Vivaesianist, but they may save their breath, for the mother knows. Do doctors deny the truth of this picture? I have seen it myself, I have heard the rhetoric, and been present at the ratiocinations. So I, too, know. Of course I do not mean that the rhetoric was quite equal to that of Demosthenes, or the reasoning to that of eminent lawyers. Still they did their best, first, to save the credit of vaccination; secondly, to save the credit of their brother practitioner.—Fashions of the Day, by Henry Strickland Constable.
THE VACCINATION INQUISITOR.

PROFESSOR JAMES E. THOROLD ROGERS, now M.P. for Southwark, writing to Mr. George Bone from Oxford, 7th March, 1879, thus set forth his difficulties and determination on the vaccination question—

"The existing law is one of the most puzzling topics on which to give an answer. The consent of all medical science asserts that vaccination is a protection against the most loathsome, destructive and persistent disease which has ever scourged the human race, one perhaps only excepted. I cannot resist the information of those who are well-informed on a subject when I am ill-informed. The medical profession further has urged the Government to eradicate this disease by enforcing vaccination, and the legislature has carried out the advice on the ground, I presume, that it is not just that those who take precaution against disease should be exposed to risks which those who will not take the precautions put on them.

"But from this point the action of the legislature has been illogical, unfair and negligent. Illogical, because it punishes the parent instead of ordering the compulsory vaccination of the child (I do not say that I could do this); unfair, by visiting the refusal to obey the law with an indefinite number of penalties; and negligent because it takes no precautions that in the case of the poor, who are unprotected, the operation shall not be the means of conveying another disease into the body of the child.

"Of course the legislature might demand, if it conceded to the parent that his child should not be vaccinated at all, that there should be some easily distinguishable mark by which they who refuse to accept the operation should be known, and if need be avoided. For no one, however he may object to those acts, can deny that they who fear a possible contagion from the presence of unvaccinated persons—I assume of course that the risk exists—should be protected against the risk in question, just as one has a right to know that a person keeps explosives next door to one's own home.

"I do not know to what extent the objections to vaccination are founded on evidence, and how far the evidence if it is forthcoming is to be traced to the negligence with which the operation is performed, but I am quite prepared to admit that the present practice of the law is illogical and unjust.

"S."

As regards one part of your letter, I have no difficulty in forming a judgment. If the law is to be enforced, no rank or station should be exempt, for a compulsory law which is partially executed is the height of injustice."

CAUSE AND EFFECT.—The Lancet of 27th March, 1880, says of the "many months" duration of the small-pox epidemic in Dublin, that "neglect of vaccination seems to lie at the root of the evil." The ground for such an assertion is that 260 non-vaccinated children have been discovered in the Dublin Union. Does the Lancet really mean seriously to imply that the presence of 260 non-vaccinated children induces an immense number of vaccinated people to take small-pox? If not, what does it mean? Perhaps it will explain.—A. W.

THE REV. MARMADUKE MILLER, of Manchester, who is well known throughout the United Kingdom as a preacher and lecturer, in a letter to Mr. Henry Pitman, says—"I am prepared to admit that it seems to me probable that in some cases diseases are caused by vaccination. I have seen children who have never been well after vaccination; and I think it is very probable that if I had lost a child through vaccination, I should have refused to have another vaccinated; and therefore I cannot blame those who take this course. Hence I disapprove of the enforcement of the Act, especially cumulative penalties and imprisonment. The wisest course to be taken, as it seems to me, is the one suggested by the Archbishop of York, namely, that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the working and results of the Act."

AS OTHERS SEE US.—At Wilmington is published the North Carolina Medical Journal, and the Editor having received a copy of Vaccination Tracts thus relieves his mind:

"A more persistent and determined wrong-headedness seems never to have possessed an intelligent community, than that organised by the anti-vaccinationists. In their tracts they openly advise mothers to go to adjoining counties before the birth of their children that the proper officials may lose all track of the new-born when they return. They also, with criminal cunning, advise that tartar emetic produces a vesicle and leaves a cicatrix scarcely distinguishable from those described and illustrated by Jenner in his Inquiry. One medical man residing in a fashionable London suburb has for years given babies lymph as a dose of medicine, and filled up the vaccination certificate in the usual way! We should have refrained from noticing these people, but we have felt it necessary to warn our people against imitation. If our knowledge of the protection afforded by vaccination is not a certainty, we had as well burn all our books and abandon the human family to its fate."

"Alas! for the human family thus abandoned!"

The Editor continues, "What our English friends now need to extricate themselves and silence dishonest objectors to vaccination, is to substitute animal virus." — Extricate themselves from what? They are in a fix, are they? and with animal virus they are to seek release. Verily our Carolina critics is not so discreet as he ought to be.

Dr. F. R. Lees, the veteran champion of the temperance movement, in a letter to Mr. Henry Pitman, of Manchester, remarks—"I think it is certain that the injection of vaccine lymph, however simple, must poison. Possibly it may antagonise, under some conditions, small-pock; but in the long run, it may produce special evils by reducing the vitality of man. Small-pock is amenable to rational treatment, and is by no means the same in these sanitary days as in the old times. At any rate, it is a question on which men may fairly doubt; and therefore compulsory vaccination is a medical tyranny which ought to be resisted. A vested interest is at the bottom of it."
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A GOOD NIGHT'S WORK.

We have reason to be thankful to Dr. Cameron for providing the occasion of Mr. P. A. Taylor's admirable discourse in the House of Commons on the 11th of June; and we feel sure our readers will excuse us in setting aside other matter to make room for a report of his speech and the debate.

Concerning what is called Animal Vaccination, there is little to say. There was a conference of medical men held in London in December, with the view of promoting the practice; but the discussion left no doubt that Calf Lymph was a whimsey, whose chief advocates were extremely ignorant of the system they attacked, and extremely credulous as to reports from foreign parts. Dr. Cameron's vehement assertions of the safety and efficiency of animal vaccination in Belgium, France, and the United States, do him little credit; he should leave such unverifiable hearsay, with simplification from inner consciousness, to his friend, Dr. Wyld. Fiction from other countries has, however, a currency denied to English facts; and Madame Rachel know what she was about when she described her washes as prepared from Arabian herbs, conveyed across the desert on swift dromedaries. When Jenner's vaccinated patients began to take smallpox like other folk, the good man grieved over the perversion of his countrymen, and, turning his pious eyes heavenward, found inexpressible comfort in the reflection that he had extinguished smallpox in Mexico and Peru, and that the saving process was going forward rapidly in the vast empires of Asia. None, we believe, are more thoroughly satisfied of the imposture of animal vaccination than the officials of the Local Government Board, and in consenting to issue "animal vaccine" they are merely humouring a demand they consider it impolitic to resist. The vaccination fabric is in a shaky condition, and as the polite newspapers and their polite readers have agreed to ascribe all the evils of vaccination to impure lymph, what can be more judicious than to appease their clamour by providing what they are pleased to imagine is pure? Mr. Dodson made the proviso, that before issuing the undefiled lymph, the Board was determined to make sure of its pedigree—that it really originated in cow-pox. As to this, all concerned should keep a sharp lookout. The editors of the Veterinarian have been advertising in vain for cow-pox, and Professor J. B. Simonds, Principal of the Royal Veterinary College, stated at the December Conference, that in all his experience he had never seen a case of the disease described by Jenner, and threw grave doubts on its existence, asking, "Whoever heard of bull-pox? and if there be no bull-pox, what other eruptive disorder is limited to the females of a species?" If Mr. Dodson and the Board keep true to their promise, the public may have to wait awhile for the issue of the pure impurity. If, however, they resort to Belgium, and accept the legend of the Beanguney cow, the issue may commence immediately. Believers in pure lymph out of pox are not likely to be exacting.

The concession to the Calf Lymphers on the ground of policy is certain to lead to greater difficulties—as usually happens with insincere policy. How can it be supposed that tax-payers and electors are to submit to First and Second Class Vaccination?—to lymph from the calf certified safe, and to lymph with risks indefinite! A few months ago Mr. Solater-Booth intimated to a deputation bent on promoting animal vaccination, that the introduction of the practice by the Local Government Board would imperil the whole system of public vaccination. In saying so he made a reasonable prediction, which we shall not regret to see fulfilled.

The abolition of repeated prosecutions for
non-vaccination is a measure to which the present Administration is pledged, unless men in office may repudiate their solemn professions when in opposition. The Bill that has been drawn for the purpose is not very clear, and the end might be more conveniently effected by the repeal of Section XXXI. of the Act of 1867. There should be no doubt left that only one prosecution is intended for each unvaccinated child. It is needless to say how inadequate we regard this concession, but it is probably as much as can be obtained under present circumstances. We shall accept it as an instalment, and press with fresh urgency for complete liberty. What would Dissenters say if their children were only exempt from Church baptism on condition that they answered to a summons in a police-court, and submitted to a penalty of 20s. and costs? What answer would it be, that baptism could do a child no harm, and that it was absurd to make a fuss about nothing! Every Nonconformist would reject the plea with scorn; and why should we be required to pay for exemption from a medical rite which none in this free land would suffer if demanded for exemption from a priestly rite? But the case is worse. No one could pretend that a little water would harm a child, but the doctor’s rite poisons our children’s blood, and induces manifold ailments; and the authorities now admit the risk and injury by consenting to substitute one sort of virus for another sort of virus in the administration of the abominable operation.

As anti-vaccinators grateful for anything that compels attention to a form of cruelty and imposture that primarily affects little children, who cannot speak for themselves, and whose sufferings are disregarded or denied, we shall have some cause to regret the cessation of multiple penalties. In this matter we have discovered anew that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. Nothing has so tended to beget inquiry and discredit vaccination as these repeated prosecutions; and where they have failed to lead to the conviction that Jenner was a most pernicious quack, they have excited sympathy with the victims and indignation that Englishmen should be subjected to fine and imprisonment because they do not see the good of a certain medical prescription. The discredit thus incurred by vaccination has long been recognised by the Local Government Board, and Mr Sculater-Booth (unless again deferred by the clamour of his uninformed associates, as in 1878) will co-operate with Mr Dodson in the amelioration of the law. Indeed the law in its proper severity has been unworkable, and the Board has had to intervene for its mitigation from time to time. The Evesham Guardians were instructed by the Board to refrain from an incorrigible anti-vaccinator. He might be prosecuted repeatedly by way of experiment, but if found steadfast in his conviction, and if, moreover, his righteous example was likely to provoke admiration and imitation, why then the Guardians had better leave him alone! And in many parishes the steadfast anti-vaccinator is left alone as too dangerous for handling. Mr William Tebb fought out the St Pancras Guardians, and at last stood victorious over the law, a noble incitement for others to do likewise. But Guardians and Justices are not always amenable to the counsels of Mr Worldly Wiseman spoken from Whitehall, and finding a poor Englishman within their jurisdiction fine him again and again, and if he will not or cannot pay, consign him to prison. When the Return moved for by Mr Otway is produced we shall see how widely this grinding and iniquitous tyranny has operated—a tyranny so hastily that it is difficult to describe it with composure. Mr Dodson says the law is equal, but when he says so he speaks as a dull official, not as Mr Dodson. He knows the law is not equal. He knows that the wealthy man pays his fines, and laughs at the impotent authorities, whilst the poor is crushed under their infliction. Well said Mr Bright, “The law is monstrous and ought to be repealed.”

Mr Taylor’s speech has rendered it henceforth impossible to howl down resistance to vaccination as fanaticism in the House of Commons. His facts and arguments came upon many members as a revelation of unsuspected truth, whilst the humour of his narrative maintained their unflagging interest. Mr Taylor’s record of service on behalf of unpopular principles is long and honourable, but nowhere has his valour shone more conspicuously than in this attack on medical superstition and intolerance. He was left unanswered. Dr Farquharson recited afresh the stock fable about the efficiently vaccinated and re-vaccinated hospital nurses, and Mr Mitchell Henry, formerly surgeon, protested that no person of distinction entertained the anti-vaccination heresy; but such insanities were as dust in the wind of Mr Taylor’s oratory. The vaccination imposture is upheld by consummate audacity, and whoever is vigorous enough to confront it with equal audacity will find it vanish away like other structures of
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fallacy and make-believe. Mr. H. Strickland Constable should be in the House to re-enforce Mr. Taylor with the shrewd wit that illuminates the pages of Our Medicine Men. More of the spirit of Swift and Molière is required to dissolve the contradictions, absurdities and insanities involved in the word Vaccination.

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN ON
COMPULSORY MEDICINE.

It does not rest with Parliament to enact how a disease shall be treated. If a bill were proposed to enforce that every one who is seized with apoplexy shall be bled, the Lancet would probably be foremost in outcry. I should expect it to propound that Parliament is no authority in medicine; that to protect us from dangerous treatment by ignorant pretenders, Parliament enacts medical degrees as mere tests of knowledge, but it must not dictate to those who have displayed their knowledge by gaining the degree.

Nor is it to the purpose to say that Parliament took advice of physicians before it legislated. Some thirty or forty years ago, when homoeopaths first discussed bleeding for apoplexy and fever, the disapproval of their conduct by the orthodox medical faculty was so universal and vehement, that Parliament might easily have got medical warrant to enforce bleeding. Nay, a hundred years ago, physicians were zealous for inoculation. My father was with difficulty saved from it by the sturdy refusal of his mother, who said (as she told me)—"If God send small-pox of my child, I must bear it; but never will I consent to give it to him on purpose; how can any one know what would come of it?"

At that time Parliament might have been advised by educated and learned physicians to make inoculation compulsory; and I make no doubt those physicians spoke as dogmatically to my grandmother in favour of it, as they can now speak of vaccination: yet, by the advice of physicians, inoculation is now made penal! It is certainly possible that by the advice of physicians vaccination also will hereafter be made penal. Medicine is a changing and (let us hope) progressive art: it has no pretension to be science, or to have any fixedness at all.—Letter to H. Pitman.

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XVI.

RAPID TRIUMPH OF VACCINATION AND OF JENNER.

The House of Hanover has been reproached for indifference to literature, science and art, but an exception might be asserted on the score of various and vaccine inoculation. It was Caroline, Princess of Wales, who in 1721 promoted Maitland's experiments; and Jenner found none so ready to hear and believe as George III. and his family. His first convert was the Duke of Clarence, subsequently William IV. The Duke's surgeon happened to be Francis Knight, who had lived in Wilts and Gloucestershire, and was familiar with the country faith in cow-pox, and received Jenner's revelation with a ready mind. In 1799 Knight was allowed to vaccinate two of the Duke's children by Mrs. Jordan, and the fact was noise abroad and passed to Jenner's credit. Nor was the Duke's service limited to this example. He made Jenner's acquaintance, listened to his stories, and became his active partisan. Then the Duke of York, commander-in-chief of the army, was convinced, and enforced the new practice to the full extent of his power. He, moreover, acted as patron of the Vaccine Pock Institution until he was persuaded that Pearson, its founder, was injurious to Jenner. On 7th March, 1800, Jenner was presented to George III. at St. James's Palace, and delivered the Inquiry bound in crimson to his majesty, who was pleased to accept the dedication of the second edition. On the 27th he had an interview with Queen Charlotte, who conversed about the new specific with all the curiosity of a grandmotherly quack. The Prince of Wales followed suit; and Jenner found himself invested with the full effulgence of the royal favour. It was a magical success; for, consider, not two years had elapsed since the publication of the Inquiry!

Jenner naturally became very popular. He wrote to Mr. Shrapnel—"I have not yet made half my calls in town, although I fag from eleven till four;" and, "Pray tell Tierney how rapidly the Cow-Pox is marching over the metropolis, and indeed through the whole island. The death of three children under inoculation with small-pox will probably give that practice the Brutus-stab."

With little ability to make and maintain ground, Jenner, like many feeble folk, had the faculty of converting those he called his friends to his private advantage. He did not subdue them by will, but by weakness. Indeed, whoever chooses to observe will often have to mark
with amaze how stronger natures suffer their means and energies to be appropriated by inferior organisms, and used with the thanklessness of rightful possession.

John Ring was a remarkable instance of this sort of possession. He was a surgeon in New Street, Hanover Square, London. In 1799 he entered into correspondence with Jenner, and his interest in cow-pox and its advertiser developed into an enthusiasm without qualification by weariness or fear. Whatever Jenner asserted he swore to; whatever charge was brought against vaccination he denied. He was ready for all comers with such voluble and hearty vigour that his outrages on propriety were laughed at and excused as “John Ring’s way.”

Among his earlier services was the preparation of the Testimonial in favour of vaccination, which he carried from house to house and obtained the signature of nearly every London physician and surgeon of distinction. The Testimonial was published in the Medical Review and Medical Journal for July, 1800, and was reprinted in the newspapers. It ran as follows—

“Many unfounded reports have been circulated, which have a tendency to prejudice the public against the Inoculation of the Cow-Pox: we, the undersigned physicians and surgeons, think it our duty to declare our opinion, that those persons who have had the Cow-Pox are perfectly secure from the future infection of the Small-Pox, provided the infection has not been previously communicated.”

“We also declare that the inoculated Cow-Pox is a much milder and safer disease than the inoculated Small-Pox.”

The first signatures comprised thirty-two physicians and forty surgeons, and, the example being set, others hastened from town and country to record their adhesion. “I feel proud,” wrote Mr. Witham in sending his name, “that my little bark may, with others more illustrious, pursue the triumph, and partake the gale.”

The Testimonial had great effect on the public mind: to the majority it was irresistible. As Ring said, “It confounded the enemies of the new practice”—adding in his characteristic vernacular, “and it secured the triumph of reason over the scruples of prejudice and ignorance, and the base manoeuvres of sordid and self-interested men.”

Thus early was it discovered that an opponent of vaccination was an ignoramus or a rascal. Ring’s easy arrogance is concisely illustrated in this deliverance—

“It is no want of candour to affirm that those who are hostile to vaccine inoculation, are total strangers to it; those who are doubtful, are almost total strangers to it; and I defy the whole world to produce one single instance of a person that has had any experience of the disease, who is not a decided friend to the practice.”

Jenner recognised his thorough-going supporter, and used his loyalty to strike at Pearson and others who failed to abide in like subservience. He wrote to a foreign physician—

“The discovery which I had the happiness to announce to the world is much indebted to Mr. Ring’s ardent zeal and indefatigable exertions for the rapid progress it has made; while some of those who vainly conceived themselves instrumental in promoting its adoption have in reality from their ignorance and indiscretion rather retarded than accelerated its progress.”

Wonder is frequently expressed over the rapid conversion of England and the world to vaccination, but, as we have before remarked, wonder is much reduced when we set the circumstances clearly before us. Inoculation with small-pox to avert small-pox was the practice of the time, and it was not a universal practice simply because it was troublesome and dangerous: everybody believed in the saving rite; and where evaded it was as onerous and perilous duties are always and everywhere evaded by the indolent and cowardly. Inoculation with cow-pox was introduced to the public as a substitute for inoculation with small-pox, equally efficient or more efficient and neither troublesome nor dangerous. Thus easy and seductive was the transition from the one practice to the other. Jenner had no serious battle to fight: the contest was decided in the years during which inoculation with small-pox struggled for prevalence. The warfare that subsequently cost him so much irritation was conducted by the conservatives of Inoculation, as experience revealed the inefficiency and mischiefs of Vaccination. Resistance such as is now offered to Vaccination on physiological grounds there was none, so far as I can discover. It had apparently occurred to no one that small-pox was a consequence of the transgression of the laws of health, and was preventible by submission to those laws. It was imagined that the disease came by the will of God, or the devil, or by force of

* Meaning thereby, as happened under Woodville at Battle Bridge Hospital where Small-Pox and Cow-Pox were incurred simultaneously.
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fate, and that to dodge it by medical craft was the utmost that was practicable. Unless we bear in mind these conditions of the public intelligence, we shall misapprehend the demeanour of the people who so cordially welcomed Jenner’s advertisement. It is always a mistake to criticise the conduct of an earlier generation by the light of a later. We turn history to ill account when we use it to nourish our self-complacency; for the probability is that had we lived with our forefathers, we should have done exactly as they did.

Some will ask, How did it ever come to pass that so many doctors in 1800 signed Ring’s testimonial certifying that inoculation with cow-pox was a sure and everlasting protection from small-pox when they had not, and could not have, any experience to warrant their assertion? True, but they had an illusory experience by which they were beguiled, namely, the Variolous Test. Hundreds were inoculated with cow-pox and subsequently with small-pox, and were also exposed to small-pox contagion, and as the disease did not “take” it was concluded it could never take, and that the subjects of the operation were fortified for ever. The fallacy is now manifest, but it was by no means manifest in 1800, and all manner of men received and propagated the fable with energetic sincerity. It was once admitted that a tub full of water did not overflow when a fish was slipped into it, and many explanations were current of the curious phenomenon until a sceptical spirit suggested that the experiment be tried. A like spirit might have suggested that it was expedient to wait and see whether cow-pox was indeed a perpetual defence against small-pox, insomuch as nature had an awkward habit of confuting prognostications apparently irrefragable.

The ease with which it was asserted cow-pox inoculation could be performed, coupled with its harmlessness, not to say wholesomeness, and the absolute security it afforded against small-pox, induced benevolent busybodies to set up as vaccinators all over the country. What the kindly quack delights in is something cheap and handy with a touch of mystery and the promise of immeasurable advantage—conditions which the new practice completely fulfilled. The memoirs of the time, especially of the Evangelical party, abound with instances in which this good soul and that good soul had vaccinated so many hundreds or thousands, delivering them from the peril of an awful disease. Thus in the Gentleman’s Magazine for December, 1800, we read—

“Two respectable families near Manchester have within these few months inoculated upwards of 800 of the neighbouring poor from two months old to twenty years with uniform success. Twenty of them were subjected to the variolous test, and all were found proof against the disease.”

And John Ring relates—

“Dr. Jenner lately met in a large party of fashion a lady of Fortman Square, who, with another lady, has inoculated 1800 in the north of England. The rural swain, when he receives the blessing of Jenner’s discovery from such a fair hand, must conclude that the Goddess of Health has adopted the practice.”

Of course medical practitioners had little favour for this sort of intrusion into their domain, but Jenner encouraged and boasted himself in the domestic diffusion of the discovery. By and by when disasters became common it was found extremely convenient to ascribe them to these unskilled operators; and ultimately vaccination was resigned entirely to the legally qualified practitioner, whose failures are rarely inquired into, and when proclaimed are, as professional matter of course, explicitly denied.

Jenner after six months of lionising left London on 23rd June, 1800, and on his way home passed through Oxford where he was introduced to Dr. Marlow, Vice-Chancellor of the University, and other dignitaries, who subscribed the following testimonial, drawn up by Sir Christopher Pegge, Reader in Anatomy—

“We, whose names are undersigned, are fully satisfied upon the conviction of our own observation, that the Cow-Pox is not only an infinitely milder disease than the Small-Pox, but has the advantage of not being contagious, and is an effectual remedy against the Small-Pox.”

Honour was abundant, but honour is windy fare, and Jenner had an eye for something more substantial. Among his papers we read—

“While the vaccine discovery was progressive, the joy I felt at the prospect before me of being the instrument destined to take away from the world one of its greatest calamities, blended with the fond hope of enjoying independence and domestic peace and happiness, was often so excessive that, in pursuing my favourite subject among the meadows, I have sometimes found myself in a kind of reverie. It is pleasant to me to recollect that these reflections always ended in devout acknowledgments to that Being from whom this and all other mercies flow.”

But how was the fond hope of enjoying independence to be realised? The question was discussed by Jenner and his friends, and it was

† Baron’s Life of Jenner, vol. i. p. 146.
finally decided to apply to the House of Commons for a reward. But in order to go to Parliament it was necessary to have a good case, and Jenner's case was open to various objections. The Inquiry, published in 1798, was obviously a hasty production and by no means a manual of practice. He had advertised the Gloucestershire faith in cow-pox, but had left to Pearson and others the labour and hazard of the practical development of his suggestions; and it was by no means improbable that his claim for cash wherewith to enjoy independence might be seriously contested. In this strait what was to be done? The question was a grave one, and he met it by resolving to claim as his own the results of the common experience since 1798—maintaining that nothing had been discovered or ascertained with which he was not perfectly familiar! To establish this position he came to London, and in May, 1801, issued a quarto pamphlet of twelve pages, entitled The Origin of the Vaccine Inoculation.

First it was necessary to represent that his investigations had extended over many years—a fact of which there was no sign in the Inquiry, the evidence indeed being distinctly otherwise; and thus he shaped his statement—

"My inquiry into the nature of the Cow-Pox commenced upwards of twenty-five years ago. My attention to this singular disease was first excited by observing that among those whom in the country I was frequently called upon to inoculate, many resisted every effort to give them the Small-Pox. These patients I found had undergone a disease they called the Cow-Pox, contracted by milking cows affected with a peculiar eruption on their teats. On inquiry, it appeared it had been known among the dairies from time immemorial, and that a vague opinion prevailed that it was a preventive of the Small-Pox. This opinion I found was comparatively new among them; for all the older farmers declared they had no such idea in their early days—a circumstance that seemed easily to be accounted for, from my knowing that the common people were very rarely inoculated for the Small-Pox till that practice was rendered general by the improved method introduced by the Suttons: so that the working people in the dairies were seldom put to the test of the preventive powers of the Cow-Pox."

Jenner's design in this paragraph is manifest. It was to minimise the faith of the country folk, and to represent that by his own perspicacity he discovered the virtues of cow-pox through his failures to inoculate with small-pox. The inquiries of Pearson and others, however, showed conclusively that in many parts of the south of England, in Ireland, and on the Continent it was believed that to have suffered from cow-pox was to be secure from small-pox; and this belief was entertained altogether independently of failures to inoculate with small-pox. The opinion was neither vague nor new, nor confined to Jenner's neighbourhood.

In contradiction of the vulgar opinion, it was asserted that it was possible to have cow-pox and then to have small-pox; and surgeons averred that they had successfully inoculated many who had suffered from cow-pox. Jenner met this difficulty thus—

"In the course of the investigation I found that some of those who seemed to have undergone the cow-pox, nevertheless, on inoculation with the small-pox, felt its influence just the same as if no disease had been communicated to them by the cow. This occurrence led me to inquire among the medical practitioners in the country around me, who all agreed in this sentiment, that the cow-pox was not to be relied upon as a certain preventive of the small-pox. This for a while damped, but did not extinguish my ardour; for as I proceeded I had the satisfaction to learn that the cow was subject to some varieties of spontaneous eruptions upon her teats, that were all capable of communicating sores to the hands of the milkers, and that whatever sore was derived from the animal was called in the dairy the cow-pox. Thus I surmounted a great obstacle, and, in consequence, was led to form a distinction between these diseases, one of which only I have denominated the true, the others the spurious cow-pox, as they possess no specific power over the constitution."

The distinction was ingenious, but it was no more than an artful evasion. It came simply to this, that when small-pox followed cow-pox it was left open to assert, "Ah! the cow-pox must have been spurious, for small-pox is impossible after inoculation with true cow-pox." Jenner, an indolent man, had the facility of a lover of ease for inventing excuses. In his Further Information, 1799, he expressly admitted that of spurious cow-pox he knew nothing, and that it remained for experience to determine which was true and which spurious; nor did he ever adduce any sort of evidence that milkers did contract other diseases from cows and describe them as cow-pox. There is little reason to doubt that his division of cow-pox into true and spurious was an arm-chair invention designed to obviate a difficulty which it was inexpedient to inquire into too particularly.

When Woodville and others began to inoculate, they found they had to ascertain at what period the virus should be taken from the cow, and from the arms of the inoculated. Jenner afforded them no guidance; his practice had been so slight and hasty that it did not occur to
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him to determine the point. Writing to John
Ring, 1st July, 1801, he inadvertently con-
fessed—

"In the early part of my inoculations I had
not learned to discriminate between the efficacy
of the virus taken at an early and at a late
period of the pustule." 10

Where Jenner had not learned to discri-
minate, the line became clear in the course of
the disasters and disappointments of the general
practice; and Pearson was especially explicit as
to the right time for taking the virus; but to
make good his claim to national consideration,
Jenner fancied it necessary to exhibit himself as
complete master of the art of cow-pox inocula-
tion, owing nothing to others, and therefore he
proceeded to appropriate the fruit of the com-
mon medical experience, assigning it to a season
when he alone was in the field. Referring to his
separation of true from spurious cow-pox, he
thus proceeded to make his raid—

"This impediment to my progress was not
long removed before another, of far greater
magnitude in its appearances, started up.
There were not wanting instances to prove that
when the true cow-pox broke out among the
cattle at a dairy, a person who had milked an
infected animal, and had thereby gone through
the disease in common with others, was liable
to receive the small-pox afterwards. This, like
the former obstacles, gave a painful check to my
fond and aspiring hopes; but reflecting that the
operations of Nature are generally uniform, and
that it was not probable the human constitution
(having undergone the cow-pox) should in some
instances be perfectly shielded from the small-
pox, and in many others remain unprotected, I
resumed my labours with redoubled ardour.
The result was fortunate; for I now discovered
that the virus of cow-pox was liable to undergo
progressive changes from the same cause pre-
cisely as that of small-pox, and that when it
was applied to the human skin in its degener-
ated state, it would produce the ulcerated
effects in as great a degree as when it was not
decomposed, and sometimes far greater; but
having lost its specific properties, it was incap-
able of producing that change upon the human
frame which is requisite to render it unsuscep-
tible of the various contagion: so that it be-
came evident a person might milk a cow one
day, and having caught the disease, be for ever
secure; while another person, milking the same
cow the next day, might feel the influence of
the virus in such a way as to produce a sore, or
scars, and, in consequence of this, might experi-
ence an indisposition to a considerable extent;
yet, as has been observed, the specific quality
being lost, the constitution would receive no
peculiar impression."

"This observation will fully explain the
source of those errors which have been com-
mittted by many inoculators of the cow-pox.
Conceiving the whole process to be extremely
simple, as not to admit of a mistake, they have
been heedless about the state of the Vaccine
Virus; and finding it impervious, as part of it will
not be, even in an advanced state of the pustule,
they have felt an improper confidence, and
sometimes mistaken a spurious pustule for that
which possesses the perfect character."

No one apparently thought it worth while to
expose the fictitious character of these state-
ments invented by Jenner to baffle objections
to the efficacy of cow-pox inoculations and to
justify his pretensions. Any careful reader of
the Inquiry of 1798, and the Origin of Vaccine
Inoculation of 1801, cannot fail to detect their
inconsistency, and to see with wonder how a few
hap-hazard experiments, hurried to press, came
to be magnified into a long course of arduous
research. If we did not know what is given to
audacity, and what may be risked on the pre-
sumption of ignorance, we might express sur-
prise at the hardihood wherewith he thus drew
attention to the Inquiry—

"The result of these trials generally led me
into a wider field of experiment, which I went
over not only with great attention, but with
painful solicitude. This became universally
known through a treatise published in June,
1798." 11

He wound up his statement with this flourish
and prediction—

"The distrust and scepticism which naturally
arose in the minds of medical men, on my first
announcing so unexpected a discovery, has now
nearly disappeared. Many hundreds of them,
from actual experience, have given their attesta-
tions that the inoculated Cow-Pox proves a
perfect security against the Small-Pox; and I
shall probably be within compass if I say thou-
sands are ready to follow their example; for the
scope that this inoculation has now taken is
immense. An hundred thousand persons, upon
the smallest computation, have been inoculated
in these realms. [May, 1801.] The numbers
who have partaken of its benefits throughout
Europe and other parts of the globe are incalcul-
able: and it now becomes too manifest to admit
of controversy, that the annihilation of the
Small-Pox, the most dreadful scourge of the
human species, must be the final result of this
practice."

For the end designed—to establish and exalt
a claim with the purpose of exacting a corre-
ponding recompense, we are ready to allow that
the Origin of the Vaccine Inoculation was an
adroitly drawn document: its veracity is a
different matter whereon our opinion is manifest.
A just man, not to say a generous, would have
had some praise for Pearson, Woodville and
others who had developed his crude suggestions,
and to whom the wide extension of the new practice was due; but Jenner was essentially a mean character: it is "the liberal who deviseth liberal things, and by liberal things doth stand." His selfish silence as to the promoters of cow-pox inoculation and his shameless appropriation of their labours are scarcely less noteworthy than his silence as to Horse Grease. The distinctive note of the Inquiry of 1798 was Horse Grease. Cow-Pox was usually believed to be good against Small-Pox, and Horse Grease likewise, and sooner or later the rural faith in these specifics would have come under cosmopolitan discussion: Jenner was merely their advertiser; but the derivation of Cow-Pox from Horse Grease was in a special manner his own, and as a man of science he was bound to make good his contention, or explain how he came to be misled. But Jenner was less a man of science than a medical adventurer; and when he came to see that the public did not like Horse Grease, and that Horse Grease was not likely to pay, why then he dropped it after the manner of a sensible tradesman. He dropped Horse Grease, we should say, as far as possible. It continued to exist in the immortal Inquiry, and readers would persist in putting it to the test, and some of them, as we shall see, to all appearance successfully. But with Jenner business was business, and science was science, and he did not see it to jumble them unnecessarily.

When a prophet in the country turns out a prophet in London his country neighbours begin to believe in him; and thus it was with Jenner. His metropolitan reputation was reflected in Gloucestershire. Earl Berkeley wrote to the Duke of Beaufort—

"Every father of a family owes the greatest obligation to Dr. Jenner for preventing the dreadful effects of the small-pox."

And the sense of this obligation took shape in a service of plate presented in 1801 and bearing this inscription—

Presented by the Nobility and Gentry of the County of Gloucestershire to their Countryman, EDWARD JENNER, M.D., F.R.S., as a Testimony of the high sense they entertain of those eminent abilities which discovered, and that disinterested philanthropy which promulgated the Vaccine Inoculation.

Hints of a larger reward now began to multiply. L. H., "personally unknown to Dr. Jenner," wrote from Bath, 27th Sept., 1801, to the Medical Journal that the time had come to recompense the saviour of mankind from small-pox: and believing, as the world then believed, he was entitled to consideration.

A BILL TO AMEND THE VACCINATION ACTS.

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as "The Vaccination Act, 1880."

2. This Act shall be construed as one with the Vaccination Act of 1867, the Vaccination Act, 1871, the Vaccination Act, 1874, and those Acts and this Act may be cited together as "The Vaccination Acts, 1867 to 1880."

3. After the passing of this Act no parent of a child shall be liable to be convicted for neglecting to take or to cause to be taken such child to be vaccinated, or for disobedience to any order directing such child to be vaccinated, if either—

(a) He has been previously adjudged to pay the full penalty of twenty shillings for any of such offences with respect to such child; or

(b) He has been previously twice adjudged to pay any penalty for any of such offences in respect of such child.

[Prepared and brought in by Mr. Dodson and Mr. Hibbert, and ordered by The House of Commons to be printed, 16th June, 1880.]

INVACCINATION OF SYPHILIS.—I think that syphilitic contamination by vaccine lymph is by no means an unusual occurrence, and that it is very generally overlooked because people do not know either when or where to look for it. I think that a large proportion of the cases of apparently inherited syphilis are in reality vaccinal; and that the syphilis in these cases does not show itself until the age of from eight to ten years, by which time the relation between cause and effect is apt to be lost.—C. BRUDERELL CARTER, M.R.C.S.

NOTHING has so much checked the progress of philosophy as the confidence of teachers in delivering dogmas as truths, which it would be presumptuous to question.—SIR HUMPHREY DAVY.
DEBATE ON ANIMAL VACCINATION.

In the House of Commons, on Friday evening, 11th June, Dr. Charles Cameron, M.P. for Glasgow, rose to call attention to the practice of animal vaccination. He had no intention of raising the question of compulsory vaccination. He was opposed that compulsion was productive of much good. He proposed no interference with the law, but simply an improvement in it, which he believed would tend to the benefit of the community. His object was to do away with the rational objections which were raised against vaccination. It was said that through the agency of vaccination other diseases had been inflicted upon humanity. For instance, it was the opinion of some persons that it was a means of spreading syphilis. Though he denied this possibility, such cases were extremely rare. Nevertheless there were undeniably cases of post-vaccinal syphilis, and in 1874 Dr. Hutchinson had given instances where syphilis had been induced by vaccination before the Royal Medical and Surgical Society. Admitting the possibility of such a catastrophe, no precaution which could be taken in the collection of humanised lymph would be a perfect safeguard against the possibility of communicating that disease. But vaccine taken direct from the calf afforded an absolute guarantee against it; and the Local Government Board was, he thought, bound to supply those who liked it, that lymph of which they could insure the thorough purity. He therefore proposed that the Government should set up an experimental station in London or elsewhere. He did not desire to overturn anything. His proposal would work concurrently with the present system. At the experimental station persons could be vaccinated directly from the calf, and a supply of calf lymph could be collected there and sent thence to the country to those who might require it. There could be no doubt that a large section of the medical profession believed that lymph used for vaccination had deteriorated, and that the results obtained from vaccination now were nothing comparable to what they were in early days, in consequence of repeated transmission. At Brussels 10,000 were vaccinated with animal lymph from 1856 to 1870, and they all passed through the epidemic of small-pox without a single death or one being reported as having been attacked by the disease. In America, where animal lymph had been applied, there was not a single case in which the disease appeared after a successful vaccination. In the early days of vaccination we had precisely the same results. In France, out of 2,671,000 properly vaccinated, there were only seven that afterwards took the small-pox. There was no institution for the cultivation of calf lymph in this country. The public would be induced to use private persons; they would distrust them. When he had been asked where animal lymph might be obtained he told the inquirers it might be obtained at Brussels, and they wrote to Brussels for it. At the present moment, the calf lymph might be obtained from the British and French, or the best medical practitioners. Instead of parents being punished for refusing to allow their children to be vaccinated in the ordinary manner, they should be punished to allow them to be vaccinated from the calf, and in most cases it would be found that the fears of the parents which led them to object to vaccination would vanish. It had been stated that animal diseases might be communicated by animal vaccination, but in no single instance had any serious disease been communicated through it. If this system were adopted the Local Government Board would, in the case of an epidemic, have at their command an inexhaustible supply of lymph. One of the main difficulties in the way of re-vaccination was the difficulty of obtaining a sufficient supply of lymph, and wherever animal vaccination was adopted re-vaccination was continually resorted to. While in this country only one in 60 of the population was re-vaccinated, in Belgium one-twentieths and in Brussels one half were re-vaccinated. The medical profession had for years past recommended the practice of animal vaccination, and he therefore moved—"That as cow-pox lymph derived from the cow known as animal vaccine, is of at least equal value as a prophylactic against small-pox with the ordinary humanised lymph, and as its use affords an absolute guarantee against the propagation of those human diseases occasionally inactivated with humanised lymph, this House is of opinion that to meet the objections to vaccination founded on the possible communication of other disease through that operation, a supply of animal vaccine should be provided by the National Vaccine Establishment for the use of those who prefer it to the ordinary lymph."

Mr. P. A. Taylor said—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am quite sure that I shall take the House unanimously with me in the first proposition that I shall venture to lay down, and that is, that the less the State interferes with the home management of the various portions of the community in regard to their habits, manners, and customs, the better both for the State and the people; and that above all things, it is not desirable, unless under some strong necessity, that the State should interfere, and that, for instance, the fashionable doctrine of medical men for the time being should by compulsion be thrust upon an unwilling community. The opposite view of legislation has taken rather rapid strides of late years, and paternal legislation, which has been called grandmaternal legislation, has spread to an extent which, fifty years ago, would have been repudiated by all classes of the community. In other words, the danger we have to meet at the present time is that which was threatened by political writers in the past, who told us that one danger in our progress towards democracy would be that we might change the tyranny of the few for the tyranny of the many. On this particular question that we are discussing tonight, Sir Robert Peel,—the late Sir Robert Peel,—thus gave expression to the same opinion. When some one proposed to make vaccination compulsory, as it is in some despotic countries, he objected, remarking that such a proceeding would be a是对 to the mental habits of the British people, and the freedom of opinion in which they rightly gloried, that he would be
no party to such compulsion. The present Prime Minister, writing the other day upon the same subject, said: "I view with misgiving all new aggression upon private liberty unless upon a clear and certain proof of necessity, and I keep my mind open upon the question whether such proof has or has not been supplied in the matter of vaccination." Nor is it the wrong done to the individual by this aggression upon the right of personal liberty, the only danger we have to incur. When too much stress is put by the State upon individual rights there is liable to be a very sudden and strong reaction against it. The existence of this feeling has been shown upon this very question lately in Canada. The Canadians appear to have rather less inclination to such infractions of individual liberty, and in Montreal, where it was proposed to enact a law of compulsory vaccination, the people rose ten thousand strong, they produced a great riot and disturbance, they threatened the town-hall, and to what extent they might have gone I know not, had not the demand for compulsory vaccination been there and then withdrawn, and no more heard of it up to the present time. I maintain that there is no ground for compulsory vaccination. I thank my hon. friend for having brought the matter before the House, and therefore before the country. I am so strongly convinced of the utter wrongfulness of compulsory vaccination, that I feel perfectly sure that it can continue but a very short time after the facts have been communicated to the House and to the country. There has been a sort of conspiracy of silence, especially among the press upon this subject. The great London daily press, as conservers of public morality, occasionally think it their duty to take a stand upon some such matter as this, and to infer that so great would be the danger of spreading popular delusions, as they term it, in regard to such matters, that they deny access to their columns of any discussion upon the matter. We have, therefore, the orthodox theories of the great daily press of the country on one side, and on the other the special organs of the anti-vaccinators. It is evident that in such a condition of things there is no scientific discussion of the question whatever. The most monstrous facts are asserted; the most absurd conclusions suggested; and the most ridiculous deductions, in consequence of this enforced silence, pass current with everybody. Now, I think the right hon. gentleman, whom I see opposite, the late president of the Local Government Board, was rather of my opinion in regard to the danger of once re-opening this question of compulsory vaccination, and when before the House and the country, for, when a deputation waited upon him some time ago, he begged that they not attempt to force the hand of Government prematurely; for Mr. Selater Booth said "they would only produce confusion, and, probably, an entire collapse of the existing system of vaccination, which all admit is extremely difficult to work as it is." With that opinion of the right hon. gentleman I cordially concur. I believe that this debate, if fairly carried on the great wings of the press from one end of the country to the other, will sound the death knell of compulsory vaccination. Nor is it at all fair as regards the medical profession that this secrecy should be maintained. They have their interests and their prejudices like other members of the community, and we know that the medical men of this country do not fairly represent the facts in respect to vaccination to the community. This would be a heavy charge if I should make it. I do not make it. I take it from their own lips. Mr. Henry May, health officer to the Aston Union, Birmingham, in an article on certificates of death, said: "In certificates given by us voluntarily, and to which the public have access, it is scarcely to be expected that a medical man will give opinions which may tell against or reflect upon himself in any way, or which are likely to cause annoyance or injury to the survivors. In such cases he will most likely tell the truth, but the destruction of the town-hall, and to what extent they might have gone I know not, had not the demand for compulsory vaccination been there and then withdrawn, and no more heard of it up to the present time. I maintain that there is no ground for compulsory vaccination. I thank my hon. friend for having brought the matter before the House, and therefore before the country. I am so strongly convinced of the utter wrongfulness of compulsory vaccination, that I feel perfectly sure that it can continue but a very short time after the facts have been communicated to the House and to the country. There has been a sort of conspiracy of silence, especially among the press upon this subject. The great London daily press, as conservers of public morality, occasionally think it their duty to take a stand upon some such matter as this, and to infer that so great would be the danger of spreading popular delusions, as they term it, in regard to such matters, that they deny access to their columns of any discussion upon the matter. We have, therefore, the orthodox theories of the great daily press of the country on one side, and on the other the special organs of the anti-vaccinators. It is evident that in such a condition of things there is no scientific discussion of the question whatever. The most monstrous facts are asserted; the most absurd conclusions suggested; and the most ridiculous deductions, in consequence of this enforced silence, pass current with everybody. Now, I think the right hon. gentleman, whom I see opposite, the late president of the Local Government Board, was rather of my opinion in regard to the danger of once re-opening this question of compulsory vaccination, and when before the House and the country, for, when a deputation waited upon him some time ago, he begged that they not attempt to force the hand of Government prematurely; for Mr. Selater Booth said "they would only produce confusion, and, probably, an entire collapse of the existing system of vaccination, which all admit is extremely difficult to work as it is." With that opinion of the right hon. gentleman I cordially concur. I believe that this debate, if fairly carried on the great wings
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dreamed of making it compulsory. Then my second point is, that if it be necessary in the interests of the State to enforce vaccination, that it is a thing so important and so sacred that it should be enforced upon all. To enforce it upon the poor only is simply an infamy — if it is essential to public health that every child should be vaccinated, the State is bound to take the infant from its mother's breast, and, with the policeman's baton, to force the parents to allow a surgeon to vaccinate the child. Will the House of Commons do this? No, the House of Commons will not dare to do it. And yet to inflict compulsion upon the poor, and to persecute them as they are being persecuted now by fines because they will not do that which other people in the upper and middle class — eyes and members of this House — will not do, is alone enough to stamp the present system as an enormous evil. Is there not something touching in the report of a trial of a poor man for not having his child vaccinated? He was convicted of the offence, and these were his last words before he went to prison. "Lock me up, gentlemen, I will not pay, I swore on my dead child's body that I would not." And have we really come to such a condition of things in this free country of ours, that we can look with satisfaction or indifference on a man having to utter such a sentence as that in a British court of justice? Beyond this, I say under any circumstances that this is a matter of the highest impolicy. Granted all they believe, or say they believe, in regard to the necessity, and I say, to treat the matter in this manner is a foolish course to pursue. What would be the political course to pursue? To bring home to the House and everyone in the country what they are pleased to call pure lymph, and to permit everyone to choose between having this protection or not. Do you think under these circumstances, if there were no compulsion, and vaccination be an excellent thing, that the desire for it would not spread? Do you think that parents of vaccine to see their children die? Tell me, is the most ridiculous thing in the world to talk of anti-vaccinators as a few fanatics. One would suppose it was a conspiracy of parents who desire that their children should die. It is said that they are very few. I don't know how many there are, but there is this thing about their numbers, that wherever inquiry has arisen in any great town, or wherever it has been necessary or thought well to examine closely into the results of vaccination, those who have been the places where the opposition of vaccination have sprung up. At this moment there is a person living at Farthingdon, who has just suffered his 82nd prosecution because he will not have that done to his child which he believes to be a danger and an injury. I saw the report of that trial, and he was condemned after, by cross-examination, he had elicited from the officer who prosecuted him, that there was a child lying within a few hundred yards suffering, if not dying, from the effects of vaccination. I say, therefore, that even granted that all that the vaccinators believe and say is true, it is an unwise and a tyrannous system. But suppose there be doubts of the efficiency of the system, and there are grave doubts of its efficiency. My hon. friend here, Dr. Cameron — who was kind enough to anticipate the arguments which he admitted I had not explained to him — said, amongst other things, that I was amongst the few very terrifying the world with the alleged results of vaccination. My hon. friend is mistaken; I have nothing to do with the testimony for or against vaccination. I am not a medical man; neither the House nor anybody else would pay any attention to my opinion of the matter. (Loud laughter.) Sir, I do not ask the hon. gentleman to pay any attention to my opinion, but if there are facts and authorities which do go to show that vaccination is not the protection which it is generally believed to be— I pass no opinion whether it is or whether it is not—but I only say it is an explanation of the conduct of those who refuse to have their children vaccinated. If we look a little into the question of vaccination, as the last words before he went to prison, it was not until the year 1887 that there was any authentic system of registration in this country. In the last century there were the most various kinds of story as regards the people being so dreadfully marked with small-pox. I have plenty of stories who tell me, "I never saw it now; in my youth everybody had it, and all their faces were hideously marked and seamed with small-pox." That proves a great deal too much. Compulsory vaccination can have nothing whatever to do with that, because it was only established comparatively in 1854, and absolutely in 1868. Therefore, amongst all persons in the country above thirty years of age, there should be a due proportion of hideously seamed and marked faces. But if hon. members have ever studied the history of the medical treatment of small-pox in the last century, they will be surprised that any who took it ever recovered, or, if they did recover, that they should have recovered without hideous marks. The infallible doctors of that day placed the unhappy patients in a hot room — with every door and window closed; with enormous fires made; with the clothes heaped upon them, which, in order to increase the effect, were coloured red; they refused the patients' drop of cooling drink. That was what the infallible doctors, who want to enforce compulsory vaccination now, did in the last century. Now I
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will make a general statement in regard to vaccination in the past—not based on any authority of my own, but taken from the evidence of Dr. Farr in reference to the dreadful and enormous fatality of small-pox in the last century. He says, "Small-pox attained its maximum fatality after inoculation was introduced." Inoculation in the last century was the pet of the infallible profession. "The annual deaths from small-pox from 1760 to 1779 were, on an average, 2,923. In the next twenty years, 1780-1799, they declined to 1,740. The disease therefore began to grow less fatal before vaccination was discovered." It is the fact that after the beginning of the century the deaths from small-pox still decreased, although the vaccination of the people at that time was probably not one per cent., and could have had no influence whatever upon the rates of mortality. The vaccination prophets of the present day, however, make the two coeteris paribus, and declare that it was vaccination which produced diminution at the beginning of the century. The fact is, the whole thing is absolutely a foregone conclusion. If there happens to be no epidemic, the vaccinators triumphantly say that they have stamped it out, as they say they have stamped it out in Ireland, in Sweden, and in Germany; but small-pox, like all other zymotic diseases, comes in epidemics; the population begin to die; then the vaccinators fall back upon some excuse, always taking care it is consistent with the fundamental assertion that vaccination stops the small-pox. Sometimes they have bad lymph; sometimes they have not enough marks: not enough marks! Jenner declared that one mark was as good as any number; and although I am no medical man, I presume that it matters not whether there is one mark or twenty. If one is bitten by a cobra, one mark is as fatal as twenty. Yet, after all, there can be no doubt that people die from small-pox after they have been vaccinated. Why, then, the cry is—"Re-vaccinate them!" If vaccination twines in life does not do, why, then, vaccinate early and vaccinate always. (Laughter.) Vaccinate once, at least, every seven years, we are told (Laughter); and there was a gentleman who wrote to the papers the other day actually to recommend that persons should be vaccinated every three years! In fact, the unhappy man is to spend his life in a perpetual condition of cowpox in order to escape the small-pox. (Laughter.) One of the alleged reasons for the failure of vaccination as a protection is that bad lymph is used, and, in fact, my hon. friend (Dr. Cameron) makes use of that very assertion as a reason for having new and fresh lymph from the cow. His words are, in a letter to the Times: "The recurrence, therefore, in the latest period, of a mortality almost as high as that experienced prior to the Vaccination Act, shews either that the protective virtues of vaccination are mythical, or that there is something radically wrong in our national system of vaccination." Just so! My hon. friend, like all the rest of the world, cannot believe that vaccination is a myth, and so he takes us as a remedy to lymph, fresh and pure from the cow. (Laughter.) Dr. Seaton, the medical officer of the Local Government Board, in precisely the same spirit of assuming that vaccination is an absolute protection, and then making all the facts bend to his theory, deals in the same way with the late tremendous epidemic, in which upwards of 44,000 people lost their lives. What did he say of it? Was he shaken by it from his faith? Not the least. All he said was,—"Except for vaccination this epidemic would, presumably (Hear, hear) have caused such frightful and demoralizing mortality as the worst pestilence of past centuries. If the House will permit me, I will tell them a little anecdote exactly characteristic of this kind of argument. I was talking to a friend of mine the other day, who is a very warm advocate of vaccination, and he assumed a little superiority over, another great authority, Dr. Stevens, speaking at the Medical Conference, said,—"He had seen more vaccinated children than any man, and all his experience led him to the opinion that the arm-to-arm system practised in this country was as nearly perfect as a system could be made, and as efficacious as could be desired." But how, then, are all the deaths from vaccination to be accounted for? According to the report of the Local Government Board, the deaths in London from smallpox in 1871 were 7,912, of whom 5,382 had been vaccinated. Where, then, is your protection? In 1870, 1871, and 1872, the total deaths from smallpox were 44,840! Be it remembered that this was at a time when we were vaccinating up to the hilt, when 90, 95, and even 97 per cent. of the people were vaccinated. All this time there was this sad increase in the deaths from smallpox in epidemic after epidemic. What is the answer to these figures, coupled with the fact that for years everybody has been vaccinated? Mr. Ernest Hart has just published a pamphlet, in which he says,—"The number of attacks of persons efficiently vaccinated and successfully re-vaccinated is extremely small." And the Local Government Board declares that "no case of smallpox has come within the cognizance of the medical superintendents of any person who has been efficiently vaccinated and successfully re-vaccinated" (Hear, hear); which is only another way of saying that if they have the small-pox, vaccination has not been satisfactorily or efficiently done, and that really is the only test these medical men vouchsafe to us. I was astonished to hear my hon. friend speak as if the value of vaccination was beyond all question, and had been proved an almost absolute protection against smallpox. Why, my hon. friend himself, in the letter I have just quoted, said,—"The recurrence, therefore, in the latest period of a mortality almost as high as that experienced prior to the Vaccination Act, shows either that the protective virtues of vaccination are mythical, or that there is something radically wrong in our national system of vaccination." Just so! My hon. friend, like all the rest of the world, cannot believe that vaccination is a myth, and so he takes us as a remedy to lymph, fresh and pure from the cow. (Laughter.)
very lightly. I should have had it very badly if I had not been." Presently he said, — "You remember so-and-so. Well, he had smallpox frightfully. They thought he must have died." "Good Heavens," I said, "Why had not he been vaccinated?" Well, he said, he had been vaccinated, and he had been vaccinated, and he had been vaccinated, but for that." (Laughter.) Mr. James Ashbury, a late member of this house, and who represented me, in fact, for I was one of his constituents at Brighton, told his constituents that such was his faith in vaccination, that he had already been vaccinated twice, and meant to be punctured again. The hon. and learned gentleman, the member for East Surrey (Mr. Grantham) also told his constituents he was a living illustration of the benefits of vaccination, because, having been vaccinated, he took the small-pox afterwards, and did not die. (Laughter.) So much for the certainty of the protection afforded by vaccination from small-pox, But now, supposing that vaccination instead of being a protection, actually inoculated with all small-pox. I must say it is a very difficult matter to say what may be, in any theory at all in connection with vaccination, I take it that small-pox and cow-pox are diseases of a similar type, and that if a man takes the milder disease of the same type it will protect him at slight inconvenience from the more dangerous form of the disease. Therefore, when the theory of the bad lymph began to be prevalent, it was thought desirable that fresh lymph should be obtained, and prepared from a cow inoculated with small-pox. Accordingly Mr. Badoeck inoculated cows with small-pox, vaccinated more than 14,000 persons from the lymph so obtained, and had supplied more than 400 doctors. He says, "I had by careful and repeated experiments produced, by the inoculation of the cow with small-pox, a benign lymph of a non-infectious and highly protective character." A benign lymph! One is inclined to rush off and be vaccinated on the spot. (Laughter.) "The experiments of which this was the result, were conducted by me during eighteen years with the most exact care, at a great sacrifice of time and money, and with important results. My lymph has now been in use at Brighton for forty years, and is at the present time the principal stock of lymph employed there, being that exclusively used by the public vaccinators." Well now, what does my hon. friend say to Mr. Badoeck, and his spreading throughout the country this benign lymph? What he says is this. With unwonted severity he writes to the Times: — "Now what I want to know is what has become of this lymph? My reason for asking the question is that more recent and searching experiment has demonstrated that it is not vaccine lymph at all, but small-pox lymph, capable of being inoculated apparently with greater safety to the individual than ordinary small-pox, but, like the mildest inoculated small-pox, capable of propagating that disease in its most virulent form by infection." (Cheers.) The members of the Galway Board of Guardians were so much impressed with this "haunting" of vaccine lymph known as the Rivalta series, known as the Rivalta series, known as the Rivalta series, which occurred in May and June, 1861, with these words:—
Among the thirty-nine infected from Chisbrea was Louisa Manzone (the second vaccinator of the series). She was aged six months. On the tenth day, again, she was used for the vaccination of seventeen other children, of whom seven became affected with syphilis, suffering in the same manner as the thirty-nine infected from Chisbrea. Two months afterwards she was taken to Acque, and seen by Dr. Sylventi, who recognised upon her a syphilitic eruption, with mucous tubercles about the arms and vulva, mucous patches on the commissures of the lips, and indolent glandular enlargements, the primary affection at the seat of the vesicles not even being healed. The child died in September. The nurse who sucked her got ulcers on the breast, and from the various other children who were syphilitised the disease spread by contagion to eighteen mothers and nurses, and to three other children." (Sensation.) This is only one of several similar outbreaks quoted by Dr. Ballard. And this was all kept a secret! Not a word of it is known for the two years. (Cheers.) I am not going to assert that vaccination can or does endanger the health of the infant population by introducing various other diseases; but this I will say, that it is at any rate a fact that contemporaneously with the increase of vaccination these diseases have greatly increased among the infant population. Many years ago, M. Ricord, the famous French surgeon, said—"The obvious fact is, that if ever the transmission of disease with vaccine lymph is clearly demonstrated, vaccination must be altogether discarded." I do not venture to go so far as that, but I do say that it is a disgrace to attempt in face of these facts to continue compulsory vaccination. (Cheers.) But what do the medical profession themselves say to all this? The medical profession in this country are, I am convinced, much less univerally favourable to vaccination than would appear upon the surface. I can tell the House that there are many medical men who are at least very doubtful about it, but who do not care to offend their popular and to incur odium by venturing to say anything against it. I am not going to measure heads against heads all over the world. It is enough to know that there is a considerable portion of them who think it both useless and dangerous. If I can show that, I say that compulsory vaccination is an iniquity. I will give the House just the view shortly of four or five doctors in different countries. The late Dr. Schiefferdecker, of New York, in a monograph which he prepared upon the subject of vaccination, in which Dr. Wm. H. Weaver perfectly coincides. Those results were—"1. That it is not true that vaccination is a preventive of small-pox. 2. That cow-pox virus is as decided a poison as that taken from the small-pox patient. 3. That vaccination propagates a variety of other diseases more fatal than small-pox, such as scarlet fever, croup, typhoid fever, scrofula, consumption, syphilis, cancer, tuberculous formations, diphtheria, etc. The well-known Herr Kolb, of Munich, says about vaccination: "The inoculation of cow-pox, he absolutely objects to. What will he say when I assert—and it is maintained by good authority
that there is no such thing known as spontaneous cow-pox in the cow. It is absolutely certain that Jenner said, and always believed, that cows were inoculated from a diseased horse. But spontaneous cow-pox? There is no such thing. Did he see a letter from the trout fishers in counties bordering the Thames, the Daily News the other day? There are sometimes little bits of news coming in from foreign sources which we should never get if the things occurred at home. In the Daily News for May 25 there is this paragraph: "In the Voltaire a Dr. Bremond takes credit for being the first to announce that there is now in Paris a diseased horse from whose leg may be taken pus just as efficacious for vaccinatory purposes as the lymph habitually used. This discovery is a mare's nest. No scientific fact is more certain than that Jenner's cows, who accidentally vaccinated milk-nurses, themselves caught a disease from rugged horseboy's hands after they had stroked down greasy-heeled horses. There is not to be found in the whole world a cow with natural cow-pox." Who then is this pure lymph to be got? Not from the small-pox; not from natural cow-pox, for there is no such thing known. If my hon. friend asks any veterinary surgeon he will tell him so. It is obtained where it is obtained now in Paris and in Bavaria, where there is so much talk now of re-vaccination and pure lymph. "The owners of heifers in Paris, who make a rich harvest by advertising vaccination direct from the cow, blink the fact that their beasts are all vaccinated from the more or less wholesome arms of children." (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Dr. Cameron—Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain that there are an immense number of cases, thoroughly well authenticated, of spontaneous cow-pox recorded in, amongst other places, the Manual of Vaccination.

Mr. Taylor—Well, I will refer my hon. friend upon that point to his great prophet, Dr. Jenner, who distinctly asserts in his Inquiry, "that the pustulous sores which frequently appear on the nipples of the cows" are different in nature from "the pustule or eruption which constitutes the true cow-pox." Well, now, what does the Lancet say in respect to the safety of animal lymph? Writing on June 22, 1876, it says: "The notion that animal lymph would be free from chances of syphilitic contamination is so fallacious, that we are surprised to see Dr. Martin, of Boston, U.S., the great advocate of calf lymph, "reproduce it." And Dr. Sexton, who is a great authority, what does he say of my hon. friend's specific?—"The difficulties of carrying such a plan to the vaccination of the general population are I apprehend quite insuperable." He says of its results also, "So far from being likely to produce fewer ailments and cutaneous eruptions in the predisposed, Mr. Geely"—and there is no one who has nearly the knowledge that he possesses of the disease in the cow and of its transplantation to the human species—"says he knows from his experience that it would produce more." (Hear, hear.) But let us come from theory to practice. Here is an abstract of the petition of Dr. Gutz and a bill to the Diet of the German Empire. He says—"Above all, the dire fatality which lately occurred at Lebus, a suburb of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, would alone warrant the abolition of the vaccination laws. Eighteen school girls, averaging 13 years of age, were re-vaccinated, and thereby syphilised, and some of them died. . . . Yet the lymph, the syphilitic lymph, in this case was obtained from the Royal Establishment for the new 'regenerated' or 'animalised' vaccine lymph, so warmly recommended for the re-vaccination of schools." I will trouble the House with but one more extract. The Gazette d'Italia (21st May, 1879) describes a sad occurrence in Castiglione d'Oria, in the province of Siena. A vaccination committee established by the Prefecture in Rome sent to the above-named parish virus for the impending vaccination on April 26th. Some well-known physicians who vaccinated the children. After the time of inoculation, it was discovered that in all those houses a terrible poison had been disseminated, and had caused most sad results in the shape of pustules and ulcers upon the bodies of the children. After a few days, the grand-daughter of the Syndic, Irma Petessi, fell a sacrifice to the disease thus caused by vaccination. The physicians immediately carried their report to the magistrates; on the 11th inst., the tribunal of Montepulciano ordered an inquiry to be instituted, as also an examination of the body of the dead child. It was found that of the 88 vaccinated, 29 were infected similarly. It was supposed that the cow was diseased from which the virus was obtained. Now, sir, I protest against the House passing a compulsory law that children, willy-nilly, are to be vaccinated from cows, wholesome or diseased as the case may be, and I somewhat confidently assert that after the facts and statements I have brought forward, I have come to a very mild conclusion in the amendment that I have now to propose, the purpose of which is "That in the present unsettled condition of medical opinion in regard to the safety of using ordinary humanised lymph, as also of the safety, effectiveness, and practicability of the use of animal vaccine, it is in the opinion of this House inexpedient and unjust to enforce vaccination under penalties upon those who regard it as undesirable or dangerous." I say, sir, that is a mild conclusion, and that I might have gone further, and have asked the House to affirm that compulsory vaccination is a disgrace to our jurisprudence, and a shameful intrusion upon the rights of personal liberty. (Loud cheers.) Mr. C. H. Horwood, M.P. for Stockport, expressed his entire approval of this amendment. He condemned the prosecutions which had been carried on in the supposed interests of society. Fathers had been sent to prison because they would not imperil the health and lives of their children, and fines had been imposed with a vindictiveness discreditale to those who administered the law. In 1878 a committee sat upon this question, owing to the dissatisfaction that the law excited, and the whole 17 members unanimously recommended that a single fine should be imposed; and a bill with that provision passed through the House, and went up
to the other House the day before the dissolution, where sixteen or seventeen noble peers by 8 votes to 8, or 9 to 8, decided against what the House of Commons thought best for the interests of the people. Almost every year since they had besought Parliament to remove the grinding oppression, but nothing had been done. In Germany where all were punctiliously vaccinated and re-vaccinated, they were continually bothered with outbreaks of small-pox, and at last they were being driven to the conclusion that the more vaccination the more small-pox.

Dr. Robert Farquharson, M.P. for West Aberdeenshire, considered that Dr. Cameron’s proposal would sweep away the only valid argument against vaccination. During the prevalence of a small-pox epidemic very few cases were admitted to the London hospitals where the vaccination had been efficient; while in no case had any nurse efficiently vaccinated and re-vaccinated been affected by the disease in the discharge of her duties.

Mr. R. Samuelson, M.P. for Banbury, thought that those who had listened to the four speakers who had addressed the House would agree with him that that was a question on which the House was not likely to come to a satisfactory conclusion. The House was not a tribunal fitted to judge between the opposite views which had been advanced that night in reference to the value and efficacy of vaccination as a prophylactic against small-pox. No arguments which could be adduced would be able to convince those people who believed that they had suffered from the method of vaccination in use.

He had himself placed on the notice-paper an amendment in favour of the institution of an inquiry into the whole subject by a Royal Commission; and since he had done so he had received numerous letters from various parts of the country, all complaining of the vexatious and oppressive way in which prosecutions were carried on under the Vaccination Act. An antipathy to vaccination had sprung up in the country, the extent of which he thought the House was scarcely aware of. Prosecutions had occurred in almost every part of the country. This was a question for inquiry. If he were told there was an inquiry in 1871, and that the inquiry resulted in the law under which we now live, his answer would be that the law was the result of a very narrow majority in the House of Lords; and, further, that fresh evidence had accumulated since that time, which, if it had been known, would probably have prevented the passing of such a law.

Earl Percy, M.P. for North Northumberland, said, he hoped the Government would give a definite answer to the question raised by Dr. Cameron, for some few years ago he had raised the same question. With regard to compulsory vaccination, certainly the House would not, without sufficient and full inquiry, attempt to abolish it. Whether compulsory vaccination should be abolished he would not say. He should be the last person to lift his voice in opposition to an inquiry; but whether compulsory vaccination was expedient or inexpedient had nothing to do with the question. Would the people, if they had the opportunity of obtaining vaccine matter direct from the cow avail themselves of it? Of late there had been proof that not a few persons would take advantage of vaccination from the calf. It might be impossible to convince men who had a strong objection to vaccination to adopt such a system; but those who would not run the risk of opposing the present law, and yet felt that they were not right in exposing their children to the dangers of vaccination from the human being, would, no doubt, avail themselves of the plan proposed by Dr. Cameron.

Mr. Mitchell Henry, M.P. for County Galway (formerly a London surgeon), while admitting that there was prima facie a case against vaccination, thought that if hon. members would look back to the beginning of the century, when many persons lost their eyesight, not to speak of their lives, owing to the terrible scourge of small-pox, they would scarcely be disposed to regard the subject in the spirit in which it seemed to have been approached by Mr. Taylor, the hon. member for Leicester. The cases in which that scourge had become epidemic showed, he contended, a lamentable failure in the manner in which vaccination had been carried out, and he challenged his hon. friend, Mr. Taylor, to instance the case of one medical man of eminence in any country who was an anti-vaccinator. Where vaccination failed it was generally through the fault of the one who, and in small-pox hospitals no nurses were attacked by the complaint unless they had been imperfectly vaccinated. It was possible by careless vaccination that great evils might be produced upon particular individuals; but this was not an argument for doing away with vaccination. It was an argument for taking care that vaccination was carefully performed. This was the very ground why successive Governments were to be blamed for the stingy manner in which they had conducted the vaccine establishment in this country. One child might be the means of disseminating disease among a community. We made vaccination compulsory on the same principle on which we prevented persons polluting streams from which drinking water was taken. Tyranny of that kind was the basis of civilisation. The individual must sacrifice his own prepossessions in favour of what the law had decided, on careful investigation, to be for the good of the public.

Mr. Dodson, M.P. for Chester, President of the Local Government Board, said that different sections to the existing system had been prominently put forward, and it was an advantage that an established system should from time to time be put upon its trial. It was said that Sir Robert Peel opposed vaccination, but that was a long time ago, and it did not follow he would have opposed it now. He was not at all in favour of compulsion of the individual, and before compulsion was resorted to a preponderating and overwhelming case must be made out in the interest of those who had opposed it. In regard to vaccination, he must say he did not think its opponents had made out such a case as would justify the House in overthrowing the present
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system. His hon. friend, Mr. Taylor, the member for Leicester, seemed to think that the law of compulsion applied only to one class of the community; but the law was the same for all classes. Whoever omitted to have his child vaccinated was liable to the same penalty as the humblest individual. His hon. friend had quoted statistics, but statistics might be quoted one way or another. He referred to the epidemic in London a few years ago as showing that vaccination was ineffectual as a preventive of small-pox; but the annual average small-pox death-rate before vaccination was introduced was more than threefold the death-rate during that epidemic. The estimated small-pox death-rate last century was 8,000 per million of the population. The death-rate during that epidemic was only 998 per million. He thought the utmost that the member for Leicester had proved in his speech was that bad or careless vaccination might do a great deal of harm; but he did not believe that he proved that proper vaccination was conducive to harm. Dr. Cameron spoke strongly in favour of animal lymph, but he did not quite know whether he wished that the Vaccine Department should supply such lymph to all comers. It would be perfectly impossible to supply an unlimited amount for the three-quarters of a million vaccinations which occur annually. The Department had not been negligent on this question of vaccination from animal lymph. At first there were objections, but he believed more recent experience had removed to a great extent some of the objections. That being so, there was no wish on the part of the Department to be in any way a bar to experiments or to a practice which should conducive to the safety and health of the community. Therefore, he was prepared to say, on behalf of the Department, that they should make arrangements by which animal lymph might be supplied to stock to medical practitioners who might desire it; but the Department were determined to make sure that the origin of the lymph before they ventured to issue it. Referring to the criticism that had been passed on the Vaccine Department, he could assure the House that the greatest care was exercised to supply only the purest lymph. It was obtained from trusty vaccinators, and microscopically examined, in order to make sure that no blood was mixed with it. The source from which the lymph was taken was recorded, as was also its destination, and therefore, if any irregularity were discovered, it could be traced to its origin. He was not prepared to agree either to the resolution which had been proposed or to the amendment placed upon the paper. The Committee of 1871 had recommended the abolition of the multiple penalties, and that was a change which he was ready to submit to the approval of the House. The Bills introduced in 1872 or 1873 for the purpose of effecting such an alteration in the existing law had passed through the House of Commons, and only suffered rejection in the House of Lords. The House of Commons hoped the House would approve the proposal of the Government—namely, the abolition of the multiple penalties, and the provision of facilities by which medical men would be able to obtain from the Vaccine Department a stock of animal lymph as well as humanised lymph. He hoped the movers of the resolutions would consent to withdraw them, and, if not, that the House would support the Government in resisting their adoption.

Mr. Sclatrer-Booth, M.P. for North Hants, and President of Local Government Board in the late Administration, said he had listened with great satisfaction to the statement of the right hon. gentleman, who had dealt with the subject in the way in which it ought to be treated. If Dr. Cameron was equally satisfied with that statement, he could only say that he would be willing to take something less than that with which he seemed disposed to be contented in the last Parliament. No Government, he might add, could for a moment consent to anything so revolutionary as the proposal of Mr. Taylor, while with the intention expressed by his right hon. friend to abolish multiple penalties he entirely concurred. An Act of Parliament, however, would be necessary for the purpose.

Lord R. Churchill, M.P. for Woodstock, inquired whether it was really the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to abolish repeated penalties for non-vaccination.

Mr. Otway, M.P. for Rochester, inquired why a return which had been prepared on the subject of vaccination more than a year ago was not forthcoming. He believed it would have thrown valuable light on the application of the law, which was not the same in the case of the poor and the rich. That a large number of people in this country should be opposed to vaccination to the extent ofsubjecting themselves to pains and penalties was a very serious state of things.

Mr. Hibbert, M.P. for Oldham, Secretary of the Local Government Board, promised that the return should be presented to the House as soon as possible. The lymph would be supplied to public vaccinators and private practitioners in the same way as it was at present. His right hon. friend, Mr. Dodson, intended to introduce a Bill to abolish multiple penalties, which he hoped would be passed this Session.

Mr. A. M'Anyrn, M.P. for Leicester, said he did not intend, at that late hour, to detain the House many minutes, but he wished to express the pleasure it afforded him to hear the announcement that the Government were prepared to recommend the abolition of cumulative or successive penalties. That would be a great relief to many. He was not able to go quite so far as his hon. friend and colleague, and to vote for the discontinuance of compulsory vaccination without further information, and he could not believe that an overwhelming majority of medical men were in league to injure the health of the community. But whether the opponents of compulsory vaccination were right or wrong, it was impossible not to sympathise with those who regarded themselves as persecuted for conscience sake, and those who were so strong against vaccination that they suffered repeated fines and imprisonments sooner than subject their children to an operation which
they believed to be not only unnecessary, but highly dangerous and dangerous. He showed in the speech expressed by Mr. Cocks that the Government did not rely on a similar manner, and that the Board considered themselves as the people. He believed it would be a great advantage to have a committee that would examine witnesses and take evidence in both cases of the question. He thought that an examination should be made by a committee to be the people's best interest. Under any circumstances, he would not oppose the measures of Dr. Cameron, because it was not compulsory, and gave a chance to those who were opposed in vaccination.

Dr. Cameron expressed his willingness to withdraw the resolution. The amendment was then proposed without a division.

Mr. F. A. Taylor in the second reading of the Vaccination Acts Amendment Bill. He said:

"That in the opinion of this House, the resolution of the question can be satisfactorily which does not abolish Compulsory Vaccination."
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terrible disease." Even Dr. Cameron in a recent letter to the Times admitted the recurrence of a mortality almost as high as that experienced prior to the Vaccination Act, showing that "either the protective virtues of Vaccination are mythical, or that there is something radically wrong in our national system of Vaccination." Again, what can we think when the old and exploded pretence is put forward that Vaccination is likely to exterminate small-pox? Dr. Ballard, a Fellow of the petitioning College, a Medical Inspector of the Local Government Board, and a recognised authority among vaccinators, explicitly renounced the assumption so far back as 1868 in these words—

"Four years after the time when Dr. Jenner made the announcement of the protective power of the vaccine disease to the world he thus expressed himself—

"'It now becomes too manifest to admit of controversy that the annihilation of small-pox, the most dreadful scourge of the human species, must be the final result of this practice.'

"Dr. Jenner's sanguine hope has not been fulfilled. Experience has not verified his prediction. Small-pox has not been eradicated. Let me add that scientific observation and reasoning give no countenance to the belief that it ever will be eradicated, even from civilised communities."

It is in presence of facts like these that we are compelled to suspect that only on the reckoning of popular ignorance with readiness to listen and believe, statements are hazarded which no well-informed physician seriously believes. In the long run such duplicity must have its Nemesis, but in the meanwhile, if "vaccination be preserved from reproach," and anti-vaccinators continue to be discredited and harried, the future may be left to answer for itself.

Incited by their medical officers, a deputation from the metropolitan unions and parishes waited upon the President of the Local Government Board on 6th July, Sir Rutherford Alcock lending himself as spokesman for Bumbledon on the occasion. They had come, they said, to express the alarm wherewith they were affected by the proposed immunity from vaccination on payment of limited penalties. Mr. Dodson begged them to calm their fears. The Government had no wish whatever to diminish vaccination, but the contrary. There were a number of people persuaded that vaccination was not only no defence against small-pox, but in itself injurious, and would not consent on any terms to vaccinate their children. They were fined over and over again, but their fines were paid, sometimes by friends, sometimes by societies. They thereby achieved notoriety, excited sympathy, and discredited vaccination. It was the opinion of the Government that a limit should be set to such prosecutions whilst a penalty was inflicted that would at the same time check wanton resistance and reckless neglect. It was not a question of principle, but of expediency. Sir Rutherford Alcock suggested whether imprisonment might not be resorted to where fines were of no effect. Dr. Brewer thought the Government should not forget the rights of the unvaccinated children, nor the rights of the vaccinated, who might catch small-pox from the unhappy children who were left unprotected. It was an unfortunate observation. Mr. Dodson pointed out that such an argument had a dangerous turn, for if vaccination secured a child from small-pox, how could an unvaccinated child imperil that security? Their contention, Mr. Dodson went on to observe, led straight to absolute compulsion, and he was not prepared to say that a policeman should take a child from its mother's arms and hand it over to the doctor. "That's what we want done!" shrieked Bumble. "That's what we want done!" but Dr. Brewer discreetly interposed, "No, no; but the doctor might visit the child"; meaning, we suppose, that the policeman should stand outside until the doctor had exhausted his powers of persuasion within.

A deputation of this sort representing Ignorance prompted by Craft proves how thin is the varnish of English liberty, and how ready it is to crack off and reveal the natural brute without regard for any will save his own. Much of the freedom we enjoy is not the result of deliberate conviction, but of the play of rival forces; even as Belgium exists, not by grace of her neighbours, but by reason of their jealousy and animosities. It is evident that no abstract reverence for liberty preserves us from forcible vaccination and re-vaccination at the hands of the doctors. However amiable as individuals, in their corporate capacity they are as merciless and mercenary, as unscrupulous and untruthful as any priesthood with mysteries and fees annexed thereto.

Mr. Octavius E. Coope, M.P., speaking at Acton, on 7th July, observed, "I have always regarded Dr. Jenner as one of the greatest benefactors of mankind, but the Government now propose, by allowing a man to pay a pound, to spread small-pox over his neighbourhood."—We believe Mr. Coope is a brewer, but when he speaks he should try to keep his beer out of his brains.
THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XVII.

JENNER BEFORE PARLIAMENT, 1802.

Jenner was timid and indolent, and, though eager for reward, required much prompting to use the means to the end on which his heart was set. He wrote to Lord Sherborne to speak for him to Prime Minister Addington; but Sherborne replied, 23rd April, 1801, that he did not know Addington even by sight. He would however try to see Mr. Pitt, adding for encouragement and direction—

"If patriot Grattan gets £50,000 for his patriotism, the true patriot Jenner deserves more: I am sure not less; and less would be perfectly shabby to think of. I perfectly recollect Grattan’s business. It was settled among his friends to propose £100,000 for him, determining to ask enough; and fearing that sum would not be granted, one of his particular friends was to get up afterwards and propose £50,000, which was immediately granted, and he took £47,500 for prompt payment."

Action had to be taken, and on 9th December, 1801, Jenner went to London to prepare a petition to the House of Commons and to canvass for support. Even at the last moment, Wilberforce had to warn him, 24th Feb., 1802, that no time was to be lost, or he would lose his chance for the year. After prolonged consultation with those accustomed to such business, the petition was got ready, and on 17th March, 1802, it was presented to the House of Commons.

"The humble Petition of Edward Jenner, Doctor of Physic,"

"That your Petitioner having discovered that a disease which occasionally exists in a particular form among cattle, known by the name of the Cow-Pox, admires of being inoculated on the human frame with the most perfect ease and safety, and is attended with the singularly beneficial effect of rendering through life the persons so inoculated perfectly secure from the infection of small-pox."

"That your Petitioner after a most attentive and laborious investigation of the subject, setting aside considerations of private and personal advantage, and anxious to promote the safety and welfare of his Countrymen and of Mankind in general, did not wish to conceal the Discovery he so made of the mode of conducting this new species of Inoculation, but immediately disclosed the whole to the public; and by communication with medical men in all parts of this Kingdom, and in Foreign Countries, sedulously endeavoured to spread the knowledge of his discovery and the benefit of his labours as widely as possible."

"That in this latter respect the views and wishes of your Petitioner have been completely fulfilled; for to his high gratification he has to say that this Inoculation is in practice throughout a great proportion of the civilized world, and has in particular been productive of great advantage to these Kingdoms, in consequence of its being introduced, under authority, into the Army and Navy."

"That the said Inoculation hath already checked the progress of the Small-Pox, and from its nature must finally annihilate that dreadful disorder."

"That the series of experiments by which this discovery was developed and completed have not only occupied a considerable portion of your Petitioner’s life, and have not merely been a cause of great expense and anxiety to him, but have so interrupted him in the ordinary exercise of his profession as materially to abridge its pecuniary advantages without their being counter balanced by those derived from the new practice."

"Your Petitioner, therefore, with the full persuasion that he shall meet with that attention and indulgence of which this Honourable House may deem him worthy, humbly prays this Honourable House to take the premises into consideration, and to grant him such remuneration as to their wisdom shall seem meet."

What first strikes a reader of this Petition is the silence about Horse-Grease, Jenner’s peculiar claim, and his remorseless appropriation of the labours of Pearson and others in diffusing the knowledge of the New Inoculation and converting it to working practice. If even we allowed that Cow-Pox was a preventive of Small-Pox, we should still have to say that Jenner’s personal claims were grossly exaggerated.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Addington (afterwards Viscount Sidmouth), informed the House that he had taken the King’s pleasure on the contents of the petition, and that his Majesty recommended it strongly to the consideration of Parliament. It was referred to a committee of which Admiral Berkeley, a zealous believer in Jenner, was appointed chairman. The points to which the committee chiefly directed their inquiries were—

I.—The utility of the discovery itself.

II.—The right of the petitioner to the discovery.

III.—The sacrifices of the petitioner in making the discovery.

As an investigation the work of the Committee was illusory. The points were decided in the petitioner’s favour from the outset. There was no devil’s advocate. Dr. Moseley, Mr. Birch, and Dr. Rowley, who became Jenner’s active antagonists, were summoned, but the matter was new to them: they had not had time to collect evidence and formulate conclusions: a remedy
that was to protect for a lifetime and to annihilate small-pox, announced in 1796, was to be advocated or in 1802? On the other hand, Jenner's friends were influential and active, and used the opportunity to parade their whole strength in his favour. The medical testimony especially was unreserved and enthusiastic.

Dr. James Steere, president of the London Medical Society, laid before the committee a unanimous resolution of the Society in Jenner's favour. He said he was at first adverse to Vaccine Inoculation, but his confidence in it was now increasing every hour. It introduced no other disease to the human frame, whilst it made an end of the possibility of small-pox, a disease that proved fatal to one in six of those it attacked. He had never even heard of Cow-Pox before the publication of the Inquiry, and regarded the discovery therein communicated as the most useful ever made in medicine. If Jenner had kept and traded on his secret, he might have become the richest man in these kingdoms.

Sir Gilbert Blane related how the New Inoculation had been introduced to the Navy. He had had the men on board the Kent, man-of-war, inoculated with cow-pox, and then with small-pox, and not one took the latter disease. Of every 1000 deaths in the country, small-pox was accountable for 95. Taking London as the standard, 45,000 must perish annually from small-pox in the United Kingdom. As soon as the remedy discovered by Jenner became universal that large mortality would cease.

Dr. Lettsom, a popular physician, a member of the Society of Friends, and a hearty supporter of Jenner, said he had paid much attention to small-pox statistics. Taking London and the out-parishes as containing nearly 1,000,000 inhabitants, he calculated that eight a day, or 8000 annually died of small-pox. Allowing Great Britain and Ireland to have a population of 12,000,000, that would give a mortality of not less than 86,000 per annum from small-pox. He had reason to conclude that about 60,000 persons had undergone the New Inoculation up to date. He did not think that the genuine cow-pox when inoculated could ever prove fatal. Had Jenner kept his remedy secret he might have derived immense pecuniary profits from it, as did the Suttons by their improved practice of variolous inoculation.

Asked whether he had known any inoculated with small-pox subsequently contract small-pox, he replied that he had two relatives inoculated, who afterwards had small-pox, and one of them died. He had recently attended two families, in each of which a child inoculated was laid up a year after the operation with small-pox.

Dr. Woodville, forgiving Jenner's evil treatment, came, like a good Friend, to bear witness to his confidence in the new practice. He had learnt to prefer vaccine to variolous inoculation at the Hospital. He had, up to January, 1802, operated with cow-pox on 7,500 patients. About half of them had been subjected to the variolous test with satisfactory results.

Dr. Bradley, physician to the Westminster Hospital, said he looked on Jenner as the author of Vaccine Inoculation, and believed no medical man doubted it. As accidental inoculation with cow-pox was proved to keep off small-pox for life, it was matter of course that intentional inoculation would do so also. Not less than 2,000,000 of persons had received vaccine inoculation, and he had never known an instance of any one dying of it. One in 800 died of small-pox inoculation in England, and not less than 1 in 150 throughout the rest of Europe, Asia, Africa and America. Had Jenner settled in London he might have made £10,000 per annum for the first five years, and double that sum afterwards.

Sir Walter Farquhar, physician to the Prince of Wales, had told Jenner that if he had come to London and kept his secret, he would have ensured him £10,000 a year. He had however divulged his secret and lost all chance of emolument. His remedy was a permanent security against small-pox, and had never proved fatal; whilst variolous inoculation, performed in the best manner, cost one life in three hundred.

Mr. Clink, surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital, corroborated the opinion that Jenner could have earned £10,000 a year in London by means of his secret. As small-pox was the most destructive of all diseases, its suppression was the greatest discovery ever made in the practice of physic.

Mr. John Griffiths, surgeon to the Queen's Household and St. George's Hospital, had inoculated upwards of 1500 persons with cow-pox without any untoward symptoms.

Mr. James Simpson, surgeon to the Surrey Dispensary, had inoculated between 50 and 60 without any injury. Considered them perfectly secure from small-pox. A child of nine months covered with crusta lactea resisted all the usual remedies, but on the tenth day after he had inoculated it with cow-pox, the crust began to disappear, and on the twelfth day was entirely gone.
Dr. Joseph Marshall related his experience as a vaccine inoculator in the Navy and at Gibraltar, Malta, Palermo, Naples, Rome and Genoa. Everywhere was successful. Believed he had operated on 10,000, and never witnessed any ill consequences whatever. On the contrary, children in a weak state of health, after passing through the vaccine infection, began to thrive and become vigorous.

Mr. John Addington, surgeon, had used Jenner's remedy since 1790 in 81 cases. One third of these he had inoculated with small-pox, and subjected to every method of infection he could devise, but found them perfectly proof against the disease.

Dr. Saxby, physician to the Worcester Hospital, testified that in the spring of 1801 small-pox was epidemic in Worcester. He inoculated a number of children with cow-pox, and none of them took small-pox although constantly exposed to contagion.

Dr. Thornton, physician to the Marylebone Dispensary, had inoculated a patient with cow-pox, and afterwards with small-pox at twelve different times during the past three years without effect. He had even slept with a person in natural small-pox, who died, but took no harm. When at Lord Lonsdale's in the North he had operated on upwards of 1000, and had completely satisfied himself, and all the medical practitioners in that part of England, that cow-pox was a mild disease, hardly deserving the name of a disease. It was not contagious; it never disfigured the person, never produced blindness, nor excited other diseases. It was equally safe whether during the period of pregnancy, or the earliest infancy, or extreme old age.

Dr. BAILLIE thus gave his influential judgment—"I think cow-pox an extremely mild disease, and when a patient has properly undergone it, he is perfectly secure from the future infection of small-pox: and further, if Dr. Jenner had not chosen openly and honourably to explain to the public all he knew upon the subject, he might have acquired a considerable fortune. In my opinion it is the most important discovery ever made in medicine."

Mr. David Taylor, surgeon of Wootton-under-Edge, had inoculated about 2000 persons with cow-pox without a single failure, nor had he met with any ulcerations, tumours, or other diseases following the operation. He knew Jenner's practice in Gloucestershire. It was in a very populous neighbourhood where there was not another physician within sixteen miles. He had surrendered an income of £500 a year to devote himself to the public service.

As a final specimen of this medical evidence we may cite, Mr. John Bino, the petitioner's valiant henchman—He considered Jenner the author of Vaccine Inoculation, a discovery the most valuable and important ever made by man. It was a perfect and permanent security against small-pox. He had himself inoculated about 1200, of whom 1000 had exposed themselves to small-pox infection with impunity. There was no danger whatever from the New Inoculation unless from ignorance and neglect. One in every 100 inoculated with small-pox in London died, owing to the unwholesome atmosphere and the necessity of operating on children at an improper age. If Jenner had kept his discovery to himself he might have made £10,000 a year by it; for others had got as much or more by the practice of physic.

This evidence may be thought tedious, but better than any secondary description it will enable the reader to appreciate the furor of the time as it affected the leaders of the medical world. The social influence brought to bear in favour of Jenner was scarcely less distinguished.

The Duke of Clarence testified that he had availed himself of Jenner's discovery from the outset. His children, his household and farm servants were all protected. A postillion positively refused to be operated on, and eighteen months after he caught small-pox in the most virulent form. Children who had undergone cow-pox were constantly in the room where the lad lay and suffered no harm.

The Earl of Berkeley had his son inoculated with cow-pox by Dr. Jenner at the age of six months. One of his maid-servants took small-pox and died, and the effluvia during her illness was so offensive that his servants had to move to another part of the house. To test the reality of his son's protection, he sent for Jenner, and got him to inoculate the boy with pox from the maid. The child was found to be proof, for the inoculation had no effect. To illustrate the validity of the Gloucestershire tradition, he related how a man of 72 in his service had caught cow-pox when a boy of 15 whilst milking, and in consequence always reckoned himself secure from small-pox, exposing himself to the disease with complete indifference.

Lord Rous gave similar evidence. His child had been inoculated with cow-pox at the age of three months, and he was perfectly satisfied that he could never have small-pox.

Then there were lay practitioners of whom
Jenner's nephew, the Rev. G. C. Jenner, may be taken as an example. He bore witness that he had inoculated 8000 with cow-pox without a single unfavourable case, from the earliest infancy to eighty years of age, and under circumstances in which it would not be prudent to use variolous virus; as, for example, children during teething and women in every stage of pregnancy. Upwards of 200 of his patients had been afterwards inoculated with active small-pox matter, and an equal number exposed to variolous effluvia, and in no instance did small-pox ensue. He was satisfied that as soon as the new practice became universal, small-pox would be annihilated.

An early date being wanted for "the discovery," Edward Gardner, wine and spirit merchant, was brought from Gloucester to affirm that he had known Jenner for more than twenty-two years, and had been in the constant habit of hearing his medical opinions and discoveries. It was in the month of May, 1780 that Jenner first informed him concerning the nature of cow-pox as a sure preventive of small-pox, and of the theory he had formed on the subject; declaring his full and perfect confidence that the virus might be continued in perpetuity from one human being to another until small-pox was extinguished.

It is needless to stigmatise Gardner's testimony afresh. It possibly had its foundation in Jenner discussing the familiar rural faith in Cow-pox. Sir Everard Home mentioned to the Committee that Jenner had brought a drawing to London in 1788 of Variola Vaccina as it appeared on the finger of a milkman, and had shown it to John Hunter, who advised him to look further into the matter; but it was not pretended that he spoke to Hunter of the matured conviction revealed to Gardner eight years before.

The Committee heard evidence as to the knowledge and use of cow-pox apart from Jenner, and their verdict was given as follows—

"The disorder itself, and its specific property of securing against small-pox infection, was not a discovery of Dr. Jenner's; for in various parts of England, in Gloucestershire and Devonshire particularly, there was an opinion of that sort current among the common people employed in dairies, which the observations of the incuba- tors for the small-pox tended to confirm. It appears not improbable that in some very rare instances this knowledge was carried one step farther, and that the Cow-Pox was communicated either by handling the teat, or by inoculation from the animal, for the purpose and with the intention of securing against the danger of Cow-Pox; but the practice of which Dr. Jenner asserts himself to be the original inventor is, the inoculation from one human being to another, and the mode of transferring indefinitely, the vaccine matter without any diminution of its specific power, to which it does not appear that any person has ever alleged a title."

Here the Committee disallowed Jenner's claim set forth in the Petition, that he discovered Cow-Pox Inoculation with its benefits, whilst indicating the true point of novelty, namely, the transfer from arm to arm of the virus. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that inoculation from arm to arm with "mild kinds of small-pox" was an existing practice, and therefore there was little merit to speak of in Jenner doing the same thing with cow-pox.

There was no devil's advocate, we said, but it may be held that Dr. Pearson assumed that office. He was heard with impatience, and afterwards delivered his mind in An Examination, to which we shall presently refer.

The Report to the House was brought up on the 2nd of June, 1802, and was conclusive as to the utility of the discovery. Indeed, the evidence on that head was only cut short because it threatened to be interminable. The judgment of the Committee reiterated the common enthusiasm—"As soon as the New Inoculation becomes universal, it must absolutely extinguish one of the most destructive disorders by which the human race has been visited."

Admiral Berkeley, chairman of the Committee, commended the Report to the House. He considered the discovery as unquestionably the greatest ever made for the preservation of the human species. It was proved that in the United Kingdom 45,000 perished annually from small-pox; but throughout the world what was the desolation! Not a second struck but a victim was sacrificed at the altar of that most horrible of diseases. He should therefore move that a sum of not less than £10,000 be granted to the Petitioner, but if the House thought fit to adopt any larger sum, he should hold himself free to vote for it. Why, Dr. Jenner's expenses in postage alone had been from 25s. to 30s. a day!

Sir Henry Mildmay did not think £10,000 at all adequate. Had Jenner kept his secret he might have made at least £100,000. He moved that he should have £20,000.

Mr. Windham said the Petitioner had surrendered his discovery to his country, and was therefore entitled to remuneration. The discovery had been the labour of years and the fruit of extensive practice.
Sir James Sinclair Erskine was assured that Dr. Jenner had expended £6000 in the propagation of his discovery, and if he had £10,000, he would be left with no more than £4000. Besides, he had given up a practice of £800 a year to benefit his fellow-creatures.

Mr. Courtney observed that the evidence showed that 40,000 men would be annually preserved to the State by the New Inoculation. These would return £200,000 a year to the Exchequer, and if the Petitioner had only a tithe of that sum for one year, he was entitled to £20,000.

Mr. Wilberforce stated that Dr. Jenner had spent upwards of twenty years in completing his discovery. He was no adventurer seeking to push himself before the world. He had already attained to great celebrity in his profession, and had sacrificed his practice for the public good. In every view he thought the larger sum ought to be granted.

Mr. Grey thought £10,000 would be no more than an indemnity for expenses. He hoped the House would vote for £20,000.

Mr. Banks said there was no question as to the utility of the discovery. If he felt more nigglishly than other members, it was because his paramount duty consisted in guarding the public purse. That purse was a large one, but it was not to be dipped into at pleasure. The strength of the country lay in economy and sound finances. He did not see that a case had been made out for so large a sum as £10,000. The discovery itself might be trusted to pay its author. He always looked on the Report of a Committee with jealousy, for it was controlled by the friends of the Petitioner, and there was no one with sufficient motive to provide the correctives required in the public interest.

Mr. Addington, Chancellor of the Exchequer, held that the value of the discovery was without example and beyond calculation. So much, indeed, was not contested. The Petitioner had received the highest reward in the approbation, the unanimous approbation, of the House; an approbation richly deserved, since it was the result of the greatest discovery since the creation of man. Whatever money the House might see fit to vote on some future occasion, his present duty was to recommend the smaller sum of £10,000. In doing so, he admitted, he surrendered his private inclination to his sense of public duty. He had, however, the satisfaction in knowing that this discussion had conferred on Dr. Jenner a reward that would endure for ever, whilst the comfort of his family would be amply ensured in the extension of practice that would follow the approbation of the House.

The question was then put that the words £10,000 do stand part of the resolution; when the Committee divided—Ayes 59, Noes 56, Majority 3.

The discussion in the House of Commons shows how deep and wide was the general craze. Facts and figures were evolved at discretion and repeated indiscriminately. To rave about Jenner, the saviour from small-pox, was the mode. It was as if the cry had gone forth, “Let’s all go mad together!” Mr. Dunning, a surgeon, otherwise rational, broke into prophetic fury—

“With pride, with just and national pride, we boast a Newton and a Harvey; posterity will boast a Jenner!”

Considering the value set on “the great discovery,” the award of £10,000 was not excessive. In the Medical Journal it stands recorded—

“...We have never witnessed a more unanimous and general disappointment than that which has been expressed, not only by the profession, but by the public at large, at the smallness of the remuneration.”

On the other hand, it was to be remembered that the times were dark and hard, cruelly hard, through war and scanty harvests; the quartern loaf selling at 1s. 11d., a significant index of the people’s misery.

Dr. Pearson speedily reviewed the operations of the House of Commons in the matter of Cow-Pox. He pointed out that Jenner had got his money for a claim different from the inadmissible one asserted in his Petition; and then proceeded to set forth how much the working practice of arm to arm inoculation owed to his own labours and those of Dr. Woodville. He had started from the Inquiry immediately after its publication in 1798, and, from the time of starting, he owed nothing to Jenner in the shape of assistance or advice. Cow-Pox Inoculation as exhibited in the Inquiry was in the most rudimentary condition—

“The whole of Jenner’s experience extended to seven or eight cases, and a part only of these, namely, four, were from human subject to human subject; and not until long after Dr. Woodville and myself had published several hundred instances of vaccine virus transmitted from arm to arm, had he any experiment to set alongside ours.”

They had to find out for themselves when to take virus from the cow, how to preserve it
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when taken, how to dress inoculated arms, when to take virus from the arm, and, in short, to do everything that constitutes the difference between a suggestion and an art. He allowed that but for the publication of the Inquiry in 1798, the profession might still have remained in ignorance of Vaccine Inoculation, but to that advertisement Jenner's merit was limited. The development and diffusion of the practice were due to other hands.

As to Jenner's keeping his secret and making a great fortune out of it, he replied, first, that he had not proved his remedy; second, that he would have had to persuade the public to believe in him; and, third, that too much was known about Cow-Pox in Jenner's country to have made a secret possible. Moreover, the talk about £10,000 a year and a fortune of £150,000 was absurd—

"Such a fortune no one ever acquired by physic in this or any other country—far exceeding the greatest ever known, those of Sir Theodore Mayerne in the first half of the 17th Century, and of the still greater one of Dr. Ratcliffe in the early part of last Century."

When it was farther said, that experiments in Vaccine Inoculation had occupied twenty years of Jenner's life, that they had cost him £6000, and that he had surrendered a practice of £600 a year in the populous neighbourhood of Berkeley for the public benefit—he would not trust himself to characterise the allegations.

Pearson's Examination is written with vigour and perspicacity; it abounds in curious details as to rural faith in Cow-Pox; and whilst exhibiting the detestation of an honest heart for imposture, is wholly free from malice. For himself he wanted nothing. He was willing that Jenner should be rewarded, but insisted that the reward be conceded in conformity with matter-of-fact. Where others had gone crazed, he preserved some degree of sanity, holding it premature to proclaim the extinction of Small-Pox, or to say with Jenner that assertions of disaster from inoculated Cow-Pox were beneath contempt.

It is said that in hurricanes of panic or enthusiasm, wise men go home and keep quiet until the sky clears, for resistance is folly. Pearson took little by his protest, and was set down as jealous and envious. Jenner attempted no reply, and assumed profound disdain. His silence was judicious, but it was not from disdain.

* When it was said that Jenner was the only physician within sixteen miles of populous Berkeley, it was meant that he was the only general practitioner thereabout who had thought it worth while to purchase M.D. from St. Andrews.

SMALL-POX MANUFACTORIES IN THE REIGN OF GEORGE III.

I subjoin a few extracts from a description of the prisons of England and Scotland, by Dr. Lettsom and Mr. Neild, seventy or eighty years ago, which will go far to explain the prevalence of zymotic disease among the vagabond portion of the population:—

Norwich Prison.—"Sewerage very offensive. Dead wells without drainage. I had to retreat one rainy morning from the jailor's parlour, the smell was so unendurably nauseous. These too often neglected matters are of the greatest consequence, and are principal ingredients of unhealthiness."

Monmouth Gaol.—"An offensive tub in one corner of the day-room, which was emptied once a quarter."

Aston Gaol (near Birmingham).—"Two dark, damp sleeping-rooms, down ten steps, through a trap door level with the court. Unfit for any human being."

Coventry Gaol.—"Descent of twelve steps into four damp and offensive dungeons, nine feet by six. Kettles of pitch and tar are burnt in them every other day; also fumigation with vinegar. A disgrace to the city. Debtors rooms fumigated with vinegar twice a week."

Our ancestors did not approve of the removal of the cause: they preferred to undergo "protection" against the effect.

We have a vivid description of the gaol of Bristol. It contained, as usual, a most offensive sewer:—

"In 1801, seventeen prisoners slept in the Pit, down 18 steps. The turnkey told me he was so affected by the putrid steam which issued from the dungeon when he unlocked the door in a morning, it was enough to strike him down. What must the miserable wretches suffer who are confined the whole night in such hotbeds of disease!"

Such is the remark of Mr. Neild; and Dr. Lettsom says, in 1807:—

"This is a noxious and filthy prison. A person issuing from these sources of contagion may enter on board a vessel, and, without apparent disease, may be so imbued with infection as to endanger the whole crew."

Cardigan, Dolgelly, Beaumaris.—"These prisons are in a filthy state."

Penwith.—"The stench of the privies and neighbouring horseyard affected the health."

Dunbar Prison.—"In the most filthy state imaginable."

Glasgow Tolbooth.—"Is offensive and filthy in the extreme. Intolerable stench from putrid fish offal among the loads of ashes. Cells so offensive that I wonder how any human being can live. The half-tubs are not removed till full."
Dr. Lettsom says:—

"It is too often the odour of stagnant water [sewage?] over which the prisoner reposes."

Craesiter.—The water supplied is filthy in the extreme. The horrid dungeon in which the felons sleep is 14 feet by 8, and the descent is 18 steps. Totally dark, and ventilated by a couple of one-inch pipes, lately increased by a couple of two-inch pipes. The mayor accompanied me to the bottom step, but the water prevented his going further."

Liverpool Borough Gaol.—"Filthy in the extreme. Large dunghill with poultry. Seven sleeping rooms, 8 feet square, to lodge three or four each, ventilated by a hole in the door."

This terrible treatment of prisoners was a remnant of medievalism. The Earl of Worcester was imprisoned in the Tower in 1650 and the small-pox was under the same roof. Biddle the Quaker died of the filth of a prison in hot weather (says Wood) in 1663. And half a century earlier Lord Bacon wrote—"The most pernicious infection, next to the plague, is the smell of the jail, where prisoners have been nastily kept."

Dr. Lettsom says:—

"It has often occasioned surprise to me that water should be an object of little or no attention with the public. Were the numerous sewers which are emptied into the Thames, and the matters with which other streams are impregnated, considered, most persons would feel disgusted, and desire to have this universal fluid rendered more healthy and palatable."

To this description of prison life let me add a picture of the lodging-houses for trampers, extracted from the report of the Commission of 1842.

Birmingham.—"The lodging-houses generally in a very filthy condition."

Barnet.—"Lodging-houses for trampers are a prolific source of disease."

Manchester.—"No description can convey an accurate idea of the abominable state of these dens of filth, disease, and wretchedness. Where cellars are used as lodging-houses, the back room is generally the sleeping apartment, and ventilation is impossible. The crowded beds are promiscuously filled, and the suffocating stench is almost intolerable."

Macclesfield.—"The lodging-houses are a fruitful source of fever."

Duham.—"Lodging-houses are a fruitful source of generating and propagating contagious diseases. The stench of excrementitious matter in the rooms being most revolting."

Dr. Heberden, in 1800, says:—

"The annual pestilential fever of Constantinople very much resembles that of our gaols and crowded hospitals."

Since the introduction of proper sewerage and ventilation our prisons have been relieved from epidemic visitations, not only of small-pox but of the allied zymotic spreading diseases. Formerly the gaol was often ravaged when the town was free; now the gaol is proverbially safe, even when the town is ravaged. Mr. Rawlinson says, "We have advanced so far in the road of national improvement as to have made zymotic disease in a prison impossible."

It is difficult to realise the amount of nuisance which the open-air life of our agricultural ancestors enabled them to endure—the dung-heap at almost every village door; the sewage percolating into nearly every well. When these farmyard habits of daily life were transplanted by the surplus population into the narrow lanes of the manufacturing towns the era of epidemics commenced, and the inadmissible "preservatives" were puffed in the press and sold in the streets, changing with fashion as our cow-lymph is changing into calf, each improvement being doubtless a "purer" form of imaginary protection than its predecessor and rival.

After perusing the above specimens of the habits and resorts of the lowest order of the proletarian of the eighteenth century, we are not surprised to read in the Gentleman's Magazine of 1804, that "it is the poor, wretched families that suffer most from small-pox."

Vaccination is not a disinfectant of sewer gas. And yet in the hottest times of furious vaccinating and inoculating philanthropy there have been medical men capable of forming reasonable views, and fearless of enunciating them. Thus, in 1808, Dr. Mitchell, of New York, wrote to Dr. Lettsom—

"Night soil nuisances have been collecting in our city ever since its first settlement. Fifty acres of artificial land have been made and built upon by filling up low grounds with these putrifying substances. These animal and vegetable remains have spoiled most of our wells, and deteriorated the rest. They are accumulating prodigiously on us, and no general or permanent plan of removal has been adopted. From this foul colulvises, increasing most rapidly from year to year, a world of febrile mischief may be expected. This year Fahrenheit has marked 82 to 94 degrees in the shade for weeks, and the contents of unalkalised British ships turn to pestilential air in our harbours, and excite yellow fever in the British seamen on board, when there is no such disease, nor anything like it, in the city."—H. D. Dudgeon.

The Hon. Auberon Herbert writes to Mr. Henry Pitman—"I am thoroughly opposed to compulsory vaccination."
THE GREATEST TRIUMPH OF SCIENCE.

That is one of the phrases used by its high priests in praise of vaccination. Yet the vehicle by which this “triumph of science” is to be perpetuated, is as little understood now as ever by its devout and believing operators. At no period has it been known what cow-pox matter is. Jenner at first thought it was horse greese exudation filtered through the cow; he afterwards thought both it and horse greese were small-pox on the animal. Both points were contested then—are contested now. Some like Mr. Fleming think the cow-pox a disease sui generis, and hotly contest Jenner’s definitions. Some think it is possible now to find “genuine cow-pox;” others seem in despair of meeting with a case. These are questions debated with the utmost gravity by learned physicians. From the smallest licensed apothecary up to Sir Thomas Watson, M.D., the profession is stirred upon this subject, and Why? The answer is one equally grave to the profession, and ridiculous to the outside and unprejudiced observer. The reason is, that no matter what kind, sort, or genus of cow-pox virus is used, the failures as regards the supposed protection from small-pox are too frequent to be overlooked by the most bigoted partizan, and cause the greatest concern.

It is true the priests of this superstition still swear by the same name, and perform the same rite as of yore; that in proportion as the rite fails they are mad with rage, as Baal’s prophets were, with those who mock their zeal and their performances; but the “failures multiply” now, as Dr. Baron records them to have done in 1804-6.

It never seems to occur to these foolish priests that they are working at a superstition, that there is no more common-sense in their doings than there was in the exercises of the prophets of Baal, or in a Zulu medicine man’s performances.

Dr. Cameron is one of the strong Jennerian phalanx, yet he is uneasy. He is a firm believer in the rite, but finds something wrong in the system, or the virtues “must be mythical.” “Forbid the latter thought!” says the prophet of vaccine. What then? The “lymp” must need renewing. And so he goes to Government begging them to renew it. But what is it to be renewed with? Dr. Cameron’s greatest distress is spent over the age and number of transmissions of the ordinary Jennerian virus. He is troubled at the “failures” he cannot be blind to, but puts them down to this cause. He becomes confident in proportion as the chances of a change are apparent: wastes his breath in predicting just as Edward Jenner did, a complete banishment of the small-pox, or, at any rate, a “reduction of the deaths to nil,” if the animal virus he favours is adopted. Government does. The animal virus is to be adopted, the fears from numerous transmissions are gone, and all is to work well.

But unfortunately Dr. Cameron is not the whole profession. The Lancet scores a “success” for Dr. Cameron and then proceeds to blow cold upon it. And the most curious thing is that the very danger Dr. Cameron wishes to avoid, viz., the risk of weakened virus from “long continued transmissions,” is the very one the Lancet most dreads. It says (19th June),

“It seems to us obviously undesirable that in commencing this great experiment (!) we should have to depend for its origination upon stocks of lymph derived either from the Continent or the United States, which have undergone more or less numerous transmissions from animal to animal.” Yet there is nothing in it. Dr. Martin tells us he offered a reward for years for a case of genuine cow-pox, and never found what he so earnestly sought. And so we are again paying much public money for a “great experiment!” For nearly eighty years we have been paying for this great experiment, and are no nearer certainty than ever, and that because the thing is a mere superstition.

All “lymp’s” result in failure, all methods are alike unsuccessful. The “failures multiply.” Yet instead of a fair acknowledgment of failure the quack resort is the only one permitted us. Try more of it—try another kind—try more punctures—try it twice—try it thrice—try it every ten years—try human—try animal;—and always pay for them, every one.

We confess to much disgust at the gullibility of the British Public. The day has come when the quackery of vaccine should be exposed by our Commonwealths; who ought to say to the priests of Jenner, “You are rich enough, and yet millions have been paid you for this nostrum, never to produce success. Go your own way. No more shall one penny of public money be allotted you by us. Spend over it out of your own pockets, or you shall not spend at all. The poor have been oppressed to help you, their children diseased, sometimes killed by the rite you have inflicted, fathers have been persecuted, treadmilled, ruined, hunted from one town to another, to satisfy you. Enough! Outraged justice would demand a remuneration. We merely bid you in the future to fare for yourselves.”

ALEXANDER WHEELER.

FASCINATION OF AUDACITY.—It is a noticeable truth that whereas the trained and logical intellect requires that the proof shall be always proportionate to the magnitude of the thing to be proved, there is a very large class of minds for which a dubious assertion has such a fascination, that if only the assertion be daring enough, no other proof is desired.—Dr. Littledale.

AMERICAN EVIDENCE.—Vaccination is a practice that causes a vast amount of disease and suffering. Its effects are far more terrible than the disease it is designed to prevent. No matter how pure the vaccine matter may appear to be, virus is left in it to be adopted, the fears from numerous transmissions are gone, and all is to work well. Were I to relate a few of the cases that have fallen under my observation of persons injured by this practice, it would fill the mind with horror.—J. R. Newton, M.D.
AGAINST COMPULSION.

Taken altogether, the Liberal majorities, it seems, are of a substantial character; in short, the constituencies have this year reversed the verdict of 1874, and wrested back a Liberal Government. But, after all, is Liberalism in 1890 a downright sham? Let us hope not. Yet a policy of freedom is not practised in the matter of vaccination, either by Radicals, Liberals, or Home Rulers. I find the majority of the new House of Commons, like the greater number of old J.P.’s, are as ready now as ever speculatively to accept “Truth about Vaccination,” for example, from the advocates of compulsion by fine or imprisonment. Alas! Vivisection, Dissection, Experiments, and their constant horrors are changing many amiable minds and feeling hearts into—something that I decline to characterise. Suppose an M.P. is taken suddenly ill in Westminster, does he not know that the treatment will get, when far removed from “our family doctor,” depends largely on some passing fashionable theory? The custom—inter alia—is, vaccinate, re-vaccinate, and stimulate! Within my own experience the orthodox formula has been variously expressed as “bleed,” “saltivate,” “purge,” “blister,” or burn some and scald others. Caprice, rather than enlightenment, has changed from active manifold poisons to bread pills and coloured water in the divers fallacies of the faculty. And all “by authority”! Is repentance at hand? It is now admitted by the upholders of medical despotism, that even compulsory vaccination is not a complete success, and that at home and abroad there has long been a reactionary sense of justice amongst very experienced medical practitioners; indeed, public vaccinators are honestly declaring that “pure lymph” itself has been grossly over-rated as a prophylactic of small-pox, and that it is often the means of doing incalculable wrong. Is compulsion justifiable in face of grave scientific doubts, and an enormous deficiency from the general and jubilant confidence in vaccination, which once, perhaps, persuaded the profession and the people? Let the Liberal M.P.’s fairly inquire. If they profit by the results of clinical studies, the result must shortly appear in “local option” to vaccinate or not, since there is no alternative but sincerity or sham. Jenner’s prophecy that small-pox must be truly annihilated by vaccination was inspired by a “lying spirit,” and the compulsory operation, whether for injecting animal or human virus into healthy blood, affords unanswerable evidence that variola is not to be controlled or prevented by vaccinia, nor is the general mortality in this way diminished. And what are the moral aspects of compulsion? Offer monthly sacrifices to Mammon, or some other god of expediency, and your child is virtually “free,” i.e., to remain unpolluted by the lancet of the vaccinator? This, in a word, is immorality, evil State Quackery, or compulsion for Mr. Lazarus, but not for Mr. Dagon. And who has still the hardihood to declare that excessive vaccination is capable of conferring an immunity from small-pox, either upon nations, cities, or individuals? or, who has decided the precise relations of nondescript vaccine virus to epidemic small-pox? No practical scientific vaccinator. The “truth about vaccination,” as recently acknowledged in the first Medical Assemblies of Europe, is this: “An operation hitherto thought absolutely incapable of exerting any injurious effect is often the means of conveying into the system the seeds of dangerous and intractable diseases.” Let Liberal M.P.’s fairly admit that the subject of compulsory vaccination now wears an entirely different aspect from that which it assumed only a few years ago, and at once repeal a penal law which enacts that every new born child, whatever may be the experience and observation of intelligent parents, shall be vaccinated with small-pox, cow-pox, horse-pox, or other virus, and that ugly crops of pustules shall no longer be generated, on pain of fine or imprisonment—even to maintain a fallacy of the faculty—or for the propagation, as science demonstrates, of periodical disease, by living or germinal matter, which, when introduced into the body, is nourished, and reproduced itself by the assimilation of a pubalum, pre-existing in the blood, from the cradle to the grave. It would certainly, in this place, be superfluous were I to reiterate in detail the overwhelming evidence which exists of the evils of compulsory vaccination, or of its utter inutility as a certain preventive of small-pox. I have submitted thousands of persons, during the past 40 years, to the touchstone of avoiding vaccination or revaccination, a crucial experiment tested over and over again, and no fatal case of small-pox has yet occurred, notwithstanding unvaccinated children have sucked the maternal nipple, around which the skin was thickly studded with confluent small-pox pustules, and have escaped unharmed. In defiance of hackneyed ex-parte statistics, let Liberal M.P.’s prove their love of freedom and justice in actual practice, as well as mere discussion, by repealing the Compulsory Vaccination Acts, or their procrastination, I fear, may ruin the health of thousands and mar the happiness of millions. Let them not forget that it was the abettors of this form of contagious disease who asserted that bleeding, mercury, and inoculation were “essential for the safety” of mankind, until the public were undeceived by those of the profession who adopted Homeopathy, Hydropathy, or “Hygiene.” In compulsory cow-pox, moreover, we have an efficient cause, rendered excessive by rewards, for the roasting of tuberculæ, scrofulous, or syphilitic germs, which but for its official taint, might remain innocuous for ever. No care exercised in the taking of lymph can reduce the probability of vaccino-syphilis, the most filthy of chronic eruptions, to anything like a moral or physical vanishing-point, and certain is it that epidemic small-pox will continue to recur, from time to time, in spite of the integrity or degeneration of humanised lymph, or the adoption of animal vaccination, upon the human system of “six pustules on either arm,” with its erysipelas-like local inflammation, and constitutional febrile disturbance, shall have given place to the scientific maintenance or rational preservation of a sound mind in a sound body.
short, men must be made to understand and appreciate something of human physiology and kindred branches of natural philosophy, and thus obey the laws of health, conserve vital force, and avoid State Quackery, or national blood-poisoning, even though the latter may be prescribed by Court Physicians and enforced by Parliament at the instance of an ignorant peasantry or a superstitious milkmaid.

WILLIAM HITCHMAN, M.D.

DR. COLLINS AND THE STANDARD.

On 8th June, Dr. Collins wrote as follows to The Standard—

"You refer to an unvaccinated child as being 'a constant source of public danger.' Now, either vaccination is a protection against small-pox or it is not. If it be a protection, the unvaccinated alone can suffer by refusing the prophylactic. They cannot endanger the vaccinated, for 'they are protected.' Whereas if vaccination be not a protection, no power on earth should enforce it.

"You refer to the Select Committee of 1871, and omit to mention that that Committee recommended the adoption of a clause identical with that proposed by the present Government, viz., 'that wherever in any case two penalties, or one full penalty, have been imposed upon a parent, the magistrate should not impose any further penalty in respect of the same child.'

"You state your belief that there is not a single case on record where a re-vaccinated nurse has taken small-pox. Allow me to refer you to the Pall Mall Gazette of 23rd April, 1877, which says, 'Three of the re-vaccinated nurses and attendants of the Stockwell Small-Pox Hospital have caught small-pox;' and also to the report of Dr. Makuna, of the Fulham Hospital, who states 'that two of the re-vaccinated nurses took small-pox.' It must be remembered that no less than 60 of the employees at the Hampstead Hospital have previously had small-pox, and Mr. Marson told the Vaccination Committee that he was in the habit of drawing his nurses from the convalescent cases, his head nurse being a retained small-pox patient; and, according to the same authority, small-pox is a far greater protection against small-pox than vaccination is."

And again on 8th July—

"It seems remarkable that your correspondent, Mr. Ernest Hart, who is such an eminent 'apostle of truth,' should deliberately accuse me of impugning the veracity of the late Mr. Marson of the Small-Pox Hospital. I have never done so. I merely asserted that it was a fallacy to suppose that all the nurses he employed at the Highgate Small-Pox Hospital, owed their immunity from the disease, to vaccination; for many of his nurses, including his head nurse, were retained small-pox patients, and therefore protected in so far as small-pox is a protection. So far from denying Mr. Marson's statements, I will quote his own words when he was examined before the Committee of 1871.

"Question 4,218. Have any of the nurses in your hospital had small-pox before they have been engaged as nurses?—Some of them.

"Question 4,220. Do you consider small-pox itself is as great a protection as vaccination?—Yes; much greater. As you see by the returns.

"Question 4,225. Will you explain the statement that has been made to the Committee that some of the nurses of the Small-Pox Hospital have been seen to be marked with small-pox?—Yes; but that very nurse who was alluded to was a person who had remained with us after being a patient.

"Question 4,228. That case was the case of a person coming in as a patient and engaged as a nurse after she recovered?—Yes; she is now our head nurse. We never had so many employed in hospital as we have at this time who came in as patients; for, in consequence of the want of nurses at other large hospitals which have been established lately, we have not had the same facility of getting nurses, and we have employed those who have come in as patients and who are willing to stay."

"I fully agree with Mr. Hart that 'the accuracy of Mr. Marson was exceptionally great,' and have never had the slightest doubt as to the veracity of his statements."

KIRKLEY FOR EVER!—Mr. George Kidson writes, "We expect lively times here presently. The town is extensively posted with proclamations signed by the vaccination officer, threatening legal proceedings against all defaulter, of whom there are over six thousand! I hope they will all stand firm."

TRUTH IN A FEW WORDS.—The following letter from Dr. Holbrook, Treasurer of the first American Anti-Vaccination League, was published in the Anti-Vaccinator some time ago, and is worth reprinting.—'I believe compulsory vaccination to be an error, upon which future generations will look back with wonder and astonishment. If one-half of the effort which has been put forth to prevent the spread of small-pox by means of vaccination, since the days of Jenner, had been devoted to spreading among the masses the necessity—nay, the absolute importance—of hygiene—cleanliness, pure air, wholesome food, and other natural agencies not only would small-pox have been prevented, but with it a multitude of other diseases which, by their constancy, destroy more lives than small-pox ten times over. I am with you heart and hand in your labour. What you are doing will save us from doing, where the matter has not been carried so far. But while we war against compulsory vaccination, let us not forget to teach well the laws of life and health. These obeyed, will save the world from disease and premature death; disobeyed, will lead to suffering, misery, and untimely death.'—M. J. HOLBROOK.
TRACTS.

Mr. Gladstone, speaking a short time ago in the House of Commons during the debate of Mr. J. W. Pease's Bill for the abolition of multiple penalties, and referring to the extent of the opposition to vaccination, said, "The tables of honorable members groan under the weight of anti-vaccination literature." If this was true two years ago it is doubly so now when the feeling of resistance to compulsory vaccination has become widened and intensified. New tracts and publications on the subject are issued every few days in some one of the centres of activity—Cheltenham, Leicester, Newcastle, Keighley, Banbury, Brighton or London. In Brighton, which offers a worthy example to less energetic towns, a monthly publication—The Brighton Anti-Vaccinator, edited by Mr. T. Ashwell—has been published several issues, and is extensively patronised by local tradesmen as an advertising medium, an example we commend to the leaders of the movement in other places. One of the most valuable tracts, which has gone through four large editions, is entitled, How Vaccination has increased Infant Mortality, with the converse side showing How Vaccination has stamped out Small-Pox, both based upon Parliamentary returns issued by the Registrar General. An edition of 50,000 copies of a leaflet containing Testimonies of Eminent Physicians, Physiologists, Philosophers and Publicists is now in circulation, making the third edition of this useful publication. A pamphlet has just been issued entitled "Our Legislators on the Vaccination Question," containing the utterances of Members of Parliament during a period of upwards of three-quarters of a century. With such cognate evidences before our Parliamentary representatives against vaccination, and the cruelty and injustice of enforcing it, as this document reveals, they will surely be guilty of criminal negligence to allow the sanction of the law any longer to this revolting and disease-engendering practice. We hope every reader of these pages will call the attention of his representative in the House of Commons to this invaluable compilation and urge immediate legislation. Mr. Ernest Hart in his recent pamphlet (which some anti-vaccinators have industriously circulated as a vindication of the truths of their principles), says that Members of Parliament and magistrates are often at their wit's end for the true facts about vaccination. This unhappy condition need trouble them no longer. Let them consult some of the publications alluded to, and others advertised in the Inquirer; and we would particularly recommend the admirable volume of Tracts by Dr. J. Garth Wilkinson and Mr. W. Young, which can be had at Mr. Allen's, 11 Ave Maria Lane. The odious institutions of chattel slavery in America, and the unjust taxes on the bread of the people, in the shape of imported corn in this country, were overthrown mainly by the publication of tracts, pamphlets, and leaflets, scattered like autumn leaves broadcast over the land. The vaccination tyranny is now rapidly crumbling by the same useful agency. Let all who value health for the body and freedom for the conscience aid the work of demolition by circulating this cheap and convenient form of literature.

W. T.

VACCINATION TRACTS.—We have just seen a German translation of this useful volume—a handy cyclopedia of the facts and arguments of the great controversy. It has been got up in the first class style as to type and paper in Hanover, and we understand copies are to be placed in the chief libraries throughout Germany.

Dr. G. A. Appleby, of Sunderland, is occupied on a volume chiefly designed as a reply to Mr. Ernest Hart's recent pamphlet, dealing also with various parliamentary utterances on vaccination, re-vaccination, and lymphs, animal and humanised. Upwards of £100 has been subscribed for the publication of the treatise.

THE GOVERNMENT VACCINATION BILL.—At a meeting of the Council of the National Association for the promotion of Social Science held on the 21st July, a resolution was brought forward by Dr. A. Carpenter proposing that a petition should be presented against the Government Bill. The motion was opposed by Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P., and was negatived.

THE ANTI-VACCINATION MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.—The movement against Compulsory Vaccination in America is a rapidly growing quantity. Professor Robert A. Gunn, of the United States Medical College, New York, writes that "a considerable amount of public interest is already created. The New York Anti-Vaccination League has arranged to hold regular monthly meetings, and I have accepted an invitation to lecture on 'Vaccination a Fallacy and a Crime,' which will be noticed in the press. 800 post card invitations will be sent out, and discussion invited. So far the defenders of vaccination have not dared to meet us, but we confidently look forward to a time when medical superstitions will give place to scientific truths." Papers have reached us from Boston, New York, St. Louis, Hyde Park (Mass.), New Orleans, Baltimore, Oregon, Indiana, and other states and cities, containing valuable articles against vaccination. Two able and instructive articles in one of the leading journals of Massachusetts—the Boston Courier for the 14th and 23rd May—indicate thorough converse with the subject: and Dr. M. L. Holbrook of New York writes, June 20, that within the past two weeks four children in that city have succumbed to the effects of vaccination. This is where animal vaccination is universally in vogue. What does Dr. Cameron and Dr. G. Wyld say to this?—W. T.
ADVERTISEMENTS.

THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION.
GRAY'S INN CHAMBERS, 20 HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.
I.—The Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.
II.—The Diffusion of Knowledge concerning Vaccination.
III.—The maintenance in London of an Office for the publication of Literature relating to Vaccination, and as a Centre of Information.

The minimum Annual Subscription constituting Membership is 2s. 6d. Every opponent of Compulsory Vaccination in the United Kingdom is earnestly invited to join and co-operate with the Society.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE—
WILLIAM TEBB, Esq., 7 ALBERT ROAD, GLOUCESTER GATE, REGENT'S PARK, N.W.

TREASURER—
J. A. PARKER, Esq.,
Gothic Villa, Woodlands,
Ialeworth, Middlesex.

HON. SECRETARY—
WALTER HASKER, Esq.,
Gray's Inn Chambers,
20 High Holborn, W.C.

THE VACCINATION INQUIER AND HEALTH REVIEW.
Monthly, price 2d., or by post, 2a. 6d., or 10 copies, 20s. per annum, from the Publisher, E. W. ALLEN,
11 Ave Maria Lane, London, E.C.
Manchester: JOHN HEYWOOD.

VACCINATION:
OPPOSED TO SCIENCE AND A DISGRACE TO ENGLISH LAW.

By ALEX. WHEELER.

Order of the publisher, E. W. ALLEN, 11 Ave Maria Lane London.
8s. per hundred, or 1d. each.

ANTI-VACCINATORS and all lovers of freedom from Medical and Official Tyranny should read the NATIONAL INTEREST, published every Friday, Price 1d Office: West Street, Leeds. To be had everywhere.


HOW PARENTS MAY PROTECT THEIR OFFSPRING FROM THE DANGERS AND INJURIES OF VACCINATION. Second Edition. Sent free on receipt of stamped envelope; or, for distribution, 1s. 6d. per hundred. George Bone, 17 Brandon Street, London, S.E.

BRETT'S ST. LEONARDS AND HASTINGS GAZETTE and VISITORS' VADE MECUM, published every Saturday, 12 pages (with Visitors' Lists) Ed. Published by the proprietor, Thomas Brandon Brett, at his Office, 60 Norman Road, St. Leonards-on-sea, Hastings, in the County of Sussex.

THE MEDICAL TRIBUNE. The Exponent of Free Medicine, maintaining rights and opposing privileges, liberal in belief and practice so far as relates to Science and the Healing Art, and opposed to the Jennerian practice of infections Vaccination. Edited by Alex. Wilder M.D., and Robert A. Gunn, M.D. The Medical Tribune is published Monthly, 40 pp., and will be sent to any address in England, postage prepaid, for 10s. Address—Publishers, 60 John Street, New York, U.S.

GOOD HEALTH: a Household Magazine devoted to Health, Temperance, Science, and News. Terms, 1 dollar a year. It has long enjoyed the largest circulation of any Health Journal in America. Subscriptions may be addressed to J. N. Loughboro, Southampton, or to the Publisher, Battle Creek, Mich., U.S.


THE LAWS OF HEALTH, 8 pages, quarto, 50 Cents per year, an original journal of health, teaches the Science of Healthful Living, and is the exponent of a new philosophy of healing the sick. Though not by any means the largest it is said to be the Best Health Journal published in America. Address—Robert Walter, M.D, Editor and Publisher, Warrensville, Berks Co., State of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

VACCINATION TRACTS.

1. Letters and Opinions of Medical Men.
2. Facts and Figures, showing that Vaccination has failed to stamp out, arrest, or mitigate Small-pox.
5. Cases of Disease, Suffering, and Death, reported by the Injured Families.
6. The Vaccination Laws a Scandal to Public Honesty and Religion.
7. Vaccination a sign of the Decay of the Political and Medical Conscience of the Country.
8. The Propagation of Syphilis to Infants and Adults by Vaccination and Re-Vaccination.
9. Vaccination evil in its Principles, false in its Reasons, and deadly in its Results.

In 1 Vol., cloth, with Preface and Supplement, pp. XXX, 2s. 6d., post free.

Just Published, One Penny.

THE FABLE ABOUT THE HOSPITAL NURSES SAVED FROM SMALL-POX BY RE-VACCINATION.

E. W. ALLEN, 11 Ave Maria Lane, E.C.

Just Published, Price Sixpence,

CAN DISEASE PROTECT HEALTH?

Being a Reply to Mr. Ernest Hart’s Pamphlet, entitled,

THE TRUTH ABOUT VACCINATION.

By Enoch Robinson, M.R.C.S., Dukinfield.

Now Ready, Price 1s., or Three Copies, 2s. 6d., or Thirty Copies, 20s.

OUR LEGISLATORS ON THE VACCINATION QUESTION.

A Record of Parliamentary and Extra-Parliamentary Utterances and Opinions during Eighty Years. Collected and Arranged by William Tebb.

E. W. ALLEN, 11 Ave Maria Lane, E.C.

By H. Strickland Constable.

Demy 8vo. 600 pp. Price 10s. 6d.

OUR MEDICINE MEN: A FEW HINTS.

Demy 8vo. 500 pp. Price 6s.

FASHIONS OF THE DAY IN MEDICINE AND SCIENCE: A FEW MORE HINTS.


NEW LEAFLETS AND TRACTS.

"VACCINATION MORTALITY (Third Edition), and How Vaccination has Stamped Out Small-Pox." 1s. 6d. per Hundred, 8s. 6d. per Thousand.

"WHAT HAS BEEN SAID CONCERNING VACCINATION." 1s. 6d. per Hundred, 8s. 6d. per Thousand.

Slips containing Eminent Testimonies, suitable for enclosing in Letters, 1s. per Hundred.

"Anti-Vaccination in the United States," by Wm. Tebb, with Pages of Medical and other Testimonies. 1s. per Dozen.

W. WHAT, 66 Carlton Street, Kentishtown, London, N.W.

CONTENTS FOR AUGUST.

Much Ado about Little.............................................. 61
Mr. Octavin E. Coope, M.P...................................... 62
Small-Pox Manufactory in the Reign of George III. By H. D. Dudgeon................................. 68
The Hon. Auberon Herbert.......................... 69
The Greatest Triumph of Science. By Alexander Wheeler.................................................. 70
Fascination of Audacity................................. 70
American Evidence................................. 70
Against Compulsion. By Wm. Hitchman, M.D.................................................. 71
Dr. Collins and The Standard................................. 72
Keighley for ever!............................................ 72
Truth in a Few Words................................. 72
Lively Lessons in Vaccination Law................................. 72
Truthful and Fearless Heart!................................. 73
Deputation to the President of Local Government Board.............................................. 73
Tracts.............................................................. 74
The Government Vaccination Bill................................. 74
Vaccination Tracts.............................................. 74
Dr. G. A. Abrath of Sunderland................................. 74
The Anti-Vaccination Movement in the United States.............................................. 74

PRINTED BY HAY NISBET & CO., 39 STOCKWELL STREET, GLASGOW.
OUR CASE BEFORE PARLIAMENT.

"For this Session the Vaccination Bill is withdrawn," said Lord Hartington in the House of Commons—an announcement not unexpected. In the meanwhile, we trust that those concerned will reconsider the question. The Bill was a poor affair, but inasmuch as it would have put an end to the flagrant outrages perpetrated on worthy citizens like Joseph Abel of Farington, S. J. West of Rochester, and Benjamin V. Scott of Liverpool, we felt bound to accept it thankfully as a small instalment of justice.

The agitation which the introduction of the Bill has excited has been most useful, especially in the exhibition of the temper and tendencies of the Medical Trades Unions, which when proclaimed by us have been repudiated as uncharitable, and even slanderous, assertions. They opened their minds to Mr. Dodson, and we now know exactly with whom we have to deal and what we may expect. The agitation has also made manifest the general ignorance which exists as to the origin and operation of the existing law. With hardly an exception, any newspaper comments we have read on the Bill have been tainted with error, and the criticisms of M.P.'s and the curses of M.D.'s have alike been wide of the mark. Ignorance inspired by terror of small-pox, or hatred of Gladstone, has written the articles and made the speeches. The Solicitors' Journal pointed out that the Government measure was "word for word the same as a clause which was inserted in the Vaccination Bill of 1871, which passed the House of Commons, but was rejected by a majority of one in the House of Lords." The clause so passed is then described as "the deliberate expression of the will of the legislature"—the will deliberately expressed being represented by the said majority of one in the Lords and assented to by the Commons in a spirit of indifference at the fag-end of a session! The legal journalist proceeds to observe—

"The Vaccination Acts are passed for the benefit, not of parents, but of their children and the public, and to allow parents to buy the power of breaking the law by discontinuance of a penalty for a continuing offence is not only without precedent in our statutory law, but is a distinct encouragement to an agitation the most fanatical and ignorant in our history."

So much has been said of our ignorance and fanaticism, that they might conveniently be taken for granted. We would merely point out to our learned and logical contemporary, that the law as it stands allows any parent to exempt his child from vaccination by the payment of fines, and that many thus purchase exemption. The scandal is that to the poor man the recurrent fine is sometimes a crushing infliction. In this respect, no M.P. will face his constituents and justify the law. It is vicious in the worst sense. Moreover the extreme impolicy of thus allowing the law to be defied at a price has been admitted by the Local Government Board in a letter to the Evesham Guardians, wherein it is set forth that if a parent shows himself incorrigible, they had better consider whether it is not expedient to let him alone, leaving him slate and victorious! Again as the law stands it meets with two checks, first, in the discretion of Guardians in originating and continuing prosecutions, and, second, in the discretion of Magistrates in inflicting penalties. Any one who wishes to discover the operation of the law in these respects should refer to the National Anti-compulsory Vaccination Reporter where a record of vaccination prosecutions is kept up. He will there see that parents who abhor vaccination are let off with fines ranging from 6d. to 20s., sometimes with costs, sometimes without costs; that there is severity in one court, and laxity, and even sympathy, in another; that there are Guardians who decline to sanction any prosecutions; and others who prosecute with the vindictiveness of devils. In short if a parent were to consult a solicitor as to what would happen if he persistently refused to
vaccinate his child, the answer would be, "It entirely depends first on the temper of the Guardians, and then on the temper of the Justices. You may be let alone, you may get off for 2s. 6d., and you may be let in for £40 or £50 ere the fight is over." Such is the administration of the existing law! If the doctors and lawyers like it and politicians are satisfied with it, they must have peculiar notions as to equity and the education of the people in reverence for authority. Supposing the Government measure had passed, and the modified law were rigidly enforced, we, as anti-vaccinators, would suffer much more than we now suffer. Our only advantage would consist in having the extent of our possible prosecution defined. We take it that those who proposed to alter the law had in view its more systematic infliction, and thus inflicted, the majority of anti-vaccinators would have more to endure than they have at present under the existing loose and irregular régime. Such however has been the fury excited by the imagined concession to "ignorance and fanaticism" that few have possessed sufficient calmness to survey and estimate the facts of the situation.

Consistently logical, but indifferent to realities, the editor of the Solicitors' Journal continues—

"The only possible amendments of the law appear to be two, either (1) to compulsorily vaccinate a child as soon as the child can be safely detached from its mother for that purpose, or (2) to return to the principle of permissive vaccination, which obtained from 1840, when the first Vaccination Act was passed, to 1855 when vaccination was first made compulsory."

As to the first alternative, often threatened and sometimes recommended, our reply is, Try it: the attempt would settle the controversy off-hand, and much else beside. The second alternative we accept with the addition, that all parliamentary support of vaccination be withdrawn, and that it be left to maintain itself like other nostrums on its own merits. To make such a proposal in the present condition of public opinion may appear visionary, but we have seen much that appeared equally visionary come to pass in the course of even a few years; and if only we are right there is nothing that we consider impossible. We have great allies in nature and human nature, and no clamour, not even the clamour of the medical mob, need discourage us.

Nevertheless we do not imagine that vaccination can be disestablished and disendowed suddenly or magically. We who labour for its entire suppression are prepared to achieve our end gradually and laboriously, always taking what we can get and pressing steadily for more. And as the Government Bill for the limitation of penalties is withdrawn, and as the limitation was pronounced odious on all sides by reason of a price being set on what was stigmatised as the right to defy the law, we would ask Mr. Dodson, Why not simplify and dignify your measure by the complete removal of the money penalty? We shall not argue afresh the question, Why if a parent is convinced that vaccination is a useless and dangerous operation he should be prosecuted and fined for his conviction; but accepting that conviction as every whit as entitled to respect as any theological conviction (which all agree to respect) why not enact that Vaccination Officers be authorised to receive declarations of objection to vaccination on affidavit before Justices of the Peace? It is a fair proposition; indeed it can only be objected to on principles that would justify any tyrannical invasion of parental rights. Let children thus exempted be carefully registered as unvaccinated, and let us await the verdict of experience. The experiment would be a useful one, and could not harm the vaccinated, who according to vaccinators are proof, or almost proof, against small-pox. At present the unvaccinated afford no data for a just comparison with the vaccinated. The unvaccinated are those who are rejected as too feeble to undergo the vaccine fever, or who are the offspring of the wretched and the homeless and thus escape the vaccination officer. With whatever disease afflicted, such miserable creatures would compare disadvantageously with the vigorous, well-nourished and well-cared for who are vaccinated. The children of anti-vaccinators, on the other hand, would afford a fair test of the advantage or the disadvantage of unpolluted blood. The experiment would not only be valuable scientifically, but it would be a worthy exploit on the part of statesmen whose pride is their Liberalism, their reverence for the rights of conscience, and their hatred of oppression—at least in Bulgaria and Armenia.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ANTI-VACCINATORS.
—We are requested to announce that a Congress of Anti-Vaccinators will be held in Paris from the 9th to the 15th October. Those who intend to be present, or to read papers, will please communicate with M. Labbé, 57 Rue Pigalle, at as early a date as possible.

MR. HENRY FITMAN has been remarkably successful during the past month in obtaining the publication of several letters concerning vaccination in London and Manchester newspapers. Mr. Fitman's communications have always the merit of conveying a large amount of unpopular truth with extreme perspicacity and with little irritation.
THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Observations on the Position in 1802.

One of my medical readers observes—

"The House of Commons in 1802 was committed to a variety of extravagances, but, allowing for these, you have to account for certain evidence that cow-pox had some influence over small-pox; for you surely do not mean to contend that it had no influence over that disease, and that the evidence before the Committee was a uniform tissue of illusion and delusion."

Put thus, it is as difficult to deal with the objection as it is to prove a negative. It is not for me to define the influence of cow-pox over small-pox, but for those who believe in its prophylaxis. I should argue that as ill-health leads to ill-health, and as corruption breeds corruption, that inoculated cow-pox would generate a habit of body favourable to small-pox, and at the same time tend to excite and intensify other forms of disease. I would also ask, What are the extravagances to be allowed for? When these are determined we may then proceed to discuss what are not extravagant. It is a common form of evasion to make a general confession of guilt in order to avoid the pain of specific and explicit condemnation. It is conceded that the House of Commons in 1802 "committed a variety of extravagances," and under this appearance of candour the chief extravagance is implicitly re-asserted and carried forward, namely, that inoculated cow-pox had an influence adverse to small-pox.

In the "variety of extravagances," few, I suppose, would hesitate to include the asserted annual small-pox mortality of the United Kingdom. Sir Gilbert Blane pronounced it 45,000 whilst Dr. Lettsom gave it as 86,000—a wide difference in the play of fancy! Dr. Lettsom, who claimed to have paid much attention to figures connected with small-pox, was pleased to convert an extreme London mortality, namely, 8000, into the ordinary mortality, although in some years it fell under 1000. Then estimating the population of London at one million, and the population of the United Kingdom as twelve millions, he multiplied 8000 by 12, and evoked the astounding national death-rate of 36,000 annually from small-pox, all of whom were to be saved by Jenner's prescription! But whether he had taken the average or even the lowest metropolitan mortality, the computation would have remained grossly fallacious. London, crowded and pestiferous, was no standard for the general population, urban or rural; and the assumption was monstrous that small-pox, a notoriously epidemic and sporadic disease, was constant and equally diffused over the land. We are without comprehensive vital statistics for the period in question, but arguing from the London of to-day in continual connection with the provinces, to the London of 1802 in comparative isolation, what do we find? Why, small-pox prevalent in London with little or no small-pox in the country! In the Pall Mall Gazette of 31st May, 1878, we read—

"The degree in which the small-pox epidemic of the last seven years has been localised in London is very remarkable. The Lancet points out that during the week ending 26th May, 51 fatal cases were registered in London and its suburban districts, whereas not one was recorded in any of the nineteen large provincial towns having an aggregate population about equal to that of London. Since the beginning of the year the fatal cases of small-pox within fifteen miles of Charing Cross have been 1,184, while but 8 have occurred in the nineteen other large towns."

We find similar illustrations of the sporadic character of small-pox wherever we can get at the facts. In 1874 there died in London 735 of small-pox, but not one in Birmingham; 386 in Liverpool, but not one in Plymouth; 347 in Salford, but not one in Nottingham; 190 in Manchester, and but 1 in Sheffield; 24 in Bristol and 4 in Leeds; and so on. What reason is there to believe that what is true of small-pox within our own experience was otherwise in the experience of our forefathers?

I said that few would hesitate to include Dr. Lettsom's 86,000 and Sir Gilbert Blane's 45,000 among the extravagances of 1802, but I forgot myself. We have a National Health Society with the Duke of Westminster for President and all manner of notables, aristocratic, scientific and literary, among its committee and members. Now this Society issues a hand-bill of advices and warnings relating to small-pox, and there we find set forth as unquestionable matter of fact—

"Before the introduction of Vaccination Small-Pox killed 40,000 persons yearly in this country."

We thus see how hard it is for a convenient fable to die, even when known to be false, and how respectable people will keep repeating it as long as they fancy it is for good.

Absurd as was the extension of the ratio of London small-pox to the populations of the United Kingdom, of Europe, and of the world, the London disease itself afforded little warrant for the extreme terms of horror and dismay.
with which it was described. Small-pox did not increase the death-rate of London: when small-pox was most prevalent and least prevalent, the total mortality was but slightly affected. As long as the sanitary conditions of the great city remained unchanged, fevers replaced small-pox and small-pox replaced fevers, and whether deaths were from one form of disease or another, so that the people died the same, what did it matter? Small-pox when most prevalent was never accountable for much more than 10 per cent. of the total London mortality, and in some years for less than 8 per cent.; and it is to be remembered that the larger portion of that mortality was infantile mortality—small-pox being in the great majority of cases a disease of the young; none less objectionable on that account, but less chargeable than some other forms of zymotic disease with striking down the adult bread-winner and enlarging misery and pauperism.

Again, in much of the talk about small-pox, it was assumed that the disease had no limits—that it was something like fire, and might spread to any extent if unchecked. But what was there to justify such an assumption? Assuredly nothing in London experience. Small-pox was always present in London, waxing and waning under some unknown law; the deaths rising as high as 8992 in 1772 and falling as low as 522 in 1797—the extremes of the century. Why did 4000 never die in any year, or 7000, or 10,000? When a fire is extinguished, we know it has met with a check; and if small-pox caused 8992 deaths in 1772 and 522 in 1797, and small-pox be like fire, there was, we see, a check; and I ask, What was that check? There may be answers, but none for unreserved acceptance. What is certain is, that in London small-pox was never an illimitable affliction. It had limits, and it was only in the rhetoric of alarmists that it had none.

And the check to the disease (whatever it was) lay in the bodies of the citizens, and not in their therapeutics. Isolation was rarely attempted, and in their crowded habitations was impracticable. Moreover they had not only the small-pox appropriate to their evil conditions to contend with, but the disease as propagated and diffused by the inoculators. What we have to say is, that while in the London of last century we behold small-pox endemic and cultivated, yet in no year did the mortality therefrom exceed 4,000; and further, that with so much to favour and stimulate the disease it was a diminishing quantity. In the words of Dr. Farr, "London small-pox attained its maximum mortality after inoculation was introduced, and the disease began to grow less fatal before vaccination was discovered."

We shall see as we proceed how the natural check to small-pox (whatever it was), the immunity of the majority from infection, and the decline of the disease were all claimed as the blessed results of Jenner's prescription; and now-a-days it has passed into common-place, for which evidence is thought superfluous, that without that prescription small-pox might have illimitable extension. If anywhere a variolous epidemic is slight, it is said that but for vaccination it would have been severe; and if severe, that its intensity would have been doubled or trebled save for the action of the same prophylactic. We have a remarkable illustration of this style of prophecy in the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons upon the Vaccination Act of 1867, dated 23rd May, 1871, where we read—

"Small-pox, unchecked by vaccination, is one of the most terrible and destructive of all diseases as regards the danger of infection, the proportion of deaths among those attacked, and the permanent injury to the survivors. Your Committee believe that if vaccination had not been general, the epidemic (then prevalent) would have become a pestilence, raging with the destructive force of the Plague of the middle ages."

What is beyond evidence is beyond refutation; and the imaginations of the dull though they be, not unfrequently prevail over their intelligence.

To set aside the mass of testimony adduced by Jenner's friends before the Commons' Committee in 1802 is sometimes described as a hopeless undertaking; but the answer to such a boast is, that experience has nullified the essential part of that testimony, and that there is little left to account for: No well-informed medical practitioner now believes what the Committee was led to believe, that to be vaccinated was to be secure from small-pox for life. The security, where still credited, is subject to so many qualifications that the primitive vaccinators would have thought such protection not worth paying for, still less of exercising over as the greatest discovery ever made in medicine. How would many now admit the validity of the variolous test which then carried conviction with irresistible force. Inoculation with small-pox was in itself an uncertain operation, and that it should fail after inoculation with cow-pox, ere the poisoning of the blood had been worked off,
was in no wise surprising. The exposure of vaccinated subjects to small-pox infection was in like manner deceptive; and it was conveniently forgotten that all manner of people were exposed to contagion with impunity in the usual circumstances of life. Taking a year of exceptional small-pox in London, such as Dr. Lettsom set forth as ordinary, when 18,000 were affected and 8000 died (that is one in six) there were in the million of inhabitants 982,000 who escaped. How did they escape? A multitude must have come into immediate contact with the sick: How did they remain unscathed? The question is simple, but it is crucial. If small-pox were like fire, and men, women and children like fuel, why did not all burn? Under what prophylaxis did they abide secure? Again in this connection, we must not lose sight of the magic of faith. Things being equal, two persons exposed to small-pox, one confident that he was invulnerable through vaccination, and the other apprehensive of danger, the chances are, that the fearful would be attacked whilst the fearless would have his faith justified in immunity.

In considerations thus obvious it is not difficult to understand how the testimony delivered to the Committee had a semblance as of varicious Nature. Any one who has studied the history of remedies, or the various quackeries within his own observation, will know how easy it is to conjure up testimony, with asseverations presumptuous to question, which by-and-by are gradually discredited and ultimately disappear.

A TABLE SHEWING THE ADVANTAGES OF VACCINE INOCULATION.

THE NATURAL SMALL-POX.

I. The natural Small-Pox is a loathsome, infectious, painful, and fatal disease. It is confined to no climate, but rages in every quarter of the world, and destroys a tenth part of mankind.

II. Those who survive the ravages of that dreadful disorder, often survive only to be the victims of other maladies, or to drag out a miserable existence worse than death.

III. This cruel and lamentable disorder leaves behind it pits, scars, and other blemishes and bodily deformities which embitter life.

THE INOCULATED SMALL-POX.

I. The inoculated Small-Pox also is loathsome, infectious, painful, and sometimes fatal; and, when partially adopted, spreads the contagion, and increases the mortality of the disease.

II. It sometimes occasions the same maladies as the natural Small-Pox.

III. It frequently leaves behind it the same blemishes and deformities as the natural Small-Pox, which are the more deplorable as they are brought on by a voluntary act.

THE INOCULATED COW-POCK.

I. The inoculated Cow-Pock scarcely deserves the name of a disease. It is not infectious; and, in the opinion of the most experienced practitioners, has never proved fatal.

II. It occasions no other disease. On the contrary, it has often been known to improve health, and to remedy those diseases under which the patient before laboured.

III. It leaves behind no blemish, but a Blessing—one of the greatest ever bestowed on man—a perfect security against the future infection of the Small-Pox.

From this faithful statement of the advantages attending Vaccine Inoculation, it must appear evident to every unprejudiced person, that it is the duty as well as the interest of every parent, of every individual, and of every nation, to adopt the practice, and to hasten THE EXTERMINATION OF THE SMALL-POX.
It was thus that Vaccination was introduced to the English people, not by men esteemed quacks, but by leaders of the medical profession; and whatever the illusions and mischiefs of the new practice, we must allow it the credit of discouraging and ultimately superseding the grosser practice of inoculation with small-pox. As for the various items in the bill, we have had, and shall have, them before us, and I would only now recall attention to the initial statement that "Small-Pox destroys a tenth part of mankind." The summary answer to the statement is that the number of mankind was unknown, likewise their diseases, and the proportion in which they were fatal. It was a repetition of Dr. Lettsom's unwarrantable extension of a bad year of London small-pox to the whole earth. It was not true that in London a tenth of the mortality was due to small-pox; and even in the occasional years when 8000 died, the total average mortality was not seriously affected thereby. The deaths, as we have observed, were merely taken out in small-pox instead of in some other form of fever. That nothing can permanently reduce the death-rate of any community save improved sanitary conditions and personal habits was unreviewed in 1802.

Notwithstanding the exultation over Jenner, "the saviour of the world from small-pox," and over "the greatest discovery since the creation of man," the suspicion is unavoidable that it was largely factitious—"from the teeth outwards," as Carlyle would say. The vote of £10,000 to the miraculous benefactor of the human race was carried by a majority of three in a Parliament to which no more than 116 members could be whipped up, and neither Pitt or Fox thought it worth while to be present. Nor was Jenner treated as if his asserted services to mankind were soberly credited. "Yes," it may be said, "the world never recognises its true benefactors," but the observation does not apply, for Jenner was profusely recognised, and received praise from his contemporaries which posterity hesitates to repeat. Nevertheless the praise, though profuse, was little more than verbal. Some expressed indignation at the paltry award of £10,000, and proposed to start a national subscription, but no one took the initiative, and the national gratitude was not put to the test. Even the £10,000 was paid tardily. Writing to a friend on 3rd June, 1804, Jenner had to relate that—

"The Treasury still withholds the payment of what was voted to me two years ago; and now there are new officers, and it may yet be very long before a guinea reaches me from that quarter."

When at last the money was paid, nearly £1000 was deducted for fees, etc.; and, having the repute of the money, he was considered public property. As Dr. Baron records—

"The people of England seemed to think that the fee-simple of his body and mind had been purchased by the ten thousand pounds; and many an unjust and ungenerous intimation of this feeling was conveyed to him. To a mind like his, this was no small annoyance. He was called upon for explanations and opinions by every person who thought a direct communication with the Author of Vaccination an honour worth seeking, while they might get all the information they wanted in his published writings."

So much was matter of course, but Jenner had worse to encounter. He took the fine talk of his medical and political friends as serious, bade farewell to Berkeley, and set up as London physician in Hartfield Street, May Fair. The result we have in his own words—

"Eloated and allured by the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I took a house in London for ten years, at a high rent, and furnished it; but my first year's practice convinced me of my own temerity and imprudence, and the falsity of the Minister's prediction. My fees fell off both in number and value; for, extraordinarily to tell, some of those families in which I had been before employed, now sent to their own domestic surgeons or apothecaries to inoculate their children, alleging that they could not think of troubling Dr. Jenner about a thing executed so easily as vaccine inoculation. Others, who gave me such fees as I thought myself entitled to at the first inoculation, reduced them at the second, and sank them still lower at the third."

His fees did not amount to £550 a year, and he presently found himself nothing the better for the parliamentary grant, and involved in grave financial difficulties. He wrote to a friend, 2nd November, 1804—

"The London smoke is apt to cloud our best faculties. I do not intend to risk the injury of mine in this way, unless occasionally for the transaction of business. The public has not the smallest right to require such a sacrifice of me. I have received no reward for showing them how to remove one of the greatest obstacles to human happiness; but, on the contrary, am loaded with a tax of more than £400 a year!"

And to another correspondent—

"I have now completely made up my mind respecting London. I have done with it, and have again commenced as village doctor. I found my purse not equal to the sinking of a £1000 annually (which has actually been the case for several successive years) nor the grati-
tude of the public deserving such a sacrifice. How hard, after what I have done, the toils I have gone through, and the anxieties I have endured in obtaining for the world a greater gift than man ever bestowed on the world before (except the gift of oxygen), to be thrown by with a bare remuneration of my expenses."

It was hard! People who attributed to Jenner the greatest discovery ever made, the preservation of from 36,000 to 45,000 lives annually in the United Kingdom, and the salvation of the human race from small-pox, were indeed entitled to have dealt with him more handsomely. He had sympathisers and candid friends. "Your liberality and disinterestedness every one must admire," wrote Mr. Benjamin Travers, "but you are sadly deficient in worldly wisdom. If you had undertaken the extinction of the small-pox yourself, with condutors of your own appointment, I am confident, you might have put £100,000 in your pocket; and the glory would have been as great and the benefit to the community the same." How that £100,000 was used to tantalise him! and yet, as Dr. Pearson pointed out, never any one showed on what practicable terms the immense sum could have been earned by means of cow-pox.

---

THE MULTIPLE FINE.

The following letter appeared in the Echo—

On a recent occasion yon permitted me, as an independent thinker, to criticise the medical dogma that a person who catches the small-pox is a person not properly and successfully protected against catching it. I find from the British Medical Journal of 17th July, that it is now no longer "maintained for vaccination that it is a sure and certain protection against small-pox, even should the operation have been in all respects efficient." Consequently, it is not inherently protective; it only protects when it protects; and the anti-vaccinators may fairly claim a similar power for non-vaccination. Would it not be wise, therefore, to allow public opinion to settle this question without the intervention of the multiple fine? The claim of the medical profession to be the Court of final appeal on all questions may choose to call medical, may be compared with the acknowledgment in the above journal that on a late trial "a large number of medical witnesses were examined on both sides, and the usual much-to-be-regretted contradictory evidence was given."

I hope that in making these proposals for peace I am not placing myself under the ban of those who maintain that the selling a licence to a parent to do what he believes to be right is as immoral as the selling a licence to a drunkard to do what he knows to be wrong.

Quorn, Aug. 6.

H. D. DUDKSON.

---

GOVERNMENT VACCINATION BILL.

DEPUTATION TO MR. DODSON.

On Monday, 2nd August, a numerous Deputation representing all parts of the kingdom, waited, by appointment, on the Right Hon. J. G. Dodson, M.P., President of the Local Government Board, with whom was Mr. J. T. Hibbert, M.P. for Oldham, Secretary of the Board, and Sir John Lambert the Permanent Secretary. The Deputation was organised by the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, and comprised Mr. Sergeant Simon, M.P., who, in the absence of Mr. F. A. Taylor, introduced the Deputation—Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P.; Mr. Summers, M.P.; Mr. Enoch Robinson, M.R.C.S.; Dr. W. J. Collins; Mr. Alexander Wheeler; Mr. William Tebb; Dr. E. Haughton; Mr. F. Davis, junr.; Mr. C. B. Marriage; Mr. Cornelius Pearson; Mr. Andrew Glendingen; Mr. George Bone; Mr. William White; Mr. James Lewis; Mr. Burgesses; Mr. Amos Booth; Mr. Emery; Mr. Thomas Baker; Mr. J. A. Parker; Mr. Walter Haeker; Mr. Henry Fitman; etc.

Mr. Enoch Robinson, M.R.C.S. (author of Can Disease protect Health?), was the first speaker. He said—The Bill which the Government has introduced to limit the penalties for non-vaccination is based upon the Report of the Committee of 1871. We do not object to the Bill in the way it proceeds; our objection is that it does not go far enough. I wish respectfully to point out that if we are to be guided by that Report of 1871 and the scientific authority upon which the quality of safety of vaccination rested, and if the scientific evidence of Mr. Simon (the greatest authority on that subject) is compared by the Government with Mr. Simons’s opinion of last December upon precisely the same subject, it seems to us that the Government would have seen that the scientific foundation for the quality of safety had vanished; and that instead of protecting by this Bill the well-to-do and the courageous of society, the Government would have seen it to be their duty to exercise their power (as Government power should always be exercised) in favour of the helpless and poor. Allow me to remind you that in the Report of 1871, Mr. Simon asserts two things (page 385), namely, that vaccine lymph cannot in many instances transfer infectious germs; and that in those instances in which it is possible, the vesicle would show such symptoms and signs of the contamination as to be observed by the operator. But in the British Medical Journal of December last, Mr. Simon published, in anticipation, an article which has yet to appear in a standard work of medicine, in which his evidence, reprinted in the Report of 1871, is directly contradicted. Mr. Simon there admits that any of these infectious germs can be transferred from one person to another; and that in cases which he especially
mentions, the vesicle which may contain them will show no symptom that it does contain them, and that the child from whom the lymph is taken will have no symptoms upon its body. I respectfully submit that after this change in the scientific authority (upon which authority the quality of safety rested in 1871), such quality of safety has no foundation to rest upon; and if that be so, it is reasonable for this Deputation to ask the Government to consider whether, in addition to protecting the courageous and the well-to-do, it is not the duty of the Government to protect also the helpless and the poor. Mr. Simon's opinion is supported by facts. The Return obtained by Mr. Hopwood, the hon. member for Stockport, shows that in consequence of the communication of these diseases, strumous, erysipelas, etc., the mortality during recent years has been considerably increased. Then there is the fact that eminent men who in 1853 stated that these things did not occur, have one by one changed their opinion. Only as late as last Saturday, Dr. Robert Lee stated in the British Medical Journal that he now admits that the vaccine vesicle does give rise to cutaneous eruptions. Then there is the other fact that the proportion of small-pox cases after vaccination has increased exceedingly since vaccination was made compulsory. Mr. Marsan showed that in the years preceding 1853 the per centage of small-pox after vaccination was 53. Mr. Jebb from statistics given in the Times, (October 1879), shows that the per centage of small-pox after vaccination was 75. But I now refer to a fact which has not been commonly mentioned in connection with this matter, to show that this quality of safety no longer exists. At the present moment this question is being debated in the medical profession—Has scrofula and its allied forms of strumous disease assumed in our day the syphilitic form? Now that is a terrible suggestion, when taken in connection with the 28 years of compulsory vaccination, whereby you have been transferring from child to child lymph which can possibly contain this poisonous germ. The extent of the responsibility is seen, if you remember, that whilst a strong Government may repeal a tax, no Government, however strong, can repeal or recall the mischief done by 28 years of systematic blood-poisoning. Let me point out to you the difference in the quality of safety and non-safety. If, according to Mr. Simon, the vesicle could not contain the poisonous germ, then if multiplied a million times the quality of safety would remain the same; but admitting that it can be transferred, then if you multiply that case a million times, the result is simply incalculable. I observe that Mr. Ernest Hart and others, in referring to this chance of infection, have termed it infinitesimal. I respectfully submit that that danger cannot be termed infinitesimal which is possible in any instance, and which is being multiplied a million times. And bear in mind, sir, that this remedy is not one of the ordinary remedies of medicine whose power is tested by weight and measure; but it is a living remedy, the minutest portion of which has the power to develop and increase to an extent only limited by the number of human beings in whom it is placed. Therefore, sir, I submit that the basis of the quality of safety has disappeared. I had the privilege of attending the medical conference held last December in London, and heard Dr. Warlomont, who was brought over as the godfather, as it were, of the new system of animal vaccine lymph; and you, sir, have promised that the profession shall have opportunities of using animal lymph. Well, sir, to us that is no consolation. I will give you my reason why. I heard Dr. Warlomont's paper, which was afterwards printed in the British Medical Journal; and Dr. Warlomont's ideal system of vaccination is, that at every vaccination station, and in every village, there shall be a weekly calf from which every child and grown up person shall be vaccinated. He looks upon arm-to-arm vaccination as temporary, and to be deprecated, if you can have calf lymph. Last year I wrote to the Local Government Board for lymph, and asked them to guarantee it free from the taint of syphilis; and they sent me a letter stating that they dare not guarantee the lymph to be free from the taint of syphilis. Precautions are recommended in order to avoid importing that disease. I venture to say that no public vaccinator can comply with these precautions. He cannot strip every child naked and examine it; he cannot take the lymph and put it under the microscope; and he does not know the history of every child's parents. But even if these precautions could be taken, the Government dare not guarantee the lymph to be free from disease, and the Government is quite right in not doing so; because, according to Mr. Simon's doctrine, the child may not at the time that it contains this tainted lymph, show any symptoms, either in the vesicle or in its person that it possesses that taint. And although you are intending to provide this animal lymph, you expect it to be used as "stock" lymph. Every child is not to be vaccinated direct from the animal lymph provided; you expect the surgeons to carry on the arm-to-arm method as before. But I would point out to you that the moment you begin to transfer this stock lymph from child to child, you run the risk of transferring diseases; therefore, the provision of animal lymph does not give us the slightest consolation. Then with respect to this animal lymph, Mr. Ernest Hart in writing upon the subject in the British Medical Journal in 1877, asked "why should it transmit syphilis, or foot and mouth disease, or malignant pustule?" Mr. Hart may have changed his opinion, but the calves are vaccinated from children, and therefore to talk of the purity of animal lymph, or to say that it can be free from the diseases incidental to human beings is simply absurd and impracticable. Inasmuch as scrofula is admitted by Mr. Simon to be a disease that can be transmitted, and as scrofula is a disease found in bovine animals, therefore, apart from the communication of disease from the child to the calf, you may transmit diseased conditions. But after all, the real point with us is that disease cannot protect health. It is disease
whether you get it from the calf, the cow, or the child. We do not believe that disease can protect health. We wish the battle ground upon which small-pox is to be fought to be outside and not within the human body; and we believe that if sanitary measures were thoroughly carried out—as suggested by Mr. Simon in his able reports—and I am sorry for the sake of the medical profession that those reports have ceased to be compiled under his superintendence, then should I have no fear, but that small-pox could be dealt with like other diseases. To those persons who are not under the influence of a superstitious fear, small-pox is not the formidable disease that it is supposed to be. There are many persons who would prefer at this moment to have small-pox rather than the smallpox as it is now. It is sooner cured. A case cannot occur in any decent community without being at once spotted and placed under proper conditions. We all know from the reports of the Government inspectors in Scotland and in Scotland that ordinary sanitary conditions should be carried out notwithstanding their professed faith in the protective power of vaccination, and although 80 per cent. of the community may be vaccinated, other arguments are put before us, showing that there is a want of confidence amongst vaccinators in the protective power of vaccination. They tell us that although nearly all the population are vaccinated, yet if there is one unvaccinated child he is like a person with a loaded gun. That shows there is a want of confidence in the practice of vaccination. Let me refer to that illustration, which, I think, was used by Dr. Farquharson, a member of the House of Commons. I accept the illustration, but I put it in its proper place. There are two ways in which men can protect themselves in society; one is the barbarous way of carrying a loaded pistol, which is dangerous to the man himself and those around; and the other way is by the man being peaceable, and trusting to the police to protect him. A child with the smallpox disease in it is like the man with a loaded pistol; he carries the element of danger to himself and others. It is admitted that the vaccinated child is no protection to others. On the other hand, the child, strong and hearty, living under sanitary conditions, cannot possibly be a source of danger to the community. Dr. Warlomont makes an astounding recommendation to medical men. He says that medical men should not take the responsibility of the quality of the lymph where it is used from arm-to-arm, but that the parent who wishes to have a child vaccinated should himself provide the lymph, and the doctor should simply perform the mechanical operation. Is that a fair thing to society? We say, if medical men wish to experiment upon this question, let them do it on their own responsibility. Just think of the experiments that are being performed. First, you have the arm-to-arm vaccination, then you want animal vaccination, and then you want compulsory revaccination. Are you prepared to follow these gentlemen? They ask for compulsory re-vaccination to-day; but in France it is suggested that vaccination should be done once every ten years. Are they prepared to say to Parliament, "We want a second compulsory vaccination?" Logically they ought to do, if you accept the first. Where is this to end? If you, sir, will ask your medical advisers, Dr. Buchanan and others, they will not be able to tell you what is the law which determines how long lymph will protect, therefore, there is no limit to the period, whether it shall be one or ten years. I hold that the Government is bound before sympathising with these gentlemen to say how far they are prepared to go. What we say is this, that considering the vast improvement which has taken place in the sanitary condition of the country—as Lord Macaulay observed, country gentlemen no longer suffer from fever. It is no farm-yard under the windows of the bed-chambers—the compulsory system should be done away with, and that if there is to be experiment, let it be done solely on the responsibility of the person who wishes to try it. I do not care if the experiment is made in an Act of Parliament, as you are doing now, and you check healthy criticism, and kill that vitality which all honest remedies have to improve under the increased experience of mankind.

Mr. Alexander Wheeler said—We who are here feel the disadvantage under which we are placed. We represent a great number of people, it is true; and I believe that your Department knows better than any one of us the number of persons we really represent. It is perfectly correct to say that we represent a larger number of people than the Deputation which waited upon you last week. But the people we represent are generally speaking the masses of the poor. We cannot speak as representing halls of learning. We cannot speak as representing Royal Societies and Royal Colleges; nor can we speak as having Royal Families upon our side; but we can speak with considerable authority as representing a large number of our fellow-countrymen. Nevertheless as we appear for the poor, we speak under great disadvantage. In coming to the question we are met to bring before you to-day, I would like to impress upon you that your Department is the authority for the statements which I am going to make. I have sought in the records of the Local Government Board, I have sought in the utterances of its officers and in their annual reports, as well as those of the hospitals, to find what are the facts. The Deputation which waited upon you last week made a great deal of the authority which they represented. They made a great deal of the fears they entertain themselves as to what might happen if anything were conceded to us; but unless the reports which have met my eye are in Government, they have expressed opinions and presented nothing in the way of facts telling against us. They had no great
experiences pointing against us; they had no scientific observations pointing against us. Therefore, I will, if you will permit me, for a few moments endeavour to show what facts they are which Government officials of your Department and others, have been gathering which tell heavily and entirely against themselves. A hundred and fifty years ago, the practice of small-pox inoculation was begun in this country; and Dr. Jurin, who was one of the most prominent members of the medical profession, and who endeavoured to show the great facility with which people could undergo the artificial disease, and the great danger they ran in incurring the natural disease, found from a large number of observations that the fatality of natural small-pox was one in six of the cases. This is confirmed by Reece’s Cyclopaedia and other publications. About 16 per cent. died after taking the disease in the natural way. I wish now to bring you to our own times. I will confine myself solely to the period since 1869, the hospital reports and those of the Metropolitan Asylum Board, many of which I have carefully culled for this occasion—reports presented by officials, none of them on our side, and all of them of unimpeachable authority; these reports show that more than 16 per cent. die in hospitals to-day. Now this is a tremendous fact; because if you have been vaccinating the people of this country to the extent of 81, 86 and 87 per cent. of the births, and still you find that the hospitals only cure the same number that were cured 150 years ago, can you say that vaccination is of any avail? Supposing you have 100 cases in hospital, and you take no notice as to whether they are vaccinated or not, no more will be cured to-day, taking a large average of cases, than were cured in Dr. Jurin’s day. That shows there is no improvement, no matter how many are vaccinated, as regards the recovery from the disease.

Mr. Dodson—You are taking now the case of the people who have the small-pox.

Mr. Wheeler—Yes, and who are admitted to the hospitals for small-pox. I have reports of hospitals since 1869, which cover 89,000 cases, and out of that number no fewer than 20,000 are vaccinated, as recorded by the doctors treating them. Now that admission is entirely fatal to the existing law, for this reason, that Jenner’s practice was primary vaccination; he never contended for anything else, and that is the only thing which has ever been recognised and enforced by the laws of this country, although there are five distinct enactments under which we suffer. Now Dr. Gayton of the Homerton Hospital goes so far as to say “that he supposes no one is prepared to state that primary vaccination is an absolute preventive of small-pox.” Your own officer, Dr. Ballard says,—and I admire him for saying it, “Dr. Jenner’s prediction has not been fulfilled.” Experience has not justified his prediction, scientific observation and reasoning do not lead to the conclusion that small-pox ever will be eradicated even from civilised communities.” At the Conference Dr. Robinson has mentioned, Mr. Ceely was present, and I am perfectly amazed that Mr. Ceely should listen without remark to Dr. Quain and allow his statements made to you on Monday last to pass without challenge. Mr. Ceely at the Conference stated—“I say would not be able to annihilate small-pox, and he denied any one to show that he had claimed such a result;” and yet Dr. Quain comes here and says that you can. Further than that, Dr. Gregory, and I do not know a better authority, for he was for many years at the head of the Small-Pox Hospital in London, in reviewing the epidemics of his own time, says—— “All idea of banishing the small-pox is vain and illusory.” Now this is absolutely fatal to compulsory vaccination. The only thing which is now compelled is primary vaccination, and primary vaccination, on the confession of the hospital reports, is a gross and entire failure. Many of the hospital reports classify the disease simply by the vaccine marks; and the only ground upon which vaccination can to-day show any raison d’etre is the difference between the vaccinated and unvaccinated according to the marks. The hospital reports show that 96 per cent. of the discrete cases (the mild kind) are vaccinated; and the number of the vaccinated decreases to about 60 per cent. of the cases as the disease grows more malignant. That shows, and it is confirmed by Dr. Russell’s Glasgow report, that the tabulation of people according to their vaccine marks is wrong, because you only get the mild cases properly recorded. In very mild cases you can see the marks; but in malignant cases they are not so easily discovered. Dr. Russell points out that the compilers of the Metropolitan Hospital reports have not dealt with this difficulty. Dr. Russell says that they altered the registration of some of their patients, because when convalescent they discovered vaccine marks sometimes “very good;” but what of those who died? They were not corrected, and they simply swelled the unvaccinated death rate. This we contend is one reason why the unvaccinated show a greater death rate; but on the total you show no reduction.

Mr. Dodson—On the total of what?

Mr. Wheeler—You take 100 persons in an hospital, and you have no fewer deaths among them than 150 years ago.

Mr. Dodson—Of people who have the disease.

Mr. Wheeler—Yes. The Lancet says we must not take notice of these cases of 150 years ago, because they were all unvaccinated. But that is the strength of our contention. Then the unvaccinated population in this country include a large number of children who have been vaccinated three times, and remain “unvaccinated” because of non-success. The Local Government Board’s returns show nearly 1000 of them per annum. They are if entering hospital, unvaccinated. I have observed once or twice that children of this, and of the “unfit” class, have been noticed in the registration returns, but generally they are not specified when dying of small-pox. Then there are 5000 children annually who have been turned aside by the public vaccinators, because you select the population you vaccinate; you dare not submit
every child to this rite; you know its danger; and therefore you exempt those children that are not healthy. 'We submit that this is one of the most damaging statements that can be made against the rite. Further than that, the 5000 children that you put aside are some of the unvaccinated; they are unhealthy and stru-
mous and delicate, many of them have eczema and skin complaints. I have one case in my
mind, from which no medical man would vaccinate because they had such a terrible dread of the erysipelas which would follow. These are
the children who ought to be singled out in the
reports, and specified separately, so that we may
know if the unvaccinated are as we contend, the
weakest of the small-pox hospital patients. I think
you have here complete evidence showing the
uselessness of primary vaccination, and I con-
tend that it gives just ground for the total abolition
of compulsion. But if it is contended that revac-
cination is successful, then there is no better.
Dr. Keller’s report has never been challenged.
He is not particularly friendly to us, nor does he
appear to like being in any way connected with us.
Yet Dr. Keller reported a considerable number
of revaccinated cases occurring amongst the
State Railway servants in Austria, and they
yielded nearly the same mortality as the
unvaccinated. I will not detain you further.
I think we have here ground for saying that
any concessions you may make to us—and we
shall be glad to receive them—will only have to
be followed by others; for as certainly as the
people of this country are on the path of science,
and disposed to follow its teaching; and as
surely as scientific procedure is being more and
more adopted into our legislation and into the
homes and habits of the people, so certainly and
so surely will the march of science doom this
superstition to decay.

Dr. Edward Hadront, of Upper Norwood,
said—On the present occasion we do not pur-
pose occupying your attention with many details, but
rather prefer to lay before you the general facts
and principles on which our own judgment in
this matter has been based. So far as we have
been allowed in the non-medical press, we have
found that with our opponents’ arguments; but
the medical journals have been, up to the present
time, absolutely closed against us. On the one
hand, we find ourselves made the subject of
continual attacks of the most scurrilous descrip-
tions; whereas we are not, on the other hand,
permitted even to answer libellous accusations,
or to state what are our real opinions. Notwith-
standing these disadvantages, we gain ground
every day in the contest; and in place of asking
for a mere mitigation of penalties under the
Vaccination Acts, we now demand the total
disestablishment of the blood-poisoning trades-
union, with all its ratteners, picketers, spies,
and informers. If you ask me why I compare
the pro-vaccinators to a trades-union, I say that
their present and past behaviour alike justify the
appellation. The last act of which they have
been guilty is the issuing of a circular through
the medium of the British Medical Journal,
with a view of obtaining the signatures (if
possible) of about 9000 medical men, who are
asked as a personal matter, to sign and return
‘the subjoined declaration,’ or words to that
effect. Obviously many signatures may have
been obtained in this way which, had time for
reflection been allowed, would have been with-
held. For the circular in question not only
states that a healthy child, if unvaccinated, is
‘a nuisance’ (an obviously silly remark); but
it makes a charge against the opponents of the
Acts, which a very little inquiry would have
shown to be entirely false. Yet this is issued
by the author of a tract called The Truth about
Vaccination, who is hereby challenged to pro-
duce (if he is able) one single ‘interested
person’ who is engaged in deprecating vacci-
nation or subverting the minds of ignorant
and thoughtless people. As for the leaders of
the movement being now, or having been at any
previous time moved by personal interest
in the matter (as many of our opponents
must necessarily be), if such be the meaning
intended to be conveyed in the declaration be-
fore mentioned, we trample it under our feet
with indignant scorn; and beg to say in addi-
tion, that if it lost us twice as much in the
future, as it has done in the past, we will con-
tinue to tear away the refuge of lies; nor will
we cease until we have cut down, root and
branch, the upas tree that stands as an obstacle
in the path of science, and overshadow every
home in the land with its poisonous influence.
I will not weary you with a discussion of the
needless alarms with which an attempt is made
to frighten ‘thoughtless and ignorant people’ in
the case the present acts are mitigated in their
severity; but I will ask our legislators whether
they are themselves prepared to carry out the
theory of vaccination which is now generally
received? Unless all of them who are past
middle life have been several times vaccinated
‘successfully,’ as it is absurdly called, they are,
according to all pro-vaccinators ‘barrels of
petroleum, kegs of gunpowder, cakes of nitro-
glycerine, and public nuisances which ought to
be put down.’ Nay, more the magistrates who
administer this unconstitutional law, are not
only themselves usually in a practically unvac-
cinated condition, but are, moreover, individually
liable to penalty under another law which for-
bids inoculation with small-pox matter, and
which they are aiding and abetting whenever
they promote the use of the so-called ‘vaccine
lymph’ now provided by Government, which
turns out to be, on the confession of these gentle-
men who recently addressed you on the other
side to be, in the great majority of cases, neither
more nor less than small-pox matter diluted by
being passed through the body of a beast.
That it is altered in its essential properties by
this dilution is contrary to all scientific analogy;
whilst the increase in the number and severity
of epidemics of small-pox since it has become
fashionable, fully justifies the supposition that
it retains its pricks and virulence unchanged.

Mr. Amos Booth (Leicester) said—I have
the honour of coming from a town which sends to
Parliament Mr. Peter Alfred Taylor, the gentle-
man who has made such an important move in
the House of Commons in connection with this matter. At Leicester we have, I am happy to say, an increasing number of anti-vaccinators; and speaking on their behalf, I can assure you that whilst we do not wish to throw any impediment in the way of the Government Bill which you have introduced, we certainly will not rest satisfied with anything short of the total repeal of the Compulsory Acts. We have looked at this matter rather strongly in Leicester, and I presume we may claim to stand A.1., so to speak, in fighting the battle of anti-vaccination. Our prosecutors have sent over thirty men to Leicester jail who have refused to comply with this law. ("Shame.") We have paid out of the pockets of poor people hundreds and hundreds of pounds in fines; and to-day, on the authority of the Vaccine Law Commissioner, we have some 500 defaulters. We have looked at this matter from various points. It is customary with those who are opposed to us, especially the medical profession, to accuse us of introducing far-fetched statistics; to accuse us of doing anything of the kind. We never introduce statistics of our own; they are always the figures of the vaccinators. We have no figures, and we do not want any. As far as I am personally concerned, I consider it against common-sense to attempt to discuss vaccination on the basis of statistics. But as the doctors introduce them (trying to take us as far from home as possible)—we refute them. I prefer, however, to take our own experience. We have sufficient evidence from our own medical officer in Leicester to prove that vaccination is a thing rotten from the core.

Mr. Dodson—Apart from statistics—as you do not attach weight to them—what is your own argument?

Mr. Booth—My own argument is that vaccination is opposed to nature—that it is an unnatural operation. I have a little boy in this room, one of the asserted foci of infection. I have been summoned for him five times because I have refused to comply with the law and have him vaccinated, and I shall protect him in spite of fifty thousand prosecutions. This Bill, if passed by the Government, will not confer on us at Leicester much advantage; and I hope from the facts adduced by unprejudiced and disinterested witnesses, that you will see your way not only to abolish multiple penalties, but to go in for what we in Leicester intend to have—total and unconditional repeal.

Mr. James Lewis (Ipswich) mentioned a case within his own knowledge of a child whose death from small-pox was registered as "unvaccinated;" but on searching the vaccination register it was found to be entered as "successfully vaccinated."

Mr. Burslem (Norwich)—My object is not to argue the question, but simply to inform you as to the state of public opinion in the district from whence I come. I am a native of Norwich. After being away for some time I returned and there were no less than 500 of my fellow-countrymen requested to have my child vaccinated. I declined, and was prosecuted. That, I believe, was the first prosecution in Norwich. Since that time there have been a number of prosecutions. I sat on the Board of Guardians, and we had occasion to call for a return in February 1879 of the number of children then unvaccinated, and we found that those above six months old numbered 260, showing that from 1878 to 1879 the feeling against compulsory vaccination had grown astonishingly. Further, last March I had the honour to be returned at the top of the poll for the School Board of Norwich, although I do not occupy such a prominent position as would warrant my being placed in that capacity, beyond the fact that I have all along protested against compulsory vaccination. The feeling on the subject in Norwich is so strong that I polled 900 more votes than any of the other six candidates. I think that fact alone shows that the feeling against this law is very strong in Norwich. We have a number of people who pay weekly to a "defence fund," and the more they are prosecuted the more will they contribute towards these subscriptions and collect subscriptions. As anti-vaccinators I think we ought to give you credit, sir, for an honest attempt to deal with this question; at the same time I must say that should this Bill become law, I believe that where there is now one anti-vaccinator, there will then be twenty; because in our city and throughout the country there are hundreds of people who cannot afford to pay fines time after time. I do not say this to discourage the Government from passing the Bill, but because I am convinced that the only satisfactory settlement of this vexed question will be the total abolition of the Vaccination Acts.

It was announced that Mr. John Lucas, of Gateshead, whose name was next on the list of speakers, was unable to come.

Dr. W. J. Collins said—I wish to impress upon you, sir, and the honourable Board over which you preside, the absolute necessity of practical experience upon this vital question. Men are often two times because I have refused to comply with the law and have him vaccinated, and I shall protect him in spite of fifty thousand prosecutions. This Bill, if passed by the Government, will not confer on us at Leicester much advantage; and I hope from the facts adduced by unprejudiced and disinterested witnesses, that you will see your way not only to abolish multiple penalties, but to go in for what we in Leicester intend to have—total and unconditional repeal.

Mr. James Lewis (Ipswich) mentioned a case within his own knowledge of a child whose death from small-pox was registered as "unvaccinated;" but on searching the vaccination register it was found to be entered as "successfully vaccinated."

Mr. Burslem (Norwich)—My object is not to argue the question, but simply to inform you as to the state of public opinion in the district from whence I come. I am a native of Norwich. After being away for some time I returned and there were no less than 500 of my fellow-countrymen requested to have my child vaccinated. I declined, and was prosecuted. That, I believe, was the first prosecution in Norwich. Since that time there have been a number of prosecutions. I sat on the Board of Guardians, and we had occasion to call for a return in February 1879 of the number of children then unvaccinated, and we found that those above six months old numbered 260, showing that from 1878 to 1879 the feeling against compulsory vaccination had grown astonishingly. Further, last March I had the honour to be returned at the top of the poll for the School Board of Norwich, although I do not occupy such a prominent position as would warrant my being placed in that capacity, beyond the fact that I have all along protested against compulsory vaccination. The feeling on the subject in Norwich is so strong that I polled 900 more votes than any of the other six candidates. I think that fact alone shows that the feeling against this law is very strong in Norwich. We have a number of people who pay weekly to a "defence fund," and the more they are prosecuted the more will they contribute towards these subscriptions and collect subscriptions. As anti-vaccinators I think we ought to give you credit, sir, for an honest attempt to deal with this question; at the same time I must say that should this Bill become law, I believe that where there is now one anti-vaccinator, there will then be twenty; because in our city and throughout the country there are hundreds of people who cannot afford to pay fines time after time. I do not say this to discourage the Government from passing the Bill, but because I am convinced that the only satisfactory settlement of this vexed question will be the total abolition of the Vaccination Acts.

It was announced that Mr. John Lucas, of Gateshead, whose name was next on the list of speakers, was unable to come.
late Thomas Wakley, made a penal offence. It is now the fashion to be vaccinated and re-vaccinated. One of the Court physicians, who was whipped up for the occasion, told the Select Committee of 1871 that the body was not designed to ‘think himself wicked if he were not to recommend every one, whenever the small-pox became epidemic, to be vaccinated and re-vaccinated.’ Now I say, as a practical man, Never under any circumstances vaccinate or re-vaccinate during an epidemic, as I have known the worst possible results follow, and even death. If we were to adopt this learned gentleman’s advice, considering we have upon an average five or six epidemic outbreaks of small-pox every twenty years, it is hardly possible to conceive what a mass of diseased animals we should become. If you wish to stamp out small-pox, isolate all who fall ill, institute and enforce a more rigid observance of the necessary sanitary laws, do away with the plague spots and fever dens that abound in the metropolis, and especially that filthy cesspool, the Regent’s Canal, which, to my knowledge, has been used these last forty years as a receptacle for the whole of the sewage from the Zoological Gardens, and in my opinion is the cause of many preventable diseases. As to the transmission of syphilis through vaccine lymph, no man of eminence and experience now denies it. Hereditary syphilis has of late years been playing an important part among the population generally, and the offspring of those constitutionally affected are often used as vaccinators. ‘The blood theory,’ as it is called, is a delusion. Where does the lymph come from if not from the blood? Besides, specimens of the purest lymph from a national vaccine station have been found to contain blood corpuscles. The whole system of vaccination, as now practised, is involved in doubts, difficulties, and disputes, and is liable to so many reasonable objections that nothing short of the adoption, of Mr. Taylor’s amendment to the Bill now before the House, of compulsory vaccination will satisfy those who, like myself, are opposed to compulsory vaccination.

Mr. Thomas Baker said—There had been three deputations to the Government upon this question, and some of the medical men had been urging greater stringency in the law. The present deputation asked for the total repeal of the compulsory law. As the Government could not advance or recede without making hosts of enemies, he suggested that it would be better to have a full and fair inquiry, and he suggested that able lawyers would make suitable referees. He would be quite satisfied with their verdict. (“We should not.”)

Mr. Dobson reminded the speaker that some of the able lawyers mentioned had expressed decided views in favour of vaccination.

Mr. F. Davis, junr., (Ennisworth, Ireland), pointed out that there had been severe visitations of small-pox in his country, notwithstanding the enforcement of vaccination and the burning of infected clothing and small-pox. There was an increasing objection to the compulsory vaccination law in Ireland. Those who were prosecuted over and over again were regarded as martyrs, and one gentleman was removing his family to America in consequence of having been proceeded against nine or ten times.

Mr. Dobson—How can that be? Such is not the law in Ireland.

Mr. Davis repeated that the multiple penalties applied to Ireland, the law having been altered last year.

Mr. Dobson referred to the Act of Parliament and found that Mr. Davis’s statement was correct.

Mr. Henry Pitman (Manchester) pointed out that many poor parents were induced by fear of prosecution to neglect the registration of the births of their children; other parents tried to evade the law by removal or by giving false names. Mr. Hastings, M.P., said that as a magistrate he had never known any person prosecuted for refusing to vaccinate; the implied inference being that the anti-vaccinators were a contemptible minority. The fact was that hundreds of prosecutions took place every year, and there would be thousands more if the poor could afford to pay the fines, or had the courage to go to prison. Parents yielded up their children to this detested operation against their conscience; but the law makers were the real criminals. Sir John Lubbock stated that he had never been questioned on the subject of vaccination at any election meeting. In the North of England every candidate was closely questioned, as Mr. Jacob Bright and the other members of Parliament present could testify. There was a very strong feeling in the Manchester district against this mischievous and oppressive enactment, and nothing would satisfy the people but total repeal. Modifications of the law were only accepted as instalments of justice. He recommended suspension of the compulsory power pending a Royal Commission of Inquiry. To show the dangerous effect of the present stringent law, even in the opinion of pro-vaccinators, Mr. Pitman quoted the following from the report of the medical officers of the Hospital for Sick Children. ‘The excitable glandular system of a child so young may be (and sometimes is) so affected by the irritation and effects of the operation (vaccination) as to leave results which are, to say the least, undesirable, and which might be avoided if a longer period were allowed.’ Mr. Pitman contended that vaccination was nothing less than inoculation, and therefore ought to be a penal offence. In proof of this he quoted from a Report on the present state of vaccination, made at the request of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association in 1889, by a committee of 28 duly registered medical men, of whom Dr. Baron, Jenner’s biographer, was chairman. In this report it was stated:— ‘The vaccine disease is not the preventive of small-pox, but the small-pox itself, the virulent and contagious disease being a malignant variety.’ Mr. Pitman also exhibited Mr. Celsy’s work of the same date, with its coloured plates of the sickening sores present in small-pox, and of the vaccinal animal lymph. In conclusion, he urged that as vaccination could not possibly prevent small-pox, and as the law was not really compulsory
and could not be absolutely enforced, it had better be repealed.

Mr. W. A. Tenx presented a Memorial from the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination setting forth the evils of vaccination and praying for the repeal of the Vaccination Acts. Mr. Tebb said the Memorial embodied the feelings of a large number of intelligent parents throughout the kingdom. Statistics had proved that vaccination had no effect in preventing or mitigating small-pox; hence the memorialists urged that vaccination ought to be optional and not compulsory. The facts set forth in the Memorial were not invented by anti-vaccinators, but were obtained from the highest and most reliable authorities. To show the extent of the opposition to these Acts, Mr. Tebb mentioned that there were three journals devoted to the work of repeal, and there was a large amount of dissatisfaction with the Acts throughout the country.

The literature published on the question was so extensive that the head of Her Majesty's Government lately stated in the House of Commons that the tables of honourable members literally groaned under its weight. Nothing short of the entire repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Acts would allay the widespread irritation and acute feeling of injustice produced by this unwise and mischievous legislation.

Mr. Stewart Simon, M.P., said the Deputation represented all parts of the country. The honourable member added—"In my part of the country, there is a very strong feeling about it. In the parliamentary borough of Dewsbury and the neighbourhood of Leeds, I believe there are many hundreds of the working class who are opposed to this measure."

Mr. Emery related how he had lost one child through vaccination, and expressed his detestation of the practice and his determination to oppose the compulsory law until it was repealed. He referred to the fact that whereas the communication of syphilis by vaccination was utterly denied a few years ago, the dreadful facts were now admitted. This was sufficient to justify parents' refusal to allow their children to be vaccinated. He characterised vaccination as the greatest mistake ever made by medical men, and advocated suspension of the Acts and a full inquiry. The investigation by the Committee of 1871 was partial, witnesses were refused a hearing, and the Committee came to an abrupt conclusion. One of the witnesses was Sir William Jenner who said repeatedly that he was no authority upon vaccination, yet he had the hardihood to recommend all the Royal Family to be revaccinated. Mr. Emery said the letter written by Sir William Jenner to some member of the royal family was satirizing in its stupidity. Victims cried aloud for vengeance on those who had passed these iniquitous Acts.

Mr. Dodson, in reply, said—He had listened with interest to the statements which they had made on the question. In regard to the evidence before the Committee of 1871, he did not quite understand a remark which had been made to the effect that anti-vaccination witnesses were not heard before the Committee. There was a thick volume of evidence. It might be that every man in the country who was opposed to vaccination was not heard, but there must be a limit to inquiry, or the question would never be brought to a conclusion. He had the greatest respect and sympathy for those who thought their children had suffered through the law. It was the duty of the Government to act as far as they could on what they believed to be the average settled public opinion of the country, and they had to weigh on the one hand the feelings of individual parents, and on the other hand to consider what was believed by the community at large to be of material consequence for their protection from disease. The Bill before the House was not one either for the establishment or disestablishment of compulsion, nor had it anything to do with the question of re-vaccination; the Bill was simply one for reducing the great multiplicity of penalties which might now be inflicted on the same person. Some difference of opinion had been expressed in the room as to the Bill, and he should like to know whether the majority of those present wished for the Bill or not. (Cries of "Yes, yes," and Mr. Tebb said that he was sure the majority accepted the Bill as an instalment, and that they felt the difficulties of the right hon. gentleman's position. Hear, hear.) Mr. Dodson said that having ascertained their opinion on this point he did not think he could say anything more than that he was glad he had met them.—Sergeant Simon thanked the right hon. gentleman, and the Deputation withdrew.

A private meeting of the members of the Deputation was subsequently held at Whitehall, when Dr. Collins spoke of the importance and beneficial effect of questioning candidates at elections, and only voting for those who promised to support the repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Law.

Mr. Alex. Weelker impressed on all the friends of the movement, present and absent, the duty and necessity of persevering and energetic efforts on behalf of their cause, and especially in educating members of Parliament.

Mr. Tenx thought the meeting would like to hear a statement from Mr. Giles, of Boston, U.S.A., respecting the anti-vaccination movement in America. Mr. Giles gave a very interesting and encouraging account of the growing feeling against vaccination amongst his countrymen. There were no vaccination prosecutions in the United States, but unvaccinated children were excluded from the public schools. It was believed by Dr. Wilder that the increase of consumption in the United States was largely due to vaccination. The attempts of the "regular" doctors to get a monopoly of the art of healing had been signally defeated. Many eclectic practitioners were opposed to vaccination; the press also was more disposed to publish articles against the practice. He agreed with Sir John Forbes that there would be fewer deaths in civilised communities if there were no doctors, and with Oliver Wendell Holmes when
he advised them to throw medicine into the seas, for it would be better for mankind, though worse for the fishes.

Mr. Tubb congratulated the members of the Deputation that, in the opinion of such a high authority as Mr. Jacob Bright, it had been very successful. He hoped they would all feel animated to renewed efforts to procure the entire repeal of the compulsory law, and advised every friend of the movement to co-operate with the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, which had opened central offices in London, at Gray's Inn Chambers, 20 High Holborn. The subscription had been placed as low as 2s. 6d. per annum. Mr. Haaker, the secretary, would be glad to receive the names of new members.

Several names and subscriptions were handed in.

Mr. Tubb, on behalf of the Committee, thanked those members of the Deputation who had come long distances.

On the motion of Mr. Booth, seconded by Mr. Baker, it was resolved that a recommendation be made in the way of the Government Bill, the Deputation would not rest satisfied until the Vaccination Acts were unconditionally repealed.

The meeting closed with hearty thanks to Mr. Tubb and the Committee for the energy they had shown in organising the deputation.

LETTERS CONNECTED WITH THE DEPUTATION.

Many letters were received excusing attendance with the Deputation, the chief reason being the awkward day, 2nd August, Bank Holiday. The preceding Monday, 26th July, had been originally fixed by Mr. Dodson for the interview; and Mr. P. A. Taylor had consented to introduce the Deputation, but the change of date compelled him to write—

22 Ashley Place, S.W.
27th July, 1880.

Dear Sir,—I am always engaged on August Bank Holiday—all my old employés spend the day with me at Brighton, so that it would be very inconvenient for me to attend. But it does not matter, as you will easily get another M.P. to introduce you, and there will be no more time for speaking than the medical men of the deputation should take. Besides which I have so lately spoken at large that it will perhaps be better that I should not do so now.—

Yours truly,

Wm. White, Esq.

P. A. TAYLOR.

From C. H. Hopwood, Esq., M.P.
Liverpool Assizes,
30th July, 1880.

Dear Sir,—I should be glad to attend the deputation on Monday next if I can get away from this, which is not at present quite certain.

Yours truly,

W. White, Esq.

CHAS. H. HOPWOOD.

From Lord Clifton.

Cobham Hall, Gravesend, 29th July, 1880.

My dear Sir,—Our aims and desires are the same, viz., the repeal of the Vaccination Acts. I prefer, however, to work alone, and not through deputations, associations, and committees. I do not greatly believe in the success of deputations to ministers. Furthermore, I decline to attend one on Bank Holiday. I have written strongly to Mr. Dodson, but I do not wish it to be thought that he has given a public and successful reply to my arguments. I advise you to rely strongly on isolation and disfavour as the only true means of preventing the spread of small-pox. That would be a fair subject for Government to take up. How can the vaccination of children who have not got any disease whatsoever affect the spread of small-pox? It is an atrocious impudent lie for the press to say that the non-vaccination of healthy children is the same as the dissemination of small-pox. It is a contradiction in terms, and a transparent absurdity. Pray give it my friend Mr. Dodson hot and strong on this point. Tell him that he himself, for the matter of that is a possible focus of small-pox, measles, scarlatina, diphtheria, typhus and typhoid fever, and Asiatic cholera, and is, therefore, a danger to the public. The confusion between fact and vague possibility involved in the enforcement of vaccination is really too puerile when you look into it; and as under the most extreme circumstances a large majority of the population must escape small-pox, even if vaccination had never been invented, therefore, by their own confession, the doctors inflict a certain disease on the entire population, for which the majority get no compensation at all. A whole nation is given a “mild” pox (of which, however, many die, and more are seriously poisoned) in order that a minority may escape small-pox, a by no means necessarily fatal, or even permanently disfiguring disease.—Yours very faithfully,

Wm. White, Esq.

CLIFTON.

From Thomas Burt, Esq., M.P.
House of Commons,
29th July, 1880.

Dear Sir,—I leave to-morrow for Newcastle-on-Tyne, and cannot return to London before Monday night. I regret, therefore, that I shall not be able to accompany the deputation to Mr. Dodson on Monday. I entirely agree with the object sought by the deputation, and wish you every success.—Truly yours,

Wm. White, Esq.

THOMAS BURT.

From A. J. Ottway, Esq., M.P.
19 Cromwell Road, S.W.
31st July, 1880.

Dear Sir,—Regret that I shall be in Staffordshire at the time arranged for the reception of the deputation. I think it right, however, to say that I am by no means prepared without further inquiry and authority to go the length that Mr. Taylor does in the matter.—I am, dear sir, yours truly.

Wm. White, Esq.

ARTHUR OTWAY.
From the Mayor of Leeds.

Town Hall, Leeds,
29th of 7th Month, 1880.

Dear Friend, Wm. White,—I regret that I shall not be able to join your deputation. I am writing to our member, J. Barran, and hope that he and Herbert Gladstone may see their way to be present and support the Government Bill.—I am respectfully,

GEORGE TATRAM.

From John Barran, Esq., M.P.
38 Queen's Gate, S.W.
29th July, 1880.

Dear Mr. Mayor,—I regret that I cannot join the deputation to Mr. Dodson in reference to the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, as I am not favourable to such a change in the law. I am, however, in favour of providing such safeguards as will, as far possible, prevent some of the worst effects of the present system.—I am, dear Mr. Mayor, yours truly,

To the Right Worshipful the Mayor of Leeds.

JOHN BARRAN.

From Herbert Gladstone, Esq., M.P.
House of Commons,
30th July, 1880.

Sir,—I regret to say that I do not consider it advisable for me to attend the deputation to-morrow, for the reason that my presence might give rise to misunderstanding about my own position in regard to the vaccination question.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Wm. White, Esq.

HERBERT GLADSTONE.

From the Hon. Auberon Herbert.
Pancraster, Hereford,
29th July, 1880.

Dear Sir,—I am thoroughly opposed to compulsory vaccination. I express no opinion on vaccination itself. Be good enough to guard me from doing this. I could not attend the deputation as I am returning home.—Yours faithfully,

Wm. White, Esq.

AUBERON HERBERT.

From S. Lennard, Esq., Leicester.
Linwood Villa, Humberstone Road,
1st August, 1880.

Dear Sir,—I fully intended to join the deputation to Mr. Dodson, but our Sunday School Centenary Festival is fixed for to-morrow, and as I am superintendent of a large Sunday School, I must attend it. I regret very much that the two events are on the same day, as I should have been glad to have supported, in any way I could, the deputation. If in the future, occasion arises for taking such steps again, kindly let me know, and I shall be happy to assist. With thanks for your kindness and trouble.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

Wm. White, Esq.

S. LENNARD.

From the Rev. William Cuff.
Shoreditch Tabernacle,
4th August, 1880.

My dear Sir,—I should have been with you on Monday, but I was out of town. I write to say this because I should not like you to think I am at all indifferent about the vaccination question. I very much regret I could not form one of the deputation, and take public part in the humane and Christian demand for reform in the law on this matter. It is to me astounding that intelligent Englishmen quietly submit to such a farce as vaccination. But I hope the time of deliverance is near, and that sound reason and common-sense will prevail with statesmen who are liberal and noble on almost every question touching national and social progress. At the last General Election I pleaded everywhere, privately, and publicly, that no question should be a test question except Gladstone or Beaconsfield—Which? This tens of thousands of us did, and I hope it will not be forgotten by those we sent to St. Stephen’s. Let us plod on, bravely and wisely, for we can wait to win, and the next generation will bless if this shall curse us.—I am, sir, yours sincerely,

Wm. White, Esq.

W. CUFF.

THE MEMORIAL TO MR. DODSON.
To the Right Honourable J. G. Dodson, M.P.,
President of the Local Government Board,
The Humble Memorial of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination,
Sheweth,
That no fewer than five Acts of Parliament have been passed to make the practice of vaccination universal, and to reduce to the smallest possible number the unvaccinated people of England and Wales.
That those enactments have effected the object aimed at to so great an extent as is possible, comparatively few children except those certified to be unfit now remaining unvaccinated.
That this has been the case with only slight variations since 1870, the Act making vaccination very difficult of evasion having passed in the year 1867.
That we may therefore consider the population of England and Wales which has been subject to the legislation of 1867 an almost entirely vaccinated population.
That since the year 1889 certain Hospitals have reported 29,680 cases of treated small-pox.
That of this large number no fewer than 29,680 are reported as vaccinated prior to admission. That with every increase on the per centage of the population who are vaccinated, the proportion of vaccinated persons thus treated in Hospitals for the small-pox increases.
That Edward Jenner’s so-called “discovery” of the practice of vaccination was accepted and adopted in 1802, because of his then declaring in the most positive language it was possible to employ that primary vaccination absolutely protected from small-pox for life.
That the above named Hospital experience of recent years has compelled medical authorities to entirely abandon Jenner's ground, and deny the statements he made in 1802.

That Dr. Gayton has even gone so far as to say in his well known Homerton Report, "I suppose no one is now prepared to say that primary vaccination is an absolute preventive of small-pox."

The failure of primary vaccination (the only enforced practice) thus confessed, is a universal failure, and applies wherever vaccination is practiced.

That the severity of the disease in bad cases produces so much eruption as to cover up or obliterate vaccine marks upon the patient.

That the mild cases are those on which vaccination marks are clearly visible.

That there has resulted a classification of Hospitals that is done by "marks" of vaccination which is wholly misleading.

That this has been proved to be misleading in Glasgow Hospitals, the classification of the patients having been altered on recovery.

That this classification by marks of vaccine is further proved to be misleading, from the fact that the disease now follows the exact course described by Sydenham, long before Jenner was born.

That in severity and fatality it is now just what Jurin's collected cases show it to have been in the early part of the 18th century.

That so far as statistics show, vaccination is therefore proved to have no influence either in preventing or modifying the small-pox.

That the foregoing facts clearly lead to the conclusion that the practice of vaccination ought to be entirely optional.

That as no public benefit is derived from it, no portion of the public funds should be paid for its support.

Your Memorialists therefore pray that you will introduce a Parliament a Bill having for its object the Repeal of all the existing Vaccination Laws. And your Memorialists will ever pray.

WILLIAM TERR, Chairman.
WALTER HASKER, Hon. Sec.
(and about 40 others.)

ARE VACCINATORS FOOLS, OR KNAVES, OR WHAT?

We have been aroused to ask ourselves the question —Are our medical vaccinators fools, or knaves, or what? From their extraordinary action and extraordinary statements against the Bill, recently before Parliament in relation to vaccination, to limit the persecuting power of Boards of Guardians and of Justices Shallows.

For instance, we have one aged physician who should command respect, but whose conduct only excites pity. A little more than a year ago he wrote an able letter, in which he deprecated and denounced anti-vaccinators for bearing numerous penalties, or even repeated imprisonment, rather than submit their children to the ghastly risk of vaccino-syphilis. Now he can be dragged before the President of the Local Government Board to give influence by his presence to a medical deputation desiring unlimited persecution of parents, to force them to submit their children to the ghastly risk he, in a lucid moment, strongly deprecated. We say his presence advisedly, for he was as impotent to make a speech or plead a reason as Jenner himself when before a Parliamentary Committee.

Then the medical vaccinators reason that to give up perpetual persecution of virtuous parents (which is in itself a crime) and to be allowed only a limited power of crushing the consciences of fathers and mothers, and to be allowed only a limited power to take from parents their authority and right over the welfare of their children, will result in a fearful epidemic of small-pox! Natural liberty, then, is dangerous folly. Small-pox, then, does not come of filth, but bursts out only when parents are not the serfs of medical impostors. Then the Government is informed that the anti-vaccinators are so small a minority that it should not listen to them; but it also is told, that they are so strong that if they are released from the despotic chains of persecution they will overturn and destroy vaccination altogether!

Such action and such reasoning have convinced us to see if our forefathers, or the inhabitants of other countries, were burdened with the curse of medical follies, superstitions, and crimes. It seems that the evil has ever been the same, though varied in form.

For instance, in modern times, as late as the reign of James I., English physicians resorted to judicial astrology to discriminate diseases and determine if death or a cure would result!

We have in the history of physicians the question that they put to candidates for licence to kill or cure the people, and the answer given by a medical student—"Being asked in astrology what house he looked into to know a disease or the event of it, and how the lord ascendant should stand thereon," he answered, "He looks for the sixth house, which being disproved he saith he understands nothing therein but what he hath out of Calimam; and being asked what books he hath read in that art, he saith he hath none but Calimam."

Long before the reign of James I., and down to the end of the reign of his grandson, physicians and surgeons published book after book to prove that the touch of our kings cured scrofula. Richard Wiseman, surgeon and surgeon to Charles II., was probably skilful up to the light of his day, and an accurate observer of disease. In his Treatise on Scrofula, a work that proves his knowledge of the disease, he says: "His Majesty cured more in any one year than all the chirurgeons in London in an age."

In another passage he says: "I myself have been a frequent eye-witness of many hundreds of cases performed by his Majesty's touch alone, without any assistance of chirurgy, and many of them such as had tired out the endeavours of able chirurgeons before they came thither. It was neither wet nor dry, and what I receive acknowledgments of by letter, not only from the several parts of this nation, but also from Ireland, Scotland, Jersey, and Guernsey."

Higher medical evidence could not be given in any case. Yet the whole thing was falsity and superstition nevertheless. The skill and honesty of Wiseman cannot be doubted. He believed as his predecessors, but his belief was confirmed by bishops and priests. The English Prayer-Book for centuries contained a special service for the

* Goodall's Royal College of Physicians.
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Ceremony of the Touch, wherein God was reminded that through the sign of the cross this realm is granted unto the kings thereof, that by the sole imposition of their hands a most grievous and filthy disease should be cured," etc. No fact or statement in medical men for centuries than this belief in the cure of scrofula by the touch of the fingers of our kings, as is proved by the assertions of medical men, confirmed by bishops and priests and lords. The ready admission of medical men for centuries of their impotence to cure scrofula, and of the unfailing power of our kings to transmit health from the tips of their fingers to the afflicted, and even to give sound flesh to the rotten and unsound, is one of those marvels of deceiver that should make us indifferent to the startling figures and unreasonable statements of modern medical men in relation to the superstition and fraud of vaccination. We can cite their adhesion to judicial astrology, and their support of the Ceremony of the Touch as proofs that their teaching was always false. Now, medical men have a vested interest in untruth-doing; they lie methodically to perpetuate and increase their fees. Of old, they were deluded by a superstition that injured their social importance and reduced their fees. They had then a deficiency of reason whilst their modern representatives have a deficiency of honesty.

But we have another more striking instance of the unreason of medical men in the past, exactly parallel to the reason of modern medical impostors of modern times.

The King of Spain determined, in the year 1760, to free Madrid of the abominably disgusting custom of throwing all ordure and slops from the upper windows upon the highways. He issued a proclamation that the proprietor of every house should build a proper receptacle for all defecations, promising that drains or common sewers should be made at the public expense. The innovation on old custom quite shocked public opinion, but the physicians of Madrid exceeded all other parties in violent opposition and loud protests against improvement. They would have cheered the heart of Mr. Ernest Hart and the medical men who get their light or darkness from the British Medical Journal.

The Spanish physicians worried the King with deputations—as their representatives have here lately worried the President of the Local Government Board. "They bade the fairest to interest the King in the preservation of the ancient privileges of his people; for they remonstrated that if the filth was not thrown into the streets as usual, a fatal sickness would probably result, because the putrescent particles of the air which such filth attracted, would then be imbued by the human body."*

The reasoning of the physicians at Madrid is just as good and just as convincing as the reasoning of medical vaccinators of our day. The medical men of the past and present reverence filth. Of old, it was required that the eye and nose only should be taintcd with the filth. In our days the filth, far more putrescent than that of Spanish streets, must be inserted under the skin—within the sacred fabric of the human body—to ferment the blood, and plant in it the foulest of all diseases, and sacrifice its life, sometimes inch by inch, and sometimes rapid as a lightning flash. The action of the Spanish physicians was silly—the action of English vaccinating medical men is murderous. The action of the Spanish physicians had no taint of selfishness. Our vacinaators take hire and receive bribes to applaud and perpetuate the fraud.

English men and English women when they fully comprehend the futility of vaccination and the untrustworthiness of medical men will certainly put down the murderous and costly superstition with a heavy hand. Our medical vaccinators, in slaying thousands of infants every year, and polluting temporally and for life many thousands more, are trying the patience of God, and exasperating fathers and mothers until rebellion and revenge must ensue. The crime of compulsory vaccination is so infamous that even the coarse consciences of imposed Liberals must soon be aroused to take quick action to compensate for their long indifference to the oppression of their neighbours, and the unjust waste of public money.

W. G. WARD, F.R.H.S.

A Return as to Persons imprisoned or fined for non-compliance with the Vaccination Act, moved for in the House of Commons by Mr. Otway, has been published. Next month we shall give some account of it. It is obvious at a glance that it is extremely incomplete and inaccurate.

Mr. JOSIAH JACOB of Limerick, Member of the Society of Friends, repeatedly prosecuted for refusing to have his child vaccinated, has settled the controversy by selling his business and emigrating to Pennsylvania. We wish he had remained and fought the battle out. Ireland can ill afford to lose such citizens.

THE WICKER ORDER OF GUARDIANS.—At a meeting of the Guardians, Newcastle-on-Tyne, on the 6th August, Mr. E. Procter moved and Mr. Johnson seconded a resolution, that the Board should petition Parliament in favour of the Vaccination Amendment Act, 1868. The motion was met with a direct negative, but was carried by a large majority.

SPECIAL INFORMATION WANTED.

The poor are not only the most numerous, but the chief sufferers from Vaccination—the rite being inflicted on their offspring without the preparation and precautions which the upper and middle classes secure in private practice. The physicians of the poor are chemists and apothecaries, who thus better than any class of men can testify to the character and extent of the injuries induced by the cruel and mischievous superstition. Whether they can be persuaded to tender their evidence remains to be discovered. Many of them are largely dependent on the good will of medical practitioners and cannot be expected to speak out. Others are independent, or can afford to be independent, and their evidence is earnestly solicited for use in Parliament. Communications may be addressed to Mr. WALTER HASKER, Hon. Secretary of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, Gray's Inn Chambers, 90 High Holborn, W.C., and they will be held strictly private unless express permission for public use be given.

THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION.
GRAY'S INN CHAMBERS, 20 HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

I.—The Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.
II.—The Diffusion of Knowledge concerning Vaccination.
III.—The maintenance in London of an Office for the publication of Literature relating to Vaccination, and as a Centre of Information.

The minimum Annual Subscription constituting Membership is 2s. 6d. Every opponent of Compulsory Vaccination in the United Kingdom is earnestly invited to join and co-operate with the Society.

Hon. Secretary—WALTER HASKER, Esq.,
Gray's Inn Chambers, 20 High Holborn, W.C.
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Compulsion in India.

India is a continent rather than a country, and what may be true of small-pox and variolous and vaccine inoculation in one province may be but partially or wholly untrue of another province. Wherefore, in writing of India, we have always to guard ourselves from generalising too freely, and supposing that what is projected by Government can be accomplished among its multitudinous and diverse populations with the certainty and ease with which similar legislation is applied to the few and homogeneous millions of England.

A Vaccination Act received the sanction of the Governor-General of India in Council on the 9th of July, 1880, which deserves the serious attention of all who are interested in the welfare of their eastern fellow-subjects. The argument of the Act is, "That it is expedient to give power to prohibit inoculation and make the Vaccination of children compulsory in certain municipalities and cantonments situated in the territories administered respectively by the Lieutenant-Governors of the North-Western Provinces and the Punjab, and the Chief Commissioners of Oudh, the Central Provinces, British Burma, Assam, Ajmer and Coorg." It then directs that areas for Vaccination may be formed (and may be unformed), and that within such areas the practice of variolous inoculation shall be prohibited under penalty of imprisonment for three months, or with fine which may extend to 200 rupees=£20, or with both imprisonment and fine. Similar penalties are prescribed if any inoculated patient be conveyed within a Vaccination Area unless forty days have elapsed since inoculation, or without bearing a certificate from a certified medical practitioner that all risk of infection from variolation has ceased. The latter provision affords a fresh illustration of the absence of faith in vaccination among vaccinators. They pretend to have a security from small-pox, yet act as if it were no security whatever. They denounce anti-vaccinators for their scepticism, but in their behaviour toward small-pox they exhibit precisely the same heart of unbelief.

The Act then proceeds to enforce Vaccination on the lines of our English law. When an unprotected child (defined as a child who has neither had small-pox naturally or artificially) has attained the age of six months, and has lived for one month in a Vaccination Area, and has not attained 14 years if a boy, or 8 years if a girl, the parent or guardian of such child shall have it vaccinated. No fees are chargeable for the operation, but if a preference be asserted for animal or for humanised lymph, a rupee=1s. 1d. may be levied as the price of the inconvenience caused by the demand. Three attempts are to be made ere a child is certified as insusceptible. Where a child is found unvaccinated within a Vaccination Area, the parent or guardian is to be warned, and if the warning is disregarded, the parent or guardian shall be summoned before a magistrate, and unless fair cause be shown, a vaccination order shall be issued, and a fine of 60 rupees=£5 imposed. If a vaccination order be disobeyed, then imprisonment for six months, or a fine of 1000 rupees=£100, or both, may be inflicted. A remarkable concession accompanies these overwhelming penalties—overwhelming in a land where a labourer's income does not exceed £4 or £5 a year—

"The magistrates appointed under this section shall, as far as is conveniently practicable, be natives of India, and not paid servants of the Government."

Yet it may be a concession in appearance rather than reality; for as the worst slave-drivers were negroes, and the worst Turks have been Greeks, native magistrates are not unlikely to be possessed with greater vaccination fury than their masters.

We have also to observe that the law, as in England, falls short of absolute compulsion. An Indian parent or guardian might be imprisoned
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for six months and be ruined with a single fine, and yet his child remain unvaccinated. It is often suggested by our wilder vaccinators that the policeman should be placed at the service of the doctor, but English legislators have a judicious dislike to manslaughter. What, however, would be dangerous in Yorkshire might be risked with the mild Hindoo. Our medical friends are scarcely equal to their opportunities.

Again, a choice is offered between humanised and animal lymph, but which is which, and how they are to be distinguished, are left to conjecture. A poor fellow might pay his rupee for his choice, and fail to get what he asked for, and be none the wiser. As Dr. Garth Wilkinson has pointed out—

"The Vaccination Acts give no definition of what that vaccination is which we are compelled to undergo. Vaccination is a basket of different adders. There is horse-pox, cow-pox, genuine and spurious, ass-pox, swine-pox, goat-pox, sheep-pox, dog-pox; then there are all these things multiplied by inoculation from small-pox in man: with all his diseases coiling about the small-pox, so that there is the kneading of man and beast, their 'knotting and gendering,' in the basket of adders. All this is now in circulation in the veins and lymphatics of little children, and it is difficult to say what arithmetical figure of substance is represented in the total called vaccination: we can hardly be wrong in calling the number 666, which includes all degrees of pollution. A humane Government naturally wishes that the proper adder should be selected. At present imprudent practitioners make use of the whole basket, each according to his fancy; and the practical solution appears to be, that whatever a 'legally-qualified practitioner' affirms to be vaccination, is vaccination. In this fundamental matter, Vaccination Law differs from all other law, in that all statutes, either commanding something, or prohibiting something, or limiting something, state what that something is. Vaccination law makes no declaration of the kind."

An Act like this is good for trade—for the medical trade. It will provide place and scope for izany a Bob Sawyer whose career would be a hard one at home. It will be easy to mark out Vaccination Areas, to set young fellows to work on the natives, and to charge their salaries to the Indian exchequer. At the same time we do not intend to assert that the Act has been passed with any such mercenary motives; for we know with what sincerity Vaccination is held as an article of faith by men otherwise rational and well-informed, and how they consider they do their fellow creatures service when they maintain and extend the superstition. Nevertheless, when power and patronage go with well-doing, what is accounted well-doing is accomplished with the greater acracy; and, it must be allowed, there are some in whom the mercenary motive prevails over the philanthropic, and, if vaccination did not promise to pay, would take no trouble whatever about it.

How the Act will operate, and what will be its extension, we do not pretend to know. There are, we are told, no anti-vaccinators in India, and that therefore there will be no contest with the law on physiological principles as in England. The strife, if any, will be with the believers in variolous inoculation, and with their suspicion and dislike of European interference. Small-pox is endemic in many parts of India, and there is no difficulty in accounting for the disease in presence of numerous unsanitary conditions of life, and its perennial propagation by inoculation. The sadness of the position consists in the fact that we who might bring to Indians light in their darkness bring them merely a modification of that darkness.

Lastly, we would remark that there is little use in expending indignation on this Indian Vaccination Act. It is a logical outcome from English faith and English authority, and the attack to be effective must be delivered at home. It is in England that the battle has to be fought, and victory over vaccination in England will result in its overthrow the whole world over.

"THE BANDS OF WICKEDNESS."

Mr. Wm. Birch, preaching in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, on Sunday, 8th August, from Isaiah viii. 6-11, observed—"There is another oppressive band which has been put on by the doctors; and I am sure if I don’t mention it, my esteemed friend who is reporting the sermon [Mr. Henry Pitman] will think I am not truly humane. This band which fetters the whole people is the law which says that if we do not vaccinate our children, we shall be fined, and doubly and trebly fined, and that those who cannot pay the fines shall be sent to prison. Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, and all the members of the Cabinet regard this law as oppressive, and they have brought in a bill to make it less burdensome; but the doctors have begged the government to abandon the bill. I hope and believe that the time will soon come when the people will be freed from the oppression of this mischievous medical delusion. Doctorcraft is becoming as intolerable as priestcraft. It is right the people should be free from the fetters upon conscience and health which have been forged by the self-interest and love of power of men who say, ‘You must not think for yourselves; you must do as we tell you.’ It seems to me impious and irrational to say that disease can protect health. All such galling fetters should be removed."
THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE ROYAL JENNERIAN SOCIETY.

Jenner jealously of Dr. Pearson was especially anxious to supersede the Institution for the Inoculation of the Vaccine Pock established by him in 1799; but Jenner was what Scots call "a feckless creature," whose wishes rarely issue in sound fruit. After his success in Parliament, he did not remain in London to improve his opportunities, but retreated to domestic quiet at Berkeley and Cheltenham. His friends, however, were mindful of him, and Dr. Hawes, Mr. Addington, surgeon, Benjamin Travers, and Joseph Leaper met in Queen Street, City, 3rd December, 1802, and resolved to establish a "Jennerian Society for the Extinction of the Small-Pox." Mr. Addington transmitted the resolution of the meeting to Jenner, saying—

"We look to your direction and assistance, and feel very desirous of knowing when it is probable we may have the pleasure of seeing you in town."

Joseph Fox of Lombard Street, fashionable dentist and enthusiastic promoter of the new inoculation, also wrote to him, 4th December, soliciting his co-operation—

"The plan which is in agitation is of the most extensive and liberal kind. It is even expected that the Royal countenance will be gained; but much depends upon thee. All are looking toward thee as the proper person to lay the foundation-stone. It would be well if this could be done in the course of the present year, particularly as it is the memorable time when the practice received parliamentary sanction."

But the ease-loving Jenner was not to be drawn. He wrote to Mr. Addington from Berkeley, 10th December, 1802—

"Your very obliging letter found me just returned with my wife and children to our pleasant home, where I promised myself a few weeks of domestic comfort after some years spent in constant anxieties."

"This is the pull on one side. On the other is the delightful prospect held up to my view of an Establishment for the promotion of Universal Vaccine Inoculation—an establishment to which I have for years been looking forward with a longing eye."

"I need not go farther into explanation, and shall only say, that if it be incompatible with the generous design to suffer me to remain here for the time I had allowed myself, I will certainly comply with the wishes of my friends and go to town. Yet it must be observed that I humbly conceive and ardently hope that my presence will not be absolutely necessary. I have written to my friend Dr Lettsom and requested him to have the kindness to be (as far as such a thing is admissible) my representative. In his judgment on the present occasion I can place every confidence."

The letter describes the man. He did not like to be troubled—not even when trouble stood for the advancement of his own glory. As Pearson observed, "If Vaccination had been left to Jenner, it would never have come to anything." Benjamin Travers also wrote to him at the same time urging the necessity of his presence in London, but he was put off with similar excuses and with expectations of assistance from the public purse—

"Government, I have no doubt, will give due support to so just and laudable an undertaking. I am warranted in this suggestion by a long conversation I had with Mr. Abbott, Speaker of the House of Commons, who said that after the investigation of the Parliamentary Committee he thought it became a public duty to form Institutions for Gratuitious Inoculation."

As Jenner was not to be had, the promoters set to work without him, and succeeded beyond expectation. Their triumph was complete when at a meeting in the London Tavern on 17th February, 1808, it was announced that his Majesty had graciously condescended to become the patron of "The Royal Jennerian Society for the Extermination of the Small-Pox": that her Majesty had with great benignity acquiesced in the request to become patroness: that his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and their Royal Highnesses the Duke of York, the Duke of Clarence, and the Duke of Cumberland, had evinced, in a most flattering manner, their willingness to accept the office of vice-patrons: that his Grace the Duke of Bedford had consented to fill the office of president; and that many prelates, noblemen, and gentlemen of the highest rank and respectability had agreed to be vice-presidents of the Society.

The approval of the Prince of Wales was conveyed in a letter to the Earl of Egrermont, over which Dr. Baron, Jenner's biographer, (writing when the Prince had blossomed into George IV.) bursts into worship in capitals, as follows—

"The gracious and beneficent mind of the Illustrious writer is displayed in every line; and the whole is truly characteristic of those great qualities which continue to add lustre to his still more exalted station, and shed so much of real glory on his reign."

Subscriptions flowed in freely. The Corporation of London gave £600, the East India Company £100, the Duke of Bedford £50, and guineas ten, five, two and one were contributed
with a liberality that attested the fervour of the common credulity. But it was much easier to get money than to administer it with a nice adjustment of means to ends. The Jennerians, too, were over organised. There was a Medical Council and a Board of Directors. The Medical Council consisted of twenty-five Physicians and twenty-two Surgeons of the first eminence in London with Jenner for president and Letsom for vice-president. Such mechanism could never work, and at the point where real business was to be transacted, an officer was selected of extraordinary character. John Walker was born at Cockermouth in 1759, and was a school-fellow of Woodville, subsequently physician to the London Small-Pox Hospital. After a rambling career as blacksmith, engraver, and school-master, he turned his attention to medicine, graduated at Leyden, associated with French revolutionists in the guise of a Member of the Society of Friends; then accompanied Dr. Marshall on a vaccinating cruise to the Mediterranean, from whence, after a multitude of adventures in war and weather, he appeared in London in 1802, habited as a Quaker with a long beard—an apparition in that clean shaven community. Joseph Fox, the dentist of Lombard Street, gave him the use of a part of his house, and there, in his own words, "I set up my Vaccinum for the glorious cause." As soon as the Jennerian Society was initiated, Walker was put forward by Joseph Fox and other Friends as its inculinator-in-chief, and Walker made application in the following terms—

"To the Jennerian Society.

"Friends,—Perhaps there is not any individual who has greater reason to be gratified with the interest ye are taking in the Vaccine Inoculation than myself. Of late years, the practice of it has been the chief business of my life; and I am partly indebted, during some of the last months, to the zeal of individual members of your Society for being enabled to continue it. They have sent patients to me from remote and distant parts of this extensive City, when, for want of notoriety, I might otherwise have been employed. May I offer to you my services in this City: during the infancy of your Institution, you cannot do me a greater pleasure than to increase my number of patients; for where I now vaccinate tens, I could easily do the same for hundreds. After this declaration, I hope you will consider the present address as neither unseasonable nor intrusive, but rather as a mark of unwavering zeal in the happy cause in which ye are now embarking.

"Respectfully, John Walker.

"54 Lombard Street, 29. xii., 1802."
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

were opened in London where cow-pox was inoculated gratis, and in eighteen months Walker was able to announce that 12,988 patients had been operated on, and that 19,852 charges of virus had been dispatched to the country and foreign parts; whereon Dr. Baron observes—

"The effect of these exertions was immediately perceived by a striking diminution of the number of deaths from small-pox within the Bills of Mortality. In 1803 they amounted to 1173; in 1804 they were only 622. The contrast will appear still greater when it is considered that the deaths amounted to 2409 in the year 1800; and that the annual average of deaths for fifty years previously was 3018."

The passage is noteworthy as representative of many similar passages in the literature of Vaccination. It might be described as dishonest, but the craft is so transparent that the epithet would be extravagant. The probable explanation is, that Vaccination had come to be regarded as so unquestionably beneficial that anything may be asserted in its favour, and that anything is true. Else a child might have asked how 12,000 or 24,000 vaccinations could by any possibility effect an immediate diminution in the deaths from small-pox in a population of eight or nine hundred thousand. Baron would also lead his readers to suppose that the low mortality of 1804, namely 622, was unexampled, though with the Bills of Mortality before him, he might have seen that the deaths in 1797 fell to 623; and he knew that the low figure of 1804 was not maintained but rose to 1868 in 1865. But as remarked, any statement, if only it be favourable to Vaccination is expected to pass muster as veracious, and the public credulity amply justifies the expectation.

Let us look at the London Bills for ourselves, taking the last ten years of the 18th and the first ten years of the 19th Centuries, and try to discover what they teach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>All Diseases</th>
<th>Small-Pox</th>
<th>Fevers</th>
<th>Measles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>18,760</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>20,218</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>21,749</td>
<td>2882</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>19,241</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>21,179</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>19,288</td>
<td>8548</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>17,014</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>18,155</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>18,184</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>23,068</td>
<td>2409</td>
<td>2712</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

196,801 18,477 19,880 2707


It is to be observed, that we have not here the record of the deaths of the entire population of London, but merely the number of intramural interments, which diminished as the city graveyards got stuffed beyond capacity of decent decomposition and assimilation, and relief was sought in the cemeteries of extra-mural parishes, such as St. Pancras and Marylebone. It is only thus that the diminishing number of burials (which ranged from 25,000 to 30,000 during many years of the 18th Century) is to be accounted for. In this light we have to consider the following table, where we note fewer burials, less small-pox, less fevers, but more measles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>All Diseases</th>
<th>Small-Pox</th>
<th>Fevers</th>
<th>Measles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>19,374</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>2908</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>19,379</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>19,582</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>17,038</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>17,565</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>17,938</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>18,334</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>19,954</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>16,680</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>19,893</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>1031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

185,787 12,534 16,230 5680

From whatever cause there was an abatement of small-pox, but it was a continuous abatement which had set in before Jenner was heard of; and at the same time we must repeat that at this day, when all swear by the unity of Nature and the correlation and convertibility of her forces, it is grossly unscientific to pick out small-pox from the group of zymotic diseases and deal with it as an independent entity. It is a fever among fevers, bred and propagated in the same conditions, and can never be studied apart from its associates without serious misunderstanding.

These Bills of Mortality, as compared with our more accurate statistics, are of little value, but, such as they are, they are constantly referred to, and their items used, as by Baron, as pretexts for most unwarrantable assertions. Any influence of Vaccination on the small-pox mortality of 1801-10 was practically nothing. Vaccination was limited to a few thousands, and those chiefly of the classes least subject to the disease. The great-seething mass of metropolitan squalor, in which small-pox and typhus were endemic, was as yet untouched by the vaccine lancet. If the new practice did any good, it was in discrediting and discouraging the culture of small-pox in the form of variolous inoculation.
To return, however, to the Royal Jennerian Society. Its halcyon-days were of brief duration. Enthusiasm abated, subscriptions fell off, cases of small-pox after vaccination began to be heard of, and serious illness and death consequent upon "the benign and harmless operation." Opponents waxed bold and could not be silenced. Then jealousies and dissensions began to operate within the Society. The financial secretary strove with the medical secretary. Dr. Walker's habits and eccentricities, viewed at first with amusement, excited irritation and disgust, whilst Jenner's easy-going mode of life and impecuniosity were a source of scandal and distrust. The climax was reached in 1806 when Jenner and Walker were set openly at loggerheads, and a fight to the death ensued.

Walker, it is to be said, never treated Jenner with much respect. Like Pearson he took stock of his merits, and did not rate them highly, and in his practice would not listen to his dictation. "Vaccination," he used to observe, "is extremely simple as to facts, while, as to causes, it is entirely out of the reach of medical men with all their theories." Jenner, as president of the Medical Council, thought he had a right to be obeyed, but Walker was the last man in the world to yield obedience when he had formed an opposite conviction.

"Jenner," writes Baron, "considered it his duty to admonish him, and repeatedly represented to him, in the most friendly manner, the mischievous tendency of his innovations. These remonstrances were unavailing, and he ceased to have any communication with Dr. Walker after the summer of 1806; submitting rather to lament in silence the fate of the Society than come before it as a public accuser."

Of course such forbearance could not last long, and instructions issued by Walker to the Nottingham Vaccine Institution in March, 1806, were made the occasion of an open rupture. Jenner brought Walker's conduct under the consideration of the Medical Council, and secured his condemnation. The question was then referred to the General Court of the Society on the 26th of July, when a motion that Dr. Walker be dismissed from his office was negatived by a majority of three, Walker being supported by Sir Joseph Banks and Jenner by Dr. Sims. But the victory was not satisfactory to Walker, and on the 9th of August he put an end to the strife by sending in his resignation.

Baron's solemn account of the contest must appal every ingenuous reader. Jenner, it is written, regarded Walker's proceedings as of "the most dangerous character," as "placing in peril the safety of the practice," and "as likely to wreck the Society"; so that had he not retired Jenner would have been compelled to withdraw his countenance from Salisbury Square. As we read we exclaim, Whatever did the dreadful Doctor do! Here is Baron's answer—

"It is unnecessary to mention the specific instances of misconduct which were established. They regarded even the very name of the affection; the method of managing the pustules; the characters of correct vaccination; the precautions to be observed in conducting the practice, etc., etc."

Did ever old woman make more ado about nothing! Moore states the offence plainly—

"Walker's method of taking lymph was to cut open the vesicles, and to wipe out the contents with lint, in order to procure the fresh secretion. This harsh treatment of infants was the reverse of that which he was directed to employ; and as he was unalterable in his resolution, it was at length deemed requisite to remove him."

Turning to the Life of Walker, by Dr. Epps, we have the difference 'twixt Tweedledum and Tweedledee still further illustrated—

"Two different modes have been adopted in taking the matter of inoculation from the vaccinated subject: one, by making punctures round the outer part of the pock, Dr. Jenner's mode; the other, by removing the crust or scab from the centre of the pock, wiping out the fluid beneath it, and then taking the matter, indiscriminately, from any part of the whole substance of the pock, Dr. Walker's mode."  

As in brawls and wars generally, the ostensible offence is rarely the true or entire offence, so when we revert to the events of 1806-8 we discover that vaccination was being found out, and that Walker served Jenner's purpose most opportunely as scapegoat. Walker's behaviour, too, constituted him a convenient victim. Many who cared nothing for his mode of "taking lymph" had been hurt by his scorn for their self-importance, their rank, and their wealth, and were ready to assist Jenner in effecting his humiliation. Mr. Cline, the surgeon, after listening to many speeches against Walker, summed up the indictment, "All they complain of are his dress and address." A naval officer, meeting Walker on 25th July, said, "I came to town to-day to hold up my hand in your support. You and Jenner do not agree over some trifles, and your enemies wish to turn the fact to your hurt, but

they have been beaten. Is the man who launches a vessel the only one who can navigate her? If Jenner were to live for fifty years to come, he could never have the authority of your experience."

Jenner's victory over Walker was utterly disastrous: it destroyed the Royal Jennerian Society. The substantial supporters of the Society were the adherents of Walker, and with him they seceded, secured another house in Salisbury Square, and established the London Vaccine Institution with Walker for manager. The remnants of the Jennerian Society appointed a young Irish surgeon as Walker's successor, and for his distinction purchased him the degree of M.D. from St. Andrews. He had the snivity that Walker disdained, and little else beside. He neglected his duties, and soon the traffic in the "benign fluid" was transferred to the new establishment. Ultimately the lease, fixtures and furniture of the Jennerian house were disposed of, and a retreat effected to humbler offices, until in 1818 what remained of the Society was incorporated in Walker's concern.

Walker obtained much assistance from members of the Society of Friends, and the fact affords Moore (Jenner's apologist) occasion for certain sneers. He describes the meetings in Salisbury Square as—

"Shaded with their broad-brimmed hats; for their schismatic assiduity was most conspicuous, though their primitive meekness was indiscernible. In support of their friend, they argued sily, wrangled tumultuously, and voted almost unanimously. Yet, in spite of this contentious pertinacity, the turbulent Quaker, on the motion of Dr. Jenner, was dismissed from his office, and peace was restored."

Dismissed he was not, and the peace that ensued on his resignation was destruction. The success of Walker's Institution (necessarily dependent on subscriptions) he accounts for by an anecdote like this—

"A noble Duke informed me that on a sultry day a steaming, squab, broad-faced man, in a Quaker's garb, with his hat on his head, entered his room, saying, 'Friend, I am come on a charitable mission to request thy mite.' The Duke, amused with the oddness of the salutation, desired him to be seated, and to explain his business. The Quaker willy suppressed all mention of disputes in the Jennerian Society, and of the dismissal of Dr. Walker, which were the real causes for soliciting this subscription; and enlarged tediously on the utility of vaccination, and by awkward eunomious on Dr. Jenner, led the Duke to believe, that the subscription was solicited for a Society approved by him. This cunning harangue drew forth the Duke's purse, which the Quaker spying, unrolled his list, and added his Grace's name as a decoy for others; and saying, 'Friend, fare thee well,' strutted out with an uncouth gait and an air of uprightness. By such artifices a large subscription was raised from those who prefer paying to inquiring; and in the meantime the Jennerian Society diminished in numbers, and, undermined by calumnies, declined to its downfall."* 

It is not to be imagined, however, that the collapse of the Royal Jennerian Society disposed of Jenner and his party. There was Jenner to provide for: he could not with decency be forsaken; and there was a stock of vaccine virus to be kept up, for which pride forbade dependence on Walker's dispensary. It was in vain to appeal fresh to the benevolent public, whose confidence had gone elsewhere, and whose suspicions were excited. It was therefore determined to resort to Government for help. The political influence of the Jennerian party was considerable, and we shall see to what purpose it was exerted.

DARKNESS FOR LIGHT.—The writer of the political article in the Quarterly Review for July asks—"What are the Hares and Rabbits Bill, the Irish Compensation Bill, and the Vaccination Bill, but unblushing class legislation?" In a sense all legislation is class legislation: good laws protect honest classes against dishonest classes, whether pickpockets or nefarious landlords; but to cite Mr. Dodson's Vaccination Bill as an odious instance of class legislation is a singular instance of inverted vision induced by political rancour.

LORD RIPON was engaged in congenial business when he signed the Compulsory Vaccination Act for India. He "tried his prentice hand" in this country. The organist of Ripon Cathedral is a staunch anti-vaccination man, and has been repeatedly fined by the bench of which Lord Ripon was Chairman. We also hear that by a curious fatality the Government has just passed a severe Game Law for certain parts of India! It is evident that Englishmen must begin to look sharply after the pranks of their countrymen in a land where the people lie at their mercy.

A DUTCH CASE.—The Rev. Dr. A. Kuyper, Professor at the Free University, Amsterdam, writes, 3rd September,—"A child of Mr. J. Forster, Professor in Medicine at the Amsterdam Town-University, one year old, has been vaccinated by his colleague, Mr. H. Hertz, Professor of Medicine at the same institution. The lymph came down from the Münich-park. The child was poisoned by the vaccination and died twenty-four hours afterwards. All the newspapers have mentioned the fact, causing a great sensation."*

* The History and Practice of Vaccination, pp. 212-215.
"DO MEN GATHER GRAPEVINES OF THORNS, OR FIGS OF THISTLES?"

Analysis of a Return of Infant Mortality made by the Registrar-General to the House of Commons, No. 76, Session 1880.—HANSARD, One Halfpenny.

Table I. of this Return states that the general average death-rate in England and Wales was 22,388 per million of population, during the sixteen years from 1886 (when registration commenced) to 1883, when Compulsory Vaccination was enacted; and 22,141 during the twenty-three years, 1854 to 1877. [The rate during 1871 and 1872 (the "ferocious" small-pox epidemic) was 22,600, and 21,800 respectively.] From this we see that the expenditure of 120,000,000 of sterling on sanitary works has apparently made no appreciable diminution in the death-rate.

Table II. states that the increased proportion of deaths among infants under one year, per million of births, in 1877 as compared with 1847, was—from syphilis, 1,274; scrofula, 770; tubercle (internal, 1,184; skin disease, 281; and erysipelas, 94. Among children between one and five, also, the increased mortality per million deaths (all causes) was—syphilis, 278; scrofula and tubercle, 2,197; and skin disease, 146. In other words, these foul diseases (communicable by the poisoned lancet to adults [see p. 288 Commons Vaccination Committee Evidence], and, therefore, a fortiori, to weakly infants) carry off thousands annually in proportion, more than they did prior to enforced vaccination.

Table III. shows that the average small-pox death-rate per million before 1853 was 205, and two-thirds of these were under five years old, and the average rate from this disease during the last decade, 1868-77, was 261, but only one-third of these were under five. The reason that fewer young children were carried off by epidemic small-pox when it came, is abundantly exhibited by Table II. —i.e., thousands are annually slaughtered to save them from the risk of a disease, far less mortal, which is epidemic perhaps once in ten years. But deduct the two-thirds and one-third respectively, and the result of Vaccination by law exhibits 174 per million, all ages above five years, as compared with 100 per million only before this paternal legislation. If these little victims had survived vaccination, they would naturally have died from small-pox in the same proportion to the total as formerly, when the average small-pox mortality would have been 348 per million after enforced vaccination, against 205 before. In round numbers, 1400 more infant deaths from small-pox would then have occurred, to save which 4500 are sacrificed to the poisoned lancet—in more than twice as many die annually from five inoculable diseases under five, than are by this most effectual method saved from small-pox. But when are added the deaths of other innocents, indirectly caused by vaccination, as being thus disabled from standing against bronchitis (increased about 17,000 per million, according to this Return), diarrhoea, and numerous other troubles, probably twenty times as many deaths, as the small-pox saving claimed, will be the result.

And yet, after all, it must be confessed that as far as the filthy inoculation is concerned, the thousands killed outright are far better off than the tens, or hundreds of thousands who survive to groan under the protracted curse of a syphilitic life. Finally, it is obvious that had not these thousands of infants been thus sacrificed, the effects of the sanitary works in sensibly diminishing the general death-rate (as they no doubt have done) would have been made clearly manifest.

The Return also gives the number of deaths from all causes among children, by which it appears that notwithstanding the alarming increase of mortality from inoculable diseases the death-rate under five was 43,000 per million lower in 1877 than in 1847. Sanitary works, then, have exerted an influence, and had it not been for the losses by enforced poisoning, the gain among children would probably have amounted to 100,000 per million. Obviously, it follows—the general average death-rate having been maintained—that the rate of mortality, at all ages above five, has been increased, for any noxious influence in childhood operates through life. Moreover, adults have not only primary vaccination, but often re-vaccination, to contend with. The rite is required as a qualification for public employment, e.g., for the navy—the robust alone being admissible—re-vaccination is enforced on entering the service, and "sudden death" within a year after is not unknown. Official doctors, and doctor-ridden laymen, cannot see cause and effect, but physiologists, and men of common sense, are able to put two and two together.

The note to the preceding Return, which raises the pre-sanitation small-pox average by omitting four non-epidemic years, is unworthy of notice; but the latest report (No. 66, 2nd quarter,) 1880 of the Registrar-General for Ireland [Dr. Seaton's "best vaccinated country in Europe"] affords an illustration of the inutility of the nostrum:—"The continued and increased fatality of small-pox in Ireland is due to the persistent prevalence of that disease in Dublin, where it has been constantly present for the last three years."

THOMAS BAKER.

Inner Temple, 7th Sept., 1880.

In quest of Cow-Pox.—We learn that the Medical Officer of the Local Government Board, Dr. Buchanan, has left London for the purpose of visiting several of the Animal Vaccination Establishments on the Continent, in furtherance of the arrangements contemplated by the Department of the Government for the introduction of the practice into England.—The Lancet, 21st August, 1880.
JOSHUA JACOB IN AMERICA.

[From the Philadelphia Times, 18th August.]

The arrival of Joshua Jacob, a wealthy and influential citizen and member of the Society of Friends of Limerick, at this port yesterday recalled something of the old associations of William Penn's time. The pictures of Penn, which every schoolboy has been wont to see in the old histories and atlases, with his queer knee-breeches and broad-brimmed hat, were faithfully reproduced in the personal appearance of Mr. Jacob. Then there are other traits of resemblance. Mr. Jacob is a man of distinction in his native city; his leaving was a matter of regret among his townsmen; and his arrival here is an event of importance among his future friends and neighbours. About two weeks ago, having disposed of his property and completed all his preparations, his family, accompanied by one man and two women servants and four tons of luggage, sailed from Liverpool in the Lord Gough. It was the quaintest sight imaginable to see the family of plain shaven boys and girls, with the rosietest of rosy cheeks and the bluest of blue eyes running about the deck.

The cause, too, of Mr. Jacob's departure from his native country is that of persecution. He has shaken the dust of the Old World from his feet, and come over to the New World with his wife to find a home in a country where the people acknowledge no allegiance to a law of compulsory vaccination. Otherwise as peaceable and law-abiding a citizen as his great Quaker prototype, on this point Mr. Jacob and the English government could not agree. His opposition was not of the character of a freak or of a captious spirit, but the result of a firm and sincere conviction brought about by an alarming experience in his own family. Several years ago one of his elder children was dangerously inoculated with virus, and, though thanks to medical skill, the poison was eliminated from the system, the father resolved solemnly that never again should any of his offspring undergo the ordeal of vaccination, the express law to the contrary notwithstanding. By his adherence to this resolution he has suffered no little pecuniary loss. Prosecution followed prosecution, but with no other effect than to mict Jacob in fine and costs each time. His case attained national importance in Ireland. On one occasion, his first appearance in court, he pleaded his own cause. With him was his second daughter, a beautiful girl, under ten years of age. In the midst of an impassioned argument against the injustice of the law, Jacob seized his daughter, and holding her up, the picture of health, in view of the court and the spectators, said in a tone that sent an electric thrill through the audience: "I will never allow that beautiful child to be injured for life by Submitting to undergo a law." Nearly a dozen times Jacob has been brought up before the court and fined. It has cost him several hundred dollars, but he has all along steadily and firmly maintained his resolution.

DUBLIN SMALL-POX NURSES.

At a meeting of the Surgical Society of Ireland on 1st March, 1872, Mr. Frank Thomas Porter, M.R.C.S., of 15 Upper Merrion Street, Dublin, read a paper entitled "The Correlation of Varicella and Variola," and referring to his experience in the Small-Pox Hospital of the South Dublin Union, he observed—

"In the treatment of variola, every effort should be based on the principle of isolation. A number of warm, well ventilated huts would secure this object better than sheds. Mild cases could be better treated at the patients' homes. Rigid enforcement of the Sanitary and Vaccination Acts, combined with a more extended system of out-door relief, would limit the spread of infection. I do not coincide in Professor Haughton's opinion that the use of spirits is propylactic in epidemics. Testototers recover soonest. Increased facilities for taking baths should be placed at the disposal of the poorer classes with a view to prevention. I have but little faith in drugs, although I think the marinated tincture of iron is beneficial in some cases. . . ."

"With reference to re-vaccination, I have no faith in it. Not one of the 86 attendants at the South Dublin Union sheds has taken small-pox. Only 7 of the number were re-vaccinated, and as the remaining 29 enjoy the same immunity, wherein is the necessity of the operation? I have known gouty inflammation, abscess of the breast, and angio-leucitis to result from the operation. I cannot, in the face of such facts, approve of it, and moreover the sense of the profession is against it. It is only to be employed when there is no evidence of the success of infantile vaccination, and even then it seems to do more harm than good, at least, so far as I have seen."

Mr. Porter's paper was printed in the Medical Press and Circular, No. 1729, 27th March, 1872.

BYRON ON VACCINATION.

(From Don Juan.)

What opposite discoveries we have seen!
[Signs of true genius and empty pockets]
One makes new noses, one a guillotine,
One breaks your bones, one sets them in their sockets;
But Vaccination certainly has been
A kind antithesis to Congress's rockets,
With which the Doctor paid off an old pox,
By borrowing a new one from an ox.

Bread has been made (indifferent) from potatoes,
And galvanism has set some corpses grinning,
But has not answered like the apparatus
Of the Humane Society's begetting,
By which men are unsuccoured gratis.

What wondrous new machines have late been spinning!
I said, the small-pox has gone out of late;
Perhaps it may be followed by the great.*

* Considering the increase of infantile syphilis concurrent with the spread of vaccination, this last line is prophetic.

W.V.
The following notes made during an attendance at one of the largest Government Vaccine Stations may be of interest to your readers, as giving an insight into the daily working of the Vaccination Acts:—

1. The room set apart for the business adjoins a chapel, and is built without any view to ventilation; the window not being constructed to open, and the door kept closed by a spring, and here, in a space of considerably less than 3000 cubic feet, are to be found some thirty babies with as many mothers, some half-dozen students and the public vaccinator.

2. Vaccination is almost always performed from arm to arm, the lymph being taken on the 8th day; occasionally, however, recourse is had to lymph preserved in tubes. The lymph used in arm to arm vaccination receives none but the most careful naked-eye examination, and is not unfrequently opaque probably from the admixture of pus-cells. The public vaccinator was not acquainted with the original source of the lymph he employed.

3. The vaccinators are not thoroughly examined with a view to ascertain the presence of any constitutional disease, much less the parents; a few superficial queries only being made as to the general welfare of the children.

4. Vaccinations rarely fail to "take"; there are extremely few total failures; some children presented only one or two vesicles as the result of four insertions; others exhibited some local erysipelas confined to the vaccinated arm; a few had papular and papulo-vesicular rashes of a lichenoid character; one child on the 12th day after vaccination showed symptoms and an eruption closely resembling true discrete small-pox.

5. Some re-vaccinations took as well as primary vaccination, notwithstanding the presence of four good cicatrices on the arm, the result of vaccination some ten or twelve years previously; others were abortive.

6. Syphilitic children usually presented prematurely "fine arms."

7. Powders are given to the mothers on the 8th day for the children; presumably with the plausible intent of evaporating by the bowel the virus absorbed by the skin.

8. Cards are given to the mothers for their friends, on the back of which appears the following gratuitous information:—"Mothers in having their children vaccinated should know that when small-pox occurs after vaccination, it is generally due to the bad way in which vaccination has been done. One or two small places do not give the protection that four or five do. Everybody should be re-vaccinated when about 17 years of age. The nurses of the Small-pox Hospitals are always re-vaccinated before commencing their work. This has been the rule for over 50 years. None of them have taken small-pox since this rule has been observed." The utter untruth of this latter statement, both in fact and in suggested inference, has been often and repeatedly proclaimed and is now notorious.

9. Some statistics are provided by the Privy Council to be distributed by the public vaccinator among the students. The only inference it seems just to draw from them is that three-fourths of the deaths from small-pox are in persons under fifteen years of age; whereas re-vaccination is not deemed necessary before the age of seventeen. (See note 8.)

10. A careful microscopical examination of a tube of lymph selected for its purity, revealed several red and white blood-corpuscles, some shrivelled epithelial scales and micrococci in abundance.

W. J. COLLINS, M.R.C.S.

SMALL-POX IN LONDON.

The following particulars are extracted from the 41st Annual Report of the Registrar-General, recently published:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods of 10 years</th>
<th>Total deaths in London</th>
<th>Deaths from small-pox in London</th>
<th>No. of deaths from a-pox to 1000 deaths from all causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-50</td>
<td>523,110</td>
<td>8,416</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-60</td>
<td>610,478</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-70</td>
<td>786,342</td>
<td>8,347</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-79 (6 years only)</td>
<td>710,869</td>
<td>15,076</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same Report also records 85 deaths from "erysipelas after vaccination" and four from "cow-pox," all in children under one year of age.

The late Dr. W. B. HODGSON, Professor of Political Economy in Edinburgh University, wrote to Mr. Henry Tulman, "Dear Sir,—I have read your Prison Thoughts with great interest and sympathy, and I must expect good to come out of your suffering in this matter. As regards the questions either of Vaccination or Compulsory Vaccination, whatever my leanings may be, I delay committing myself by overt action or speech. I watch the course of things, and I do not neglect the growth of evidence. It seems to me, that the question even of Compulsory Vaccination depends not on the opinions of A or B, but on the facts for or against Vaccination itself. If it can be shown that it is dangerous, nay pernicious (and it certainly seems unnatural and disgusting), the compulsion exercised becomes intensely odious. The other side you will not so readily admit—that if the absence of Vaccination greatly increases the risk of outbreaks and diffusion of disease even beyond the cases of the unvaccinated, the compulsion assumes another aspect. But I do not wish to argue the question, or to dogmatise upon it. I wait for light, and I lean to the notion that in a doubtful case (if the case be doubtful), freedom should prevail.—Yours most truly, W. B. HODGSON."
VACCINATION IN VICTORIA.

SMALL-POX does not flourish in Australia. As we recently observed, there is not only no small-pox in Queensland, but vaccination is found to be impracticable, "the summer being too hot and the winter too dry." Of course the doctors surrender the practice of the rite very ruefully, and predict awful possibilities. Victoria being cooler, vaccination is more generally successful, and has the credit of keeping small-pox away. A few months since some children were vaccinated at Ballarat, and were so seriously injured that there was a vaccination scare." A medical investigation ensued with the inevitable report that the illness of the children was due to other causes. In the Legislative Assembly on the 11th June, Mr. Davies advised the Chief Secretary either to bring in a bill to abolish compulsory vaccination, or to appoint a commission of inquiry. Liverpool, they said in England, the opinion was rapidly gaining ground that vaccination was objectionable, and it was not worth their while in Victoria, where the risk of small-pox was so slight, to incur the danger of infecting their children with diseases as loathsome and fatal as small-pox itself. Mr. Williams supported Mr. Davies. He knew cases in which great injury had been inflicted by vaccination, and it ought not to be compulsory. It was the opinion of some of their medical men that diphtheria was induced by the practice. He knew a family where ulcerations lasting five years had followed vaccination, and the parents, evading the Act, had other children perfectly healthy. An extensive correspondence in the newspapers has accompanied the agitation in which our friend Mr. D. Macalister of Melbourne has borne an honourable part. We hope our countrymen in the South will presently forewear the Jennerian superstition, and trust to health to maintain health. Their medicine men will shrivel but that they must disregard as so much "business," and matter of course.

Mr. Otway's Return of Vaccination Prosecutions.—On examination we find this Return so inaccurate and incomplete as to be unworthy of attention. It would be far better for Parliament to refuse the production of such a document than incur so much labour and expense for what is valueless. There is scarcely a case of repeated prosecution that is correctly given. For example, under Marylebone Mr. Tebb is set forth as having been fined three times the extent of £3, whilst under Liverpool Mr. B. V. Scott is not mentioned at all! Mr. William Young writes,—"The Return is so manifestly imperfect that I would suggest that copies be sent to the secretaries of the various Anti-Compulsory Vaccination Societies with a request that they would compare the Return with the facts known to them, and report to you. When the replies are received, a statement should be drawn up, sent to Mr. Otway, and brought under the notice of the House of Commons."

TO THE RIGHT HON., J. G. DODSON, M.P., PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Sir,—I read in the Lancet that the College of Physicians, the College of Surgeons, the Royal Society, and some other learned societies are about to address you with objections to your Vaccination Bill. I have no desire to say anything in favour of this Bill, but only wish to remind you that if vaccination is to hold its ground—law or none—it must be ultimately by favour of experience; and experience is against it. It does not require a very learned society to teach us that if a supposed remedy or mitigant leaves the same proportionate number of patients in hospitals, dying from a certain disorder, as when such supposed mitigant was unknown, it might as well have remained in the shades of obscurity. Now this is the fact with regard to small-pox. We have the most reliable testimony that an average of 18 per cent. of patients died in small-pox hospitals during the last century, and practically the same number die now; although three-fourths of the patients or more, are allowed to have been vaccinated by the recording doctors; despite the rule adopted of judging by the appearance of marks, which necessarily excludes many—and these the worst cases—from this class, who ought to be in it, as having undergone the futile operation. I trust that when you have the learned bodies before you, you will propound this problem:—If 100 patients—deaths = 82; and 26 + 7 1/2 — deaths = 82; what is the value of V? Also, as you may have the opportunity, it would be well if you could get a clear explanation from one of the most eminent physicians and surgeons, why, until the year 1865, they denied isoto the possibility of contamination through the practice desired to be upheld and enforced by their influence? No change in the "nature of things" then took place, neither has any taken place since, and they lay themselves open to the deepest reproach in endeavouring to save a practice doomed only by the light of unprejudiced investigation.

George S. Gibbs, F.S.S.
Darlington, 14th June, 1880.

Mr. Joseph Abel was summoned before the Faringdon bench on 18th September for the 33rd time. Mr. W. Dundas presided and Mr. Haines prosecuted. Mr. Abel in his defence maintained that Wright, the vaccination officer, had received no instructions from the guardians to prosecute, and that the summons was issued without proper authority, and from personal spite. Nevertheless Mr. Dundas issued an order to vaccinate within six months with costs 10s. 9d. The case is a public scandal, and Mr. Dodson ought to interfere. Mr. Abel's children will never be vaccinated, and these repeated prosecutions are discreditible to all concerned.
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

WHAT SANITARY REFORM HAS COME TO.

Mr. Edwin Chadwick, C.B., speaking on 11th June at the Annual Conference on the Progress of Public Health, complained bitterly of the increased cost of sanitary administration with a marked decrease of efficiency. He said—

"During the first five years of the first General Board of Health, fundamental sanitary principles were laid down, and examples of large direct reductions of death-rates were obtained in a number of towns, and extended action on those principles promoted in other places. But this sanitary service has been merged with other functions, and placed, not in the principal position due to it, but in a position secondary to the mass of other functions heaped upon that Board. For twenty years, some £27,000 a year has been expended upon the Medical Department; about double the expenditure upon the first General Board of Health, the Sanitary Engineering Department included! And what has been the outcome of that double expenditure? I have inquired, and I cannot learn of one instance of a town or place where a death-rate can be shown to have been reduced by it; and the reduction of death-rates is the only real test of the efficient expenditure of the public money. You will apparently only find traces of its action against one epidemic, which is of no more than the fifth magnitude, namely, small-pox, and that action very incomplete."

Just so! Sanitary reform has fallen into the hands of medicine men with a craze for vaccination—a handy prescription that pays well. What we have to say is, that small-pox is merely a member of the group of zymotic diseases, which have to be dealt with as one and interchangeable. What is good against typhus and scarlet fever is good against small-pox; and to assert the contrary is to contradict the plainest teaching of experience.

KEIGHLEY maintains the place of honour in faithful witness-bearing against the vaccination superstition, and the time will come when the whole world will associate its name with praise. Here is the Vaccination Officer’s Return for the half-year ending 31st December, 1879—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Births</th>
<th>Successfully Vaccinated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haworth</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>970</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Puncture cover Five or More.—It is now customary to make more than one puncture in vaccinating, generally with a view to give the operation an additional number of chances of succeeding. But some vaccinators have of late insisted on a great extension of this practice, in the idea of infecting the system more completely. Jenner was careful to insert no more than a single puncture in each arm, and it is unphilosophical, as well as against experience, to suppose that twenty vaccine pustules produce a greater amount of specific effect upon the system than one.—_On Diseases of the Skin._ By Jonathan Green, M.D. Page 125. London : 1835.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANTI-VACCINATION CONGRESS will be held in Paris from the 8th to the 17th of this month, October. It is hoped that the country where Vaccination was initiated may be fully represented on the occasion. The London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination has appointed the Chairman of Committees, Mr. William Tebbo and Dr. Haughton of Upper Norwood as delegates. Mr. Tebbo proposes to deliver an address on the position and prospects of the agitation against compulsory vaccination in England. The subject of Dr. Haughton’s paper is “The Immorality of the Compulsory Vaccination Acts.” Mr. Thomas Baker of Kingscote intends to speak upon the evidence against Vaccination as revealed by recent Parliamentary Returns.
ANOTHER MARTYR.

ROCHDALE has supplied a second victim to the Vaccination Laws. Nearly opposite One Ash, the residence of Mr. John Bright, lives Robert Tweedale, a factory worker in the employ of the Messrs. Bright. About two months ago Robert Tweedale was again summoned for the non-vaccination of his youngest child. Being out of work he was unable to pay the fine of 20s. and costs. The magistrates' clerk said, "We shall distress your goods." "All right," was Tweedale's response, though he felt that it was "all wrong." No sentence was passed upon him, yet six weeks after, without warning, he was " fetched" from bed at midnight and committed to prison for 14 days. This was clearly illegal. I was served in the same way, as shown in my Prison Thoughts on Vaccination, which I will send freely to any applicant. "I was in prison and ye came unto me." Our unchristian penal laws seem framed to nullify this commutation. Only those who have tried to visit a prisoner know what a tax it is upon time and patience, especially since Government undertook the management of our prisons.

The Chairman of the Visiting Justices, Mr. Richard Harwood, ex-Mayor of Salford, gave me a letter to the Governor of the County Jail, and after two calls and several hours of waiting I was allowed to see friend Tweedale and shake his honest hand. The interview took place in the office of the Governor, Captain Leggett, who, as also the Deputy Governor, Captain Connor, treated me courteously. Friend Tweedale was dressed in prison garb, but his beard had been spared. Questioned about his food, he said, "I haven't enough to eat." I asked as to his bedding, and was grieved to learn that he had the "plank" punishment. The poor fellow's sides were sore, and he could get no sleep. The Governor asked, "Were you sentenced to hard labour?" "No sir. Could you allow me a mattress?" "You should speak to the surgeon." I reminded the Governor that "hard labour" in such cases was illegal, and expressed the hope that this rough treatment would be modified. I found there was no Bible in his cell. He requested to have one. He was much affected on being assured that his wife and five children would not be allowed to want or go into the workhouse.

I laid the facts before Sir William Harcourt, the Home Secretary, who replied that the case would be "fully considered." I also wrote to Mr. T. B. Potter, M.P. for Rochdale, who promptly replied—"I have written to Harcourt on the subject of your letter. The treatment seems very cruel." I informed Mr. Bright of the case, and a deputation waited upon him by appointment. The interview lasted an hour and a half. Mr. Bright expressed much sympathy for Robert Tweedale and his family, and endorsed what he wrote to me in his Birmingham letter, that the law of multiple penalties is "monstrous, and ought to be repealed;" but he feared that public opinion was not advanced enough for repeal. Mr. Bright asked and received information on many points, such as the reason for the fewness of pox-marked faces, which he was assured was due to improved medical treatment, and had no more connection with vaccination than Tenterden Steam had with Goodwin Sands. The deputation left with the resolve to work on until public opinion demands repeal.

On Friday morning, September 24th, at eight o'clock, we welcomed friend Tweedale outside the prison gates. We were glad to find that his treatment had been ameliorated. We accompanied him to Rochdale, where he was met at the station and escorted through the town by thousands of admiring and sympathising friends. In the evening a crowded meeting was held in the Public Hall, when an address was presented to Mr. Tweedale. This event aroused public feeling and driven another nail into the coffin of vaccination.

HENRY FITMAN.
41 John Dalton Street, Manchester.

SUPPRESSED LETTERS.

ANTI-VACCINATION.

(To the Editor of the British Medical Journal.)

19th July, 1880.

SIR,—Your correspondent Mr. George Worthington is very angry because qualified medical men dare to differ from him as to the efficacy of "Jenner's great discovery," and also because they communicate their opinions to non-medical journals. Well, Sir, I am sorry to be guilty of anything that causes pain to my professional brethren, but what am I to do? The medical journals will not admit my medical views on this subject, and the non-medical ones express their desire to have them. Who is therefore to blame? Compulsory Vaccination is a social, political, and even a moral question, affecting every parent in the country. Am I obliged to see through Mr. Worthington's speculations? But perhaps I may not give quite as much calomel and jalap as some of my confères. This, it seems, is quite enough to give offence in another direction. It is but the other day that you informed your readers that the opponents of the Compulsory Acts were "Homeopaths." As there does not exist any authoritative definition of what constitutes "Homeopathy," I am unable to verify this accusation; but it has always appeared to me that the only true homeopaths are those who take various matter and insert it into the body of a beast with a view to producing such a similar virus as may afterwards be used on the human subject to prevent or cure the same disease. I do not see anything irrational in the supposition that zymotic diseases do not readily return twice in the same constitution; but this is not "a discovery," and, to be logical, we ought to carry it out with all the zymotics. I protest against the imputation of moral wrong which is made against the members of the Association who are not allowed the privilege of self-defence, or even of statement of their actual opinions.

EDWARD HAUGHTON, M.D.; B. A. &c.
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

CUTANEOUS AFFECTIONS FOLLOWING VACCINATION.

(To the Editor of the British Medical Journal.)

18th August, 1880.

SIR,—I have now under treatment a girl who has an eruption, not unlike small-pox, on her shoulders, arms, and face, and which causes her intolerable itching. She was vaccinated 18 years ago, and has an eruption every summer of a similar kind to that which followed shortly after having been vaccinated. At these times she is greatly debilitated and looks thoroughly out of health. I have also just given up attending a gentleman who, having suffered from chronic eczema on the arms and legs, was recommended to try the experiment recorded in Dr. Joseph Kidd's book on Therapeutics (page 98), and get vaccinated with a view to cure. The result was a great increase of the disease, which almost drove him to despair. He is now nearly well. I have also seen an eruption, almost indistinguishable from small-pox, coming out on a patient round the site of the vaccine vesicle in a ring of several inches circumference. In this case no further harm resulted, but I am inclined to think that those cases which are said "not to take" are those in which the vital organs are most likely to be injuriously affected.

EDWARD HAUGHTON, M.D.

The Editor, Mr. Ernest Hart, disposed of the foregoing letter in answers to correspondents as follows—

"HOMEOPATHIC TREATMENT OF ECZEMA.

"Dr. E. Haughton, Norwood.—We are not disposed to record here a case in which a patient suffering from eczema was recommended to be vaccinated as a means of cure. The person who is responsible for such absurd advice and its consequences should send it to a homoeopathic journal."

(To the Editor of the British Medical Journal.)

21st August, 1880.

SIR,—From the manner in which you have alluded to the cases mentioned in my letter of 18th inst. (selecting one that I only referred to as a failure, and leaving your readers to suppose that I was advocating the practice in question), I fear you are unduly sensitive on the question of homoeopathic relationship. In truth, it leaves you open to the argumentum ad hominem, for your own notion of what vaccination ought to be appears far more fitted for "sending to a homoeopathic journal."

You say, at page 16 of your Truth About Vaccination, "The small-pox of man conveyed to the cow produces cow-pox; but the cow-pox thus induced, retransferred to man, is as incapable as the natural small-pox itself of producing infectious small-pox." Here we certainly have the "doctrine of similars"; the only difference being that it is a question of prophylaxis rather than of cure. You are, however, aware that vaccination has been recommended as a cure for small-pox, and even for rinderpest by men whose professional position might have led us to expect better things from them, and what was worse, these follies were put into practice with the most disastrous results. In conclusion, I would remind you that, in attempting to suppress the honest record of actual cases, you are neither serving society nor the interests of the great Association which has hitherto reposed so much confidence in your judgment and spirit of fair-play.

EDWARD HAUGHTON, M.D.

THE BITER BITTEN.

Our correspondent, Mr. W. Gibson Ward of Perriston Towers, Herefordshire, was summoned on 10th September before the Ross magistrates for disobeying their order to have his son vaccinated.

On entering the Court, the Clerk shook hands with Mr. Ward, and asked, "Are you going to give us an hour's speech on vaccination?" "I am going to give you a lecture on law," Mr. Ward replied.

The Clerk guessed what was coming, and turned to his authorities, and dispatched policemen for books, and again for books. Then he whispered to the Bench that as the Vaccination Officer had failed to serve an order on Mr. Ward within twelve months, the prosecution must be a failure. The five justices after much subdued conversation with long faces retired to an ante-room for more convenient discussion. When they returned the Rev. E. B. Hawkshaw took the chair, and at once Mr. Ward objected, Mr. Hawkshaw being ex-officio Guardian and promoter of vaccination prosecutions. He told Mr. Ward to sit down. Mr. Ward replied that he would not sit down, and demanded, "Why do you interrupt me? You cannot silence me, and you only turn the Court into a bear-garden by your unseemly interference." "Your case is dismissed," said Mr. Hawkshaw. "I am not going to be disposed of in that way," rejoined Mr. Ward. "You brought me here unjustly, and you must compensate me for doing so." He demanded 20s., and read the note to the 31st clause of the Vaccination Act of 1887 empowering magistrates to compensate in such cases. The Clerk said, "You have been unjustly summoned, as we cannot deny, and you must receive compensation; but 20s. is too much. We shall allow 10s. Mr. Parsons, the vaccination officer, must pay you that sum as the fault lies with him." Parsons, thereon, drew out the money amid much laughter in court. Mr. Ward apologised for disappointing so many who came to hear a discourse on the evils of vaccination, but said he had little doubt an opportunity would soon recur.

Many might thus save themselves from fine and imprisonment, and confound their persecutors if they would take pains to master the Vaccination Acts. The law is loosely administered, and conviction has, unfortunately, a place that is grossly irregular. It was simply Mr. Ward's superior knowledge that prevented the infliction of fine and costs.
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OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

I.—The Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.
II.—The Diffusion of Knowledge concerning Vaccination.
III.—The maintenance in London of an Office for the publication of Literature relating to Vaccination, and as a Centre of Information.
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SMALL-POX is a member of the group of diseases described as symptomatic, which originate in unwholesome conditions of life, and in common are diminished and prevented by the reduction and removal of those conditions.

In times when the laws of health were imperfectly understood, the fanciful discovery was made that by poisoning the blood with the virus of small-pox or cow-pox, a future attack of small-pox might be escaped. While many kindred superstitions in medical practice have been discredited and forgotten, Vaccination, because it was endorsed by the State, has survived, and has entered into legislation, and is enforced with fine and imprisonment. It is in vain for Nonconformists to plead that they do not believe that Vaccination has any power to prevent or to mitigate small-pox: they are told they may believe what they like, but that vaccinated they must be, for the benefit of the rite is settled beyond dispute, and that only fools and fanatics venture to question what has been irrevocably determined.

It is to attack and overthrow this monstrous tyranny that the LONDON SOCIETY has been established. The members desire to enlighten the public mind as to the history of Vaccination, as to its injury in communicating and intensifying other diseases, and as to its failure to avert the malady against which it is invoked.

Some, too, whilst disinclined to discuss Vaccination as a medical question, or to surrender confidence in its prophylaxis, are opposed to its compulsory infliction. They maintain that every remedy should be left to justify itself by its own efficacy, and that of all prescriptions the last which requires extraneous assistance is Vaccination; for its repute is based on the fact that its subjects are secure from small-pox, and in that security may abide indifferent to those who choose to neglect its salvation. Even nurses in small-pox hospitals, it is said, when efficiently vaccinated and re-vaccinated, live unaffected in the variolous atmosphere. Therefore, they hold that to compare an unvaccinated person to a nuisance, as is frequently done, is to make use of an epithet that implicitly denies the virtue asserted for Vaccination: a nuisance being a voluntary danger or annoyance which another cannot conveniently avoid. They also hold that to establish any medical prescription, and to create interests identified with that prescription, is to erect a bar to improvement; for it is obvious that any novelty in the treatment of small-pox must, in the constitution of human nature, meet with resistance from those whose emoluments are vested in the established practice.

The LONDON SOCIETY, therefore, claims to enlist the energies of those who resist Vaccination as useless and mischievous, and of those who, true to their faith in liberty, would leave its acceptance to the discretion of the individual. In the controversy into which they enter, they propose to employ all the familiar agencies wherewith in England revolutions are effected in the public mind and in Parliament; and they appeal with confidence for the sympathy and support of their countrymen. The Vaccination Acts under which they suffer have not been enacted with the full cognizance of the nation, but have been forced through indifferent Parliaments by the persistency of medical faction. The members of the SOCIETY are confident that as soon as the truth about Vaccination is fully known and appreciated, the freedom they contend for will be conceded without fear, and that posterity will view with amusement the outrage upon human right and reason that is at present committed under the shadow of English liberty.
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VACCINATORS AT EDINBURGH.

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE CONGRESS.

An opinion is rapidly gaining ground that the syphitic diseases are branches of the same tree, and streams from the same fount; that their root and source are the foul sewer, the wet cess-pool, the reeking manure heap, and the pointed well; and that whenever a community feels the pressure of an epidemic malady, it ought to recognise that the fault lies not with Nature, but with man. And thus we are driven to the conclusion that the daily removal of decaying animal and vegetable refuse from the precincts of the dwelling to the garden and the farm is a double blessing; it strangles epidemic disease in its cradle and in its birth, while it restores to the impoverished soil the virtue which the annual harvest is slowly taking away. This line of thought is logically inconsistent with the vaccination theory; it has been combated with anger almost amounting to fanaticism by one class of writers, and it is also in open antagonism with some of the more recondite hypotheses of the modern scientific imagination, which invite us to withhold our hand till the methods by which Nature works in assigning to sewer gas its deleterious qualities have been scientifically analysed and decompounded, and the deepest mysteries of chemistry and physiology laid open to the popular gaze.

Vaccine protection is theoretically held to act alike on young and old, on rich and poor, offering to each and to all a safeguard against a contagion which indiscriminately attacks the young and the old, the rich and the poor, the healthy and the sick. But the observations of calm and unprejudiced inquirers have shown that small-pox epidemics, so far from affecting all classes in one and the same manner, with a contagion that respects neither age nor position in society, is really a scourge that exercises a very careful selection in choosing its victims, giving an overwhelming preference to unhealthy slums where poverty, filth, and sanitary neglect hold permanent sway, and attacking no one who has not been already weakened by bad constitution, bad habits, bad water, or bad air. So distinctly has this been shewn, that at length the pro-vaccinators are changing their ground, and, disregarding the friendly advice to confine their advocacy of compulsion to the squalid dwellers in uncleanly domiciles, their present policy seems very generally to be directed towards coupling their animal safeguard with every sanitary proposal hitherto propounded by their anti-vaccinating opponents for the suppression of epidemic disease. Some years ago our fashionable doctrines taught that small-pox was almost if not wholly beyond the reach of sanitary measures; that among the syphitic maladies small-pox stood on separate ground, the descendant of a long line of ancestry which no filth could generate and no cleanliness expel, the vaccine shaft being the only arrow by which it could be pierced. But public opinion has advanced; and we find Dr. Van Overbeek de Meijer declaring in 1879 that small-pox as well as other epidemics, must be attacked at the place of its birth with extraordinary precautions of cleanliness and ventilation, purification of surroundings, and removal of collections of filth. Certain of our English towns are adopting a similar method of making vaccination effectual. We learn from Lucian that on the occurrence of a severe epidemic in the Roman Empire in the second century, the professional authorities recommended that an invocation to Apollo should be placed over each door as a protective measure. Great numbers made use of this remedy; but those who relied on its protective power were the principal sufferers, for, by their neglect of other precautions, dietetic and sanitary, they omitted to help their protective to help them (says our sarcastic author), and they had to pay the penalty of their neglect.

At the late meeting of the Social Science Congress at Edinburgh, an important statement...
was made on the varying incidence of small-pox in varying localities in well-vaccinated Paris. There had been 569 deaths in that city during the months of January and February last, which is by no means a decisive proof that vaccination, after eighty years of trial and coercion, is capable of reducing the natural causes of small-pox to inactivity. One of the speakers, Dr. Sir John Rose CORMACK, quoting from Dr. Bertillon, explained that "these deaths were unequally distributed through the city, one arrondissement giving six or seven times its calculated proportion, and another contributing sixteen times its due share. This latter was a locality (says Dr. Bertillon) specially adapted for the spread of any contagious disease introduced into it, the dwellings being old and ruinous, piled up one above another, and very sparingly supplied with air and light, and the inhabitants a dirty people, in rags, lean and wan." It might have been recognised by this Edinburgh Congress that the small-pox epidemic required no further explanation; but the meeting were informed on the same French authority, that the excess of deaths in this district was due to the presence of a small-pox hospital from which the seeds or germs of the poison were blown by the wind. It was an "imperfectly vaccinated" district.

There was another hospital in a different part of Paris, around which no such special epidemic fatality occurred. "In this district (says Dr. Bertillon) the houses are of good character, and inhabited by a better-vaccinated community!" The comparative mortality of vaccinated and unvaccinated in these districts does not appear to have been alluded to. Vaccination statistics, indeed, have become somewhat discredited of late; but it may be easily imagined that the mortality was high, for Dr. Cormack proceeded to say, on the authority of Dr. Bertillon, that the small-pox hospital (an annexe of the Hotel Dieu) contained at an average 140 patients, crammed into "horrible wards." One would not be surprised at a high death-rate of unvaccinated children under such circumstances, away from home, amid strange faces, and the most dismal surroundings. Such is isolation!

From this description of the incidence of the small-pox in modern Paris, the anti-vaccinator will derive confirmation of the opinion that all symptomatic diseases originate in filth and squalor and dissipation, and are powerless against cleanliness and temperate habits. Yet the speakers at this Congress appeared to concentrate their gaze on vaccination, as if by that alone the small-pox could be effectually confronted and appalled. It is indeed one of the peculiarities of our time that the loud outcry in favour of Dr. Jenner and his discovery should be so unmistakeably professional, and that abuse of the anti-vaccinator is so much in vogue as a substitute or argument. Admiration of vaccination surely is not necessarily inconsistent with courtesy to those who entertain an adverse opinion.

Inasmuch as the general aversion to the practice is now becoming admitted, a leading member of the British Medical Association lately remarked that "the efficiency of vaccination in Ireland and Scotland is sustained by the knowledge that there is a power behind that will compel, when other means for securing obedience to the law have failed." It is much the same in England. Before compulsion, vaccination was fashionable and popular. Under compulsion, it has become unfashionable and unpopular. Fashion resents legislative dictation, and the results of coercion might have been foreseen by any one conversant with English feeling. In the Vaccination Committee of 1871 we heard the proud boast that small-pox was virtually stamped out in Scotland and in Ireland. The vaunt was premature in both instances. Sir Robert Christison told the Congress that "a few years ago they had a most violent epidemic of small-pox in Edinburgh in which not even the vaccinated had been spared." But in what epidemic do we find them spared? In the Birmingham epidemic so seldom alluded to by the cautious vaccinal writer, the vaccinated furnished nearly seven thousand patients, of whom more than 12 per cent. died.

The Report of the Conseil de Salubrité of Paris in 1889 says, "How shall we explain the difference that is remarked between the mortality of one quarter and that of another, in the same town? of one street and that of another in the same quarter, or of the same village? or, lastly, the difference which is observed in this respect between houses in the same street? It is replied to us that misery is the cause. Yes! without doubt, misery is a powerful cause, especially when it is driven back into the most insalubrious quarters, streets, and houses, where it lives habitually in the midst of an atmosphere infected with filth and dirt." The houses of the lower orders in Paris are thus described by the Conseil de Salubrité: "The bad state and filth of the passages, privies, and sinks give rise to infectious exhalations which vitiate the air of these humble abodes, and affect the health of the inhabitants in a manner so much the more
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mischievous in that the greater part of them work all day in crowded and ill-ventilated worksho.

In the Journal d'Hygiène for 2nd October, 1879, Dr. Vaison describes a small-pox outbreak at Bastia, in Corsica. "The disease was local, and was neither guided by hazard nor by caprice. It affected the populous quarters, houses where the laws of health were wholly unknown. In the better streets and among the well-to-do classes, scarcely a case occurred, while the working class population in the narrow and crooked streets in which air and light with difficulty enter, were decimated. So completely was the disease confined to the poor, that the medieval cry was renewed, 'the fountains were poisoned' to produce the disease, and the rich escaped because they drank the water of Orezzo or of Cardo. No! (says Dr. Vaison) it is not the fountains, it is the atmosphere which is vitiated by the exhalations from the sewers, and by the filth of every kind which lies putrefying around the dwellings; it is overcrowding in small and low apartments; and it is the lodging-houses for tramps, where eight or ten beds are often crammed into one room. Such is the origin of the evil. A shed and an armful of straw with pure air would be preferable." Yet, with all these causes before his eyes, Dr. Vaison does not venture to break with the traditions of the profession. Corsica suffers because she "resists vaccination." If vaccination were a substitute for cleanliness or a defence against filth!

Dr. Boens writes: "On the 19th May, 1879, a vaccinated child ten years of age exhibited typhoid symptoms, followed by small-pox eruption, and died. On the 2nd June, an unvaccinated child fell ill in the same house and recovered. The father also recovered from an attack. A young vaccinated girl living close by was so ill as to be removed to the hospital. Dr. Wauthy recommended disinfection of houses, courts, and sewers, and, of course, re-vaccination. The authorities immediately cleaned the streets and houses. After that no new case occurred. There had not been time to re-vaccinate, and the disease having succumbed to cleanliness, the matter was allowed to rest. In August, small-pox broke out in another street, in a house occupied by a number of poor people. They were removed, and the disease was immediately stopped by a thorough cleansing and disinfection of the place. A much better plan (says Dr. Boens) than the vaccinal monomania which has so long fascinated us."

The medical profession of Europe have bound themselves so publicly to the once fashionable Jennerian theory, that in their entanglement they find it difficult to allow due force to the dictum that the science of the day may be the falsehood of the morrow. What is progress but change? Dr. Raffnesque, while upholding vaccination, says that sanitary hygiene is adequate to the suppression of all epidemics. "Every house in which systemic disease occurs should be disinfected and rendered wholesome." For the moment disinfection reigns triumphant — artificial disinfection — one method rapidly succeeding another in popular favour, and each claiming to be the genuine effective agent. Yet we know little of contagion; there is no scientific proof that it can be destroyed by our disinfectants, neither can the experiment be easily made upon an unknown factor. Dr. Vidal recommends obligatory disinfection of clothing, bedding, and susceptible objects generally, with compulsory re-vaccination every ten years. Dr. Van Overbeek de Meijer says, "Compulsory vaccination has by no means answered the expectations of its promoters; the fine being too light, and re-vaccination not being enforced." Dr. Farquharson in the Edinburgh Congress is reported by the Scotsman of October 11 to have said, "that he was not without hopes that they might eventually come to a point at which compulsory re-vaccination might be got... He was of opinion that the State should take hold of an unvaccinated child and have it compulsorily vaccinated." Of late, marvellous changes have taken place in English law and English feeling, and we are on the eve of still greater movements. The extent of the change of feeling during the last two centuries may be approximately measured by quoting from the honoured names of the past the sentiments which gave them fame, but which are now, apparently, no longer appreciated. The celebrated Whig statesman, Charles James Fox, in 1780, said,—"I am a friend of universal toleration, and an enemy to that narrow way of thinking that makes men come to parliament, not for the removal of some great grievance felt by them, but to desire parliament to shackle and fetter their fellow-subjects." Bishop Burnet says,—"The authority of parents over their children is antecedent to society, and no law that takes it away can be binding. Persecution (he trenchantly remarks) if it were lawful, ought to be extreme, and go to extirpation; for the bad treatment of those who are suffered still to live in a society is the creating.
of so many malcontents, who, at some time or other, may make those who treat them ill feel their revenge. And the principle of persecution, if true, is that to which all have a right when they have a power to put it in practice, since they, being persuaded that they are in the right, from that must believe they may lawfully exert against others that severity under which they groaned long themselves."—H. D. D.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON, BART., M.P.

The following letter from the President of the United Kingdom Alliance to Mr. Saul will be read with much satisfaction:—

17th October, 1880.

My dear Sir,—I have your note referring to the Vaccination Question.

I do not exactly know the steps which Mr. Burt and Mr. Jacob Bright propose to take in the matter, but I have little doubt that they will do the right thing and will deserve support. At all events, I am opposed to the present system of what is called Compulsory Vaccination. But whether Vaccination be desirable or not, the existing system is not compulsory since a rich man by giving or paying fines can avoid it, and so can the poor man, although he is sent to prison.

As regards the general question of Vaccination, there seems to be a serious conflict of testimony; but as almost all the Doctors support it, I should think that probably in the end it will turn out to be a delusion. Most of the theories on which they have been most positive have been upset after having held sway for a certain number of years.—Yours truly,

W. LAWSON.

REV. W. SAUL,
45 London Road, Carlisle.

COW-POX FROM HORSE-POX.—In the Mark Lane Express of 8th August we read,—"According to the Gazette Medicale, among the horses of a German horse-dealer, M. Alexander showed to M. Le Blanc a case of horse-pox in a well-bred animal from Germany. Lymph from this animal was inoculated by M. Chamblon on a three months' old heifer, by three punctures on the udder. These inoculations were most successful, and from this heifer another was as successfully inoculated on 18th May. On the 19th there was a very fine vaccinal eruption, no fewer than sixty pustules being present, from which two other heifers were vaccinated. From this source the Société de Hygiène was amply supplied with lymph for vaccination purposes."
Commons. Moreover he succeeded in winning over the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the manner he thus describes—

"During my residence in town in the summer of 1805, Lady Crewe happened in conversation to tell me how much Lord Henry Petty wished for a conference with me on the vaccine subject; and that she would like to bring us together. We met at her villa at Hampstead, and went so fully into the matter that his Lordship, convinced of the injury I had sustained, expressed his determination to bring something forward in the ensuing session. Before the session arrived Mr. Pitt died, and Lord Henry Petty became Chancellor of the Exchequer. In the early part of 1806, I again saw his Lordship, and found that his ardour in my cause had suffered no abatement. This was soon after proved by his Lordship's motion in the House."* 

Lord Henry brought Jenner's case before the Commons on the 2nd of July, and recited the fabulous matter communicated to him with the force of personal conviction. Vaccination was a preventive of small-pox, that loathsome disease which spreads death throughout the world. It was in 1777 that Jenner obtained some obscure knowledge of the peculiar virtue of Vaccine; and from that period he meditated profoundly on the subject, accumulated information, and instituted cautious and decisive experiments. At length he perfected his discovery, and published it for the benefit of mankind. Lord Henry then proceeded to relate the triumphs of Vaccination, not only throughout Europe, but China and India! Wherever the practice was introduced, there small-pox diminished and vanished. There was Vienna, for instance, where the average mortality from small-pox was 885 annually. Vaccination was commenced in 1799, and the mortality dropped in 1802 to 61, in 1803 to 97, and in 1804 to 2. Thus in Vienna there was an annual salvation of 883 human beings. This undoubted fact had made a deep impression on his mind [as well it might!]. But, alas! what was doing so much good abroad was neglected and distrusted at home. In the City of London the deaths from small-pox had been on an average 1811 annually, and this mortality had been gradually reduced by Vaccination to 629. Through the diffusion of the disease by various inoculation, the deaths last year (1805) had been raised from 629 to 1065. This dreadful destruction of life, especially shocking when a certain preventive existed, demanded their most serious attention, and in the situation he felt bound to propose a plan to bring forward a mass of evidence, to elicit the truth, and enlighten the public. He would therefore move—

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, praying that he will be graciously pleased to direct His Royal College of Physicians to inquire into the state of Vaccine Inoculation in the United Kingdom, and to report their opinion as to the progress it has made, and the causes which have retarded its general adoption."

Should this Report from the Physicians corroborate the favourable opinion of Vaccination entertained by foreign nations, it must greatly tend to subdue those prejudices against the practice which have been fomented here. And in that case, the House may consider whether the ingenious Discoverer has been remunerated conformably to the liberal spirit and character of this country.

Dr. Mathews seconded the motion, and contrasted the safety of vaccine with the dangers of variolous inoculation. He had no doubt the country would hasten to testify still further its gratitude to the learned physician to whom they owed this inestimable benefit.

Mr. Wilberforce did not approve of the reference to the College of Physicians. He would have preferred an investigation by a committee of the House, and another committee of the House of Lords. The opinions of such unbiased persons would be more congenial to the feelings of the people, and far more satisfactory than any medical report from the College of Physicians. The latter might be suspected of being influenced by professional motives, whereas a report from the Lords and Commons would be universally received as proceeding from a pure desire to promote the general good. It did not surprise him that Vaccination had made less progress at home than abroad. The resistance was due to that curious principle in the human mind which accepts what comes from afar with admiration whilst what is familiar is neglected and despised. The remedy would be found in diffusing information as to the complete success of Vaccination in foreign countries. They would thus disperse those absurd prejudices which are engendered and fostered by certain selfish and interested individuals.

Mr. Windham did not concur in the advice of Mr. Wilberforce to refer the matter to a parliamentary committee. It was a question for medical men. To a committee of the House the advice might be applied, Ne autor ultra crepidam. Let them enforce with their approval the report of the Physicians, and then let them proceed to remunerate that meritorious individual to whom

* Baron's Life of Jenner, vol. ii. p. 56.
society owed the utmost gratitude. He could not help thinking he had not yet received what was due for the expense and trouble the discovery had cost him.

Mr. Banks, was of a sceptical turn. He wished the motion had been made earlier in the session, for then he should have supported the suggestion of Mr. Wilberforce. They wished to know whether Vaccination really did afford reasonable security from small-pox. It was not a question for medical men for which the House was incompetent. They were as capable of determining the point, and setting it clearly before the public, as the most learned body that ever existed. He wished too, since the motion would be carried, that the Royal College of Surgeons might be united with the Physicians in the production of the report. As for Dr. Jenner, if Vaccination were as efficacious as asserted, he might be left to find his reward in its practice.

Lord Henry Petty in summing up the debate expressed his satisfaction with the general approval extended to his motion. He did not think the House competent to form a judgment on Vaccination. They could not decide whether cow-pox was genuine or spurious, or whether the affection resulting from its inoculation was regular or otherwise; nor could they determine whether eruptions that might break out after Vaccination were induced by the operation, or were due to other causes. Such delicate questions could only be solved by medical men. As for the proposal to annex the Royal College of Surgeons to that of the Physicians, it was superfluous. The College of Physicians would not only consult the Surgeons, but the Medical Colleges of Scotland and Ireland likewise. If the report should prove favourable, it would then be his duty to propose that remuneration be awarded to Dr. Jenner for his inestimable discovery.

The motion was then put from the Chair and agreed to unanimously.

It is needless to remark that the report of the College of Physicians was a mere formality toward a vote of credit for Jenner’s relief. He lay heavy on many hands, and none were more anxious to be relieved from the pressure than certain influential members of the College whose report was solicited. The operation was skilfully planned for the end designed, and Lord Henry Petty allowed himself to be primed and applied with singular facility: but public men have often to deliver as of themselves what is communicated by others, and to stand responsible for absurdities of which they are unconscious.

The Report of the Physicians appeared on 10th April, 1807, a verbose and contradictory document wherein assertion and conjecture are awkwardly intermingled. As to the extension of the practice, it is said—

“During eight years which have elapsed since Dr. Jenner made his discovery public, the progress of Vaccination has been rapid, not only in all parts of the United Kingdom, but in every quarter of the civilized world. In the British Islands some hundred thousands have been vaccinated; in our possessions in the East Indies upwards of 500,000, and among the nations of Europe the practice has become general.”

“Professional men have submitted it to the fairest trials, and the public for the most part have received it without prejudice. The testimony in its favour has been most strong and satisfactory, and the practice of it, though it has received a check in some quarters, appears to be upon the increase in most parts of the United Kingdom.”

It appears plainly from the Report that the opposition to Vaccination proceeded from the Inoculators, and the document may be described as a charge against the old practice as much as a positive defence of the new—

“However beneficial the inoculation of the small-pox may have been to individuals, it appears to have kept up a constant source of contagion, which has been the means of increasing the number of deaths by what is called the natural disease. It cannot be doubted that this mischief has been extended by the inconsiderate manner in which great numbers of persons, even since the introduction of Vaccination, are every year inoculated with small-pox, and afterwards required to attend two or three times a-week at the place of inoculation, through every stage of their illness.”

Some Inoculators asserted that Vaccination produced “new, unheard-of, and monstrous diseases,” and made use of pictures to excite terror and disgust—

“Publications with such representations have been widely circulated, and though they originate either in gross ignorance, or wilful misrepresentation, yet have they lessened the confidence of many, particularly of the lower classes, in Vaccination.”

Whatever the character of Vaccination—had the claim made in its favour been a true claim, still the chief resistance to its practice would have consisted in the common apathy. Hence the Report fairly attests—

“The lower orders of society can hardly be induced to adopt precautions against evils which may be at a distance; nor can it be expected from them, if these precautions be attended with expense. Unless, therefore, from the
immediate dread of epidemic small-pox, neither Vaccination or Inoculation appears at any time to have been general, and when the cause of terror has passed by the public have relapsed into indifference. It is not easy to suggest a remedy for an evil so deeply implanted in human nature."

The suggestion was, however, made that Vaccination should be offered gratis, but at the same time it was the opinion of the College that until variolous Inoculation was superseded or prohibited, "it would be impossible to prevent the constant recurrence of natural small-pox."

The recommendation of Vaccination gratis provoked the wrath of Dr. Moseley—

"Gratiss!" he exclaimed, "Why, every person knows that for years past in almost every street of London, signs or boards on the sides of houses, or on Methodists' shops, or in apothecaries' windows have invited the ignorant multitude to gratuitous Vaccination. I have seen as many gratis cow-pox hand-bills, gratis puffs, gratis pathetic sermons and addresses, and gratis station advertisements as would load an ox. What does the College think of the mountebank Jennerian placard, dispersed on walls and alleys, and among all the blackguard public-houses in town and country, and hung up in the shop or parlour of every Cow Poxer in England with Their Majesties' Names and those of Their August Family audaciously emblazoned upon it?"

The Report of the College is especially interesting as a historic confession and mark of progress. The physicians who drew it up were the same men who in 1800 professed their unlimited confidence in Vaccination, whilst as yet they knew little about it, proclaiming in the newspapers that they considered it their duty to declare—

"That those persons who have had the Cow-Pox are perfectly secure from the future infection of the Small-Pox."

From a profession so unqualified an absolute retraction was not to be expected; but experience had begotten caution, and it is instructive to remark with what qualifications the retreat from the original position is attempted. Thus—

"The security derived from Vaccination if not absolutely perfect is as nearly so as can perhaps be expected from any human discovery; for among several hundred thousand cases, with the results of which the College has been made acquainted, the number of alleged failures has been surprisingly small, so much so as to form no reasonable objection to the general adoption of Vaccination."

The Report is not the deliverance of men possessed with the confidence of 1800: throughout there is manifest the failing conviction which evades responsibility and seeks for confirmation from sources external to itself. After a reference to the Variolous Text, the Report runs on—

"It appears from numerous observations communicated to the College, that those who have been vaccinated are secure from the contagion of epidemic small-pox. Towns and districts of country in which Vaccination had been general, have afterwards had small-pox prevalent on all sides of them without suffering from the contagion. There are also in the evidence a few examples of epidemic small-pox having been subdued by a general Vaccination."

The liability to confound coincidence with cause was not unknown in 1807, and might have been suggested as a possible explanation of the cessation of an epidemic contemporaneously with Vaccination. How general Vaccination could secure universal exemption from small-pox was apparently never asked. Extraordinary tales of Victorious Vaccination were related and piously received. If a fraction of an urban or rural community happened to be vaccinated (usually a fraction least likely to be troubled with small-pox in any event) and small-pox did not break out, or did not widely spread, the salvation of the community was ascribed to the Victorious Vaccination. The phenomenon has, strange to say, escaped the attention of theologians, although, even at the present day, medical men constantly attest its occurrence.

Usefully was it conceded that Vaccination was not an absolute preservative from small-pox, but the pain of concession was softened with the plea of mitigation—

"In almost every case where small-pox has succeeded Vaccination, the disease has varied much from its ordinary course; it has neither been the same in violence, nor in the duration of its symptoms, but has, with very few exceptions, been remarkably mild, as if the small-pox had been deprived, by the previous vaccine disease, of all its usual malignity."

It goes without saying, that such a statement was on its face quackish romance. How could a physician know that any case of small-pox had been made milder by Vaccination? for how could he know how severe the disease would have been without Vaccination? Any ground of comparison was entirely wanting. Small-pox is an eruptive fever of wide degrees of intensity—slight as to be a trivial ailment, severe as to be inevitably fatal. "So true," wrote Dr. Wagstaffe in 1723, "is that common observation, that there is one sort in which a
nurse cannot kill, and another which even a physician cannot cure." Yet every case of mild small-pox after cow-pox came into fashion was placed to the credit of Vaccination!

"Some writers," the Report continues, "have greatly undervalued the security Vaccination affords, while others have considered it to be of a temporary nature only; but if any reliance is to be placed on the statements laid before the College, its power of protecting the human body from small-pox, though not perfect indeed, is abundantly sufficient to recommend it to the prudent and dispassionate. The opinion that Vaccination affords but a temporary security is supported by no analogy in Nature, nor by the facts which have hitherto occurred."

The analogy of Nature was a treacherous support, whilst the Physicians could not foresee the time when their successors would plead the fact of the temporary security of Vaccination as a reason for systematic Re-Vaccination.

It is not difficult to discern between the lines of the Report a spirit of doubt and hesitation. Those who framed it had gone too far to turn back; there was Jenner on their hands; and a public ready to hoot if there was any open apostasy. The outlook at home was not encouraging, but there was the Continent, yea more, the wide world itself wherein to cover the reproach of failure—

"They could not be insensible," they said, "to the confirmations they receive not only from the introduction of Vaccination into every part of Europe, but throughout the vast Continents of Asia and America."

The vast Continents of Asia and America! A fine phrase—a very fine phrase, with more comfort in it than scoffers might imagine.

In the Report we detect one good service, namely, the explosion of Jenner's fiction about Spurious Cow-Pox. When Vaccination was first brought forward, cases were added of small-pox after cow-pox. Jenner at once asserted that the cow-pox in such instances must have been spurious, for small-pox after genuine cow-pox was impossible; and Spurious Cow-Pox was thenceforward freely used to baffle inquirers and to account for failures. What was Spurious Cow-Pox no attempt was made by Jenner to define; indeed it was nothing else than an artful device of the idle impostor. It served his turn magnificently, but by and by it began to have awkward consequences. Genuine Cow-Pox was said to be harmless—it was the Spurious that was ineffective or worked mischief; and the Inoculators employed the terror of Spurious Pox to excite prejudice against Vaccination. It therefore became necessary to clear Spurious Cow-Pox out of the way, and Jenner, before the College of Physicians, pressed upon the point, "owned up," as Americans say, and authorised the following explanation—

"Some deviations from the usual course have occasionally occurred in Vaccination, which the Author of the practice has called Spurious Cow-Pox, by which the public have been misled, as if there were a true and a false Cow-Pox; but it appears that nothing more was meant than to express irregularity or difference from that common form and progress of the vaccine pustule from which its efficacy is inferred."

Slippery, very slippery, was the immortal Jenner.

With the report of the Royal College of Physicians were delivered reports from the London College of Surgeons, and from the Edinburgh and Dublin Colleges of Physicians and of Surgeons.

The report from the London College of Surgeons was considered most unsatisfactory, and could its tenor have been foreseen, the Jennerians might never have asked for it. 1100 circulars were dispatched on 15th December, 1806, to all the members of the College, whose addresses were known in the United Kingdom, submitting the following questions—

"1st. How many persons have you vaccinated?
"2nd. Have any of your patients had small-pox after vaccination?
"3rd. Have any bad effects occurred in your experience in consequence of vaccination? and if so, what were they?
"4th. Is the practice of vaccination increasing or decreasing in your neighbourhood? if decreasing, to what cause do you impute it?"

To the 1100 circulars only 436 replies were received. Why nearly two-thirds of the members kept silent, when at the outset they were converted in multitude to Vaccination, was left unexplained. The replies were thus summarised by the Board on 17th March, 1807—

"The number of persons stated in such letters to have been vaccinated, is 164,381.
"The number of cases in which Small-Pox had followed Vaccination is 56.
"The Board think it proper to remark under this head, that, in the enumeration of cases in which Small-Pox has succeeded Vaccination, they have included none but those in which the subject was vaccinated by the surgeon reporting the facts.
"The bad consequences which have arisen from Vaccination are—
66 cases of eruption of the skin, and
24 of inflammation of the arm, whereof
8 proved fatal.
"Vaccination, in the greater number of
Counties from which reports have been received, appears to be increasing: in the Metropolis it is on the decrease.

The principal reasons assigned for the decrease are—

"Imperfect Vaccination,
"Instances of Small-Pox after Vaccination,
"Supposed bad consequences,
"Publications against the practice,
"Popular prejudices."

The report of the Edinburgh College of Physicians disowned acquaintance with Vaccination, the practice being entirely in the hands of surgeons and other practitioners—

"With a view, however, to publish their conviction of the immense benefits which have been, and which will in future be derived to the world, from Inoculation for the Cow-Pox, they had spontaneously and unanimously elected Dr. Jenner an honorary Fellow of their College, a mark of distinction which they very rarely confer, and which they confine almost exclusively to Foreign Physicians of the first eminence."

The report of the College of Surgeons, dated 3rd March, 1807, left nothing for the Jennerians to desire. The Edinburgh surgeons were satisfied from their own experience that Vaccination constituted a permanent security from small-pox, and they had observed no ill consequences from the practice. Vaccination commenced in Edinburgh in 1801, and was now so general in the city—

"That for two or three years past, Small-Pox has been reckoned rather a rare occurrence, even among the lower order of the inhabitants, unless in some particular quarters about twelve months ago. Among the higher ranks of the inhabitants the disease is unknown."

Rare, unless in some quarters about a year ago! We turn to the report of the Edinburgh Dispensary for 1805, and there we read—

"The loathsome disease has unfortunately been very prevalent in several quarters of the city."

And this coincidently with extensive vaccination to which apparently there was no active opposition. We have also to remember in this connection the statement of Professor Alexander Monro in 1785, that "the inhabitants of Scotland generally have small-pox in their infancy or childhood: very few adults being seen in this disease"; and that in Edinburgh, with conditions strongly favourable to small-pox, the mortality from the disease was on an average little more than a hundred a year. The Edinburgh Physicians knew nothing practically of Vaccination, and we see how the Surgeons, who did know, shaped their evidence.

The Dublin College of Physicians echoed the fashionable opinion "that Cow-Pox Inoculation was safe, and fully answered its purpose." They were "willing to allow that doubtful cases had occurred of Small-Pox after Vaccination, but on minute investigation, these supposed instances originated generally in misrepresentation, or the difficulty of discriminating between small-pox and other eruptions." Rather awkwardly, seeing how the opposite opinion was in vogue, they professed their faith in various inoculation; thus—

"The Small-pox is rendered a much less formidable disease in Ireland by the frequency of Inoculation for it, than in other parts of His Majesty's dominions, where prejudices against Inoculation have prevailed. Hence parents, not unnaturally, object to the introduction of a new disease, in the shape of Vaccination, preferring to trust to the practice with the mildness and safety of which they are well acquainted."

The Dublin College of Surgeons showed themselves more fully abreast with the times. They had nothing to say for Inoculation, but testified their confidence in Vaccination, and how its practice was increasing in Ireland. From 1800 to 1806 a total of 14,835 had been "inoculated with vaccine infection" at the Dublin institutions, and many elsewhere—

"Cow-Pox has been found to be a mild disease, and rarely attended with danger, or any alarming symptom, and the few cases of Small-Pox which have occurred in Ireland after supposed Vaccination, have been satisfactorily proved to have arisen from accidental circumstances."

Arisen from accidental circumstances! Thus was the divine illumination of experience veiled over and denied!

Fortified with this budget of questionable evidence, the Government proceeded to claim from the House of Commons a second endowment for Jenner.

Jonathan Edwards.—Mr. White in his Story of a Great Delusion omitted to mention that Jonathan Edwards, the prince of Calvinistic metaphysicians, was killed by inoculation. There was an epidemic of small-pox prevalent in New Jersey, and for security Edwards was persuaded to submit to inoculation. The result was the generation of small-pox in a severe form, of which he died, 22nd March, 1758, in his 64th year. Small-pox in the vast majority of cases is a disease of the young, and whether we believe in variolous or vaccine inoculation, the prophylactic is mere superficially with those who have attained middle age.—M.B.
AN APPEAL TO MR. GLADSTONE.

London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, Gray's Inn Chambers,
London, 1st October, 1880.

Sir,—Knowing the pressure of your numerous and grave duties, I yet venture to draw your attention to a great wrong that you may exercise your power for its cessation.

Some days ago Robert Tweedale of Rochdale was taken from his bed at night, close by the residence of your colleague, Mr. Bright, and conveyed to the County Prison, where he was treated as a convict. Why? Because as a wise and tender parent he refused to have his child vaccinated. The law under which this outrage was committed is, in the words of Mr. Bright, "monstrous, and ought to be repealed." Yet is it not repealed.

Cases like that of Tweedale are of frequent occurrence, and I and others, are persuaded that Vaccination is a useless and hurtful superstition, find it difficult to express in terms that do not savour of violence, the indignation aroused by such deeds of brutal intolerance.

I put it to your reason and conscience, why should such outrages be permitted on my reason and conscience? Are only theological convictions entitled to liberty and respect? Are those who entertain unpopular opinions—scientific, social, secular, to be abandoned without pity to the wild beasts of bigotry? The rite of vaccination is said to secure its subjects from small-pox. Let those who trust in the rite be satisfied with their own security. Being secure, why should they inflict it on the unwilling and incredulous? If we have small-pox, they cannot take it. If they say they can, they surrender the pretext under which the rite is enforced.

Your Government introduced a Bill last session to abolish multiple penalties for non-vaccination, but whether from lack of opportunity or inclination it was not pressed upon the House of Commons. The Bill however excited much alarm in the medical trades-unions; and it was said that in allowing dissenters from vaccination to escape with limited punishment, you were preparing to sell inducements to law-breakers, whilst continuing to oppress the poor with fines and costs that were to them overwhelming; and there was truth in the criticism.

Summarily I would observe that no relaxation of the Vaccination Acts will ever be assented to by the medical corporations. You have shared in the abolition of many abuses, but did you ever abolish one with the good-will of those whose advantage, real or imaginary, consisted in the abuse? Wherefore, I say, if you have not the courage to confront the medical profession in this matter, I shall plead with you, for the protection of the weaker, but if you are resolved to make good the hope of relief held out to us, I pray you simplify, justify, and dignify your measure by the entire removal of money penalties. Let vaccination officers be authorised to receive objections to vaccination on affidavits before a Justice of the Peace. Let children thus exempted be carefully registered as unvaccinated, and await the verdict of experience.

At present the unvaccinated afford no data for a just comparison with the vaccinated. The unvaccinated are those who are rejected as too feeble to undergo the vaccination fever, or who are the offspring of the wretched and homeless, and thus escape detection by the vaccination officer. With whatever disease afflicted, the unvaccinated would therefore compare unfavourably with the vaccinated. The children of disbelievers in vaccination would, on the other hand, afford a fair test of the advantages or disadvantages of unpolluted blood. The experiment would not only be valuable in a scientific sense, but it would be a worthy exploit on the part of statesmen whose glory is their hatred of oppression and reverence for the rights of man.

—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM WHITE.

To the Rt. Hon. WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE, M.P.
First Lord of the Treasury, Downing Street.

THE GOVERNMENT AND COMPULSION.

It is not intended to re-introduce the Vaccination Amendment Act next session. Whatever the good-will of certain Members of the Government, they recognise the improbability of securing a majority in the House of Commons for a relaxation of the existing law. As one of them observed, "It would be easier to carry a measure for compulsory re-vaccination."

MEDICAL BIGOTRY.—Of all the professions the medical is the least liberal. The Church is getting more and more progressive each year. It is not uncommon to-day for clergymen of different denominations to exchange pulpits, or associate together on the same platform for religious purposes. Once it was not so. Though all professed to serve the same Master, and direct the minds of men to the same Heaven, anything but loving kindness and harmony prevailed in their ranks. But while this good feeling is taking place among theologians, medical sects seem to be separating further apart. Distrust, bitterness, strife and hatred are the ruling passions.—The California Medical Journal, August, 1880.

IMPROVED TREATMENT OF SMALL-POX.—Even before Jenner's discovery of vaccination, the improvement of medical science, consequent on increased knowledge of the structure and functions of the human body, had greatly mitigated the fatality of small-pox. Formerly the patients were shut up, loaded with bed-clothes, in heated rooms, from which every particle of fresh air was excluded, and stimulants were administered as if on purpose to hasten the fate of the sick. But sounder views of the wants of the animal economy at last prevailed; and, by the admission of fresh air, the removal of everything heating or stimulating, and the administration of cooling drinks and other fit remedies, thousands were preserved whose lives would have been lost under the mistaken guidance of the older physicians.—ANDREW COMBS, M.D. Principles of Physiology, Chap. XVI.
LORD CLIFTON TO MR. GLADSTONE.

This is what we want you, the cleverest man in England, to prove to the Queen and the country, that it is logically impossible to prove the benefits of vaccination. *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*; that is the sum total of the vaccinationist logic. Fewer deaths from small-pox occur in proportion to the population since the introduction of vaccination, *therefore* vaccination has produced this result. Unvaccinated persons have taken small-pox, *therefore* vaccination would have protected them. Unvaccinated small-pox patients die in a greater proportion than the vaccinated, *therefore* vaccination has prevented the vaccinated from dying.

It is difficult to argue with persons whose notions of logic are so rudimentary as this. They never dream of the necessity of excluding all other causes before ascribing an effect to a cause entirely and solely—according to their logic and statistics, the battle of Waterloo, the Revolution of 1880, and the repeal of the Corn Laws must all have decreased small-pox, for a progressive diminution is said to have taken place since the beginning of the century. Persons might also be produced who have worn amulets round their necks, and have not taken small-pox, *therefore* the amulets have protected them. It is obvious that this sort of logic cuts two ways. If unvaccinated persons can be produced who have taken small-pox, so also can unvaccinated persons who have not. Therefore, according to this school-boy logic, it must have been their non-vaccination which protected them. Thus, while vaccinated persons exist in abundance who have never had small-pox, so also can many vaccinated persons be found who have taken small-pox. Where, then, is the basis for a logical induction? There is no certainty anywhere, and it can neither be shown that an unvaccinated person succumbs to the disease solely from non-protection, nor that a vaccinated person is saved solely by his "protection." We are unable to discern the nexus between cause and effect in such cases as these. A vaccinated infant may die (perhaps as a direct result of the "common septic poison" contained in vaccine) before he has a chance to catch small-pox. On the other hand, you must watch your man all his life before you can be sure of his "immunity" from small-pox. Where proof is so tardy it cannot be certain.—*From a Letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone by Edward Blish, Lord Clifton, 21st August, 1880.*

CORFIELD CHARACTERIZED.—The Pall Mall Gazette, in reviewing Corfield's *Laws of Health* observes,—"One criticism at parting. On ventilation and drainage, Dr. Corfield leaves nothing to be desired; but when he discourses on constitution, idiosyncrasies, temperament, and the secret of cures are reminded that medicine is still in the empirical stage, and his treatment of these subjects is as unsound as that of Galen or Celsius."—The reviewer might have added Vaccination to the list.

IN QUEST OF COW-POX.

There is an amusing and instructive report in the *Veterinarian* for September of a supposed outbreak of Cow-Pox at Halestead in Essex, and of the flutter of expectation it excited. The cowman and milkers on the farm of Mr. Jacob Evans noticed a sore on a cow's udder on 1st June, and got ointment wherewith to dress it. Other cows became similarly affected, and a veterinarian was called in. He found the cows with reddish papule on their udders, and from a well-formed vesicle he "charged some points with very nice liquid lymph," and forwarded them to Prof. Simonds of the Royal Veterinary College, Camden Town.

Meanwhile Dr. Hinds of Halestead had heard of the ailing cows, and communicated the glad tidings to the Local Government Board. Dr. Stevens forthwith appeared on the scene, and was followed by Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Burdon Sanderson, and Mr. Ceely. The experienced eye of Mr. Ceely at once detected it was no case of Cow-Pox, but a mere eczematous eruption. Dr. Sanderson and Dr. Buchanan discreetly said nothing. The cows were turned out to pasture, and in a week or two all traces of the disease passed away.

Professor Simonds, however, made trial of the lymph. He had the abdomen of a well-bred male calf shaven, and inoculated in twelve punctures and four sets of scratches. The poor beast was examined day by day, but no effect was produced, and the failure was duly reported to Dr. Buchanan of the Local Government Board.

The trial of the Halestead lymph did not, however, terminate with the male calf in Camden Town. Mr. Ceely had charged some "points" with the fluid, and inoculated the arm of a child without any result, and rubbed three points on a cluster of scratches on the back of his own hand, but nothing came of it. He also gave some "points" to Dr. Cory, the vaccinator at the Local Government Board's station in Blackfriars Road, but Dr. Cory's experiments were equally futile.

FOLLY FOR FOOLS.—If you are to rule men, you must rule them through their own ideas; and I agree with the Archbishop of Naples, who had a St. Januarius procession against the plague... It is no use having an order in Council against popular shallowness.—Daniel Deronda.

A GERMAN'S OPINION.—My experience of small-pox, during these six years of bedside attendance, has given me the right, or rather has imposed on me the duty of taking part in the bold and spirited onslaught on vaccination, which is now being carried on in Switzerland, Germany, England, and other countries... I am convinced that vaccination is the greatest mistake and delusion in the science of medicine! a fanciful illusion in the mind of the discoverer; a phenomenal appearance devoid of scientific foundation and wanting in all the conditions of scientific possibility.—DR. HERMAN, Principal Physician at the Imperial Hospital, Vienna, from 1855 to 1884.
A MEDICAL CERTIFICATE MAKES ALL THE DIFFERENCE.

Rocks abound, no doubt, at all times; just as quackeries and superstitions abound at all times. Formerly it was witchcraft; now we have vaccination, living disease germs, etc. Formerly baked toads in silken bags were worn round the neck as charms against disease. In doctors’ books of 200 years ago we read the following prescription to ward off fevers:—“Take eight pints of rosemary flowers, three pints of shell snails, two handfuls of seed fux, and one puppy dog nine days old; wash the snails, kill the dog, fling away the head, and dry the quarters in a linen cloth. Pound all together to a powder, and put the powder into well-corked bottles. It is now ready for use, and if a tea-spoonful be taken once a day fever will be kept off.”

At the present time the recipe for the same thing is as follows:—“Take matter from the heels of a horse that is suffering from ‘grease’; put the matter into the veins of a cow so that ulcerous sores are produced; take lymph from these ulcers; pass it through human subjects; lance the skin of a child and introduce a particle of the lymph within the skin; then, if a running ulcer ensues, the child will be safe from the form of fever called small-pox for the rest of its life.”

Now, I really think there is very little to choose between these two prescriptions in point of absurdity, though there is in harmfulness. Of course, I would not wear a baked toad round my neck nor give anyone spoonfuls of powdered puppy dogs. Still they would do no harm. But no consideration on earth would induce me to put half putrid lymph, that came originally from a diseased beast, into the veins of a child of mine. In the first place I should consider it dangerous to its health; and in the second place, if the child died, I should be tried for manslaughter—supposing, as I am supposing, that I performed the operation myself. It would not be so if I were a certified doctor, licensed to inoculate any number of little children without a word being said; but I am not a certified doctor.—H. STRICKLAND CONSTABLE in Fashions of the Day.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HYGIENE, TURIN.

It is some comfort to find that at this Congress “England was almost unrepresented.” For if the report of the British Medical Journal, 9th October, be correct, it would have been very unpleasant for an Englishman to note such total absence of truth in the utterances of the “eminent sanitarians” who spoke.

M. Finkelburg declared that where “compulsory vaccination had been most satisfactorily received, it had effected the extinction of small-pox; and M. Klæs Linroth that “for half a century, vaccination and re-vaccination have been compulsory in Sweden, and small-pox is almost unknown there.”

Now, P. A. Sjöström has taken the pains to give us the official statistics of Sweden on small-pox, and it is certain that for the seventy-two years ending 1872, there was not a single year without deaths from small-pox; while in the eight years ending 1872, no fewer than 7866 persons died in Sweden of small-pox. And compulsory vaccination was decreed in 1816.

As for France, M. Lionville contented himself by reading the French Bill on compulsion. Was it because the present prevalence of small-pox in Paris shamed such barefaced assertions from his lips?

Why do fact and theory, observations and assertions, so strangely contradict themselves in the case of vaccine?

It can only be because self-interest blinds the eye. Farmers opposed the repeal of the corn laws. Prelates oppose the separation of the church and the state. Factory hands opposed the introduction of machinery, and brick-makers likewise. Americans protect their own industries, and exclude our manufactures to the disadvantage of every householder in the United States. And doctors, smitten with the same distemper, blind to the good of the people, faithless to Hygeia, and regardless of facts, are resisting the inevitable in vaccination.—A. W.

OLD LONDON SMALL-POX.

JAMES JURIN, M.D., was one of the first men to gather out figures to show the mortality of small-pox. His figures were as correct as he could make them. Indeed, they have not been proved erroneous or even suspected of error. But with his tables of figures before him, he drew an inference from them wholly absurd. The tables have a permanent value beyond Jurin’s object. He made them to prove the malignity of small-pox in London. We may use them to show how much more malignant small-pox became under the foolish practices of medical impostors.

LONDON.—Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Burials</th>
<th>Died of Small-Pox</th>
<th>Died in 1000</th>
<th>Died in Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>15,842</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>one in 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>17,278</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>19,432</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>20,198</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>15,729</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>18,230</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>17,504</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>21,201</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>17,244</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>18,758</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>19,067</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>20,678</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>21,730</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>21,053</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>23,971</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>20,691</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>20,587</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>23,202</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>23,222</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>22,669</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Years, 398,200: 28,459, 71 1/4 one in 14

Each Year at a Medium, 19,910, 1,423, 71 1/4 one in 14
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

LONDON.—Table II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total Number of Burials</th>
<th>Died of the Small-Pox in all</th>
<th>Died of the Small-Pox in 1000</th>
<th>Died of the Small-Pox in Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>20,471</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>one in 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>19,481</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>20,720</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>22,884</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>22,097</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>19,847</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>21,301</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>24,620</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>19,633</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>21,198</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>21,057</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>26,569</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>22,223</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>24,436</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>23,446</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>26,623</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>25,347</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>25,544</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>26,142</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>25,750</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Years, 505,596 36,620 72 one in 14
Each Year
Medium, 22,982 1,665 72 one in 14
The 43 Years, 903,798 65,079 72 one in 14

The comment of Dr. Jurin on these figures is as follows:—"By these Tables it appears that upwards of seven per cent., or somewhat more than a fourteenth part of Mankind die of the Small-Pox; and, consequently, the hazard of dying of that distemper, to every individual born into the World, is at least of one in fourteen." He took the mortality of London for the mortality of England and the world! Widely different was the mortality of London from that of England generally. According to Dr. Price in his book on "Vaccination," the expectation of a child at its birth in Holy Cross, Salop, was thirty-three years, whilst at the same time in London, according to Dr. Perceval, half of all born, died under two years of age. In London workhouses before 1767 only one child in twenty-four lived to be one year of age! Out of 2800 annually admitted to the workhouses, 2690 died before a year was out! Yet at Hoyton, a country town, near Newcastle, at the same period, only one child of seven born was dead at three years of age. At Holy Cross half the population died at upwards of eighty years of age; while, according to the same authority, only one in sixty Londoners attained to four-score. Therefore it was as absurd to convert the mortality of London into the mortality of England, as to make dreams the guide of life; and equally false and groundless was it to make the small-pox mortality of London that of every town and county of England and of the whole world.—W. Gibson Ward.

"I think your case one of great hardship. These repeated penalties for non-vaccination are, in my view, most unjust. I wish the law were changed."—The Right Hon. John Bright.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS, PARIS.

In order to afford time for obtaining a more complete representation of nationalities, the Congress has been postponed until December. M. Labés, 59 Rue Pigalle, Paris, will be glad to receive intimation from delegates and others desiring to attend, to whom full information will be sent. The Congress before terminating the session will draw up a Memorial against Compulsory Vaccination addressed to all Governments which enforce the prescription. In addition to the adherents sent in, we hope that Holland, Germany, Austria, Canada, and the United States may be adequately represented.

"I maintain that all the elements justifying compulsion on the part of the State are wanting in this instance of Vaccination."—P. A. Taylor, M.P.

A BREVISH STATEMENT.—There is no patent process to stamp out disease. The health of a people cannot be exalted above their habits. The death-rate of a people is not increased materially by epidemics; neither is it lessened by any medical skill. The death-rate is influenced by wrong eating and wrong drinking, by dirty water and dirty skins.—W. Gibson Ward.

NOTHING LIKE LEATHER.—Dr. Bristowe in addressing the Society of Medical Officers of Health on 16th October observed—"The practice of Vaccination has reduced the mortality from small-pox, and the benefit is maintained even though weak-kneed politicians not only hesitate to make it strictly compulsory, but actually seem disposed, in deference to ignorant and irrational prejudice, to grant licenses, as Sir William Jenner put it, to contract and propagate the disease. Much as vaccination has effected in the prevention of small-pox, we cannot but deplore how utterly insufficient is the existing system. As the law stands, there is only power to enforce a single effectual vaccination on infants and nothing more. And even this obligation may be evaded by any parent who chooses to pay a fine, or to undergo imprisonment! What we want is power to vaccinate all who are exposed to contagion whenever there is an outbreak of small-pox; and it is disheartening that with such means of protection in our hands, we are without the ability to enforce it."—We like Dr. Bristowe's plain speaking; but where should we be if all who traffic in quack prescriptions got Government to enforce them? It was once believed that purgatives were essential to health in spring and autumn, and also periodical veneration; but no doubt if these practices had passed into legislation with officers and fees annexed thereto, we should have had them fixed upon us just like vaccination, and men like Dr. Bristowe pleading piteously for extra salts and curds and more frequent blood-letting.
VACCINATION IN LAODICEA.

All vaccinators are not ardent vaccinators. Many practitioners hold by the practice very lightly. They admit that it is of little use; that if originally effective, its virtue has worn out; but they hope it does no harm, and it is not worth making a disturbance over a matter of such indifference. Such Laodiceans do not, therefore, make themselves manifest, so that their existence is generally unsuspected; but one of them has written a notice of Mr. Robinson's pamphlet, Can Disease Protect Health in the British Mail for October, after this fashion:

"This is a very excellent little treatise, as must be confessed by those who read it, even if they do not agree with the author's opinions. There is no doubt that vaccination is a valuable aid to other means of stamping out small-pox; but too much reliance is placed upon it, and the time has come when it should take a secondary place. Vaccination should only be looked upon as the lesser of two evils, and an effort should be made to get rid of both. The truth does not belong to either its advocates or opponents, but is to be found midway between them. Vaccination is undoubtedly a disease, and is not, per se, desirable. It is only in the presence of a worse disease that it is entitled to toleration. The law, as it stands, is not so much in the wrong as it is defective. Other means of stamping out small-pox are neglected from an overweening reliance on a mere palliative. There should be more discussion and less vituperation in dealing with the question."

THE PRACTICE OF STATESMEN.—Statesmen, not in China only but in other countries, have ever been prone to protect and cherish, the popular superstitions as a useful engine of government, and submit to mummeries in public which they inwardly despise.—Sir Rutherford Alcock.—The Capital of the Tycoon.

HUMBUG UNDER AUTHORITY.—1891. The cholera is at Riga, and 700 sail of English vessels are there. We (the Privy Council) sent for Sir H. Halford, and placed all the information we had in his hands, desiring him to associate with himself some other practitioners and report their opinion whether the disease was contagious and whether it could be conveyed by goods. They reported next day yes to the first question, no to the second. A Board of Health has been formed, composed of certain members of the College of Physicians. All the evidence proves that goods are not capable of bringing in the disorder, but we have appointed a Board of Health which is contagious, and we can't get them to subscribe to that opinion. The fact is, they take the safe side. We dare not act without its sanction, and so we are obliged to air goods. The Tories would make it a matter of accusation against the Government only they don't exactly know how. Chas. F. Grevelle, Clerk to the Council, Memoirs of George IV. and William IV.

"I HAVE received most touching letters from all quarters, complaining of the grievous sorrow and suffering inflicted on families through the Vaccination Acts."—Sir Thomas Chambres, Q.C., M.P., Recorder of London.

PRIVILEGE NEVER SURRENDERS, NOR EVER WILL.—We should like to inquire whether it is ever rational to expect great and wide-sweeping reforms from a sense of duty in the privileged classes, or indeed in any classes? Human nature being what it is, are we justified by our experience of it in expecting that any class, composed of individuals of most unequal mental and moral worth, will or can come up to such a high standard of virtue, as to willingly renounce and forego privileges which they enjoy under an existing régime? Clearly this is to expect that the average of men will transcend the average of human nature. Lofty characters of all ranks may be equal to any extremities of self-sacrifice; but classes never.—John Morley in Pall Mall Gazette, 10th June.

THE VACCINATION ACTS DETESTABLE.—In proportion as just law is valuable, so is unjust law pernicious and detestable. The more law-abiding a community is, so much the more deadly does unjust law become. Some indeed will tell us that law, however unjust, is sacred by the mere fact of its being enacted; but when a clear and strong case of injustice is presented, such as that of slavery, few will persevere in so arbitrary and paradoxical an assertion. In every case where the injustice of a law is clear, even though the thing be trifling, it becomes a mere question of personal prudence whether to risk encountering the penalties by disobedience. Where the injustice is intense, it may be the part of noble heroism to violate the law and accept all the risks; as in aiding fugitive slaves to escape, or otherwise imparting to them human rights and human kindness against the command of inhuman legislation.—Professor F. W. Newman.

WHERE ARE WE?—"It is useless to deny," says Dr. T. Wilson, in the Lancet, "that vaccination by human lymph involves danger of scrofulous, syphilitic, and erysipelas inoculation." Thus, at last, the profession is driven by the public to acknowledge these evils, and tells us, by way of remedy, to get the lymph direct from the cow or calf. But "lymph taken direct from the cow," says Dr. G. Gregory, "is often very acrid, and produces glandular swellings and local inflammation." "Some crazy enthusiasts," says Dr. Shorthouse, "recommend that lymph be taken direct from the cow or calf. They surely cannot have seen those frightful pictures of disease so produced, published by Mr. Cesly." And yet Sir Thomas Watson and the doctors say it is perfectly harmless. But for seventy years they said inoculation was "perfectly harmless," and then for seventy more that Jenner's arm-to-arm system of vaccination was "perfectly harmless."—Henry Strickland Constable in Fashions of the Day.
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SMALL-POX is a member of the group of diseases described as zymotic, which originate in unwholesome conditions of life, and in common are diminished and prevented by the reduction and removal of those conditions.

In times when the laws of health were imperfectly understood, the fanciful discovery was made that by poisoning the blood with the virus of small-pox or cow-pox, a future attack of small-pox might be escaped. While many kindred superstitions in medical practice have been discredited and forgotten, Vaccination, because it was endowed by the State, has survived, and has entered into legislation, and is enforced with fine and imprisonment. It is in vain for Nonconformists to plead that they do not believe that Vaccination has any power to prevent or to mitigate small-pox: they are told they may believe what they like, but that vaccinated they must be, for the benefit of the rite is settled beyond dispute, and that only fools and fanatics venture to question what has been irrevocably determined.

It is to attack and overthrow this monstrous tyranny that the London Society has been established. The members desire to enlighten the public mind as to the history of Vaccination, as to its injury in communicating and intensifying other diseases, and as to its failure to avert the malady against which it is invoked.

Some, too, whilst disinclined to discuss Vaccination as a medical question, or to surrender confidence in its prophylaxis, are opposed to its compulsory infliction. They maintain that every remedy should be left to justify itself by its own efficacy, and that of all prescriptions the last which requires extraneous assistance is Vaccination; for its reputation is based on the fact that its subjects are secure from small-pox, and in that security may abide indifferent to those who choose to neglect its salvation. Even nurses in small-pox hospitals, it is said, when efficiently vaccinated and re-vaccinated, live unaffected in the variolous atmosphere. Therefore, they hold that to compare an unvaccinated person to a nuisance, as is frequently done, is to make use of an epithet that implicitly denies the virtue asserted for Vaccination: a nuisance being a voluntary danger or annoyance which another cannot conveniently avoid. They also hold that to establish any medical prescription, and to create interests identified with that prescription, is to erect a barrier to improvement; for it is obvious that any novelty in the treatment of small-pox must, in the constitution of human nature, meet with resistance from those whose emoluments are vested in the established practice.

The London Society, therefore, claims to enlist the energies of those who resist Vaccination as useless and mischievous, and of those who, true to their faith in liberty, would leave its acceptance to the discretion of the individual. In the controversy into which they enter, they propose to employ all the familiar agencies wherewith in England revolutions are effected in the public mind and in Parliament; and they appeal with confidence for the sympathy and support of their countrymen. The Vaccination Acts under which they suffer have not been enacted with the full cognizance of the nation, but have been forced through indifferent Parliaments by the persistence of medical faction. The members of the Society are confident that as soon as the truth about Vaccination is fully known and appreciated, the freedom they contend for will be conformed without fear, and that posterity will view with amazement the outrage upon human right and reason that is at present committed under the shadow of English liberty.
The Vaccination Inquirer
And Health Review.

CHICKEN-CHOLERA.

The researches of M. Pasteur into the pathology of chicken-cholera, which have been causing such a stir in the scientific world in general and the vaccination camp in particular, have at length been published.

Professor Huxley had expressed a conviction that they would be the means of placing vaccination on (what it has always sadly needed) a scientific basis. The Globe newspaper professed to see in them a "scare for anti-vaccinators." Now that the facts are made known the vanity of both these prophecies is apparent. Here are M. Pasteur's chief points—Chicken-cholera is a virulent disease, rarely recurrent, due to a microscopic parasite, capable of cultivation outside the body; by a process to be afterwards explained an attenuated or benign virus may be obtained which on retro-inoculation produces the original disease in a modified form, thereby securing the animal from future attack. The only reference to vaccination in the paper is a suggested analogy between it and the attenuated cholera virus, but M. Pasteur is too scientific a man to insist on such relation. "The difference is great," he says, "in some respects between the two classes of facts, and it may be well to remark that as regards our knowledge and our deductions the advantage is with the study of fowls' cholera; the relations between variola and vaccine are still a matter of controversy." The experiences of the Lyons commission, conducted by M. Chauveau, were no doubt in the mind of M. Pasteur when he wrote the above; this commission and the admirable report published by its members have not received the attention they merit, at least in this country. It is by far the most scientific work that has been published in this department of experimental pathology. "Never, in fact, has a medical experimental commission had more ample materials at its disposal," and, after careful and patient investigation, the commission reported that "notwithstanding the apparent resemblances which, both in animals and man, exist between small-pox and vaccinia, these two diseases are none the less perfectly independent and cannot be transformed the one into the other." As Dr. Cameron has tersely put it, "You can no more make small-pox into cowpox than by stunting an oak tree you can make it a gooseberry bush."

But to return to M. Pasteur's paper and to the most important question raised in it—By what means is the cholera virus attenuated and destroyed? The answer is clear, logical, and conclusive, and if we may rely with certainty on the experiments, must be productive of the most important results in sanitary science. Here is the experimentum crucis—Tubes containing the fresh virus were hermetically sealed, just sufficient air being allowed to remain to permit the development of the virus, as shown by its increasing cloudiness. These tubes were kept for periods of from two to ten months and then opened, when the virus in every case was found to be as virulent as ever. On the other hand, tubes of fresh virus kept exposed for various lengths of time to the influence of pure air gradually and progressively, with almost mathematical precision, lost their virulence and became innocuous. The microscopic parasite was dead!

So, says M. Pasteur, "it is the oxygen of the air which weakens or extinguishes the virulence"; the presence of the cause (the oxygen) is followed by the presence of the effect (the death of the parasite and extinction of the virulence of the poison), the absence of the cause by the absence of the effect, and the greater the amount of the cause the greater is the.

* Ib., page 9.
* Ib., page 101.
effect. What more logical! "This is probably more than an isolated fact, we may here be in the possession of a principle. It may be hoped the inherent action of atmospheric oxygen, a natural force which is everywhere present, will be found efficacious in other virus. May we not presume henceforth that it is to this influence we may attribute the limitation of great epidemics?" Thus, writes M. Pasteur, and without accepting unreservedly this plausible hypothesis, it is curious to see how readily it offers an explanation of many scattered facts with which we are acquainted, e.g., the efficacy of isolation and the limitability of infection, the utility of oxidising disinfectants, the salubrity of the country and the morbidity of the town, the success of the cool or open air treatment of diseases, the decline of symtomic disease before the progress of sanitation; the theory harmonises these facts and supplies a reason for what was before only empirical, though none the less true.

M. Pasteur's conclusions receive additional support from some experiments made by Prof. Thiersch, and repeated by Dr. Burdon Sanderson, upon mice with the poison of human cholera; it was found that the poison intensified up to the third day, and then declined under exposure to air or cold.

What, then, is the inference to be drawn from these facts? Do they warrant the inoculation of every healthy person with however much "attenuated" virus? Do they give a "scientific basis" to the practice of cow-poxing? Do they not rather establish a stronger plea for what anti-vaccinators have always contended for—improved sanitation, for the means of fighting diseases outside our bodies and not within them, for making our hygiene so good that so-called prophylaxis by way of giving disease shall be superfluous? Anti-vaccinators need never fear the conclusions of true science.

W. J. COLLINS, B.Sc., M.R.C.S.

CONFLICTING TESTIMONIES.

It is difficult to avoid the conviction that much of the evidence delivered in favour of vaccination for popular use, is delivered in contempt of popular intelligence. About a year ago the secretary of the Metropolitan Hospitals published a letter wherein it was stated that the mortality among their vaccinated patients was 8·8 per cent., whilst that of the unvaccinated was no less than 44·4 per cent.; and editors all over the land, accepting the statement as veracious, proceeded to deliver the usual homilies on the folly and wickedness of those who were blind to the light of science, and the glory of the immortal Jenner. It has therefore to be said that if such statistics are contrived in contempt of the popular mind, the contempt is justified. It was in vain that we demanded, Who were the unvaccinated? or, How it came to pass that small-pox was thrice as fatal to the unvaccinated as it was before the introduction of vaccination? Such questions were resented as impertinences: the doctors had testified, and editors believed and prophesied, and would be prejudiced by nothing to the contrary. The secret, the open secret, of the high mortality among the unvaccinated is the wretched conditions and constitutions of those who escape vaccination; so that, we have little doubt, the unvaccinated die at a higher rate of pneumonia than the vaccinated: and therefore it might be taken as proved that vaccination is as good against inflammation of the lungs as against small-pox.

Again, what is better known than that the symtomic diseases are generated among the ill-fed and unclean, and that epidemics play worst havoc among starved, dirty, and crowded populations? Yet vaccinators boldly assert the contrary of small-pox. One of the sections of Mr. Ernest Hart's Truth about Vaccination is devoted to the proof that "the best authorities on the subject agree that the influence which sanitary conditions exercise on small-pox is comparatively small." Living the most wholesome life, you may catch small-pox; living the most unwholesome life, if only efficiently vaccinated and re-vaccinated, you cannot catch small-pox! Such is the extraordinary doctrine of the vaccinators, as delivered to the vulgar!

It is needless to say that the initiated believe not a word of this bosh, and that inadvertently they occasionally exhibit their inner mind on the matter. The British Medical Journal is edited by Mr. Ernest Hart, and the number for 23rd October contains an article on the vital
statistics of Bermondsey in which we read as follows:—

"The mortality in the vaccinated was 88 per 1,000, and in the unvaccinated, 444 per 1,000. The high death-rate in the unvaccinated must not be compared with the lower rate in the vaccinated, nor with the general mortality from small-pox before the discovery of vaccination, without a fair consideration of all the facts which may help to arrive at a just conclusion. There is a great difference in the intensity and virulence of different epidemics, both in small-pox and in other zymotic diseases. It is probable that a larger proportion of unvaccinated persons is to be found among the ignorant, dirty, and wretched inhabitants of the slums of London, and very few among the educated and better fed members of society. The disease is much intensified by overcrowding. Vaccination absolutely prevents an immense number of cases of small-pox in persons who, if not vaccinated, would take the disease in a mild form, or at periods of life when the mortality from small-pox is lowest. If we suppose these cases to be added to the unvaccinated, the number of cases of this disease might be four times as many, and the number of deaths twice as many, and yet the percentage rate of mortality would be reduced one-half. This explains why the mortality in the unvaccinated is higher than it was last century."

Here then it is expressly admitted that the unvaccinated are a class, and, in a physical sense, a very bad class, and that their habit of overcrowding predisposes them to small-pox in its intensest forms. In short we have a distinct retraction, under Mr. Hart's hand, of a major premise in his Truth about Vaccination; but as we say, the confession is inadvertent and is not likely to be repeated, or allowed to modify that "Truth" which the vulgar are expected to receive and pay for.

Anti-Vaccination Literature.—Any of our readers possessing the scarcer and less known publications on this subject, are requested to send them to Mr. Tabb, 7 Albert Road, Regent's Park, London, N.W., for insertion in the catalogue now in press. Will be returned if desired.

Our Legislators on the Vaccination Question.—Dr. Hubert Böens, of Charleroi, Belgium, writes that he is indebted to Dr. Brown, of Brussels, for a copy of this instructive compilation of legislative utterances. An analysis of the book, showing what it unloads, is promised in a series of articles in Le Reveil Medical, the French medical (anti-vaccinist) journal. It may not be known to all our readers that a people's edition of "Our Legislators" has been issued by the publisher of the Vaccination Inquirer at 6d. It should be extensively circulated by every opponent of Compulsory Vaccination.

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XXI.

VACCINATION ESTABLISHED AND ENDOWED.

While the Royal College of Physicians were preparing their report, there was perturbation in the political world. Dull and bigoted George III. refusing on the pretext of his oath to concede to Roman Catholics the rights of citizens, a change of administration ensued, and Mr. Perceval, a man after the King's own heart, replaced Lord Henry Petty as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and proceeded to give effect to the plan for rewarding Jenner; a purpose for which the report "on the state of vaccine inoculation in the United Kingdom" was merely a blind.

On the 29th July, 1807, the House of Commons being in a Committee of Supply, Mr. Perceval moved that Dr. Jenner be awarded a second sum of £10,000 for his matchless discovery. Small-pox was one of the greatest afflictions of mankind, from which hardly any one escaped. For this dreadful malady, Jenner had invented a preventive, unknown before, or if known, which had never been published. He did not therefore think the Committee would consider his proposal extravagant; indeed it was rather an act of justice than of liberality. Those who had read the report of the Physicians would recognise the immense advantages of the new practice. As for its inconveniences, they were as nothing to those which attended variolous inoculation, and the few mistakes recorded were due to ignorance and carelessness. It might be objected by those who adhered to Mr. Malthus, that nothing was gained by saving lives from pestilence, for deaths were not losses where means of subsistence were inadequate; but for his part he would disregard the argument even if it were true. It was much better to follow the dictates of their hearts, and preserve life whenever it was within their power. He had often heard that the true riches of a state were its inhabitants. But he would not attempt to measure Jenner's award by the number of lives that his invention would preserve to the world. If he did so, what sum would they have to offer! All he need say was, that the £10,000 proposed represented no more than a moderate acknowledgment of labour and genius devoted to the service of humanity.

Mr. Shaw Leftver opposed the motion. He had thought the former application for £20,000 excessive, and had concurred with those who reduced it to £10,000. He had moreover acquiesced in the smaller sum by reason of his faith.
in the report of the Committee of the House on the new inoculation, but he now discovered that many of the statements in that report were erroneous. It attested that Vaccination was an infallible preventive of small-pox, whilst the report of the Surgeons now admit 56 failures! The first report stated that no disease followed Vaccination, whilst now it is confessed that scrofula and other alarming symptoms are its occasional sequencess! The report thus prejudicial to Vaccination nevertheless argues in its favour, and he would like to call witnesses to the bar of the House who would make manifest still further its inconsistencies and inaccuracies. At this late period of the session, it was not right to vote away such an amount of public money. [Such “late periods” are, however, always selected for jobs.] Besides, it was generally known that Benjamin Jesty of Worth in Dorsetshire discovered the use of cow-pox long before Jenner, and if the House was resolved to be liberal, the reward should be shared with Jesty, or with Jesty’s family. He should oppose the vote, but he did not say that he would always do so. His purpose was to gain time for more careful inquiry.

Lord Henry Petty (afterwards Marquis of Lansdowne), who had first moved in the matter, came to his successor’s support. He had no doubt as to the efficacy of Vaccination, nor to Jenner being its discoverer. His difficulty was to find a rule for the justice of the case; for whoever considered the value of the discovery must perceive that it would be impossible for them to deal generously with the discoverer. His service to mankind was entirely beyond any financial estimate. It was objected that Vaccination was not infallible. He replied that absolute, never-failing perfection ought not to be expected from any human device: they should rest well satisfied in the approximation to infallibility that belonged to Vaccination. Its daily benefits were numberless. Multitudes of seamen, soldiers, and citizens of every description had been saved by it, and in contemplating its future effects on the human race, the mind was lost in amazement and gratitude. How then should they presume to talk of liberality towards Jenner, the benefactor! They should recollect how he stands in the estimation of the world, how they were acting in view of all nations, and how their own characters were at stake in their demeanour towards him. As to Malthus there was a misapprehension. He had taught nothing that forbade the extinction of an infectious disease which so greatly reduced human happiness. In their concern for Vaccination, the House should not forget the mischief that was still wrought by inoculation with small-pox. Zealous as he was for the new practice, he had no wish to meddle with what others might imagine (however absurdly) tended to their own preservation and that of their families, but no one had a right to endanger the lives of others. It was proved beyond dispute that those who were inoculated with small-pox diffused the fatal contagion by going abroad, or being carried abroad. He thought, therefore, it was not only the right, but the duty of the State to oblige those who were infected with small-pox to keep within doors until complete recovery. He would not move an amendment to the resolution, but would have no hesitation in acceding to a larger sum.

General Tarleton could not withhold his tribute of praise from the author of this blessing to mankind. To his knowledge, it had saved the lives of many in his Majesty’s service. Soldiers could march and perform every military duty when under the process of vaccination. It had been said that gentlemen in the army had no respect for anything save success in war, but he thought that many officers knew how to admire Jenner, the preserver of millions, and to allow that in future ages his glory would exceed the renown of the greatest warriors.

Mr. Strangways Denison denounced the practice of inoculating out-patients at the Small-Pox Hospital whereby the disease was systematically perpetuated and diffused throughout the community. He thought the legislature would be as much justified in taking measures to prevent this evil by restraint, as a man would be in snatching a firebrand out of the hands of a maniac just as he was going to set fire to a city.

Mr. Hawkins Brown confessed with shame that he had voted for £10,000 instead of £30,000 in 1802; but at that time he little knew the extent of Jenner’s service to the human race.

Mr. Edward Morris did not think that even what had been said sufficiently set forth their debt of gratitude to Jenner. His discovery afforded a reasonable expectation of the extermination of small-pox, and the merit of the transcendent discovery was all his own. Inoculation in the old mode mitigated the disease in a few, and spread it in full fury over many. It was therefore a curse to mankind instead of a blessing. The Small-Pox Hospital in its practice of inoculation, was a source of pestilence and a multiplier of victims to this deplorable distemper. The pre-eminent distinction of
Vaccination was that it preserved its subject and injured no one. This unspeakable blessing they owed to Jenner, nor had the least improvement been effected upon his original and carefully matured prescription. They were bound to consider how he had abandoned the lucrative pursuit of his profession, and surrendered many years of his life for the good of his country and mankind. He would therefore submit an amendment to the resolution before the Committee, that the grant be £20,000 instead of £10,000, to mark their sense of Jenner's merits and to place him in a state of independence.

The amendment was warmly supported by Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Windham, Sir John Serjeant, and Mr. Herbert.

Mr. Perceval, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, stood to his resolution, but with indifferent arguments. It was without precedent that a vote recommended by Government should be thus increased. He admitted that Jenner was entitled to much more than they could afford, but it was also without precedent that so great a sum as £20,000 (inclusive of the former vote) should be bestowed on any discoverer.

Mr. William Smith would not submit to these objections. He recited the triumphs of Vaccination in Asia and America, and said it was true as of old that a prophet had no honour in his own country. [An observation singularly inapplicable to Jenner.] He urged the Committee to vote for the larger sum, and said that whilst the Chancellor of the Exchequer might in his public capacity protest, yet in his secret heart he would not be displeased if overborne by the sentiment of the House, of the country, and of the world.

Mr. Whitbread begged the Committee to bear in mind that Jenner had scorned to monopolise Vaccination, and had thereby sacrificed a great fortune. He called on the House to vote for the larger sum. Vaccination furnished the means for lessening the poor rate. Reduced small-pox signified fewer deaths, fewer orphans, fewer widows. Vaccination meant better health for the poor and more money in the pockets of the rich. They would excuse this appeal of his to the cupidity of the landed interest inasmuch as he had been anticipated in the exhibition of loftier considerations. He also wished to relieve the House from a renewal of this question. Let them reward Jenner once for all, and liberally; and remember that what was called economy in this connection, if practised by the House, would be, in the eye of the world, their disgrace.

Others spoke in a similar strain, and when the House divided, 60 voted for Mr. Morris's amendment, and 47 against it, £20,000 being carried by a majority of 13. Including the £10,000 voted in 1802, Jenner was thus awarded £30,000 of the public money, in times, too, when war and scarcity had magnified all values.

The debate, it will be observed, was conducted in a House of 107 members at a late period of the session, and the variations among the speakers consisted in degrees of extravagance and credulity. The fabulous matter as to Jenner personally affords curious evidence of the manner in which legends originate in the presence of contemporaries, and how they come to be repeated with the fervour of good faith by men whose competence and honesty might be taken for unimpeachable. Jenner's party had whipped up their adherents, and the issue was sedulously arranged for; but because they had their way it need not be assumed that it was necessary to circumvent any active adversaries. Apathy was their chief difficulty. There was little to be got out of cow-pox by the ordinary politician; and then, as now, the average M.P. rarely committed himself to any project that did not obviously make for his popularity. As for the enthusiasm for Vaccination displayed by the speakers in the House, we have to recollect that they were not converts to the practice per se. No really new discovery was ever received with such an instant chorus of approbation by the mob, educated or uneducated. They were one and all bred under the severe and dangerous practice of variolous inoculation, whereof Vaccination was no more than a modification with a seductive promise of equal or greater security from small-pox, and exemption from its perils and annoyances. Unless this predisposition be allowed for, the conduct of Parliament toward Jenner cannot be rightly understood. There was not a word uttered against Vaccination from the ground which physiologists at this day occupy, for that ground, in a scientific sense, was as yet unknown. Small-pox was a mysterious visitation to be mysteriously dealt with—dodged, if possible, by medical artifice, and not, as we are persuaded, a crisis of impurity in the blood induced by foul conditions of life, which cannot be better disposed of than in the course of nature by eruptive fever. If we could suppress small-pox (in any other way than the removal of its causes) we should merely alter its manifestation and have to accept it in some other and aggravated form of disease.

Jenner provided for, his adherents had yet
another end to achieve, namely, their own release from the burden of the Royal Jennerian Society, paralysed by the secession of Dr. Walker and the Friends and the establishment of the London Vaccine Institution. At first they had endeavoured to discredit the new Institution, even to the extent of distributing hand-bills like the following in the streets—

A CAUTION.

To persons desirous of obtaining inoculation for the Cow-Fox gratis under the sanction of

THE ROYAL JENNERIAN SOCIETY.

Whereas, Doctor John Walker has, under various pretences, obstructed persons going to the Central House of this Society, the Public are hereby warned to be upon their guard against any insidious representations, the connection between Dr. Walker and the Society having ceased, and Dr. Knowles having been appointed the Resident Inoculator at the Society's House, No. 14 Salisbury Square.

By Order of the Directors and Medical Council, 9th October, 1806.

It was all in vain. Walker was preferred to Knowles backed by Jenner, whose friends had no liking for the support of the Society out of their own pockets. It was therefore planned to resort to Parliament for an annual subsidy so as dispense with the necessity of subscriptions. The managers of the London Vaccine Institution, learning what was on foot, naturally argued that if Government was to be thus propitiated, it was they who had the better claim to assistance, and therefore prepared a petition setting forth their exertions in spreading Vaccine Inoculation. This interference with their scheme filled the Jennerians with fury, and Mr. John Fuller undertook to speak their mind in the House of Commons. When, therefore, on 2nd June, 1806, Sir Thomas Turox presented the petition, Fuller sprang to his feet and denounced it, saying a grosser forgery had never been submitted to the House.

The Speaker interposed. The petition had not been read. When it was, the House would be enabled to judge of its contents. Mr. Fuller resumed his seat amid general laughter. The petition having been read—

Mr. Fuller apologised for his abruptness. The petition was a gross cheat, a wicked trick to swindle the public; or, if it was not absolute swindling, it went very near the wind. When they came to solicit his subscription, he thought they represented some respectable corporation, but what did they turn out to be? A parcel of Quakers, or Presbyterians, or whatever else they were called. They had got five guineas from him, but the moment he detected them, he threatened them with a Bow Street officer and a charge of swindling, which soon frightened them into a re-delivery of his money. What a shame it was to see the cause of such fellows espoused by any man in that House! He did not suppose the Honourable Baronet shared in their gains, and he might laugh as he pleased, and spout like a lawyer, but it was a poor way to show himself off for the sake of a little notoriety among such despicable sectaries. He hoped the House would not lend any countenance to the imposture.

Sir Thomas Turox good humouredly replied, that the Jennerian Society, in whose interest the preceding speaker exhibited so much untempered zeal, was not instituted till 1806. The original Vaccine Fock Institution was established by Dr. Pearson in 1799. The Institution to which the petition referred was established in 1806, chiefly by members of the Society of Friends, a sect to whose virtuous principles and behaviour it was his privilege to bear testimony. Since 1806 the Institution had communicated the vaccine matter to 61,000 persons every year in a situation of life. The petitioners only desired to have the facts they adduced inquired into, and hoped for public aid only in the event of being entitled to it on public grounds.

This application for assistance by Walker's Institution rendered its concession to the Jennerian Society impossible: it was not for the Government to get into hot water by showing favour to either; and as both could not be subsidised, it was determined to vary the application, and to ask the House of Commons to provide means for the maintenance of a new and independent institution from which "the Genuine Vaccine Virus could be distributed without expense throughout the British dominions." Mr. George Ross, Treasurer to the Navy, took charge of the measure, which he introduced to the House on 9th June, 1806. After dealing with a notorious failure of Vaccination at Ringwood, he proceeded to observe, that whilst it could no longer be said that Vaccination was a certain security against small-pox in all cases, yet the evidence showed that the failures were not one in 800. He would therefore move that the House having the testimony of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons of London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, that Vaccination was salutary and generally effective, it is desirable that a Central Institution be formed for the provision and distribution of Real Vaccine Matter, and that its administra-
tion he committed to the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons in London. The expense would not be more than £2500 or £3000 per annum.

Mr. Davies Giddy said he should not oppose the resolution, but it would have been much better to have refrained from interference. The people would neglect inoculation, and then small-pox would break out with tenfold severity.

Mr. Fuller observed that at Calcutta small-pox had been annihilated by systematic and enforced Vaccination, and he believed the same result was attainable in this country. He thought that even those who hesitated to resort to general compulsion, would not object to the Vaccination of all children in workhouses.

Sir T. Turton would have preferred a committee of investigation. There were already three Institutions in London for the express purpose of propagating cow-pox, and the object Mr. Rose had in view was more likely to be attained by private subscriptions and by assistance from Government than by a special Institution formed and endowed by the State.

Lord Henry Petty contended that as the evidence was now confessedly incomplete as to the infallible efficacy of Vaccination, it was highly proper that investigation should be persevered in under the eye of the public instead of by a number of small institutions which were not perhaps altogether exempt from the imputation of being guided by mercenary motives.

Sir Francis Burdett said Vaccination appeared before them with a complexion widely differing from that originally assumed. A short time ago they were assured it was an infallible preventive of small-pox, and that its practice was so simple that any old woman was equal to it. Now they were told that it was a very nice operation, requiring great judgment and skill, the want of which was held to account for the many failures which had occurred. Thus there was neither that simplicity nor security which was originally asserted. Considering these manifest discrepancies between promise and practice, it was, he thought, most unwise for the House to intervene in order to help what appeared to be a failing experiment. They ought to be cautious—they ought not to prop up what might prove to be pernicious error. Government in this free country cannot compel people to submit to the prescriptions of physicians, or the operations of surgeons, or anything except the laws; and it was doubtful whether science itself would be benefited if placed under Government direction. They were referred to the reports of the Medical Colleges, but as he read those reports he detected much hesitation and evasion, and anything but the assurance displayed on behalf of Vaccination by several members of the House. Many instances of failure were admitted, and such instances might safely be doubted. As for Spurious Cow-Pox, he wished to know what it was. It was used to account for all mishaps, and it was, he suspected, a mere shift, shuffle, and get off. [Sir Francis need not have spoken thus dubiously, for the Report of the Physicians admitted what he suspected.] He would much prefer a committee of investigation, and hoped the resolution would not be pressed.

Mr. Wilberforce brought up the foreign argument. There might be failures at home, but these could be satisfactorily accounted for. It was for them to consider the magnificent successes of Vaccination in other lands, concerning which there was not room for doubt. He saw no surer method of inspiring the public with confidence in Vaccination than by the establishment of the proposed Institution.

Mr. Rose explained that he merely wished to bring the House to a resolution, leaving it to his Majesty [that was to say, himself for the Government] to give it effect.

Mr. George Canning, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, declared that though he considered the discovery of Vaccination to be of the very greatest importance, yet he could not imagine any circumstances whatever that would induce him to follow up the most favourable report of its infallibility with any measure for its compulsory infliction.

This declaration of Canning's is well worth attention and commemoration. It serves to mark the reverence for personal liberty, which was the fine distinction of the former order of English statesmen, and separated, when little else did, the English from the Continental Tory. The noble tradition of this liberty meets with scant favour in these times, and Canning's avowal in the new House of Commons would be heard as an anachronism. Nearly every adventurer who has a prescription for the moral and physical welfare of his fellow creatures hopes to have it enforced by legislation; and since, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, our babes are cut and poisoned to save them from small-pox, there is no infraction of personal liberty, however outrageous, that can now be pronounced impossible.

When the House divided there were 60 for the motion and 5 against it—again a small House for so critical a matter.
With the permission to spend £5000 a year, the National Vaccine Institution was constituted, Jenner being consulted in its organisation. A Board was formed, consisting of the President and four Censors of the Royal College of Physicians, and the Master and two senior Wardens of the College of Surgeons. The Board met on 8th December, 1808, and proceeded to business. Jenner, as was his fatality on important occasions, was absent, being detained at Berkeley by family affliction. He wrote to Moore—

"I should be unworthy of the name of father were I to stir from my children. Indeed, nothing would make me, not even a royal mandate, unless accompanied by a troop of horse."

Jenner was elected Director, but not a member of the Board, and immediately began to protest that he was disregarded and subjected to indignity. "The Board," he said, "appointed me Director, but they soon contrived to let me feel that I was to be a Director directed." The arrangement he had made with Mr. Rose and Sir Lucas Pepys, the President of the College of Physicians, was, he held, altogether different—

"It was stipulated between Mr. Rose, Sir Lucas, and myself, that no person should take any part in the Vaccinating Department who was not either nominated by me or submitted to my approbation. On my reminding Sir Lucas of this, he replied, 'You, Sir, are to be whole and sole Director. We [meaning the Board] are to be considered as nothing. What do we know of vaccination?""*

Sir Lucas of course was jearing, but Jenner's head was so turned with vanity and flattery that he could not distinguish mockery from sincerity. He had constructed for himself a fool's paradise, out of which the Board pitched him uncereemoniously. He recommended his bludgeon bearer, John Ring, for Chief Vaccinator and Inspector of Stations, but the Board declined to have anything to do with him, and added insult to contempt; for in Jenner's words, written in the third person—

"They appointed a gentleman in his place who was taken from an Institution which had been personally hostile to Dr. Jenner on all occasions."

Subsequently he sent in a list of seven names for Sub-Vaccinators, of which the Board rejected five, which brought matters to a crisis, and he resigned. In the memorandum, from which we have quoted, he wrote—

"By the whole of these circumstances, Dr. Jenner felt himself under the necessity of withdrawing from the establishment. He could take upon himself no responsibility where he had no power, not even a vote. He did not wish to control the establishment; nothing was further from his thoughts. But he expected that the practical part of its concerns would have been under his direction, as the title of his office implied; and he expected that those gentlemen whom, from a consciousness of their pre-eminent ability, he had so strongly recommended to conduct this practical part, would have been appointed. But as his recommendations have been disregarded—as arrangements and appointments have been made which are contrary to his judgment, and as he is informed by the Board that it was intended for them to use their own discretion, and that they alone are responsible for the conduct of the establishment, Dr. Jenner declined accepting the station of Director, to which they had nominated him, since he found that he was to have nothing to do in the establishment, and that his office was only a name."**

To those who did not know Jenner, or who accepted him at his own estimate, the treatment to which he was subjected might appear highly reprehensible; but the Board understood their man, and only cared to have the benefit of his name, for little else was worth having. What could be made of a character insolent and untrustworthy; who disliked London and was off to Gloucestershire on any pretext; whose sickly family had from him the supreme consideration of an affectionate mother! He wrote to Moore—

"I agree with you that my not being a member of the British Vaccine Establishment will astonish the world; and no one in it can be more astonished than myself."

He was mistaken. The world, so far as it thought at all, considered he was handsomely rewarded with his £80,000, and with so much public money in his pocket might have looked for a better disposition on his part. When his nominations were disregarded, he declined even to come to London, and thus excused his sulking at Berkeley—

"I was quite in earnest at the time I informed you of my intention to come to town, but while I was getting things in order there came a piece of information from a Right Hon. Gentleman which determined me to remain in my retirement. It was as follows—

"That the Institution was formed for the purpose of a full and satisfactory investigation of the benefits or dangers of the Vaccine Practice, and that this was the reason why Dr. Jenner could not be admitted as one of the conductors of it, as the public would not have the same confidence in their proceedings as if the Board were left to their own judgment in doubtful cases."

"This is the sum and substance of the communication—

"Letter to James Moore, 16th January, 1809."

"Baron's Life of Jenner, Vol. II., p. 124.
"What do we know of Vaccination?
"We know nothing of Vaccination!
"Alas! poor Vaccination, how art thou degraded!
"You intimated something of this sort to me some time since, and now I get it from the fountain head. An institution founded on the principle of inquiry seven or eight years ago, would have been worthy of the British nation; but now, after the whole world bears testimony to the safety and efficacy of the Vaccine Practice, I do think it a most extraordinary proceeding. It is one that must necessarily degrade me, and cannot exalt the framers of it in the eyes of common-sense. I shall now stick closely to my own Institution, which I have the pride and vanity to think is paramount to all others, as its extent and benefits are boundless. Of this I am the real and not the nominal Director. I have conducted the whole concern for no inconsiderable number of years, single-handed, and have spread Vaccination round the globe. This convinces me that simplicity in this, as in all effective machinery, is best."

In the discussion in the House of Commons it was stated by his friend, Lord Henry Petty, that one of the objects of the Institution would be investigation, and it was absurd for Jenner to pretend that the fact came upon him as a revelation; and, unless completely blinded by conceit, he must have recognised that the general faith in Vaccination exhibited in 1801 had been much shaken by the experience of the succeeding seven years. But it is idle to argue the matter. When Jenner could say that he single-handed had conducted the whole concern for years and spread Vaccination round the globe, he could assert anything. The letter is interesting chiefly as an exhibition of character.

We shall return to the National Vaccine Institution and its management—a curious story. Suffice it for the present to observe, that its immediate effects were adverse to Vaccination. The annual endowment was consumed in salaries, and many ceased to subscribe to the Cow-Pox Societies since Vaccination was so well provided for. The essential mischief consisted in the recognition of the evil practice by the State, whereby it has been perpetuated to the common injury to our own day.

VACCINATION IN GREECE.—A correspondent asked a few days ago for information on this subject. By the courtesy of the Consul General for Greece, we are enabled to state that vaccination is not compulsory in that country, but the operation is generally performed, and there are doctors in every commune who are bound to vaccinate the poor gratis.—Lancet, 9th October, 1880.

* Letter to JAXM MOORE, Berkeley, 6th April, 1880.

MRS. HARRIS ON VACCINATION.

BY CINQUE PORT.

What! I see, 'ave that pore little thing vaccinized? not if I was her mother. Not for no lacs of Parlymint as is made by a parcel of meddlin' old faggis as knows as much about babies as they does about the lacs of Parlymint they passes, which ain't much, I see; for they no sooner passes one than they have to pass another to patch it up, and to let people understand it, I see; for Mrs. Fearful 'ad called on me as she was a goin' to the Infirmary to 'ave her little gal vaccinized, blood pisened, I see; that's what it is; for it sets my back right up when I see people a killin' off their 'althy babies, or at least puttin' somethin' into their blood as three times out of four lays the seeds of consumption and heaven knows what besides! Mrs. Fearful, she sees, "But, Mrs. Harris, we shall be fined over and over again," says she.

Pay it, I see, or go to prison, but don't ruin your child's 'elah for life, which I 'ave seen done over and over again in my experience. Why, I see, I recollect when I was a gal we lived in a farm-house, and just round us there was a matter of ten or twelve cottages as 'ad a whole lot of children, of course, and was wisited by the squire's daughters with tracts and wine and little comforts when any of 'em was ill. Well, just then there was a great outcry of small-pox, which certingly was bad, and ten times more to be feared, as the doctors didn't know how to treat it as they do now; for they wrapped the poor creature up and keept 'em warm, as marked 'em dreadful when it didn't kill 'em outright. Well, as I was a sayin', the small-pox was bad and the vaccinication just a comin' into fashion, for the medical profession 'as their fashions just like women. I recollects the blue pill and black draught fashion; and my mother often told me of the bleedin' fashion; then they 'ad the brandy and salt fashion, and lots more as I don't recollect, as 'ad their day and didn't kill 'arf so many as vaccination, because they never worked Parlymint up into the humour to pass a laci to make people swaller 'em. Well, as I was a sayin', vaccinication was all the go, and these ladies went to the cottages and ses to the mothers: "Small-pox is worry bad, and you must have all the children vaccinated or we shall not visit you any more." So, of course, they agreed, and it was done by a doctor, as these ladies sent themselves. My mother she see nothin', but waited to see the upshot. Well, if you'll believe me, if the small-pox didn't break out at one of them cottages, and, before a week was out, all the children failed with it, and 'ad it so bad they died like flies in a frost! Now, you know, my mother was what they call now a pore ignorant woman, because she didn't believe in vaccination, but 'ad all her children inokulatid after they fairly recovered from the measles, as her doctor told 'er would clear the system and take away any disease the measles left behind; and when we was inokulatid we 'ad about a dozen spots and run about out of doors all but a day or so. So, you see, when this pore ignorant woman's
children (she 'ad ten of 'em), as was none of them strong—not being a strong woman herself—all lived to grow up, they felt pretty safe about catchin' small-pox, as is 'arf the battle, as the sayin' is, for fear is the cause of many a takin' it. Well, as I was a sayin', my mother she waited until she saw her doctor, and she see: "How about vaccination? It didn't seem to save many o' them children at the cottages."

"Well," he see, "I don't mind tellin' you because I know you don't believe in vaccination, but you needn't say I sed so, but it is about as much good as a chip in the porridge, as the sayin' is; only I am afraid it does more harm. Not as the cow-pox wouldn't save you from the small-pox if you 'ad it direct from the cow, but then, you know, it would be as bad as 'avin' the small-pox yourself, and marks just as bad, as you may often see by the milkmaids as 'ave 'ad it."

My mother see to him: "Why don't you tell your patients you don't believe in it, and not go waccinatin' the pore things and givin' them all sort of complaints?"

"Oh!" he see, "that's not professional, and what I tell an old friend like you, I can't whisper anywhere else. Besides, I'm under a penalty if I inoculates, and should ruin my practice. Besides, the provinsh unholp waccinatin'."

"More shame for 'em," see my mother.

"Well," he see, "I don't know but it brings a good many 'arf guineas into their pockets, and when people feel safe they are not so apt to catch anythin', and they prove by figgers that vaccination is stampin' out small-pox."

"Oh, do they?" she see; "and do they put anythin' down to the new way of treatin' the patients and why do they build so many new small-pox hospitals?"

Mrs. Fearful, she see, "Oh, Mrs. Harris, the doctors must know best."

Yes, I see, like all human natur', they know what's best for themselves. Not as I don't think as many believe in vaccination honestly, but as I 'eard a judge say once and never forgot it, the human mind is hast to lean to that side as suits its convenience and fills the pocket; but, lor bless you, only open your eyes and look about you, and you'll see plenty of the vaccination blessin's. Why, there was Mrs. Tittmouse's little gal as 'ateful and as free from humour as the child could be. Well, of course, she was waccinated, and in a week or two you never saw such a sight, all between her pore fingers was breakin' out, 'er eyes was inflamed, 'er ears a mass of corruption, and her fingers swelled up three times their size, and so it went on for years, and last time I saw her she 'ad grown up, but such a sight as made my 'art ache; but if I was to tell you what I 'ave seen brought on by vaccination it would take me a month to get through it; but then, you know, I'm an infatuated fool, and ain't got no common sense, because I don't swallow everythin' the doctors say. But I goes a little further than that, for I don't swaller what they sends neither, as don't hold with so much medicine, as knows they ain't so fond of takin' it themselves. As I was a charfin' a physician as attended me, and he see: "Well, Mrs. Harris, between you and me I do believe if all the chemists' shops was at the bottom of the sea people would live quite as long." You may say that, I see, and a good deal longer, for many of your remidies are worse than the disease."

"Ah," he see, "but we must give medicine as well as advice, or people wouldn't believe in us."

Well, I see, there's somethin' in that as I mostly finds people puttin' faith in some pet pill, as knew a pore old feller as couldn't live without two pills every day, and used to buy a seven-and-sixpenny box because he had so many more for the money, but seemed to thrive on 'em till he was about seventy, and then the small-pox was about a deal where he lived, and they persuaded him to be waccinated, as made him that bad as even his favourite pills couldn't cure him, and he soon turned up his toes to the daisies, as the sayin' is.

"Well," he see, "he must a bin a ole fool, and them as persuaded him ought to be hanged."

Ah, I see, but he didn't catch the small-pox which was a great blessin'. Why, you know, he might a bin marked dreadful! "Now you're a charfin," he see, "and I must go. I shall never convert you."

No, I see, I'm much too old a bird to be caught by vaccination charf.

Mrs. Fearful, she see, "Oh, Mrs. Harris, if it ain't past the hour, and I'm too late to 'ave the child done to-day."

I'm dreadful glad, I see, and you go home and thank God as you're little gal is spared from the pinnin' of the innercens, for it's my belief as Herod 'isself 'asn't got so much to answer for as that vaccination hact, as fathers and mothers ought to fight night and day against till it is repealed, I see.

ONE OUT OF THOUSANDS.—An inquest was held at Paddington on the 15th November on the body of an infant, and the verdict was returned, "That the deceased died from convulsions following erysipelas after vaccination." The report of the case went the round of the London press without any attempt at mitigation or prevarication, and in a letter to the Daily Chronicle Mr. Harker observed, "Many similar fatal cases could be produced, and would more frequently appear, but for the medical trades-unionism which conceals or suppresses facts and evidence antagonistic to the Jennerian theory."

Mrs. Burfield, St. Thomas, Danish West Indies, writes to Mr. Fitman—"A few days ago a pamphlet was put into my hands on the subject of Vaccination. It was your report of Mr. Burn's lecture in Manchester. I am most decidedly opposed to Vaccination, which I am sorry to say is compulsory here, so much so, that before marriage a certificate of Vaccination is required! I trust if course, the minority,) fight against it. A struggle will come. None of my choice friends here or elsewhere like Vaccination. To me there is something horrid in it."
THE DISCREDITABLE MORTALITY OF
YOUNG CHILDREN EXPLAINED.

By the kindness of Dr. Schenzler, of Bulach, we have been favoured with the following table of births, vaccinations, and general mortality, together with the number of deaths of infants under one year old, in the Canton of Zurich, from 1840 to 1878.

The latter portion of the table is a comparison between the years 1851, 1852, and 1855, when few remained unvaccinated, with the years 1876, 1877, and 1878, when about half remained unvaccinated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Births Living</th>
<th>Vaccinated Children</th>
<th>No. Vaccinated out of every 100 Births</th>
<th>Total Deaths</th>
<th>Deaths under one year</th>
<th>No. of Deaths under one year in every 100 Births</th>
<th>No. of Deaths under one year in every 100 Deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten years before 1850,.....</td>
<td>70,590</td>
<td>55,487</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>58,678</td>
<td>19,123</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years before 1860,.....</td>
<td>70,586</td>
<td>58,592</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>64,758</td>
<td>26,155</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten years before 1870,.....</td>
<td>78,423</td>
<td>61,591</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>69,851</td>
<td>26,148</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Years 1870-76,.........</td>
<td>81,057</td>
<td>48,765</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>66,212</td>
<td>19,858</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840 to 1878, .............</td>
<td>299,286</td>
<td>224,885</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>258,999</td>
<td>88,284</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>33.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1851, 6,512 6,072 92.7 6,211 1,969 80. 81.7
1852, 6,488 5,672 88.4 5,570 1,880 29.2 29.2
1853, 6,549 5,568 85. 5,786 1,707 26. 29.6
1876, 9,485 4,389 51. 7,878 2,041 21.5 27.6
1877, 9,484 4,915 52. 6,780 1,761 18.6 26.
1878, 9,390 4,917 52.3 6,724 1,750 18.6 26.

It thus appears that in the years 1851, 1852, and 1853, when 88 out of every 100 children born were submitted to the vaccine process, the deaths under one year of age were 26 in each 100 births, while in the years 1876, 1877, and 1878, when nearly half the children born in the year were preserved from cowpox, the deaths under one year were only 20 in each 100 births.

These figures go far towards solving the problem of the excessive infantile mortality which discredits vaccinating Europe.

H. D. D.

WHERE the law comes into conflict with the consciences of men, it is the law that should be altered, and not conscience that should be forced.—John Morley in Pall Mall Gazette, 6th November.

Calf Lymphe Manufactory.—Dr. J. W. Cook, of Manningtree, writes in Lancet of 18th Nov. "Having had several calves placed at my disposal for the purpose of vaccination by a farmer friend, I have for the past three weeks been operating upon them and from them. I have most successfully vaccinated several children.

I may state that I vaccinated my first calf from lymph procured from the animal vaccine establishment at Utrecht; and that all the steps of my progress are known to Dr. Buchanan, of the Local Government Board, and to Dr. Robert Cory, of St. Thomas's Hospital, the latter gentleman having kindly come down here and assisted me at the vaccination of two calves."

I am not disposed to counsel people to submit passively to laws which in their hearts they thoroughly disapprove, especially when their consciences and their health are concerned.—C. H. Hopwood, Q.C., M.P.

What a Boston Physician Thinks.—Rufus K. Noyes, M.D., Member of the Massachusetts Medical Society, and late Resident Surgeon to the Boston City Hospital, has published a work On the Self Curing of Disease, or the Divine Art of Healing against the Human Art of Healing, or the Natural Cure of Diseases against the Customary Use of Drugs, in which he observes—"I believe vaccination has been the greatest medical delusion that has ensnared mankind within the last three centuries. It originated in fraud, ignorance and error, and lives as such willing foolery ever lives. It is absurdly unscientific. It has done great evil, and I cannot attribute to it any good."
THE INTERNATIONAL
ANTI-VACCINATION CONVENTION.

It may interest our readers to know that Mr. Tebb has visited Paris to assist in making arrangements for the Convention, which will be held on the 11th, 12th, and 18th of the current month, December. The object of the assembly will be to prevent further legislation for the enforcement of vaccination and re-vaccination, and to obtain the repeal of existing vaccination legislation. The proceedings will include a Conference; the consideration of reports showing the results of compulsory vaccination; a Public evening meeting at the Salle d’Encouragement; a Deputation to the President of the Republic, and one to the Minister of Commerce (who in France is head of the Vaccination Department), and the preparation of a memorial to be sent to the chiefs of all nations where vaccination is at present enforced. Dr. Hubert Boëns (of Charleroi), Professor A. Vogt (of Berne), Dr. Jur Scheurmann and a colleague (of Basle), Dr. Oidtman and Dr. Stroffe (of Germany), Dr. E. Haughton and Dr. W. J. Collins, Jr., B.Sc., Mr. Thos. Baker (Barrister at Law), Mr. William Tebb (Chairman of Committee of the London Society), Mons. E. Labbé (editor of Le Revue Medical), and Dr. Hurean de Villeneuve, Dr. Aderhold, Dr. A. Bayard, Dr. Jam, Dr. Serres, Dr. Germiquet, are among those who have signified their intention of being present to take part in the proceedings. The Committee hope to obtain delegates from all the leading European countries, as well as the United States of America. Le Courrier de l’Europe contains several interesting letters referring to this subject, and further communications relating to the same may be addressed to Mr. William Tebb, 7 Albert Road, Regent’s Park, London, N.W.

THE RIGHT OBJECTION.

Dear Mr. Tebb,—I have been going into statistics lately, and I find that in the thirty-two years, 1847-78, over 158,000 died of smallpox, or an average of more than 4,700 a-year. The epidemic of 1870-72 was, as you know, much more severe than that of 1828-40. In the latter, the greatest annual mortality was under 17,000; in the former, over 28,000.

I have been greatly struck by the injury done to our cause by our too great eagerness to prove transmission of syphilis, etc., in vaccine. We have failed to see that in the eye of the law vaccination is an operation, not a disease. Children do not die spontaneously on the touch of a poisoned lancet. Vaccination proper is confined to the raising of a mild vesicle or vesicle with moderate or normal areola. Everything else, including any abnormal spreading of the areola, is treated, and I think properly treated, as a sequel or indirect consequence and result of vaccination. It is quite unnecessary for us to prove that syphilis matter is contained in vaccine. Probably it is not. The so-called syphilitic symptoms may either be a spurious eruption simulating syphilis, or the syphilis may be developed from a latent constitutional taint which may, perhaps, have skipped a generation. Still less useful is it to insist on the transmission of scrofula, consumption, etc. It is quite enough for our case that such diseases are developed as sequela after vaccination. It is the same with measles, typhoid fever, and the like; it is the sequelae that are so terrible. Our true case ought to be, not as used to be asserted, that other diseases are transmitted in vaccine (though possibly erysipelas might be said to be contained in the “common septic ferment” of vaccine), but that vaccination habitually brings in its train as sequela, tabes mesenterica, dropy, consumption, scrofula, pneumonias, bronchitis, pyemia, erysipelas, etc. That is quite enough, surely! Yours truly,

Clifton.

Cobham Hall, Gravesend,
21st Nov., 1880.

LEICESTER.—A paragraph in the Times on Leicester says that the arrears of vaccination are 400 per quarter. This is news to me; the vaccination officer or the guardians having given the figures as 200. But I suppose the officials of the Local Government Board know the correct figures. The mortality of Leicester last quarter was 29 per 1000. If taken for the last half year it was 28, and probably a smaller figure is taken for the twelve months ending September 30. The cause of infantile mortality in Leicester is duplicate. We cannot get the vaccinators to tell us whether the vaccinated or unvaccinated children are the principal sufferers, and we suspect the former. But of late we have had great floods, such as occur once or twice in a century, and the sewers, being inefficient, the sewage is actually washed out into the streets and cellars of the lower parts of the town, where new streets have been built of late, and of course a deposit of nauseating filth is left behind at each inundation. The Corporation has just decided to spend £60,000 or more to stop this flooding. The villages along the Soar have also been repeatedly flooded, and the consequence is bronchitis and whooping cough and children’s diseases in great numbers and severity.—H. D. D., 14th Nov., 1880.
MR. WALTER HASKER AND THE GREAT UNPAID OF HOVE.

On more than one occasion Mr. Hasker has gone down specially to Hove in defence of anti-vaccinating friends, and, needless to say, has each time met with that great if not effusive courtesy for which the Great Unpaid are so much distinguished.

On the last occasion, the 1st of November, the Court was constituted by Mr. M. D. Scott, M.P., Lieutenant-General Snake, C.B., Colonel Harwood, and Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. W. L. Talbot. Before this Court Mr. Hasker appeared to represent Mr. Alfred Lucas, who was summoned for two of his unvaccinated children, one summons being under section xxix. of the principal Act, the second under section xxxi. Mr. Hasker told the Justices that his previous experience before them had satisfied him that it would be useless to again address them on the merits; and added that that being so, he should not attempt anything like a speech; but that inasmuch as his friend was brought there by the law, he (Mr. Hasker) was determined that he should have the law, together with everything the law provided. He asked that Court for nothing more, and would be content with nothing less. This bold standpoint seems to have been maintained by Mr. Hasker, who, notwithstanding that the Bench bullied and threatened, stood his ground, and persisted in his promised line of a strictly legal defence. His objections to the proceedings were based upon the vaccination officer’s omission to comply with the Act, and the general order of the Local Government Board, given under seal on the 31st of October, 1873, whereby, inter alia, it was provided that the vaccination officer shall give a defaulting parent two notices, A and B, and then make personal inquiries before issuing process. In the result the Bench convicted the defendant on the summons under section xxix., and ordered Mr. Hasker to “stand down.” This he did, in obedience to “authority,” but instantly afterwards, with irresistible alacrity, stood up again, re-examined the officer, and urged the same objections to the second summons. We do not look for consistency amongst Justices. But our readers will be surprised to learn that this Hove Bench allowed the objections to the one summons which they had disallowed to the other, and dismissed it on the ground that notice A had not been given! But, although the defendant had needlessly summoned, and Mr. Hasker had jeconomy from London specially to represent him, the Justices refused to give any costs, although authorised, if not directed, by the Act of Parliament under such circumstances so to do. Following this decision, the remainder of a tolerably large batch of summonses had likewise to be dismissed, leaving the Guardians and their officer to begin again de novo. The clerk to the prosecuting Guardians and the vaccination officer were, perhaps not unnaturally, very much cut up, and, as one of our Brighton correspondents marked, withdrew “in an undignified manner.”

It may be added that for months past prosecutions have been instituted and convictions recorded which were altogether informal in some way or other, and doubtless unfortunate parents would have continued to receive this Justices’ justice for some time further if no one had mustered sufficient courage to hear and overthrow the Bench. As our contemporary further remarked, “Without Mr. Hasker the defendant would certainly have been convicted.”

It is not our wish to rely upon technical objections, and we are sure it is not Mr. Hasker’s either, but we cannot but agree with him when he contends that they who take the law shall fall by the law, and when justice cannot be obtained it is sometimes well to rely upon its opposite, i.e., the law.

EDWIN HEARNE, J.P., M.B. LOND., F.R.C.S.

THE Lancet and the British Medical Journal jealously exclude from their columns any advertisements of literature in opposition to vaccination, thus exercising a grand motherly supervision of the principles of their readers, who might otherwise be led into serious and unprofessional error. The Lancet has the credit of being more conservative than its rival, yet it had the grace to allow that something might be said in favour of the projected bill for the abolition of multiple penalties for non-vaccination; and in the number for 8th November we find the following laudatory notice of our late friend, Dr. Hearne of Southampton, an ardent and out-spoken anti-vaccinator:—

“We have to record the death of Mr. Edwin Hearne, who died at Southampton on the 22nd October, of apoplectic. Dr. Hearne was born near Taunton in the year 1830. His father was a large farmer, descended from an old Somersetshire family. Dr. Hearne was originally intended for a business career, but his tastes being of a more ambitious nature, he entered as a medical student in University College in 1840. He there distinguished himself by carrying off many class prizes, and in 1844 graduated M.B. at the University of London, taking honours in physiology and comparative anatomy, as well as in medicine and surgery. He was afterwards house-surgeon at University College Hospital, and was a favourite pupil of Liston. He spent some time in the Paris hospitals, and on his return he happened to land at Southampton, and was so struck by the improving look of the place that he settled there in 1846 and soon acquired a large practice. He was a most accomplished surgeon and an expert operator. In politics he was a very advanced Liberal, and he worked with heart and soul in the cause. His mind was original and thoughtful, and his temperament vigorous and bold. This continually involved him in scientific and political controversies.

“In 1864 the wear and tear of his large practice, combined with his other work, brought on a painful affection of the nervous system. He retired to Germany for a time, but his health was never sufficiently re-established for him to do much work. He was well known amongst hunting men as a straight and fearless rider to...
hounds, and in Bailey's Magazine the 'White Doctor,' as he is called, is described as a hard man to beat.

"Dr. Hearne was a frequent writer, both on medical questions and in the local press. He was for some time a member of the Borough Council, and had been a magistrate for Southamptom during the past fifteen or sixteen years. Few men have lived a life more active or sustained more arduous labour; and though possessed of singular vehemence of temperament, there was a softer side to his nature, which often found expression in acts of kindness and consideration unknown to the outside world."

"The Law which inflicts penalty after penalty on a parent who is unwilling to have his child vaccinated, is monstrous. The Right Hon. John Bright.

"How Baby was Killed."—A tale in illustration of the peril of Vaccination in the widely circulated 'Weekly Times' is highly significant of the movement in the public mind, and the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination has done wisely in reprinting it as a tract. "Mothers, know the horrors and inutility of Vaccination; but what they see in their eyes are persuaded out of believing by the authorities is it their habit to respect. How Baby was Killed is a touching story, and may be the sort of writing to give shape to a mother's fears and courage for resistance. May it be distributed by thousands!

INCONVENIENCES OF VACCINATION.—It is an inconvenience to lose two legs and one arm by vaccine ulcer, as poor Mr Connell, of Southport, attests. It is an undesirable accident to die of vaccine erysipelas. The surgeon desires to avoid personal responsibility; and justly says that if Parliament commands him to vaccinate, Parliament ought to teach him how to vaccinate, and furnish him with pure Parliamentary lymph, which, kept in sure tubes, shall never rot and grow poisonous. Another surgeon, Mr. Ballard, demands absolute safety for the public from pure lymph. These gentlemen actually are blind to the fact that their own demand of impossibilities from Parliament is a total condemnation of the law. In their efforts to get up a panic concerning small-pox, vaccinators seem to forget that that disease, like every other, must have some cause, which they ought to investigate and teach people to avoid, as Anti-Vaccinators do. They imagine no cause but contagion: a theory which refutes itself. Also they expose themselves to the just imputation of incompetence, in treating small-pox as a most intractable disease, when by hot and cold baths, by hot air, and by certain herbs, other men and women, who often have no medical degree, and never have a Government salary, cure it easily. Surely, when legislators enforce the putting in of one devil to keep out another, the least they should do is to get a full and free medical debate on the question,—which devil is the more malignant?—Prof. F. W. Newman.

VICTORIAN ITEMS.—A Select Committee has been appointed by the Legislative Council of Victoria to inquire into and report upon the advisability, or otherwise, of amending the law relating to vaccination.—At a lecture on the "Danger of Vaccination" by Mr. D. Macallister at Hawthorn, the chair was occupied by Dr. Sparrin, who had been for some time surgeon to a London poor-law union, and knew from experience what a fearful scourge small-pox might be, but in Victoria the circumstances were wholly different. The people were better housed, the climate was much more healthy, and it would be as reasonable to introduce an antitoxin to Ireland, where there were no snakes, as compulsory vaccination to Victoria, where there was no small-pox. If the money expended by Government on vaccination were devoted to counteracting the ravages of diphtheria and other diseases so fatal to children, it would be more sensible. —Chiefly to the energy of Mr. Macallister in the lecture room and the press does Victoria owe its awakening on the subject of vaccination. There was little or no small-pox in the colony, but the doctors raised no objection to the practices of vaccination which put money in their pockets, and had actually contrived to make the superfluous compulsory!

WHY MEDICAL MEN ARE IGNORANT.—A young man commencing the study of medicine is at once required to endeavour to make an acquaintance with a number of sciences, such as Chemistry, as Botany, as Physiology, all of which are absolutely and entirely strange to him, however excellent his so-called education at school may have been. Not only is he devoid of all apprehension of scientific conceptions, not only does he fail to attach any meaning to the words "master," "force," or "law," in their scientific senses, but, worse still, he has no notion of what it is to come into contact with nature, or to lay his mind alongside of a physical fact, and try to conquer it, in the way one of our naval heroes told his captains to master their enemies. His whole mind has been given to books, and I am hardly exaggerating if I say that they are more real to him than nature. He imagines that all knowledge can be got out of books, and rests upon the authority of some master or other; nor does he entertain any misgiving that the method of learning which led to proficiency in the rules of grammar, will suffice to lead him to a mastery of the laws of nature. The younger, thus unprepared for serious study, is turned loose among his medical studies, with the result, in nine cases out of ten, that the first year of his curriculum is spent in learning how to learn. Indeed, he is lucky, if at the end of the first year, by the exertions of his teachers and his own industry, he has acquired even that art of arts, after which there remain not more than three, or perhaps four, years for the profitable study of such vast sciences as Anatomy, Physiology, Therapeutics, Medicine, Surgery, Obstetrics, and the like, upon whose knowledge or ignorance of which depends whether the practitioner shall diminish, or increase, the bills of mortality.—Professor Huxley, Lay Sermons, pp. 65, 66.
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GRAY'S INN CHAMBERS, 20 HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

I.—The Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.
II.—The Diffusion of Knowledge concerning Vaccination.
III.—The maintenance in London of an Office for the publication of Literature relating to Vaccination, and as a Centre of Information.

The minimum Annual Subscription constituting Membership is 2s. 6d. Every opponent of Compulsory Vaccination in the United Kingdom is earnestly invited to join and cooperate with the Society.
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WILLIAM TEBB, Esq., 7 Albert Road, Regent's Park, N.W.
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CORNELIUS PEARSON, Esq., 15 Harpur Street, Red Lion Square, W.C.
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WALTER HASKER, Esq., Gray's Inn Chambers, 20 High Holborn, W.C.

SMALL-POX is a member of the group of diseases described as zymotic, which originate in unwholesome conditions of life, and in common are diminished and prevented by the reduction and removal of those conditions.

In times when the laws of health were imperfectly understood, the fanciful discovery was made that by poisoning the blood with the virus of small-pox or cow-pox, a future attack of small-pox might be escaped. While many kindred superstitions in medical practice have been discredited and forgotten, Vaccination, because it was endowed by the State, has survived, and has entered into legislation, and is enforced with fine and imprisonment.

It is in vain for Nonconformists to plead that they do not believe that Vaccination has any power to prevent or to mitigate small-pox: they are told they may believe what they like, but that vaccinated they must be, for the benefit of the state is settled beyond dispute, and that only fools and fanatics venture to question what has been irrevocably determined.

It is to attack and overthrow this monstrous tyranny that the LONDON SOCIETY has been established. The members desire to enlighten the public mind as to the history of Vaccination, as to its injury in communicating and intensifying other diseases, and as to its failure to avert the malady against which it is invoked.

Some, too, whilst disinclined to discuss Vaccination as a medical question, or to surrender confidence in its prophylaxy, are opposed to its compulsory infliction. They maintain that every remedy should be left to justify itself by its own efficacy, and that of all prescriptions the last which requires extraneous assistance is Vaccination; for its repute is based on the fact that its subjects are secure from small-pox, and in that security may abide indifferent to those who choose to neglect its salvation. Even nurses in small-pox hospitals, it is said, when efficiently vaccinated and re-vaccinated, live unaffected in the variolous atmosphere. Therefore, they hold that to compare an unvaccinated person to a nuisance, as is frequently done, is to make use of an epithet that implicitly denies the virtue asserted for Vaccination: a nuisance being a voluntary danger or annoyance which another cannot conveniently avoid. They also hold that to establish any medical prescription, and to create interests identified with that prescription, is to erect a bar to improvement; for it is obvious that any novelty in the treatment of small-pox must, in the constitution of human nature, meet with resistance from those whose emoluments are vested in the established practice.

The LONDON SOCIETY, therefore, claims to enlist the energies of those who resist Vaccination as useless and mischievous, and of those who, true to their faith in liberty, would leave its acceptance to the discretion of the individual. In the controversy into which they enter, they propose to employ all the familiar agencies therewith in England revolutions are effected in the public mind and in Parliament; and they appeal with confidence for the sympathy and support of their countrymen. The Vaccination Acts under which they suffer have not been enacted with the full cognizance of the nation, but have been forced through indifferent Parliaments by the persistency of medical faction. The members of the SOCIETY are confident that as soon as the truth about Vaccination is fully known and appreciated, the freedom they contend for will be conceded without fear, and that posterity will view with amazement the outrage upon human right and reason that is at present committed under the shadow of English liberty.
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OUR NEW HOPE.

The International Anti-Vaccination Congress was a happy conception brought to a happy issue. In our contest with a superstition so firmly established as vaccination, we can afford to lose nothing of the strength that comes of sympathy and the communion of science and experience; and among medical men on the Continent is to be found much more freedom from routine and servile submission to authority than characterizes the profession in England. We know that the fanatical enthusiasm for vaccination, which is de rigueur in every English medical assembly, is far from the inner conviction of many in the rank and file, but, as in all trades' unions, it is the audacious leaders who prevail and compel assent to propositions and policy to which the ignoble mass are more or less indifferent. It is for this reason that the battle against vaccination in England has to be fought outside the medical profession, and on the assumption that the profession is wholly antagonistic. It is not so: we have many friends inside the profession; but the consequences of overt alliance with us are so serious that we are satisfied to dispense with assistance that can only be rendered at overwhelming personal cost. Rattling is not confined to Sheffield nor Boycotting to Ireland. By intercourse with the Continent, however, we obtain professional assistance which only ignorance can despise. We trust the Congress thus initiated may become an annual European and American assembly until its end is consummated in the entire withdrawal of State support throughout the world from the Jennerian rite.

One of our best hopes with regard to the overthrow of vaccination consists in its aggressive character. It is established, but the demand is that it be more widely established. It cannot continue as it is, and we shall be compelled to fight or to submit. Its firmest advocates admit that its prophylaxis is limited, and must from time to time be renewed. Hence the demand for systematic and universal re-vaccination. The Army, Navy, and Civil Service are all re-vaccinated, and it logically follows that what is good for them must be good for the entire population. The demand for universal re-vaccination is continually advanced, and retracted as impracticable. Why impracticable, if defensible? Why should what is good for the servants of the State be withheld from the multitude? There was a curious article in the Times of 16th December on London Small-Pox, written of course by the medical editor, in which all the ordinary "crammers" concerning vaccination were reiterated; as for example—

"It has been shown, quite clearly and beyond dispute, that an effectual vaccination in infancy confers absolute immunity from small-pox for fifteen or twenty years, or even longer; and that an effectual re-vaccination at or after the age of puberty confers a similar immunity for the remainder of life. An effectual vaccination may be defined as one which produces at least four vesicles, each of which runs its natural course and leaves a deeply indented cicatrix. The conditions of effectual re-vaccination are as yet hardly ascertained with entire precision, in consequence of the practice being of more recent date, so that there has not been time for the collection of all the necessary facts with regard to it. The knowledge which has been gained of its efficacy is chiefly derived from small-pox hospitals and from the army. All recruits are vaccinated or re-vaccinated as a matter of course, and those in whom the operation is successful do not contract small-pox. At the hospitals every nurse is re-vaccinated when she enters upon her duties; and, notwithstanding daily and hourly exposure to the severest forms of contagion, small-pox among these re-vaccinated nurses is unknown."

If so much has been shown, "quite clearly and beyond dispute," why not act upon the knowledge, and let Parliament pass an Act for Compulsory Re-Vaccination? The editor says that "in the present state of public feeling, the legislative
enforcement of re-vaccination upon young adults is manifestly impossible”; but why impossible? Is public feeling incorrigible? Have medical men so little faith in themselves, and in what “has been shown quite clearly and beyond dispute,” that they cannot trust their countrymen to believe them? When, however, we see what their countrymen are expected to believe, it is not difficult to understand their hesitation. How, for instance, would a statement like this, from the same article, fare in the House of Commons under the hands of Mr. Taylor or Mr. Hopwood?—

“Whereas the legislative enforcement of effectual infantile vaccination, and the careful supervision under which it is carried on, have rendered ninety-five per cent. of the children born within the last ten years proof against small-pox, yet these very children cannot be rendered equally proof against it during the whole course of their lives without re-vaccination; while the general adult population contains many hundreds of thousands of people who, some of them by reason of imperfect vaccination in infancy, others by reason of the want of renewal of the vaccine disease after the constitutional changes incidental to puberty, are liable to contract small-pox if they chance to be exposed to its contagion in any concentrated or virulent form. The consequence is that small-pox, which was once a disease attacking children, is now almost limited to adolescents or adults; and, as every young child attacked by it dies, while a large percentage of adults recover, so the mere transfer of its incidence has had an enormous influence in diminishing mortality.”

A reference to almost any hospital report confutes these statements. Small-pox continues to be a disease of the young, irrespective of vaccination or re-vaccination, and as we advance in years we have about as little cause to dread the disease personally as we have to dread measles, scarlatina, or whooping-cough.

The writer of this amazing article affords still further insight to his intellectual condition in an attempt to excite alarm over the threatened increase of small-pox in London. He says that “Politicians see with indifference a mortality in London which, if it occurred among semibarbarians in Eastern Europe, would drive them far towards real or simulated frenzy”; and follows up the outrageous assertion with the question, “Is it not time to remember that the lives of our fellow-citizens are also of some account, and to promote inquiry into the causes of small-pox by which London is periodically ravaged?” At the root of such remarks is the assumption that small-pox mortality in London is extraordinary mortality, which by vaccination and re-vaccination might be averted; and it is disheartening to think that a fallacy so well recognised by sanitarians should be palmed off on the readers of the Times. The prevalence of small-pox in London has never seriously affected the rate of mortality; indeed, when small-pox has been worst, the common health has been better than usual. Small-pox is not an extra cause of death, but a substitute for other causes of death. The mortality of a community can only be reduced by improved sanitary conditions. If the conditions of life remain the same, the death-rate of London will continue the same, small-pox or no small-pox. Of course this truth is intensely distasteful to vaccine-mongers, and it cannot be too frequently and emphatically enforced.

How Compulsory Re-Vaccination is to be brought about is evidently a question that is exercising official wits. The medical editor of the Times suggests that “The medical inspectors of the Local Government Board, or, still better, the members of a judiciously selected Royal Commission, might soon ascertain facts which would pave the way for effectual preventive legislation.” No doubt they would pave the way, and it is for us, forewarned, to prevent the pavement. We are credited with creating an obstructive agitation, which says the Times, “has now become international”; and, as we started with saying, in international sympathy and intercourse, we hope to find strength for still more effective resistance to one of the most desppicable superstitions that ever afflicted the minds and bodies of mankind.

With whom we are crucified!—Those who imply that because a man suffers for obeying his conscience he is persecuted, assuredly might be forced to conclusions they would certainly not adopt. As much can be said for Fenians, for Anti-Vaccinators, for adherents of the Commune, for Nihilist assassins—for every one, in short, who from belief in a principle or a crotchet defies the law from motives which are not in themselves bad.—Pall Mall Gazette, 14th December, 1880.

What is Reasonable Excuse.—Dr. Thomas Butterfield, herbalist, of 26 Rye Hill, Newcastle-on-Tyne, was summoned on 26th November, and claimed to show reasonable excuse under the 29th Section of the Act, for declining to have his child vaccinated. When asked for his excuse he replied that he had acted as assistant to several medical men, had seen the injurious effects of vaccination, and entirely disbeliefed in the practice. The magistrate replied that such excuse was not a reasonable excuse, and fined the Doctor 5/-. and costs, who refusing to pay, a distress warrant was issued.
THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XXII.

HORSE GREASE AS A SOURCE OF VACCINE.

In order to complete the account of Jenner's awards and the patronage of Vaccination by Parliament, we have passed over several matters of interest and significance, which we shall now proceed to deal with, commencing with the tactics of our hero in relation to Horse Grease.

It will be remembered that in his Inquiry published in 1798, Jenner set forth two means of security from small-pox, namely, inoculation with Cow-Pox and with Horse Grease. It was, he said, the common belief of the country folk around Berkeley that whoever had been poisoned with cow-pox could not catch small-pox, and of farriers that the like immunity resulted from poisoning with horse-grease. Both of these opinions Jenner held to be true and advertised as worthy of public attention. And he argued further, that the pox on the teats of cows was not a spontaneous affection, but was derived from grease on the heels of horses communicated by ostlers, who having dressed the horses' sores proceeded to milk cows with unwashed hands. Nor did Jenner pretend that this derivation of cow-pox from horse-grease was his discovery. It also was the common belief of his neighbourhood; and he added for confirmation that cow-pox was unknown in countries where ostlers were not employed as milkers. It was, too, he thought, additional proof of the identity of horse-grease and cow-pox, that they raised similar eruptions when inoculated on the human body.

When the Inquiry was published several attempts were made to produce pox on the teats of cows by inoculating them with horse-grease, but in vain; and the possibility was discredited. Moreover, the notion of inoculation with horse-grease, either immediately or through the cow, was disliked intensely. It was pronounced repulsive. Why virus from horses' heels should be more repulsive than virus from cows' teats was not explained; but, as we all know, there is no accounting for tastes. Many a one who eats beef steaks with relish would start with disgust from a dish of horse-flesh. A story is told of a Wesleyan lady who rebuked a sister for wearing feathers in her hat, and was sharply referred to the existence of flowers in her own. "Yes, sister dear," was the cogent reply, "but we must draw a line somewhere, and it has been drawn at feathers." The line was drawn at horse-grease, and the origin of cow-pox as asserted by Jenner and his country acquaintance was conveniently denied. Jenner was not slow to perceive how the wind of opinion was blowing, and let horse-grease drop. He said not a word about it in his petition to Parliament in 1802, nor did he ever again advance it as a reason for consideration.

Now, why was this? Was it because he had ceased to believe that cow-pox originated in horse-grease? or that inoculation with horse-grease was not as effective as with cow-pox? Not at all! Why, then, did he not vindicate his opinion and confront vulgar prejudice? Simply because he had the wit to discern, that whilst he might get something out of the national purse for the cow-pox recipe, he could get nothing for the horse-grease one. As Dr. Pearson observed, "The very name of horse-grease was like to have wrecked the whole concern"—an observation that Dr. Mason Good confirms in saying, "The mere idea of using the matter of grease from the horse's heel excited from the first so deep and extensive a disgust that cow-pox inoculation had nearly fallen a sacrifice from the supposed union of the two diseases."

It is not to be supposed that I am censuring Jenner as a tradesman. If any of us had two patents for sale, we should be great fools if we declined to take £80,000 for one without the other, or suffered one to prejudice the other, or tried to inflect any doctrine about them upon the purchaser. It is for those who go to market to adapt themselves to the market, and remember that sellers were made for buyers, and not buyers for sellers. Since then the public were ready to pay for cow-pox, whilst they shuddered at horse-grease, it was not for Jenner to force horse-grease upon them.

Such is mercantile logic; and on its own conditions it is irrefragable; but it is not the custom to deal with Jenner as a tradesman, but as a man of science, and to range him with great discoverers, inventors, and benefactors of mankind; and here it is that we decidedly demur. What, we ask, did he discover? He did not discover that cow-pox prevented small-pox: that was the dairy-maids' faith. He did not discover that horse-grease prevented small-pox: that was the farriers' faith. He did not discover that horse-grease on milkers' hands begot pox on cows' teats: that was the farmers' conviction. He did not discover that inoculated virus could be conveyed from arm to arm: that was an existing practice. What then did he
discover? He discovered nothing. He did no more than take the vulgar opinion of his neighbourhood to the London market. He made a few perfunctory experiments by way of confirmation, advertised them in a book, and by good or ill luck the cow-pox notion was caught up, and worked to practical issues, chiefly by Dr. George Pearson, who thereby incurred the full malignity of Jenner's jealousy.

The distinction between a man of science and a tradesman is this, that the mind of the one is set on the extraction of truth and the other on the extraction of profit. The man of science does not inquire what the public may be pleased to know and pay for, but he ascertains and defines what is fact, and leaves the public to adjust themselves thereto as they may find convenient. If they recognise the truth communicated, it is well for them; if they dislike or deny the truth, it is ill for them; but well or ill, the man of science is the disinterested expositor of what he knows to be true; not unfrequently, when his revelation vitally affronts popular prejudice, realising the blessing of those who are persecuted for God's sake.

What therefore we maintain concerning Jenner is, that the truth (as we may presume he regarded it) he did not fully reveal; that what he did reveal, he suffered to be derided and denied; that he was content to take credit for so much of it as was marketable; whilst all the while his private conviction about horse-grease remained unaffected, not only in theory, but in deliberate practice.

It is for us to establish these assertions.

First, we say, he did not fully reveal what he knew. In 1789 Jenner inoculated his son, Edward, an infant of 18 months, not with cow-pox, or with horse-grease, but with swine-pox; and, according to the evidence of his own papers, the result was perfectly satisfactory. The child was subsequently inoculated with small-pox on five or six different occasions, and always without the slightest effect. According to the well-known variolous test, he was proof against small-pox. In short, there was nothing that Jenner ever adduced in favour of cow-pox that was not equally valid of swine-pox. And this swine-pox experiment was made nearly ten years prior to his advertisement of the rural faith in cow-pox and horse-grease. Why, we ask, did he keep back the truth about swine-pox? When cow-pox was scarce, and every cow-house was explored for virus, why did he not recommend swine-pox as an alternative? Why, too, did he refrain from the obvious generalisation, that cow-pox, horse-grease, swine-pox, and probably other sorts of pox, generated fevers, during the prevalence of which inoculation with small-pox was not apt to “take”? The answer is plain. Because he had something to sell rather than something to teach.

In conformity with this conduct he suffered the origin of cow-pox in horse-grease, and the specific virtue of grease to be derided and denied. “It was fortunate for Dr. Jenner, and the triumph of his discovery,” wrote Dr. Mason Good, “that a minute attention to the subject gave sufficient proof that there was no foundation for his opinion that cow-pox originated in horse-grease, nor that any connection existed between the diseases.” Such was the convenient medical verdict, which Jenner did not venture to disturb, though all the while persuaded of its error. There were failures to inoculate cows with horse-grease, but Thomas Tanner, veterinary surgeon, of Bockhampton, Gloucestershire, “had the merit,” says Dr. Baron, “of proving the truth of Jenner’s statement.” He succeeded in communicating the disease to the cow from the heel of the horse, producing on the cow’s teat a complete vaccine pustule. “From handling the cow’s teats,” said Tanner, “I became myself infected and had two pustules on my hand, which brought on inflammation, and made me unwell for several days. The matter from the cow, and from my own hand proved efficacious in infecting both human subjects and cattle.” Jenner distributed the virus from Tanner, and it operated precisely like cow-pox. But the proof did not rest with Tanner: others repeated his experiment with similar issues. Dr. Loy of Whitby published in 1801 Some Observations on the Origin of the Cow-Pox, in which he confirmed Jenner’s country tales, and described how (dispensing with the cow) he managed to inoculate patients with horse-grease, producing pustules identical with those from cow-pox, and subjecting the persons thus equated to the variolous test with complete impunity. Yet, with so much to fortify him, Jenner kept silent. He preferred to be adjudged mistaken rather than risk the forfeiture of public favour and pay. Nor might we blame him, had he frankly reasserted the integrity of the Gloucestershire faith, and allowed that since the public were ready to accept cow-pox without horse-grease,
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it was not for him to stand in the way of improvement by an obstinate defence of what was non-essential in practice.

But the case for horse-grease was yet wider than we have stated. Dr. Sacco of Milan was sometimes described as “the prince of vaccinators” by reason of his enthusiasm, his professional attainments, and the facilities that were accorded to him in the Cisalpine Republic of those days for universal vaccination. He tried to generate pox on the cow with grease from the horse, but failed, and in 1801 reported to Jenner his failure. In 1808, however, he cried, Eureka! A coachman presented himself at the Milan Hospital suffering from an eruption contracted in grooming a horse with greasy heels. He was at once led off by Sacco to the Foundling Asylum where nine children were inoculated from the vesicles on his hands. On three of the children the inoculation “took,” producing vesicles which were pronounced to be the same as those resulting from cow-pox. The virus was propagated from arm to arm, and distributed in all directions. Dr. Sacco from thenceforth avowed himself a horse-greaser. “It is now admitted and settled,” he wrote to Jenner from Milan, 25th March, 1808, “that grease is the cause of vaccine, and we cannot too soon alter the designation to equine.”

Was the designation changed to equine? It was not, nor was the attempt made. Those chiefly concerned in promoting vaccination in England would not hear of horse-grease, and many were ready to swear that in the matter of pox, the horse and the cow had no connection whatever, and that Jenner had too hastily assumed the truth of a vulgar west country opinion.

Dr. De Carro of Vienna, who described himself as Jenner’s friend and first apostle, having affected the first vaccination on the Continent and transmitted the first charge of vaccine to India, was also a horse-greaser. Whilst Jenner was judiciously holding his tongue about horse-grease in England, he wrote to De Carro congratulating him on his success in conveying cow-pox to the East, and ascribing the failure of the English attempts to the absurd prejudice against horse-grease, which Dr. Loy had however completely annihilated. Here are his words under date, 26th March, 1808—

“I am confident that had not the opponents of my ideas of the origin of the disease been so absurdly clamorous, particularly the par nobilita frustrum [Pearson and Woodville] the Asiatics would long since have enjoyed the blessings of vaccination, and many a victim been rescued from an untimely grave. The decisive experiments of Dr. Loy have silenced the tongues of these gentlemen for ever.”

How the clamorous opposition to horse-grease had deprived Hindoos of the earlier blessing of vaccination, we are left to conjecture. Perhaps he meant that horse-grease would have borne transit to India better than cow-pox, or that the Hindoos themselves might have resorted to horses with greasy heels.

In reply, 22nd April, 1808, De Carro wrote to Jenner commending his moderation in maintaining silence toward his antagonists—little apprehending the motives of that silence. Pearson’s conduct, he thought, bordered on insanity. “I am extremely glad,” he continued, “that you have treated it with the contempt it deserves, though I am happy to see that your friends have exposed his ridiculous and malevolent designs.”

De Carro was intimate with Sacco of Milan and from him received virus derived from horse-grease, which he used indiscriminately with cow-pox, until in Vienna it was unknown who were vaccinated and who equinated.*

De Carro was also in correspondence with Dr. La Font, a French physician, established at Salonica, who likewise was a horse-greaser. He discovered that the Macedonian farriers recognised three sorts of grease in horses, called in general javart, and discriminated as l’écrouelleux, le phlegmoneux, et le variolique.† With the various grease, La Font inoculated two boys, and from them other children, reproducing exactly the experience of Loy of Whitby and Sacco of Milan. De Carro in communicating La Font’s success to Jenner, 21st June, 1808, observed, “These particulars, I hope, will silence all those who still doubt the truth of your doctrine as to the connection of grease, cow-pox, and small-pox”—Jenner holding that small-pox was a malignant variety of cow-pox, whilst cow-pox came out of horse-grease.

Notwithstanding these confirmations and his boast that the opposition of Pearson and Woodville was silenced for ever, Jenner suffered judgment to go against him. He recognised that it was expedient that the connection between horse-grease and cow-pox should be denied. He had his bill to settle with the English public, and it was not for him to make difficulties. A curious evidence of how thoroughly the unpopular

* Copland’s Medical Dictionary.—Art. Vaccination.
truth was suppressed is furnished by Dr. Robert Willan's treatise On Vaccine Inoculation published in 1806. There is not a word or hint in it concerning horse-grease. The treatise was the work of a competent physician, who set forth what was known of vaccination (from the standpoint of belief) with fulness and clearness, accompanied with an appendix of letters and reports from Jenner himself, from Pearson and other experts in the new practice—but as to horse-grease, the silence was absolute. How the disagreeable truth was so effectually covered up, is more than we can account for. It was not mentioned in the debates in Parliament, nor was it referred to in the reports of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, nor did the opponents of vaccination use it with the force that might have been expected. One explanation is, that Jenner's Inquiry never entered into general circulation, that no popular edition ever appeared, and that it was only known at second-hand; and that the leading representatives of vaccination so boldly disowned horse-grease and Jenner's authority in ascribing cow-pox to its parentage, that there was no use in charging them with it; whilst all the while Jenner offered no open resistance to those who contemned him for one mistake, but exhausted the language of adulation on his merits. Thus we suppose it came to pass that at the end of twenty years Dr. Mason Good, as the exponent of orthodox medical faith, felt justified in asserting that there was no foundation for the opinion that cow-pox originated in horse-grease, nor that any connection existed between the diseases, and that it was fortunate for Jenner and the triumph of his discovery that the facts were so.

Jenner was silenced, but was he convinced? How could he be convinced? Horse-grease as the origin of cow-pox might be voted detestable and impossible, but there was the evidence of the country folk, confirmed by Tanner, Loy, Sacco, De Carro, and La Font, and though a weak man may be put down, or think it worth while to be accounted mistaken, yet, in the stillness of his mind, he knows that facts are facts whatever may be said to the contrary. When, therefore, Jenner had filled his purse, obtaining all he could expect from public favour, and was clear of London, and the oppression of its savants, he reverted to his first opinion as true—true and untrue, true with a distinction, which we shall presently define. Writing to James Moore, Director of the National Vaccine Establishment, from Berkeley on 23rd July, 1818, he observed—

"You seem not perfectly satisfied that the origin of vaccine is clearly made out. For my part, I should think that Loy's experiments, independently of my own observations, were sufficient to establish it, to say nothing of Sacco's and others on the Continent. However, I have now fresh evidence, partly foreign and partly domestic. The latter comes from Mr. Melon, a surgeon of repute at Lichfield. He has sent me some of his equine virus, which I have been using from arm-to-arm for two months past, without observing the smallest deviation in the progress and appearance of the pustules from those produced by the vaccine."

And in a subsequent note of 1st August, he repeated—

"DEAR MOORE,—I have been constantly equating for some months, and perceive not the smallest difference between the pustules thus produced and the vaccine. Both are alike, because they come from the same source."

To Moore again he wrote from Cheltenham, 27th October, 1818—

"I am sorry you have not succeeded in infecting a cow. I have told you before that the matter which flows from the fissures in the horse's heel will do nothing. [Note the observation I have placed in italics.] The virus is contained in vesicles on the edges and the surrounding skin.

"Did I ever inform you of the curious result of vaccinating carters? From their youth these men have the care of horses used for ploughing our corn lands; and great numbers have come to me from the hills to be vaccinated, but the half have proved insusceptible. On inquiry, many of them have recollected having sores on their hands and fingers from dressing horses affected with sore heels, and being so ill as to be disabled from work; and on several of their hands, I have found the cicatrix as perfect and characteristically marked as if it had arisen from my own vaccination."

Then we have a memorandum of Jenner's, dated 1st April, 1817, wherein he thus traces the course of the virus—

"Rise and progress of the equine matter from the farm of Allen at Wansell. From a horse to Allen; from Allen to two or three of his milk cows; from the cows to James Cole, a young man who milked at the farm; from James Cole to John Powell by inoculation from a vesicle on the hand of Cole; and to Anne Powell, an infant; from Powell to Samuel Rudder; from Rudder to Sophia Orpin, and to Henry Martin; from H. Martin to Elizabeth Martin. All this went on with perfect regularity for eight months, when the virus became intermined with other matter, so that no journal was kept afterwards. Proof was obtained of the patients being duly protected."

Which was to say, that they were subsequently inoculated with small-pox without effect. Among
Jenner's papers, there were other entries to the same purpose, thus—

"17th May, 1817.—Took matter from Jane King (equine direct) for the National Vaccine Establishment. The pustules beautifully cor-
rect.

This equine virus from Jane King was extensively diffused. It was, we see, sent to London; it was also sent to Edinburgh; and Dr. Baron says he had supplies of it for use in the Gloucester Infirmary. Baron relates that in the following year, he was able to return the gift, having obtained virus from the hands of a boy infected directly from the horse. Here is Jenner's acknowledgment of the present, dated 25th April, 1818—

"My Dear Baron,—Yesterday H. Shrapnell brought me the equine virus and your drawing, which conveys so good an idea of the disease, that no one who has seen it can doubt that the vesicles contain the true and genuine life-preserving fluid. I have inserted some of it into a child's arm; but I shall be vexed if some of your young men at the Infirmary have not done the same with the fluid fresh from the boy's hand."

It is surely unnecessary to adduce further evidence of what was Jenner's mature faith and deliberate practice. Further, it is manifest that to the end of his career he held that pox in the cow was not only derived from disease in the horse, but that it was exclusively derived from the horse, and, that apart from the horse, cow-pox would cease to exist. Owing to the multiplication of vaccination failures, it began to be conjectured that vaccine might be worn out by transmission from arm-to-arm, and that a renovation to the cow might be expedient; and discussing the question in a letter to Moore, dated 5th March, 1816, Jenner advanced the objection—

"If there were a real necessity for a renovation, I know not what we should do; for the precautions of the farmers with respect to their horses, have driven the cow-pox from their herds."

Why did not Moore rejoin, Where was the difficulty? Suppose pox driven from the herds, what conceivable reason was there for anxiety when the cow had become a demonstrated superfluity?—when, in Jenner's own words, "the true and genuine life-preserving fluid" was drawn direct from horses' heels? Except for the perpetuation of imposture, the cow in the case had ceased to have any value what-
ever. But, as so often happens with quacks, their minds had become so saturated with their own humbug that there was nothing left for common-sense.

Having thus proved our assertions concerning Jenner, it may be reasonably asked, How was it that some got cow-pox by means of horse-grease when others could not? for, it may be argued, that if cow-pox issued straight and invariably from inoculated horse-grease, not even the most resolute prejudice against horse-grease could have permanently kept back the truth.

The answer is, that cow-pox never came out of what is commonly known as horse-grease. The statement made by Jenner in his Inquiry of 1798 that—

"The limpid fluid which issues from the small cracks or fissures in the inflamed and swollen horse's heel"—infected cows and begot pox was a blunder, which he explicitly reversed fifteen years afterwards in his letter to Moore of 27th October, 1818, already cited—

"I am sorry," he wrote, "you have not succeeded in infecting a cow. I have told you before that the matter which flows from the fissures in the horse's heel will do nothing. It is contained in vesicles and the surrounding skin."

Jenner, we have always to remember, was a slovenly investigator, not apt to take pains, but apt to eke out observation with invention. His friend, "honest Jack Baron of Gloucester," who himself inoculated with horse virus unmodified by the cow, actually wrote Jenner's life in two volumes, and not until the work was ready for the binder did he discover that he was in error in common with his master in ascribing cow-pox to grease! Such was the intellectual muddle in which these prophets of vaccination operated! In a note stuck at the end of the second volume, we have the following amazing confession, made, remember, in 1888, fifteen years after the chief conjurer's death—

"I take this opportunity of expressing my regret that I have employed the word Grease in alluding to the disease in the horse. Variola Equina is the proper designation. It has no necessary connection with the Grease, though the disorders frequently co-exist. This circumstance at first misled Dr. Jenner, and it has caused much misapprehension and confusion."

Here we have the secret and desired explanation. It was out of horse-pox, and not out of

* Baron's Life of Jenner, Vol. II., p. 300.
† Ib., p. 455.
horse-grease, that cow-pox was derived, and in confounding grease with pox, Jenner mystified himself and others, and obscured the whole doctrine of vaccination. The Macedonian farmers who in 1808 informed La Font that they recognised three sorts of grease, and one of them variolous, were more accurate observers than the Gloucestershire farmers whose opinion Jenner lastly retailed. Whether he had any clear apprehension of his own blunder, we cannot tell. We have seen how long it took his biographer, Baron, to find it out. This is certain, that he made no public attempt to set right what he had so egregiously set wrong.

Lastly we may inquire, what is the present state of opinion as to horse-grease and cow-pox. When difficult questions are asked, we usually turn to our cyclopedias, and taking down Hooper’s Lexicon Medicum, 8th ed. 1848, Art. Cow-pox, we read—

“It is now ascertained that the horse and the cow each furnish, independently of each other, a virus capable of communicating genuine cow-pox to the human subject.”

Genuine cow-pox communicated by a horse is surely a bull of the first magnitude! The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 8th ed. 1860, Art. Vaccination, illuminates us thus—

“It is now to be regarded as an established fact that grease and cow-pox are the same complaint, modified by the constitution of the animals in which they occur.”

An established fact, indeed!—established in quicksand! In cyclopedias we shall find little help in this inquiry.

Some say the Gloucestershire farmers and Jenner were correct in attributing cow-pox to horse-grease, and that they can only be charged with mistake in the matter of nomenclature. When they said horse-grease, they meant horse-pox, not discriminating between maladies that sometimes occurred together. No one now believes that the affection recognised by veterinarians as “grease” ever originated cow-pox. The same rural authorities, including Jenner, held that where there was no horse-pox, there could be no cow-pox; but, so far as we can make out, that conclusion is surrendered. Pox on the horse may generate pox on the cow, but the cow may have pox without the horse.

“In this respect only was Jenner in error,” says Mr. George Fleming, Army Veterinary Inspector. “The two diseases are perfectly independent of each other. Cow-pox appears where there are no horses, or possible contact with horses; and may affect a number of cows in a dairy while the horses are entirely free from horse-pox.” *

At this point comes the tug of war. If cows have pox, how do they contract the malady? Speaking at the London Conference on Animal Vaccination in December, 1879, Professor J. B. Simonds, Principal of the Royal Veterinary College, said—

“His contention was, that the existence of cow-pox had to be proved. Jenner’s account of the disease was an illusion. In his experience among animals for forty years, he had never seen a case of cow-pox, and he did not believe that any form of variola belonged to the bovine race. Sheep were afflicted with pox, but not cattle. They heard of cow-pox, but who ever heard of bull-pox? And was it credible that a disease should be confined to cows and never attack bulls and steers? Let any one point out an affection of females that did not extend to the males of the same species.”

Professor Simonds and others believe that cow-pox as described by Jenner was a parasitic affection of small-pox, probably communicated by milkers; and that Ceely, Badcock, and others did systematically, what had been done inadvertently, when they inoculated cattle with small-pox in order to create virus for vaccination. On the other hand, those who assert the independent existence of cow-pox, hold no terms with this heresy. As Dr. Cameron says, “We can no more make small-pox into cow-pox than by stunting an oak-tree we can make it a gooseberry bush.” Fortunately we have no call to pronounce judgment on the controversy. The more it rages, the better we like it, and if only the combatants disposed of each other as did the Kilkenny cats, we might not be very sorry.

A last word as to horse-pox. There seems to be little doubt that when inoculated on man it gives rise to vesicles indistinguishable from those raised by cow-pox. In 1868 Professor Bonley of Alfort produced pox on a cow by inoculating it with pox from a horse, and with the virus from the cow children were successfully vaccinated. In the Transactions of the Clinical Society, Vol. X., Mr. John Langton, describes the case of a groom who came to St. Bartholomew’s Hospital, 20th March, 1877, with an eruption caught from a horse exactly like that induced by vaccination; and there could be no question, says Mr. Langton, that the disease was the same as that described by Jenner as grease.

There is much lymph in currency as vaccine that is equine, and many of us are equinates who suppose ourselves vaccinated; and it might be argued that we have been saved from small-pox.

by reason of our equination. Why with all the notorious failures of vaccination, and of re-vaccination, some of the more audacious medical quacks do not recommend horse-pox as an infallible alternative, is not easy to understand. It would be a Napoleonic stroke; nor is it improbable that before vaccination is surrendered the attempt will be made. How easily it might be asserted that vaccination is a failure so far as it has lost the original virtue of equination, and that the remedy is to dismiss the cow and revert to the horse, from whose Rocky heels, as the immortal Jenner observed, there issues "the true and genuine life-preserving fluid." The oracle might be worked thus—

"Let us hear no more of pure lymph from the calf, too often, alas! an illusion. Sure and certain salvation from small-pox can only be guaranteed to those inoculated with pure pock from the horse. Come then to the horse, the horse with pock! Come quickly! Come yourselves! Come with your wives! Come with your children! Come and be saved by horse-pox from the loathsome pestilence that demimates the human race and brings myriads to untimely graves!"

A MIRACULOUS DOCTOR!—Lecturing at the London Institution on 9th December, upon "The Germination and Propagation of Disease" Dr. Lionel Smith Beale, F.R.S. observed, "I firmly believe that if we had satisfactory legislation, we should in five years succeed in stopping small-pox. The way to prevent it is of course by vaccination. There is great prejudice against vaccination—unreasonable prejudice; but no thoughtful and experienced person could disprove the fact that vaccination is a sure safeguard against small-pox. I have myself been vaccinated ten times, and I am about to be vaccinated again as small-pox is now rife." "Afraid of his complexion," said Mrs. Brown. "But would have thought a man o' his years had more sense." Bless the Doctor! say we. Our work would be much easier if more vaccinators were as outspoken concerning the sure safeguard that is never sure.

RAGS AND FEVERS.—At Maidstone an attempt has been made to trace zymotic diseases to the rag shops—an old and favourite superstition. In refutation Jacob and Nicholson of Tooley Street write—"We have been in the rag trade for years, and do a large business, both export and import, and we have never known contagious diseases emanate from either English or foreign rags. The trade in London employs many hands, yet we have never heard of any illness that could be traced to rags, and therefore consider the fears of the Maidstone Local Board perfectly groundless.—1st December, 1880."

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

The First Congress of Opponents to Compulsory Vaccination was held in the Salle des Conférences, Paris, on 11th, 12th, and 13th December. The meeting had been anticipated with much interest in England, the Continent, and America. Letters of sympathy were received from nearly every country in the world where vaccination is enforced. A letter from Prof. F. W. Newman was received with especial favour and was published in the Echo, and cited in the Paris correspondence of the Times and Daily Telegraph. In a communication to the Executive Committee, Professor Newman observed, "Wonderful as is the proceeding to which Misrule drives us, I am certainly very glad that there should be a concertcd resistance against Compulsory Vaccination in many nations, and the whole movement has my sympathy. Among the more notable correspondents were Mr. Herbert Spencer, who sent a contribution towards the expenses; the Countess de Noailles; Mr. P. A. Siljestrom of Stockholm; Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P.; Mr. C. H. Hopwood, Q.C., M.P.; Mr. Arthur Otway, M.P.; Dr. Girth Wilkinson; Herr. W. Born, Magdeburg; Dr. August Reichelsparger, Member of the Reichstag, Berlin; Dr. J. Emeri Codrer, Montreal; Dr. Alexander Wilder, Professor of Physiology, New York; Signor Damiani, Naples; Mr. Wm. Young, London; and Mr. Alexander Wheeler, Darlington.

The following is the list of Delegates:

DR. HUBERT BÖRN, President.

Belgium—

M. de Jonghe, Bruxelles.

Dr. Hubert Börens, Charleroi.

Michel de Ghittelles,

England—

George S. Gibbs, Darlington.

William Tebb, London.

Thomas Baker,

Germany—

Dr. A. Oidtmann, Linnich.

Dr. Th. Schoff, Bonn.

August Zöppritz, Stuttgart.

Switzerland—

Rod Freishwirch, Beale.

Prof. Adolf Voigt, Berne.

Holland—

Prof. Hordemaker, D.D., Amsterdam.

Prof. Fabius, D.J.,

President Hofvे

France—

Dr. J. Jam, Paris.

Dr. E. Labbé, "

Dr. E. de Lambert, Paris.

J. T. Martreze, Seine et Oise.

M. Labbé, Secretary General.

The United States was represented by Mr. William Tebb in his capacity of Corresponding Secretary of the New York League by request of Dr. Alexander Wilder, the President.

On Friday, the 10th, a preliminary meeting of the Delegates was held at the office of the Revue Médicale, and after a pleasant interchange of ideas concerning the important matter that had brought them together, Mr. William Tebb delivered in French the following address—
“Gentlemen,—I regret that my knowledge of your precise and expressive language is so limited as to render it impossible for me to speak to you in French without notes. I will briefly say that the question of Compulsory Vaccination is of the highest importance, as it concerns the happiness and well-being of all civilized nations. There are abundant indications (some of which will be enumerated in the address which I shall have the honour to deliver to you to-morrow, showing the position and prospects of the anti-vaccination movement in Great Britain) that this is in short the question of the hour, and nothing can resist the swelling tide of opposition which is manifested wherever medical prescription is enforced upon unwilling peoples; which opposition will increase in volume and force until all compulsory legislation is repealed. It is a great satisfaction to my colleagues and myself to believe that the day is not far off when we shall have the means of contributing a share towards this desirable consummation. It has been estimated that at least two-thirds of the people of Great Britain are opposed to State medicine, which they believe is so intolerable and so objectionable than compulsory creeds, and they submit to it only under compulsion. Vaccination has long since been proved a mischievous delusion, and has only been sustained by subsides, endowments, false statistics, and the suppression of the truth. It will be the duty of this Congress to throw light upon and expose these mystifications; to urge upon the chiefs of all governments where compulsion exists the duty of appointing competent and unbiased commissioners to inquire into the overwhelming evidence against vaccination which everywhere abounds; to counsel resistance to the tyrannical encroachments of the powerful medical priesthood, who, not content with enforcing vaccination, are everywhere urging compulsory re-vaccination, with more stringent and cruel laws for non-compliance. Having myself been thirteen times summoned before the Police Courts of London in company with thieves, drunks, garrotters, wife-beaters, and other breakers of the law, for daring to protect the health of my countrymen from the en- poisoned lancet of the vaccinator, I am in a position to feel for those who, both in England and elsewhere, are harassed, ruined, or imprisoned for resisting the same odious tyranny. Let us one and all resolve—by means of the press, by discussions and public meetings, by the formation of Anti-Compulsory Vaccination Leagues everywhere—unceasingly to continue this righteous agitation, so well begun, and already so far advanced. Let us give our legislative representatives and chiefs of government no rest until all these intolerable Acts, which are a disgrace to our pretended civilisation, are effaced from their several statute books.”

Various suggestions were made for the conduct of the conferences about to be held. The tables were covered with anti-vaccination literature chiefly from Germany and England. Dr. Oldmann of Linnich, the author of a dozen or more works on the medical and statistical side of the question, produced a series of diagrams prepared with that patience and accuracy of detail for which his countrymen are distinguished, indicating the increase of measles and other syphilitic diseases in proportion as vaccination had been made obligatory, and the fluctuating character of small-pox in Germany, irrespective of vaccination or re-vaccination. Similar tables showing the incidence of Vaccination and small-pox in Sweden, the largest mortality having occurred in 1807-8, after forty-two years of enforced vaccination. These valuable tables prepared by Mr. P. A. Sjöström of Stockholm can be obtained gratuitously at the office of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, and we would recommend their use to public lecturers and others.

On Saturday the Delegates had an audience at the Palais d’Élysée with M. Duhamel, the President’s Secretary, and on Monday, with M. Girerd, Minister of Commerce and Agriculture, and Mr. Ch. M. de Mornay, Minister of the Interior. After the Delegates had been introduced by M. Labèe, Dr. Hubert Böens gave in each case a concise résumé of the grounds of contention against the enforcement of medical theories by the State, the object of the Deputation being to forecast the Government against M. Lervelle’s bill for compulsory re-vaccination and any other projet de loi for the like purpose. Dr. Böens urged that the facts presented might be carefully examined by an impartial committee before the unphysiological practice is further imposed on the people. Dr. Böens among other figures cited Dr. Pearse’s celebrated statistics, and mentioned that the Delegates proposed to send a collective Memorial to the French and all other Governments by whom Vaccination is enforced. M. Constans in reply said that he would see that the representations made and the facts brought forward were duly considered; and that he did not think it would be possible to put any further constraint on the people of France in the matter of vaccination.

Mr. Wm. Tebb presented to M. Girerd, Minister of Commerce a copy of the recent Parliamentary Return of Infant Mortality, No. 76, February, 1880, showing that syphilis had increased from 472 per million in infants under one year in 1847, to upwards of 1700 in 1878. It was upon these alarming figures that Mr. Hibbert the Under Secretary to the Local Government Board recently avowed that the Government had been led to bring in their bill last session for limiting cumulative penalties for non-vaccination. Mr. Tebb handed to M. Constans a copy of his pamphlet “Our Legislators on the Vaccination Question,” and to each Minister an Analysis of the Parliamentary Return, No. 486, Session 1877 which has been so shamefully ignored by the English Government and by the English press.

On Monday the Congress was addressed by Mr. George S. Gibbs of Darlington. He said that it was peculiarly appropriate that the League should meet in Paris in such a degree of strength as might possibly induce the French Government to resist the proposal made by a Deputy that Vaccination should be compulsory in France for infants of six months old, with a repetition of the process at the age of ten years. The expect-
ence of England was not encouraging from the vaccinator's point of view, for recently one of the Government Inspectors reported that he had been examining a great many workhouse children under seven years of age, with regard to their vaccination and did not find "efficient" marks on more than 420 out of 1876; and in a recent number of the *Lancet* a comparison of small-pox mortality of children under five years of age within the last twelve months was made for London, Dublin, and Paris, the proportions per cent. of total small-pox mortality being for each place 29.2, 34.5 and 26.4, from which it will be seen that fewer died where there was freedom, than where the practice was enforced. He further drew attention to the fact that the statistics of any country which furnished the number of births, the vaccinations, the small-pox cases, and the small-pox deaths for the several localities, would if calculated into proportions at once demonstrate the uselessness of the practice. This was notably the case with France, the statistics of which country he had calculated in the way mentioned for three years and published the result in 1870. It was generally conceded that vaccination did not prevent the occurrence of small-pox but the idea of mitigation was still entertained. This was more or less based on hospital statistics which, while showing the majority of patients to have been vaccinated, represents these as dying in smaller proportions than the unvaccinated; but the history of small-pox shows that the people in small-pox hospitals in the last century died at the rate of not more than 18 per cent., and the total deaths in small-pox hospitals now is from 16 to 20 per cent., that is practically the same; but in order to show a mitigation in the vaccinated, it is asserted that the unvaccinated died at rates varying from 35 to 50 per cent., a statement perfectly incredible by anybody cognizant of the character of the disorder, and of the rule followed by hospital surgeons of classifying the patients by the visibility or non-visibility of vaccination marks.

Among the papers received by the Congress was one from Professor A. Vogt, of Berne University, "On the Absence of Scientific Data for the immunity from Small-Pox claimed for Vaccination and the necessity of a re-vaccinated army corps in Algeria. The attacks of small-pox were three times more numerous than in the civil population of the same district. In another paper, Mr. F. A. Siiljestrom, of Stockholm, maintained "that the mean rate of mortality, under similar sanitary conditions, does not widely vary, though at different times the work of death is effected by different diseases; that small-pox epidemics do not increase the general mortality; that in Sweden vaccination has always shown itself to be weak when small-pox was strong; and that the official statistics prove that vaccination has tended to increase the liability to small-pox epidemics." Dr. W. J. Collins contributed a paper on "The Theory and Practice of Vaccination"; and Mr. Wm. Tebb another on "The Present Position and Prospects of the Revolt against Compulsory Vaccination in England"; and Dr. A. Oldtmann delivered an address on "The Present State of Vaccination in Germany," in which he stated that a majority of the members of the Reichstag in Berlin were opposed to the enforcement of vaccination, and that the repeal of the compulsory acts might be accomplished next year if only the opponents of State medicine (of whom there were hundreds of thousands) would keep up their agitation. Professor Hoedemaker, D.D., of the Free University, Amsterdam, gave an interesting account of the present position of the question in Holland, in which he mentioned that many of the people regarded the enforcement of vaccination as an invasion of conscience and freedom, and loudly demanded the repeal of Acts which excluded their unvaccinated children from the public schools, keeping them in enforced ignorance, or putting their parents to the expense of private education. Dr. Fabius, Professor of Jurisprudence, Amsterdam, denounced the cruelty of inflicting diseases upon healthy organisms by the State, and referred to Dr. Capadose's able work against vaccination, written fifty years ago, when he stood alone against the pernicious medical nostrum. Papers were read from Dr. E. Haughton on "How the Vaccination Delusion is kept up"; from Dr. T. L. Nichols "On Vaccination and the Laws that compel its adoption in the United States"; and by Mr. Thomas Baker, of Wokingham. Dr. H. Schoppe, of Bonn, contributed a valuable memoir, printed in French, "On the Maladies occasioned by Vaccination," being the result of three years of investigation in the children's hospitals of Vienna. Lastly, but not least, an excellent paper was received from Mr. H. D. Dudgeon, of Quorn, written in English and French. To several of these contributions to enlightenment in physiology we shall return, and reproduce them in whole or in part, as we have space and opportunity.

A memorial is now in course of preparation by the Executive Committee embodying the main facts of contention against vaccination, as gathered from the evidence brought before the Congress. This will be submitted to all the Delegates for approval, and will then be sent to the chiefs of all nations in which the rite of vaccination is obligatory.

The proceedings closed with an admirable address from the President; and the following international committee was chosen to arrange for a Congress in 1881 to be held in Paris, Cologne, Brussels, London, or Berne, as may be deemed convenient and expedient.

**Committee:**

**Germany—Dr. A. Oldtmann.**

**France—Dr. E. Labbé.**

**England—Mr. Wm. Tebb.**

**Holland—Dr. Kuyper.**

**Belgium—Dr. H. Böhn.**

**Russia—Dr. Reitz.**

**Austria—Count Zedwitz.**

**Sweden—Mr. P. A. Siiljestrom.**

**Italy—Signor Damiani.**

**United States—Prof. R. A. Gunn, M.D.**

M. Labbé hopes to be able to publish an entire report of the Congressional proceedings.
A more detailed report of these important proceedings is now being published weekly in Lancet, the British Medical Journal, and a full report including the valuable address of President Boës, the reply of Minister Consta
ans, and the speeches, letters, and mémoires will be printed in a volume by M. Labbé. Those who require copies are requested to send their names as early as possible to Mr. Walter Hasker, 20 High Holborn, London, or to Dr. E. Labbé, 59 bis, Rue Pigalle, Paris. Reports of the proceedings have appeared in Galignani's Messenger, Le Rappel, the Continental Gazette, Le Courrier de l'Europe, the Cologne Zeitung, and many other papers.

MR. ERNEST HART ON THE CONGRESS.

A few hair-brained fanatics, who make so much noise here as anti-vaccinationists, dissatisfied with the crushing repulse with which they have been met in this country, are carrying their campaign abroad. It is not probable, however, that the ministers in France will be deceived as to the character of this senseless crusade of a few irrational beings, or that an international movement will have relatively any greater weight than the national movement. There will be found in every country a few irrational persons who indulge in crusades against reason, and by widening the scope of territory it is possible to add to their number. Frenchmen, however, must remember that Mr. Peter Taylor, M.P., and his half-dozen condottiers, represent nobody or nothing in this country but their own crotches.—British Medical Journal, 16th Dec.

FROM PROF. F. W. NEWMAN.

DEAR SIR,—You ask me a letter to be read at the approaching Congress in Paris against Compulsory Vaccination. I have no special acquaintance with small-pox, or with what is called vaccine. I have no child to protect against blood pollution. But I have seen an infant miserably perishing from erysipelas induced by the surgeon's puncture, and the mother wept over the latter day's permission. As an Englishman, and a man of common sense, I deplore and denounce this tyrannical, this usurping law. To forbid perfect health, as the law does, I hold to be beyond the legitimate power of any legislature, extra vire, as the phrase is. Still, it would not seem my special duty to step forward, were not the richer classes of England so fatuously bent to obey the medical faculty in this and other equally shameful, if not more shameful, demands, while the newspaper Press seems so frightened about anything which should split up the Liberal Party, that they act the very illiberal part of inserting the subtle and often false statements of the advocates of this tyranny, and habitually refuse admission of replies. You and I know that this is not at all the way of strengthening the Liberal Party. To say, "Down with Truth and Justice except where we can use them as pleas for our own predominance," is to undermine that predominance. Men twenty years my junior can remember the enormous changes of medical practice. At the age of twenty-seven I had 220 leeches put upon me, and in remembering it I find it still alive. But it was according to the rule of that day. Bleeding and purging, setons and Epsom salts, cupping and every form of depletion, were then the fashion, and the thing approved (thirty, forty, fifty years before Count Cavour was bled to death). Then followed a system of wine and brandy-and-water, with all vegetables but bread forbidden. Strychnine became a favourite; mutton chops, wine for children of tender age, wine for low fever, brandy for the new disease of bronchitis. Fatal bronchitis increased in proportion as brandy was given for a remedy, and still the physicians said the patients had not enough brandy (an old gentleman known to me had his stomach under three eminent doctors so ruined by this remedy that he died of starvation). The most eminent in the faculty see all this, or nearly all this, to be wrong. Of course they do not like to blame their confères too plainly, but it is clear to all outside that the tide is turned. The leaders understand that attention to diet is worth all the drugs in the world, whether to prevent or to cure. Evidently, medicine (by the avowal, indeed, of its most honoured practitioners) is a very unstable art, with no just pretense to science. It is changeable nearly as fast. Yet our upper classes and our legislators bow to its despotic claims as much as did their ancestors to the medieval clergy. And what is their now avowed theory? They are driven out of their original doctrine (which yet they often repeat to the ignorant) that vaccination is a sure preventive of small-pox; they say it prevents for an unknown time as long as the effect sticks in the constitution, but no longer, therefore we ought to be revaccinated at the end of this unknown time. However ignorant our M.P.'s are of medicine, they ought surely to see that such a theory is a contemptible absurdity. It claims to keep us in perpetual cow-pox in order to prevent a contingent small-pox; it cries out against healthy infants as dangerous to the public health. But so fallen in good sense are our upper classes (a portentous sign that they are about to fail heavily indeed), that they listen to this nonsense, and plant the lance of the surgeon, poisoned with they know not what of the corruption falsely called lymph, in the veins of innocent children.

At the same time, the medical profession refuses to try those remedies for small-pox which, by manifold attestation, show that it is very tractable; and while their own statistics prove that the years of prevalent small-pox are rather years of less than of greater mortality, they dare to claim that vaccination saves thousands of lives (80,000, according to an eminent chemist—an M.P.). "When water, chokes," says an old Greek proverb, "what shall we drink after it?" When truth, and wisdom too, but choke an M.P., what can enlighten him? Solomon said,—"A rod for a fool's back;" apparently that will come to our aristocracy, as has come to many national orders before
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now. But France has cast off her incubus, and may haply be before us in shaking off this pernicious and oppressive folly.—I am, yours truly,
(Emeritus Professor) F. W. NEWMAN.
To Wm. Tebb, Esq.

FROM P. A. TAYLOR, Esq., M.P.
22 Marine Parade, Brighton, 8th December, 1880.

Dear Mr. Tebb,—I am sorry that it is not possible for me to attend with you the forthcoming Convention at Paris on the Vaccination Question. I have no doubt that the results of the discussion will be important; in truth, open discussion is all we require to attain our object. It is my full intention to challenge the decision of the House of Commons upon Compulsory Vaccination as early as possible in the ensuing session. Compulsion in regard to a question of medical treatment is a gross infringement of personal liberty, and a most unwarranted infringement of parental rights. It was on these grounds only that I first undertook the question; but, driven by the assertions of the medical upholders of the system to study the question of vaccination itself, I have been brought to the conclusion—most unexpectedly so to myself—that the whole system of vaccination is a profound delusion, and this of course, not upon any theories of my own, but upon official statistics—I may add, supported by the admissions of the medical profession itself. I find that the history of vaccination, since it was introduced into this country some 80 years ago, so far from being a record—as the common belief runs—of triumph and success, is really nothing more than a continuous record of failure, more or less admitted, and always accompanied with apologetic explanations of the cause. But I must not weary you further, and, in conclusion, I will only repeat my belief that our success is certain, and at no distant date.—Subscribing myself, sincerely yours,

P. A. TAYLOR.

FROM C. H. HOPWOOD, Esq., Q.C., M.P.
1 Essex Court, Temple, E.C.
24th November, 1880.

Dear Sir,—I have received the invitation of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination to the meetings to take place in Paris on December 11th, 12th, and 13th. I must, however, be in England at that time, and cannot therefore be present as you request. I cannot pretend to write in French on a subject like this, for the necessary technical terms and words of art can only be gathered and retained by close industry and practice. All I can say is, the cruelty and oppressive-ness of the law compelling the vaccination of children in tender infancy first inspired me with repugnance, and made me critical of the action and merits of this notorious invention. It is proved to be answerable for many deaths of infants. It is too, impossible to estimate how much poison is conveyed to pure veins by even the best accredited lymph, or how long its evil consequences may ferment. And when all this danger and mischief have been incurred, any possible benefit rests upon mere assertion, which always contradicts itself by insisting on frequent re-vaccination. Save me from so dangerous a remedy!—so vague in promise! so empirical in proof!—Truly yours,

CHAS. H. HOPWOOD.

To WALTER HASKER, Esq., Hon. Sec.,
The London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.

FROM ARTHUR OTWAY, Esq., M.P.
19 Cromwell Road, S.W., 3rd December, 1880.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter dated 8th November, I beg to say that my opinion on the question of vaccination is not sufficiently formed to accept the office of vice-President of your Society, which you are so kind to offer me. My views are that in justice to the many persons that are annually imprisoned on account of their conscientious objections to the provisions of the Vaccination Act it is desirable that further searching inquiries should take place. Those views I advocated in Parliament. I am aware of the proposed International Anti-Vaccination Congress to be held in Paris, and earnestly hope that some benefit may result from it.—I am, dear sir, yours truly,

ARTHUR OTWAY.

WALTER HASKER, Esq.

FROM THE COUNTESS DE NOAILLES.

M. le President,—I send you my best wishes for the success of the International Congress which is about to take place.—I look upon the vaccine as one of the greatest plagues of our century. For fourteen years I have opposed the law which renders it obligatory in England. May God preserve France from the same fault committed by our Government!

Hastings, 9th December, 1880.

[From the Paris Correspondent of The Times.]

Paris, Sunday, 12th December.

The International Anti-Vaccination League is holding a Congress here under the presidency of Dr. Boens, of Charleroi. It is composed of delegates from England, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland. Letters of sympathy have been received from Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P., Mr. Hopwood, M.P., Dr. Garth Wilkinson, Professor F. W. Newman, and others. Mr. Taylor stating that while originally instigated by grounds of personal liberty, a study of the question had, to his surprise, convinced him of the fallacy of vaccination and that he intended next session to challenge the decision of Parliament upon it. The chairman dwelt on Friday afternoon on the conflicting views on the origin of vaccine, traced inoculation to Oriental fears of personal disfigurement, commented on the admitted failure, first of inoculation and next of human lymph, and drew a parallel between the alleged immunity of milkmaids from small-pox and the vulgar belief of earrings preventing ophthalmia. It was mentioned that one of the
English delegates had been fined 13 and another 10 times, and that at Leicester, Reighley, and other towns the Act cannot be enforced. Yesterday the delegates laid their cases before the President's secretary, M. Duhamel, and to-morrow they wait on two of the Ministers, one of their chief objects being to prevent the compulsion now applied in France in schools and the army from being made universal, thus setting an example to the other Latin nations.

Monday, 13th December.

The Anti-Vaccination Congress concluded today with a resolution to hold another Congress next year, probably again in Paris. The German and Dutch delegates spoke of the growing opposition to compulsory vaccination, while the French and Belgian members expressed hopes of a repeal of legislative compulsion in England and Germany as likely to facilitate the abandonment of administrative or indirect compulsion by their own Government.

[Echo, 10th December, 1880.]

We give in another column a letter written by Professor F. W. Newman to the International Vaccination Society, which holds a conference in Paris this week. Professor Newman denounces compulsory vaccination in no measured terms, and he attacks medical men all along the line. It is not unlikely that most people will for the moment smile at the audacity of his language, and conclude that his cause is hopeless because he fights twenty thousand medical men, backed up by a strong public opinion. There are however, two or three facts which are indisputable as destiny which point in a contrary direction. The first fact is that medical men hitherto have never been right. What was considered true four generations ago was admitted to be untrue a generation after; what was generally adopted and in use in the second generation ago was denounced as wrong a generation after; what was practised two generations ago was denounced as destructive a generation after; and during the present generation the whole system of medicine—we cannot call it a science—has undergone more than one revolution. The chief reason of all this is that medicine, as practised, is more of an art than a science, and that each medical man is, in himself, more or less the standard of truth. The second fact to be borne in mind in this controversy is that the changes for the better which have taken place in medical practice have generally been the result of scientific teaching from without. Medical men have moved on rather reluctantly with the general current of inquiry and verification. Because a thing obtains to-day in the medical world is no reason that it will command respectful attention in a few years. Rather the reverse. Judging from past experience, as written in every page of medical history, we should prefer saying, Because a thing has been, therefore it will not continue. Professor Newman and those who act with him, may therefore be in no way discouraged by the consolidated and interested opposition of medical men. We go still further, and say that a multiplication and a continuance of such assaults as Professor Newman's, and Mr. F. A. Taylor's in the House of Commons last Session, would produce such a change in public opinion, that medical men would soon trim their sails in obedience to the passing breeze.

QUESTIONS FROM ASHTON FOR MR. DODSON.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Sir,—On the 28th of October, two children were reported as being unvaccinated. The Guardians of the Ashton-under-Lyne Union desire respectfully to call your attention to the following questions and considerations:

1. On the 11th of June, the House of Commons was officially informed that Animal Lymph would be supplied to Medical Practitioners, as a substitute for the Humanised Lymph at present in use, in order to meet two objections: viz., that the arm-to-arm method is attended by the danger of transmitting from child to child constitutional defects, and that the Humanised Lymph from long usage had ceased to protect to the extent expected.

As such Animal Lymph has not been supplied, the Guardians therefore ask, When will it be supplied?

2. The first objection to the present arm-to-arm method is the danger of transferring constitutional diseases, such as scrofula, syphilis, etc.; and Dr. Ransome, Professor of Public Medicine at the Owens College, says:—"May I express an earnest hope that the renewal of our Lymph supply may, if possible, be obtained from genuine cases of cow-pox, and not from calves or heifers inoculated from others, or worse still, vaccinated from the human subject."

As the new Animal Lymph is obtained by passing it fructerself to calf, and as the Local Government Board intend such Lymph to be used in the arm-to-arm method, as at present, the Guardians desire to know, in what way, and to what extent, the danger of transmitting constitutional defects from child to child will be diminished by the new supply of Bovine Lymph.

3. On December 15th, 1879, Mr. Simon wrote:—"When a given (animal) body is possessed by one of these constitutional diseases (scrofula, syphilis, etc.), no product of that body can be warranted safe not to convey the infection:" and Dr. Creighton, of the Cambridge University, gives the history of twelve cases of Bovine Tuberculosis in human beings,—the disease being a more rapid form of consumption than that peculiar to man. (October No. of Journal of Anatomy and Physiology.)

As the new Lymph will be obtained from Bovine Animals, in whom this Tuberculosis is hereditary, and occurs in 4-75 per cent. of any given number of cows, the Guardians are anxious to know if the Local Government Board is prepared to take the responsibility of introducing another formidable disease (Bovine Tuberculosis) to man, by means of the system of vaccination.
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4. As to the second objection, Dr. Dixon, in referring to the protective power of vaccination, asserted a few months ago, that "the characters of small-pox, when uncontrolled by vaccination still remain the same, as is evidenced by the present mortality from it amongst unvaccinated persons, and that the death-rate of unvaccinated cases of small-pox is six times as great as the death-rate of vaccinated cases." But the same writer, on October 22nd, 1880, in commenting upon the facts, that the mortality in the vaccinated was 88 per 1000, and in the unvaccinated 444 per 1000, says:—

"The high death-rate in the unvaccinated must not be compared with the lower rate in the vaccinated, nor with the general mortality from small-pox before vaccination, without fair consideration of all the facts which may help to arrive at a just conclusion. There is a great difference in the intensity and virulence of different epidemics, both in small-pox and other zymotic diseases. It is probable that a larger proportion of unvaccinated persons is to be found among the ignorant, dirty, and wretched inhabitants of the slums of London and very few indeed amongst the educated, and better fed members of society. The disease is intensified by over-crowding."

And the most recent experiments of M. Pasteur, on the virus of chicken cholera (said by Professor Huxley to be analogous to small-pox) demonstrate the fact that the virulence of this animal poison is absolutely controlled and destroyed by the oxygen of the air; and that the influence of the oxygen of a pure atmosphere determines the cessation of epidemics. (Lancet, Nov. 6, 1880.)

With these earlier and later opinions before them, the Guardians are anxious to learn what amount of credit, if any, is really due to vaccination, in controlling and destroying the small-pox disease.

THE ANSWER.

Local Government Board, Whitehall, S.W.,

14th December, 1880.

Sir,—Adverting to your letter of the 1st instant, forwarding a paper submitted by Mr. Robinson to the Guardians of the Ashton-under-Lyne Union, I am to state that the Local Government Board cannot undertake to enter into a detailed criticism of the statements in this paper with regard to vaccination. They may remind the Guardians, however, that this question was the subject of an elaborate inquiry by a Parliamentary Committee in 1871, and that in the report of that Committee will be found information as to several of the matters referred to by Mr. Robinson. I am, at the same time, to observe that the President's announcement in the House of Commons, on the 11th of June last, with regard to the proposed supply of animal lymph, is not accurately stated in the paper which Mr. Robinson’s paper. That announcement was to the following effect:—"That the Department would make arrangements by which animal lymph might be supplied as stock, as well as humanised lymph, and that it would be sent to medical practitioners when they desired it. But the Department must proceed with the greatest caution, taking care to start from a well established case of cow-pox. They must take care to proceed, in fact, upon the best possible basis." I am to add that the Board's Medical Officer has investigated the working of various continental establishments for the supply of animal lymph, and that the Board now have under consideration the details of a scheme for securing the supply of such lymph in this country to medical practitioners who may desire to use it in commencing local series of vaccination.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. F. Horton, Assistant Secretary.

Benjamin Seymour, Esq.,
Clerk to the Guardians, Ashton-under-Lyne.

This letter was read at the Meeting of the Guardians on 16th December, when Mr. E. Robinson remarked that the reference of the Local Government Board was obsolete, and subsequently addressed to Mr. Dodson the following rejoinder—

Dukinfield, December 21st, 1880.

To the Right Honourable the President of the Local Government Board.

Sir,—The memorial sent to you by the Guardians of the Ashton-under-Lyne Union, contrasted certain equally authoritative opinions upon essential points connected with the practice of vaccination. As the later contradicted the earlier opinions, and tended to shake the confidence of men responsible for the prosecution of parents having intelligent and conscientious objections to their children being inoculated with the vaccine disease, your attention was respectfully called to these opposing authorities. In reply thereto, you console the Guardians by referring them to the report of 1871. I venture, with deference, to point out to you that the conclusions of that committee are not worthy of implicit confidence.

(1.) As to the protective value of vaccination, the committee adopt (page iii.) the dogma of Sir W. Gull, that "vaccination is as protective against small-pox as small-pox itself." The truth of this dogma, after more than twenty years of compulsory vaccination, can be easily tested by figures. At page 248 of the report of 1871, Mr. Marson says:—"The number of cases of small-pox, after small-pox, was less than one per cent., whereas it was 53 per cent. after vaccination." And Mr. Jebb, of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, says (Times, 1870):—"That of the 15,141 cases of small-pox in the asylums in 1876-7, 9, or less than 11,142 had been vaccinated; or more than 78 per cent. of small-pox cases after vaccination." What consolation can be derived from Sir W. Gull's dogma, although guaranteed by the report of 1871? The Committee also say (page iii.), "That cow-pox affords, if not an absolute, yet a very great protection against an attack of small-pox and an almost absolute protection against death from that disease." But the editor of the Times, December 16th, 1880, after upwards of 20 years'
compulsory vaccination, modifies this doctrine as follows:—"It would appear, therefore, as if the advocacy of vaccination might with advantage be placed on a different ground from that which has commonly been urged by its supporters, and as if the operation might be recommended or enforced, not as a means of preventing small-pox, but as a means of preventing mortality from it when it occurs." Which of the two doctrines is the most deserving of confidence? Does not the admission that vaccination will not diminish small-pox, but only the mortality from it, tell with terrible force against the compulsory clauses of the Vaccination Act?

(2.) As to the danger of transmitting other diseases the Committee says (page iii.) "That if the operation be performed with due regard to the health of the person vaccinated, and with proper precautions in obtaining and using the vaccine lymph, there need be no apprehension that vaccination will injure health, or communicate any disease."

This opinion is based upon Mr. Simon's authority, whose doctrine is found in page 385 of the report, 1871:—

"I may inform you that the diseases which it has been suspected that vaccination might communicate have chiefly been scrofulous and syphilitic complaints and various eruptions of the skin. In all but a very limited number of these cases it may be conclusively answered that the suspected mischief is physically impossible. Scrofula, for instance, and most skin diseases, even when for experiment their specific discharges and other products are deliberately inoculated in the healthy, are absolutely uncommunicable by contagion; and it is inconceivable that the vaccine lymph, even if it could include these products, would alter the essential condition of their nature. Of some others among the diseases referred to, it may, no doubt, be admitted that certain of their specific products are infectious; but then, again, comes the question (which is already by anticipation almost disposed of) whether the constitutional existence of such diseases can qualify the contents without modifying the characteristic development of a true Jennerian vesicle. Experiment, where it has been deliberately addressed to the solution of this question, has invariably answered No, and such experiments are worth more than many arguments."

But the same writer, in the British Medical Journal of December 13th, 1879, gives the following as the latest result of scientific research: "When a given (animal) body is possessed of one of them (disease germs), no product of that body can be warranted as safe not to convey the infection."

"Presumption against every part and product of the diseased body is by everyone readily admitted, where there are vehement general symptoms of disease; but it is important to know that not only in such feeble states, but in states of chronic dyscraea, and even at times when the dyscraea may be giving no outward sign, the infected body may be variously infective. Thus, in regard to constitutional syphilis, the vaccine lymph of the syphilitic infant may possibly contain the syphilitic contagium in full vigour, even at moments when the patient, who thus shows himself infective, has not on his own person any outward activity of syphilis."

Which of these doctrines is the most worthy of confidence? Is it reasonable for a Government department to be acting according to the tenets of an obsolete faith? As to the great precautions that appear from your letter. If needed to ensure a satisfactory kind of animal lymph, it seems to me that the length of time that has elapsed since you promised to adopt this lymph as an alternative to the present supply—the necessity that exists for an English department to seek an original source of genuine cow-pock lymph on the Continent, and to be taught by foreigners how to carry on the systematic manufacture of this new vaccine—are facts which will stimulate very searching inquiries, when the lymph makes its appearance, as to its real nature and origin, and as to the method by which it is reproduced.—I am, your obedient servant,

Enoch Robinson, Surgeon.

Mr. D. Ainsworth, M.P.

The West Cumberland Anti-Vaccination League had an interview at Maryport on 15th December, with Mr. Ainsworth with a view to elicit his opinion and to set the reasons for their contention against vaccination clearly before him. He was addressed by Mr. R. Adair, Mr. W. Adair, Mr. T. W. Johnson, Mr. Rook, Mr. Dixon, and by Mr. W. Irwin, who said he had just seen Sir Wilfrid Lawson, who told him he was "dead" against compulsory vaccination. Mr. Ainsworth in reply said—It is with much pleasure that I meet with you this afternoon, to hear your views on so important a matter. I have studied the subject, but, as you have just heard it took Sir Wilfrid a long time to get to where he is on the question of vaccination, and as I have not had the same amount of experience, or time to bring the same amount of thought to bear on the subject, I can hardly, perhaps, be expected to be as far advanced as he is. However, I think the main question is this: Is it fair that you should be compelled to do this thing? You are told that you are liable—and in fact you are liable—to be fined time after time if you do not vaccinate your children. I do certainly think that kind of compulsion ought to be lessened. The difficulty lies in doing what will be fair and just to all parties. Now, what is wanted is that the compulsory clause shall be entirely repealed. Mr. Dodson has proposed to bring in a Bill to dispense with repeated fines. That is a measure to which I can give my entire support. I think if a fine is to be inflicted at all for refusing to carry out the Act, it ought certainly to end with one fine, and not be repeated as it frequently is. I may say that I cannot pledge myself to vote for Mr. F. A. Taylor's Bill in its entirety, whatever that Bill may be. There may be many points connected with it of which I am ignorant at the present time; but I will give the whole matter my serious consideration, and if with more thought and more light comes
the conviction that it will be for the good of the community, I will support any measure that will bring about what you desire.

CHARLES GILPIN.

Mr. Wm. A'gair has called our attention to a remarkable speech delivered by Mr. Charles Gilpin to his constituents in Northampton, wherein like a true Friend he set conscience above what men please to call "law," and vindicated the duty of steadfast resistance. "Gilpin was one of the noblest characters I ever met with," said Kosuth; and thus he spoke concerning those who would enforce medical obedience—

"I have always thought that when you visit by penalties questions of opinion which rest upon such a it is not only a law and a penalty, but a penalty and a law. Where, in the ever-changing opinion of medical men, then you trench upon the liberty of the subject, then you trench upon the rights of humanity, and you are in great danger of trenching upon that authority which God has given, that primarily parents shall be the judges of such a matter. I find that a number of men are fined for adhering to the dictates of their own consciences. I ask—What class of men are they? Are they the idle? Are they the dissolute? Are they the drunk? Are they those, as a whole, who disregard the interests of their children in other respects? Are those who allow their children to be dragged up in the gutter? The answer I have received is this—that they are none of these. They are the thinking, sober, industrious men who take part in mechanics' institutions, who look into the reasons of things, and who claim that their judgment should be convinced before they are, by arbitrary law, compelled to carry out that which is opposed to their convictions. Well, I had ascertained that, and I remember it when the subject came before the House of Commons. The question was brought forward and debated in a slipshod way: when an hon. baronet, on the Conservative side got up and, alluding to the sufferings of those who had incurred penalties and imprisonment for non-compliance with the terms of the Act, said that, for his part, he did not care how soon all the violators of the law—no matter what law—expatriated themselves, or were expatriated, rather than they should be tolerated in the non-observance of the law. Well that stirred me up, and I said: 'I beg, Sir (addressing the Speaker), to tell the hon. baronet opposite that I come from a people whose pride is in our laws, and to get them abrogated and repealed; to suffer, if needs be, but not to evade, where there is the arm of authority on one side, and (in the judgment of that people) the voice of God on the other.'

"To-day there is nothing in the world. I suppose, upon which opinion is more varied—and, consequently, upon which practice is more varied—than in what we call medical science. I am heretic enough to believe that there is no such thing yet as medical science. What I am prepared to object to and vote against in the House of Commons is this. That every change of medical opinion, by whomsoever advocated—I don't care whether it be by the majority of medical men—shall be followed by compulsion and penalty upon those who, equally desirous of the truth (and many of whom are equally able to investigate the truth), come to a conclusion different from those medical men. . . .

"For some ten years I was in business in London, and during that time almost every year I had my goods seized for Church-rates. (Cheers, and a voice: 'Why did you not obey the law?'—Because I had a conscientious objection to the law to which the penalty was attached, and with a free heart and a firm voice I said, 'I will pay the penalty.') On each occasion I had a truck at my door to carry goods from out the warehouse, because I would not obey a law which I believed to be wrong. . . .

"There is always a just way of opposing an unjust law and the penalty: and when the penalty is inflicted against the convictions of such meetings as these, against men of the character I have described, that law must go, as the law for Church-rates has done. It must be stripped of its compulsory provisions. When so stripped, the subject itself will probably have a yet more and more searching investigation."

MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL.

ESPRIT DE CORPS.

FIVE or six years ago a daughter of mine, five years old, was revaccinated on the right arm, at about two o'clock in the afternoon. About five o'clock she complained of pain and stiffness in the right arm, the pain extending to the fingers. About eight o'clock the pain and stiffness had extended to the right leg, so that she had difficulty in putting her right foot to the ground. By one o'clock next morning she was in frightful convulsions. Instead of being relieved, the doctors quite giving her up. In the course of a day or two the usual vaccination eruption broke out, but not only in the vaccinated spot. It broke out on the legs and on different parts of the body.

There was much discussion about the case, which ended by my writing a pamphlet and so forcing it into a law court. Medical men from London and elsewhere were examined in the witness-box, and they swore that the illness had nothing, as it seemed to them, to do with the vaccination. Numbers of medical men were in the court, and various were the opinions expressed by them. One said it was a case of scarlatina, another that it was pappara, another that it was eczema, another that it was typhoidal, and another that it was a mere case of ordinary indigestion, whilst one of them was inclined to believe that it was a terrible disease called cerebro-spinal-meningitis—the only case of it that had ever been known in England. It is true that one of the medical men had stated privately to the parents that of course the illness had been caused by the vaccination; but when asked by the solicitor employed in the case to repeat this in the witness-box, he refused to do so. Great is the force of professional pressure, professional rules, and professional spirit de corps.—Fashions of the Day. By Henry Strickland Constable.
DEPUTATION TO MR. T. FRY, M.P. FOR DARLINGTON.

On Saturday, 27th November, a deputation numbering about fifty members and friends of the Darlington Anti-Vaccination League, waited upon Mr. Fry at his residence, Woodburn, Darlington, to place before him the grounds upon which they urged him to support any action in Parliament for the amelioration or repeal of the Vaccination Acts.

The deputation was introduced by Mr. John Morrell, the Mayor of Darlington, who, in a short speech, detailed his own objection to the Acts which, he said, he had not obeyed in the case of his own children—all of whom were unvaccinated. He also stated that on political grounds he considered the Acts indefensible.

Mr. Samuel Forthergill expressed his strong conviction that the Acts were wrong in every way. They were quite inoperative with regard to the "butcher's shop" the theory supposed to give from small-pox. In the disease of small-pox there is a distinct epidemic tendency, and it was, therefore, no wonder if there should be times of comparative absence of the disorder; but the fact was that in times when it was epidemic the vaccinated, who were supposed to be protected, were the great bulk of the victims. In this connection, not only was the experience of London, Edinburgh, and Dublin the same as that of foreign cities such as Berlin, but in Berlin itself, where even re-vaccination had long been practised, it was stated that the victims of small-pox in the great epidemic were much more numerous than in London, where 7876 died in the one year 1871. The case of Leicester was a very striking one. The deaths of persons suffering from small-pox having declined till in 1870 the medical officer boasted that they had abolished the disease by vaccination; yet, the following year, upwards of 200 died in the town from the disease which he superstitiously believed they had banished. Beside this, it was a fact that various diseases were transmitted by the rite, and he understood some instances of this would be laid before their member.

Some instances were here laid before Mr. Fry of contamination of a very grave and, in one or two cases, sickening character; Mr. Fry taking names and notes of some of the worst cases. The recital of these wrongs was accompanied by a reference to the conviction of a "butcher's shop," the feeling of the injured parents as to the tyranny and wrong done to them and their children being strongly echoed by the group of earnest men assembled. The recital moved Mr. Fry, and although he objected to the term "butcher's shop," he asked if nothing could be done to mitigate the dangers of the operation and the attendant evils by altering the system and vaccinating at home.

Mr. A. Wheeler followed, showing the complete break-down of the protection theory, enforcing the assertion that smallpox could not be banished by admissions of Mr. Ceely, Dr. Ballard, and Dr. Gregory, and exposing the falseness of Jennerian claims by an appeal to the Hospital experience of the last ten years—details compiled from some twenty-five hospital reports being handed to Mr. Fry. In conclusion, he asked how any head that could be moved by facts, or any heart that could be moved to pity, could refuse to concede the claims of the deputation.

Mr. Gibbs then proceeded to show that the statistical argument in favour of the diminution of virulence in the vaccinated was unfounded, or rather that it was the result of a classification by the marks which were obliterated in the worst cases; the result being that the worst cases came to be tabulated as unvaccinated, without there being any proof of the fact. He appealed to the utterances of great authorities like Ricord on the question of vaccine-syphilis as settling the question of compulsion, since the danger was in 1882 acknowledged by him to be so terrible that if real it must put a stop to vaccination by constraint. The dangers Ricord feared are now recognised and the highest authorities, Hutchinson and Ballard, etc., have openly confessed their reality. It follows, said Mr. Gibbs, that we should act upon the warning of Ricord, and cease compelling the practice.

Mr. G. T. Forster urged Mr. Fry to support any action Mr. P. A. Taylor may take in the House in the direction of the repeal of the Vaccination Acts, as urged upon him by the previous speakers. And he then went into the question to be raised by Mr. T. Burt, M.P., who, on the estimates, will move that the sum (£16,000 last year) voted for vaccine "awards" be left out. Mr. Forster urged that if awards were properly spent they would be spent by the same authority—the Guardians—who voted the payment, and objected to the paying twice over for one performance. It was shown that the awards were mere bribes since the payments were so dealt out as to appear quite to exclude the idea of merit.

The other speakers more or less followed on the same ground, but two hours barely sufficed for this expression of earnest protest, personal experience of mischief, and plea for justice and common-sense instead of the superstition enforced by Act of Parliament.

One gentleman, although not entirely objecting to vaccination as a failure, objected to be told what medical treatment he should pursue, and being opposed to risking the consequences, stated that he had several times been fined for this exercise of parental care. Another showed fourteen summonses which he had answered in court; and in respect of this phase of the question Mr. Fry stated that he was entirely opposed to more than one fine, no matter what was its value. And he, further, stated that if the deputation were correct (and no one could deny that they appeared to have made a study of their case) the whole practice should be left to the option of parents. And while he was not prepared to give any pledge to the deputation, yet he trusted that any fresh light that could be shown would be presented to him. If he became convinced that vaccination was wrong, he should not shrink from giving full effect to his views in Parliament.

A. W.
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SMALL-POX is a member of the group of diseases described as zymotic, which originate in unwholesome conditions of life, and in common are diminished and prevented by the reduction and removal of those conditions.

In times when the laws of health were imperfectly understood, the fanciful discovery was made that by poisoning the blood with the virus of small-pox or cow-pox, a future attack of small-pox might be escaped. While many kindred superstitions in medical practice have been discredited and forgotten, Vaccination, because it was endowed by the State, has survived, and has entered into legislation, and is enforced with fine and imprisonment. It is in vain for Nonconformists to plead that they do not believe that Vaccination has any power to prevent or to mitigate small-pox: they are told they may believe what they like, but that vaccinated they must be, for the benefit of the rite is settled beyond dispute, and that only fools and fanatics venture to question what has been irrevocably determined.

It is to attack and overthrow this monstrous tyranny that the LONDON SOCIETY has been established. The members desire to enlighten the public mind as to the history of Vaccination, as to its injury in communicating and intensifying other diseases, and as to its failure to avert the malady against which it is invoked.

Some, too, whilst disinclined to discuss Vaccination as a medical question, or to surrender confidence in its prophylaxis, are opposed to its compulsory infliction. They maintain that every remedy should be left to justify itself by its own efficacy, and that of all prescriptions the last which requires extraneous assistance is Vaccination; for its reputation is based on the fact that its subjects are secure from small-pox, and in that security may abide indifferent to those who choose to neglect its salvation. Even nurses in small-pox hospitals, it is said, when efficiently vaccinated and re-vaccinated, live unaffected in the variolous atmosphere. Therefore, they hold that to compare an unvaccinated person to a nuisance, as is frequently done, is to make use of an epithet that implicitly denies the virtue ascribed to Vaccination: a nuisance being a voluntary danger or annoyance which another cannot conveniently avoid. They also hold that to establish any medical prescription, and to create interests identified with that prescription, is to erect a bar to improvement; for it is obvious that any novelty in the treatment of small-pox must, in the constitution of human nature, meet with resistance from those whose emoluments are vested in the established practice.

The LONDON SOCIETY, therefore, claims to enlist the energies of those who resist Vaccination as useless and mischievous, and of those who, true to their faith in liberty, would leave its acceptance to the discretion of the individual. In the controversy into which they enter, they propose to employ all the familiar agencies wherewith in England revolutions are effected in the public mind and in Parliament; and they appeal with confidence for the sympathy and support of their countrymen. The Vaccination Acts under which they suffer have not been enacted with the full cognizance of the nation, but have been forced through indifferent Parliaments by the persistency of medical faction. The members of the SOCIETY are confident that as soon as the truth about Vaccination is fully known and appreciated, the freedom they contend for will be conceded without fear, and that posterity will view with amazement the outrage upon human right and reason that is at present committed under the shadow of English liberty.
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NOTES ON THE TIME.

The persistent attempts that have been made to create panic over the increase of small-pox in London have so far met with little success. What evidently is wanted is to drive the people in flocks to the doctors for re-vaccination. The "roaring trade" that was done during the epidemic of 1871 is remembered with favour, and such another "good time" is earnestly prayed for. It is lucrative work vaccinating troops of terrified middle and upper class Londoners. They hear of "carefully selected vaccine" with touching simplicity; drop their guineas with grateful alacrity; and retire persuaded that they are fortified for at least seven years from possibility of infection. Here we see old sorcery and witchcraft under new forms without essential difference.

Some time ago Mr. Edwin Chadwick complained that the whole attention of the medical department of the Local Government Board was concentrated on the prevention of small-pox by means of vaccination, in apparent forgetfulness that there were far more fatal diseases than small-pox, which was only an epidemic of the fifth magnitude; and that while the expenditure of the department had been doubled, there was nowhere to be found any town the death-rate of which had recently been reduced. Mr. Chadwick's complaint remained unanswered because it was unanswerable. What used to be sanitary reform, an operation against all disease, and especially zymotic disease, has been gradually degenerated into a persistent endeavour, as for a wager, to raise the percentage of vaccinations over the country. What is expected to ensure when the vaccinations cover the births we are left to conjecture. Not even Dr. Stevens or Dr. Ballard pretend that small-pox would thereby be extirpated. The department seems possessed by a blind lust for vaccination irrespective of consequences, and when primary vaccination is raised to the possible maximum, will probably try to make another business of re-vaccination.

We were asked the other day, "Why! what would you have? On what ground do you object to vaccinators pursuing their calling like other tradesmen?" On the tradesman's ground, we replied, we do not object, save as to the character of the trade itself; which, if hurtful, is not defensible even on commercial terms. But we have to remember that vaccinators resent the designation of tradesmen. They work, they assert, for the public good; their fees, they say, are accidents of their profession, and that we only manifest our own baseness when we ascribe to them mercenary motives. "And why," it was rejoined, "should such claims fret you? Do you not see that they too are part of the vaccinator's stock-in-trade? If you take them seriously, you simply prove how shrewdly he reckons on the multitude of fools. A vaccinator recommends vaccination as a grocer does sugar or a cutler razors, and if he happens to lay on humbug a little heavier, do not be too severe with him. Business is business all the world over. If you do not like vaccination, refuse it, denounce it, but leave those alone who make their living out of it. The most hopeless subjects for conversion are those whose interests are committed to any system. Even when they have no faith in it themselves, they fight for it as if they had. Therefore, I say, leave the vaccinators alone. It was said truly in the Inquirer last month, that the battle against vaccination must be fought outside the medical profession. It would be as reasonable for teetotallers to expect assistance from publicans as for you to expect help from medical men."

Whether vaccinators may care to be thus apologised for is questionable; but all will allow that if the use of alcohol were under discussion, we should neither look for impartial evidence...
from its vendor, nor that they should deprecate its use. Setting aside however, those who are peculiarly interested in vaccination, we have to protest against the behaviour of numerous editors, and other writers, who have no opinion about vaccination except what they derive from medical men, and who yet write and argue as from personal experience and independent conviction. We may often detect these gentlemen in the newspapers by their extravagance—they say more for vaccination than vaccinators themselves, and evolve history and statistics of a highly romantic order from their imaginations. Now whilst we cannot expect that many should make a special study of vaccination, pro and contra, we may reasonably maintain that where an editor knows nothing more of the subject than what he has received under medical authority, he should either preserve the grace of silence, or limit himself to the exact reproduction of what he has been told.

Even those who decline to enter into the vaccination question may surely be persuaded to refer to the weekly reports of the health of London, and to observe how trifling a factor is small-pox in the death-rate; and therefore how absurd is the outcry whenever there is an increase in the prevalence of that disease. Why should a bogey be made of small-pox? The deaths from typhoid and scarlet fever, from measles and whooping-cough, rise and fall without any alarm; but if there be an increase in small-pox, there is instantly organised excitement—manifestoes from the Asylums Board, opening of hospitals, and newspaper paragraphs designed to stimulate public terror. We have no favour for small-pox. In common with other forms of zymotic disease, it is preventible, and its existence is disgraceful to any community; but to single it out for pre-eminent horror is utterly absurd. If small-pox be ever so bad, the mortality of London will not be increased.

We shall merely have a certain number of deaths transferred from other forms of zymotic disease, and not improbably the total death-rate diminished.

Mr. Chadwick's test of sanitary improvement is the only valid test, namely, the reduction of the general death-rate; but to effect such a reduction implies hard thinking, hard work, and executive ability; and no one will dispute the assertion that the officials at the Foreign Office are as capable and as likely to originate and develop sanitary measures as the present medical officers of the Local Government Board. It is the way with all officials to subsist into routine, and to draw their pay at the cost of least exertion to themselves. And, as Mr. Chadwick says, sanitary reform has been transformed by these worthies into vaccination—the easiest and laziest method of pocketing the public money under pretence of sanitary service that could possibly be devised. The remarkable part of the business is, the facility with which the press and the public lend themselves to the imposture. It is as if it were said, "Save us, O save us from small-pox, and we care for nothing else!" And this is what sanitary administration has come to in this enlightened generation!

THE MEMBERS FOR BRIGHTON.

Mr. Calke Pocock took occasion to question Messrs. Holland and Marriott at their meeting with their constituents on 17th November, as to whether they would be ready to support a measure for the entire repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Acts.

Mr. J. B. Holloway in reply said he certainly disagreed with the repeated prosecution of offenders against the Vaccination Acts, because he thought in such cases the punishment amounted to something beyond what was necessary; but with regard to the total repeal of the Vaccination Laws, he thought, as he had before told them, that before they could ask the Houses of Parliament to undertake anything of the kind, they must have an inquiry into the subject, and he should be perfectly willing to support any fair and impartial inquiry.

Mr. W. T. Marriott, Q.C., replied that with regard to the Vaccination Acts he agreed with what Mr. Holland had said, and he would say to Mr. Pocock, whom he knew to be very much in earnest on the matter, that a better friend than Mr. Dodson, the President of the Local Government Board, he could not find. Mr. Dodson was a friend of the poor, and the measure which he had undertaken with reference to the vaccination question would receive, as far as possible, his support.

M.'s. ON THE VACCINATION QUESTION.—
A pamphlet is in the course of preparation (to be issued by the London Society) containing the opinions of Medical men in all countries on the Vaccination question. Those of our readers who are in possession of important testimonies, particularly of the Directors of Small-Pox Hospitals, Medical Officers to English or Foreign Governments, Medical Inspectors of Vaccination, Presidents of Medical Associations, Public Vaccinators, Chiefs of Children's Hospitals, and others whose position renders their opinions of special value, are requested to communicate with Mr. Tebb, 7 Albert Road, Regents' Park, London, N.W., as early as possible.
THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XXIII.

BIRCH, GOLDSBRO AND BROWN.

It is part of the Jennerian legend that the introduction of vaccination was resisted by prejudice, fury and fanaticism, and that the practice made its way by sheer force of its proven efficacy. The statement is widely at variance with facts. Vaccination was accepted with instant acclamation by the medical profession, the royal family, and the public as an infallible and harmless preventive of small-pox; and the subsequent course of experience was to disprove alike its harmlessness and infallibility. That in some cases vaccination was encountered with absurdity and violence lay in the nature of things, even as it was advocated with absurdity, violence and prevarication. It is always easy to raise a laugh by the exhibition of the extravagance of either side in a hot dispute, but to what purpose? It would have been no cause for surprise if some had been moved to scorn the facile credulity with which Jenner's magical prescription was so rashly accepted, but the world to which he appealed had no scientific acquaintance with the laws of health, and it was in nowise marvellous that, convinced of the prophylaxis of inoculated small-pox, they should have been overcome by the plausibility of inoculated cow-pox. Yet were not all overcome, nor were all who resisted the popular craze furious. There was John Birch, for example, surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital, who with calmness and cogency steadily protested against the introduction of "the new diseases styled cow-pox;" and we may read his letters and pamphlets and fail to note a fiery epithet or unkindly imputation. People who talk as if all who opposed Jenner were steeped in ignorance and perversity can know nothing of John Birch.

Although satisfied with variolous inoculation, he had no objection to vaccination in itself. He thought it fair that experiments with cow-pox should be tried, and the verdict of experience submitted to; but he complained that experience was anticipated and success proclaimed ere it was possible for the truth to be known, whilst every objector was overwhelmed with abuse. As an illustration of the unwarrantable persuasion that prevailed in favour of the new practice before there was time to justify it, Birch mentions that at the anniversary dinner at Guy's Hospital in 1802, he was surprised to find the usual business set aside to secure signatures to Jenner's petition for a vote of money from Parliament, and that after dinner toasts, songs and compliments in honour of Vaccinias were the order of the day. Booksellers, he relates, declined to publish anything against vaccination, and editors of newspapers and magazines would not suffer a word to appear to its disparagement. Those who resorted to doctors and hospitals for inoculation with small-pox got cow-pox instead in spite of assertions to the contrary. Church vied with chapel in recommending the new practice. The Archbishop of Canterbury was called upon to issue a letter directing the clergy to recommend vaccination from the pulpit, but with the wariness of his office, he sent his chaplain to Birch to hear the other side, and the chaplain retired with the judicious observation, "His Grace must not commit the Church." Many clergymen, however, not only preached vaccination, but practised it with restless assiduity. Dr. Erasmus Darwin was not without hope that baptism and vaccination might be associated. He wrote to Jenner, Derby, 24th February, 1802—

"As by the testimony of innumerable instances, the Vaccine Disease is so favourable to young children, in a little time it may occur that the christening and vaccination of children may always be performed on the same day."

The Vaccine Disease so favourable to young children! The sentiment affords a vivid glimpse of the prevalent enchantment. "The idea of connecting religious services with vaccination," says Baron, "had occurred to several individuals in this country as well as on the Continent."

"I viewed with indignant scorn," wrote Birch, "the ungenerous artifice adopted by the Jennerian Society of sticking up in every Station House, in the Vestries of fanatical Chapels, and in Sunday Schools, that false Comparative View of the effects of Small-Pox and Cow-Pox representing to the gaping multitude a frightful picture of Inoculation with the supposed misery attendant on it; and exhibiting representations equally false and exaggerated of the blessings of Vaccination."

The women were not behind the clergy in diffusing vaccine salvation. They were Jenner's most devoted allies. He took pains to teach ladies to operate with "a light hand" so as not to draw blood, and boasted that one of his pupils had ten thousand patients to her credit, rescued from the terror and peril of small-pox!

As Birch observed, it was not a question of medicine or of surgery that he and others had to deal with, but an outburst of enthusiasm in which the methods and arguments of science

were swept heedlessly away. Any testimony to
the credit of vaccination was accepted with
alacrity, whilst the facts to its discredit were
denied or explained away. This recklessness of
procedure was most painfully manifest in the
conduct of the Committee of the House of
Commons which sat on Jenner's first petition
for money in 1802—

"The number of witnesses in support of the
application," writes Birch, "was 40, but out of
the forty 23 spoke from mere hearsay, and not
from knowledge acquired in practice; while the
three who spoke against it were heard im-
patiently, though they corroborated their evi-
dence with proofs."

Birch wished to know what cow-pox was.
Jenner had said it was derived from horse-
grease, but "that origin is proved to be errone-
sous, and is now given up, even by his best
friends. On all hands it is admitted," Birch
continues, "that it is not a disease of the cow,
but communicated to the cow by the milker.
No cow that is allowed to suckle her own calf
ever has the complaint." What, then, is the
disease in the milker? asked Birch. Is it small-
came to St. Thomas's Hospital from an adjacent
dairy with a hand and arm covered with ulcer-
tions. He said several of the milkers and the
cows' teats were affected in the same way, and
he was told they had got cow-pox. Birch called
one of his country pupils and asked him what
was wrong with the man. "It is itch—rank
itch," was his reply. A box of Jackson's oint-
ment for the itch was given to him, and at the
end of a week he reappeared at the Hospital
cured. If cow-pox be itch, argued Birch—

"Then if a patient be inoculated with the
disorder, though it may suspend the capacity for
small-pox for a season in the constitution, it
will ultimately prove no security."—

Which was to say, that it was not probable that
small-pox and itch could occur together, and
that a person inoculated with itch would pass
through the variolous test successfully. In this
connection we may recall the fact that Jenner
found it impossible to vaccinate a regiment at
Colchester, the men with their women and
children all being afflicted with itch.

Still farther to complicate the mystery of
cow-pox, Jenner began to describe it as genuine
and spurious, but which was the one and which
was the other he left in bewildering uncertainty.

Said Birch—

"Though Dr. Jenner could not tell us what
Cow-Pox was, he soon came forward to inform
us that it was of two sorts—the one genuine and
harmless, the other spurious and hurtful.

"Spurious Cow-Pox is a term I do not admit
of. I know of no such thing as spurious Small-
Pox, spurious Measles, spurious Luces Venerea,
spurious Scrophula."

Birch's objection to spurious cow-pox was
forcible, but what in the innocence of his heart
he took for a blunder in 1806 was proved out of
Jenner's own mouth to be a deliberate dodge in
1807. Pressed by the Committee of the College
of Physicians to explain what he meant by
Spurious Cow-Pox, he had to own that he knew
nothing of such a malady, and that he had only
meant to describe irregular effects of cow-
pox on the arms of the vaccinated! In other
words, when vaccination turned out badly, he
had found it convenient to ascribe the disaster
to spurious vaccine! The policy revealed in
this shameless avowal we find cynically justified
in its results by Dr. Mannsell, who, in a well
known volume, wrote—

"The term imperfect or spurious vaccination
is frequently to be met with in books, and has
been the cause of no small degree of confusion
in practice, although, at the same time, it has
frequently afforded the practitioner an excellent
asylum against the storms now and then arising
out of failures in the protective power of the
vaccine disease."*

From out the muddle as to the origin of cow-
pox and its genuine and spurious varieties,
Birch demanded, What had Jenner discovered?
It was not that cow-pox prevented small-pox,
for that had been asserted by dairy-folk for
generations, and disregarded by physicians
because proved to be untrue. What then was
it? Let him define his discovery that they
might know how to respect it. Let him explain
why it was forbidden to inoculate from the
cow. Was genuine cow-pox invisible and to be
taken on trust? Or was the disease so virulent
on its first communication that it had to be
molarized in the body of some victim ere it was
fit for public use? Birch asked these questions
as we continue to ask What is cow-pox? Is it
a disease of the cow? Or is it communicated
to the cow by man or horse? However
definite the answers, the contradictions are
equally definite, and the authorities to all
appearance equally good.

Practical men answered for Jenner, as they
presume to answer at this day, "Whatever may
be the origin of cow-pox, we know that vaccina-

* A Practical Treatise on the Management and Diseases
of Children. By Richard T. Evanson, M.D. and Henry
Mannsell, M.D. Professors in the Royal College of Surgeons
Ireland. 2nd Ed., p. 422. Dublin: 1858.
tion is harmless, and that it prevents small-pox; and more we neither demand nor care to inquire." The consummate credulity and conceit of such practical men is that stupidity against which, says Goethe, even the gods are powerless. It was practical men who "on the mere show of reason" accepted vaccination before it could be tested; and it was practical men who constituted the Committee of the House of Commons in 1802, and on most superficial evidence, says Birch—

"Recommended Dr. Jenner to the munificence of Parliament for a discovery in practice which was never to prove fatal; which was to excite no new humours or disorders in the constitution; which was to be, not only a perfect security against small-pox, but would, if universally adopted, prevent its recurrence for ever."

These promises made in advance for vaccination were speedily and notoriously belied. The harmlessness of the practice was found to be illusory—

"It gave rise," wrote Birch, "to new and painful disorders. It was sometimes followed by itchy eruptions; sometimes by singular ulcerations; and sometimes by glandular swellings of a nature wholly distinct from scrofula, or any other known glandular disease. Eruptions of the skin are most frequent, and may be heard of in every parish of London; and whether Vaccination shall be called the Cow Evil, or the Jennerian Evil, posterity will have to determine."

The non-fatality of the practice was also speedily confused. The disorders it excited caused numerous deaths—from erysipelas especially. It was then said, as it continues to be said to this day, "Yes, but it was not vaccination, but erysipelas the patient died of"—a form of words that seems to satisfy many minds accounted rational. Birch holding by his own experience mentions three or four cases of death resulting from vaccination, and adds—

"These cases were as favourably palliated and ingeniously excused as they could be; but it is admitted that each patient was punctured by a lancet infected with what is called Cow-Pox; each arm so punctured became inflamed and ulcerated, and each patient died."

The Variolous Test, which was used so unscrupulously to win converts to vaccination, was proved by the Inoculators to be untrustworthy. They had no difficulty in variolating the vaccinated. When it was discovered that vaccination was no guard against small-pox, many of the vaccinated resorted to inoculation with small-pox, and they "took" as readily as did their unvaccinated acquaintance. Five in one family, the Hignells of Cheltenham, vaccinated by Jenner were variolated by Mr. Freeman, and small-pox resulted in the ordinary course. Nothing indeed become plainer than that the vaunted Variolous Test was a mere conjuring trick, and the more judicious vaccinators ceased to refer to it.

The promise that the vaccinated would remain for ever secure from small-pox Birch had no difficulty with. It was seen to be fallacious on all sides. Londoners vaccinated by the most approved operators caught small-pox, and died precisely as did the unvaccinated. "Every post," said Birch in 1804, "brings me accounts of the failures of vaccination." As the failures multiplied, so did the excuses. There was the prime excuse of genuine and spurious cow-pox. If vaccination failed, it could only be through the inadvertent use of spurious vaccine. Jenner had taught that one puncture was all-sufficient for protection, but as one was not found effective, it was asserted that two or three were requisite for absolute safety. Many, it was alleged, had been imperfectly operated upon by those who did not understand the disorder, and the practice of the women and clergy and other busybodies was thrown into discredit, although at the outset their services and testimonies had been blazoned abroad as indisputable; but Birch made this conclusive answer—

"It cannot be meant to class Mr. Wachsell, Apothecary to the Small-Pox Hospital, or Mr. Ring, the Accoucheur, among ignorant and equivocal practitioners; and yet from the patients vaccinated by these two persons I could bring instance of more failures, more deaths, and more diseases than have occurred in the practice of any other two persons who have come within my knowledge."

Many, moreover, who had been vaccinated by Jenner's own hand fell victims to the disease, and he was so pestered with awkward questions, says Birch, "that to avoid the perplexing appeals that were made to him daily, and the messages that were perpetually sent requiring him to visit untoward cases, he retired from London." Subsequently he had to forsake Cheltenham for the same reason. The convictions of quackery were too numerous for his endurance.

Having proved that vaccination did not prevent small-pox, whilst it was a frequent cause of illness and death, Birch held up to derision the fine promises wherewith its advocates had beguiled the people—

"Were an architect to undertake to build an edifice which should be firm in its foundations;
all its rooms wind and water tight; and such as might be inhabited with perfect security; if, before the edifice were well finished, the foundations were discovered to be rotten; and if in less than seven years, several apartments had fallen in and killed those who occupied them, while in a great number of rooms, the wind or rain was continually beating in, could I be blamed for declaring that the architect had broken his contract, and that the edifice ought no longer to be inhabited? Certainly not. Why then am I to be told that I am acting perversely when I re- monstrate against the practice of cow-pox? for such an edifice as I have described, so rotten in its foundations, so ill built, so ruinous, is Vaccination."

Those who take success as the test of truth may say that Birch was unsuccessful in his contention; but he was not unsuccessful. Vaccination in London was discredited, and the imposture abated, as the report of the College of Surgeons in 1807 attests. Where retained, it was not so much as a preventive as a mitigator of small-pox, its advocates being content to occupy the safe position that it made milder a disease the severity of which was unknown.

Birch died in 1815. His sister reprinted his pamphlets and letters against vaccination (from which have come our citations*), and erected a monument to his memory in St. Margaret's, Rood Lane, Fenchurch Street, the inscription on which is noteworthy. It runs as follows—

**SACRED**

To the Memory of

JOHN BIRCH, Esquire,

Many years an eminent Surgeon of this Metropolis; who died on the 3rd February, 1815, Aged 60 Years, and whose earthly remains lie deposited under the Pulpit and Desk.

In his professional Character, as humane as he was skilful, he permitted not the daily sight of wounds and sores, Afflictions and wretchedness of every kind, to blunt the edge of his natural feelings. For the sufferings of his fellow creatures:

But, contemning a too hasty reliance on untried Theories, Spurning of the Knife—abhorring unnecessary Torture—A foe to vancr, cruel, or dangerous experiment, Averse from rash operation, and the destruction of parts, Redeemable by patient and judicious care—He erected for himself a high and distinguished reputation, on the solid, and only secure Basis of ENLIGHENED EXPERIENCE; Stimulated throughout Life by a wise and Christian-like Ambition, to cure, not maim—preserve, and not destroy.

Mankind is indebted to him For a more intimate acquaintance with the powers of ELECTRICITY; By his own ingenious and improved application of which He performed many remarkable and almost unheoped for cures. But the Practice of COW-POXING, which first became general in his Day, Undaunted by the overawing influence of Power and Populoc, And the voice of Nations, He uniformly, and until death, perseveringly opposed;

* An Appeal to the Public on the Hazard and Peril of Vaccination, written by the late John Birch, Esq., together with his Reasons for uniformly objecting to Vaccination: and other Tracts by the same Author. 3rd Edition. London: 1817.

Conscientiously believing it to be a Public Infallibility, Framed with peril of the most mischievous consequences to Mankind. Whether right or wrong, Truth will most surely determine—MAN'S MERE OPINIONS MUST EVER BE LIABLE TO ERROR; BUT BY THE MOTIVES THAT SWAY HIS HEART SHALL HE ALONE BE JUDGED.

To perpetuate the remembrance Of Qualities so excellent, PENELLOPE BIRCH, His affectionate and only surviving Sister, Hath raised this Monument: Not out of a worldly and vain-glorious Pride of Affinity; But in order to hand down an Example worthy of imitation To succeeding Ages.

William Goldson, member of the London College of Surgeons, practising at Portsea, published a pamphlet in 1804* wherein he set forth a number of instances within his own experience of small-pox following vaccination by infection or inoculation. He did not turn against vaccination, but suggested that its prophylaxis might neither be so certain or so enduring as at first asserted. Vaccination, he pointed out, had been carried into practice on a wave of enthusiasm, and it was not unreasonable to expect that on closer acquaintance some of the claims made for it should be subject to modification. Indeed so much was already admitted; for failures had led to the discrimination of spurious from genuine cow-pox, and to the issue of new instructions as to the period of taking vaccine, "on which point, it was now said, depended the whole success of the operation." Thus what was originally set forth as an operation for which any novice was competent, had developed into one of considerable delicacy with serious liability to miscarriage. Goldson, therefore, had fair reason to believe that his own observations and suggestions would meet with candid consideration, and, if verified, serve for general guidance in the work of vaccination.

It is unnecessary to recite Goldson's cases. Interesting at the time, they are now commonplace. He found that inoculation with small-pox was possible at an interval after vaccination, and that infection with small-pox was equally possible under the like circumstances. One case is noteworthy for its connection with Jenner. A seaman, named Clarke, was successfully vaccinated on 4th November, 1800, and, returning from a voyage to the West Indies was put to the Variolous Test on 24th March, 1802, when he sickened with small-pox and was sent to Haslar. To prove that his malady was

* Cases of Small-Pox subsequent to Vaccination, with Facts and Observations read before the Medical Society at Portsmouth, 29th March, 1804: addressed to the Directors of the Vaccine Institution. By William Goldson. Portsea: 1804.
really small-pox, several persons were variolated from him. The committee of the House of Commons was sitting on Jenner's first claim for public money, and Goldson wrote to Jenner to come to Haslar and see Clarke for himself; but Jenner was too astute to cumber himself with difficulties at a time when so much cash was in question. The case was mentioned to the Committee, but was treated as of no moment in presence of what they were pleased to regard as overwhelming evidence as to the perpetual virtue of vaccination.

Goldson's was a modest pamphlet—conjectural rather than demonstrative. He ventured to think it was possible that the efficacy of vaccine might be weakened by transmission from arm to arm, and that security might be restored by reversion to the cow—

"The casual Cow-Pox is produced by virus immediately from the animal; while the inoculated disease is the effect of new matter generated by the action of the other on the human subject. Whether that new matter be possessed of the power to produce the same permanent properties as the parent virus, time alone can decide."

He likewise suggested that horse-grease might be inoculated on the nipple of the milk mare, and the virus used for equinization. These and other points were advanced with a philosophic grace that ought to have commanded respect; but, on the contrary, his pamphlet was received with a howl of fury, and its author denounced as an ill-conditioned fellow—ignorant, prejudiced, pig-headed. It was safer to be a pronounced anti-vaccinist than a vaccinator and harbour doubt as to any article of the Jennerian faith. Ring plied his bludgeon over the heretic, and Jenner wrote of him with malicious insolence—"All his reasoning was erroneous;" "his arrogance was increased by attention;" "he obstinately held a veil before his eyes, and would not behold the vaccine light;" "one might as well contend with a blind man on the nature of a prism;" and so on. Goldson's offence was that he laid his finger on some of the weaker points of vaccination; that his sight was too keen, and his reasoning too cogent. At this day the questions between him and Jenner are all decided by vaccinators in Goldson's favour.*

Perhaps the most able attack on the practice of vaccination was delivered by Thomas Brown, surgeon, Musselburgh; and it is much to be regretted that his book, published in Edinburgh in 1809,* is so little known at this day. Brown had accepted vaccination, carried away, he admitted, by the common enthusiasm, and the unqualified audacity with which its claims were asserted—

"The practice was introduced and recommended to the public by its Author as a perfect antidote and security against small-pox without any exception or reserve, and capable of banishing variola from the catalogue of human misery. I have no hesitation in confessing that I became an early convert and advocate of the new practice; and it is now eight years and a half since I have uniformly advised and practised Vaccination, in which period, I may safely say, I have vaccinated upwards of twelve hundred patients, and have only inoculated three at the positive request of parents. This course I persevered in until the present time, notwithstanding I met with several instances where it appeared to fail in giving security; some about three years after the introduction of the practice; a few more about two years ago; and those which make part of the present volume within the last six months."

An epidemic, in which his own perfectly vaccinated patients fell victims to small-pox, at last opened his eyes to the delusion in which he had so long walked, and to the perversity with which he and others had resisted the light of truth—

"I am convinced from what has passed under my own observation for these last three or four years, that we have been all guilty of rejecting evidence that deserved more attention, in consequence of the strong prepossession which existed, from the very persuasive proof of vaccination resisting inoculation and exposure to infection, and from our judgments being goaded and over-powered with the positive and arbitrary opinions of its abettors. I am now perfectly satisfied, from my mind being under the influence of prejudice and blind to the impression of the fallest evidence, that the last time small-pox was prevalent, I rejected and explained away many cases which were entitled to the most serious attention, and showed myself as violent and unreasonable a partisan as any of my brethren in propagating a practice, which I now have little doubt we must ere long surrender at discretion."

When Brown first saw the vaccinated prostrate with small-pox, he concluded that there must have been some mistake about their vaccination; "for after vaccination it was impossible to contract small-pox;" but the evidence of his senses gradually overcame the phantasy imposed

---

* Baron's Life of Jenner, Vol. II. pp. 239, 245, 249.
upon him, and like an honest man he proclaimed his error, and verified the experiences whereby he had been reluctantly corrected. He set forth with all particulars forty-eight cases of small-pox following vaccination within his own immediate cognizance, and though aware of many cases outside that cognizance, he limited himself to what he could attest with personal assurance. He knew he would be told that the vaccinations had been imperfect, or that what he took for small-pox was some other eruption—

"It is strenuously contended," said Brown, "by nearly every author, and by almost every practicioner, that vaccination is a perfect antidote against small-pox, if the disease be properly communicated; and Dr. Jenner and his relative, Mr. G. Jenner, positively assert, that they have had not one instance of failure in their own practice. They all therefore, and without hesitation, refer the whole series of failures that have been brought forward to the sweeping power of imperfect vaccination, or to the blindness and stupidity of the medical practitioner who cannot distinguish between small-pox and chicken-pox, a rash, or bug-bites."

Nor did Brown rest satisfied with proving that vaccination did not prevent small-pox. He also showed the fallacy of the various tests. He adduced cases in which vaccinated persons had been variolated as if they had never been vaccinated. Also four cases in which vaccination and variolation were effected simultaneously, the diseases running their courses concurrently, proving there was no antagonism between them; and since they could occur together, what reason was left for supposing that one might not succeed the other?

Having found liberty in the truth, he reverted to Jenner's writings, and reading them with opened eyes, he was not slow to detect and to demonstrate the laxity of statement, the contradictions, and absurdities with which they were pervaded. No reply was attempted: no reply, indeed, was possible. The surgeons of the Edinburgh Vaccine Institution issued An Examination of Mr. Brown's Opinions and Statements, but they merely carped over non-essential details, and left the main issues wholly unaffected. What they had to show was that Brown's patients were either unvaccinated, or had not had small-pox; and unable to do this, they were unable to do anything.

Brown remained victor. He did not overthrow vaccination, nor restore variolation, but he did make an end in Scotland of confidence in vaccination as an omnipotent safeguard against small-pox. The rite continued to be practised on humbler terms: "it did no harm: even Mr. Brown allowed that it might keep off small-pox for a time: and there was reason to believe that it tended to make the disease milder when it did occur." When a pretext for fees is established in any profession, it is never surrendered willingly unless for a better. Thirty years after his first publication, in 1842, Brown reaffirmed his position in a series of letters* to Dr. George Gregory, a sympathetic friend, and advised a return to variolation in view of "the acknowledged defects of the Jennerian practice"—a dismal alternative. But it is in vain to expect any man to be much in advance of his time: it suffices for honourable distinction that he be in advance. When Brown commenced practice, small-pox and other fevers were regarded as inevitable as storms and earthquakes, and the knowledge with which we are now so familiar that they are engendered in foul habits andhabitations was for practical purposes unknown. Our reproach is, that knowing so much better, we surrender ourselves to a superstitious observance conceived in days of darkness.

---

THE VACCINATION INQUISITOR.

THE POSITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE REVOLT AGAINST COMPELLARY VACCINATION IN ENGLAND.

A Paper Read by Mr. William Tebb before the International Anti-Vaccination Congress at the Salle des Conferences, Paris, 11th December, 1880.

CONTENTS.—A Political Prophecy.—What the Vaccination Laws in England Impose.—Determined Resistance.—The Keighley Guardians.—The Vaccination Acts Ignored in Keighley and Bingley.—Personal Experience among the Working Classes.—Their Repugnance to Vaccination.—The Magistracy Tainted with Vaccination Heresy.—The National Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League and the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination and their Journals—Parliamentary Opposition to the Existing Laws.—Our Legislators on the Vaccination Question.—Opinions of Members of the Liberal Government.—The Bill for the Abolition of Multiple Penalties.—Medical Opposition.—Mr. Dodson's Rebuff.—Enormous Vested Interests—Sir Thomas Chamber's Estimate—Herbert Spencer—Signs of Progress and Prophecy.

M. Larbee has done me the honour in Le Réveil Médical to allude to the subject of an address delivered by me last winter in London on the "Political Aspect of the Vaccination Question," and to the prediction I ventured to make that the new Parliament then just elected would either amend the Vaccination Acts or repeal them altogether. In England the law does not enforce vaccination vi et armis by taking the child out of the hands of the parent, but it imposes a series of penalties, easily paid by the rich but crushing and ruinous to the poor, with the alternative of imprisonment. Some Anti-Vaccinators have been fined 40 times, with costs imposed on every conviction, while one man (Washington Nye of Chatham) has been imprisoned nine times. So unjust is the law felt to be that often Guardians of the Poor, whose duty it is to initiate the proceedings, refuse to prosecute, and at Keighley almost the entire Board of Guardians were five years ago imprisoned in York Castle for contumacy in this respect. A return just made by the Keighley Board of Guardians shows that for the latter half of 1879, of 538 births there have been only 47 vaccinations, the town containing 80,000 inhabitants; and in Bingley, in the same county, with 25,000 inhabitants, only 16 per cent. are vaccinated. This not owing to indifference, but is entirely owing to the determined hostility of the people to vaccination. In these unvaccinated towns small-pox is of rare occurrence.

In the town of Leicester, with 180,000 inhabitants, which is represented in Parliament by Mr. P. A. Taylor, the revolt against the practice and the law is still more formidable, the present increase of the unvaccinated population being at the rate of 1,000 per annum. Not a single voice is raised to defend the compulsory law, and the dogs is in a rapid state of dissolution. As I have already said, I ventured the opinion that the present Liberal Parliament (elected expressly to carry reforms demanded by the people) would make an end of this oppressive law, which has not inappropriately been compared to the atrocious Fugitive Slave Law, passed thirty years ago, in the United States of America, and it may not be uninteresting to you if I briefly state the grounds for this belief. First of all let me say that the revolt against compulsory vaccination is deep, widespread, and increasing. It is no exaggeration to say that the opponents in numbers far outweigh its supporters, which last are mainly confined to a powerful interested medical profession and those who can be influenced by that profession. It has been my opportunity to travel in every part of England, and to inquire among the mechanics, farm labourers, and working classes generally, who form the bulk of the population, and those almost universally condemn vaccination as a baneful and disgusting practice to which they assent only under compulsion; and in justification of their objection they generally refer to the child of some friend, neighbour, or relative, or sometimes their own, who has been maimed for life or killed outright by vaccination. Dr. Warner, of Ryde, says from his own experience such disasters are often met with in the London hospitals, and he should not believe any medical man who testified to the contrary. A respectable working tradesman in my own parish of St. Pancras, London, told me a few weeks ago, with voice trembling with emotion, that he had lost three children through vaccination, and that he had four children in good health, without blemish, unvaccinated. He begged me not to mention the fact, as the vaccination prosecutions if begun would ruin him. The births of his children were not registered — an expedient adopted by thousands of parents in the metropolis every year in order to escape vaccination prosecutions. Public opposition to vaccination in some towns is reflected on the Magisterial Bench, and in Leicester, Boston, Bedford, Gloucester, Keighley, and other places, magistrates, although feeling bound to administer the law, take care to impose upon anti-vaccinators the smallest possible penalties, such as 6d. and 1s., and in Ireland large numbers of objectors have been fined only 1d. Some magistrates, like Lord Clifton and Sir J. Clarke Jervoise, have vacated their positions on the bench rather than put such a tyrannous law in force. In the town of Leicester the entire Board of Guardians petitioned the Government to be relieved from the odious task of prosecuting their non-vac-
cinating fellow-citizens, and only a few weeks ago a memorial was presented by the Guardians of Stalybridge, likewise showing the dangers of vaccination, and asking what credit, if any, is due to vaccination in controlling small-pox. In most of the large centres of population there are anti-vaccination leagues to carry on the agitation against compulsory vaccination; then there is the central organisation called the National Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League, under the presidency of Mr. William Hume Rotberth, an indefatigable worker, aided by his wife, the hon. secretary, Mrs. Hume Rotberth, who is a corresponding member of this International League. Mrs. Hume Rotberth is editor of the National Anti-Compulsory Vaccination Reporter. This society, by reporting all the cruel prosecutions, recording all important events connected with the movement, and exposing the devices of the medical Trades Union, always on the alert to perpetuate vaccination, has done great service to the cause. The London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, which I have the honour to represent at this Convention, is of recent formation; its aim being to publish and diffuse information on the subject whenever needed, and to assist in guiding this now irrepressible conflict. It organised an important deputation against compulsory vaccination to the Government on the 2nd of last August, and is now getting up lectures and conferences, arranging deputations to members of Parliament, publishing tracts, and sending out literature to all parts of the world. Its opinions are generally represented by the Vaccination Inquirer and Health Review. These organisations are working harmoniously with each other, and while their methods of operation are somewhat different, their great central aim is to obtain the repeal of all Compulsory Vaccination Legislation. The question then naturally presents itself—Is the opposition which I have indicated reflected in the Legislature, or is it only an unrepresented quantity. It would be easy to show that the feeling of repugnance to the existing laws has been exhibited by legislators of every shade of political opinion, and to an extent far beyond which is generally supposed. In 1871 a Committee of the House of Commons, owing to the public dissatisfaction which the law excited, sat upon this question, and every member of that Committee, numbering 17 in all, unanimously recommended that a single fine only for non-vaccination should be imposed. A Bill embodying that resolution passed the House of Commons, and on being sent up to the House of Lords on the last day of the Session, it was defeated by one vote, and that the vote of Dr. Durnford, Bishop of Chichester, who was hurried into the House for that purpose just before the count was taken. I have collected a series of testimonies in a small volume entitled Our Legislators on the Vaccination Question, which some of you have seen, but it would take too long to quote from these generally, and individual opinions, it may be thought, do not reckon for much. I shall therefore limit my references to the opinions of members of the Government, and you will see by these quotations that I am not without grounds for the prophecy I have ventured to make as to the entire abolition of the compulsory Acts. First of all, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, the head of Her Majesty’s Government, said, in a letter to Mr. Henry Pitman in 1876, “I regard compulsory and penal provisions, such as those of the Vaccination Act, with mistrust and misgiving, and were I engaged on an inquiry I should require very clear proof of their necessity before giving them my approval; but I am not able to undertake to enter upon an examination of the question.” This opinion was confirmed in a communication to myself, 29th September, 1877. Again in House of Commons in 1878, in the debate on Mr. Pease’s Bill for Abolishing Cumulative Penalties for Non-Vaccination, the same distinguished statesman said, “The great inequality of the Vaccination Law, as it stood, was the strongest reason for doing what they could to mitigate its severity. The cumulative penalties were a trifle to wealthy men, but to the poor they were of a crushing character. Even if they reduced the penalties to a limited amount, they would, under all the circumstances, be a much severer charge to the poor man than to the rich.” And, farther, Mr. Gladstone said, “The dissatisfaction of the dissentients was of an extremely acute character; its range did not appear to be diminishing, and they were not without their journal and their organisation. The tables of honourable members groaned under the number of anti-vaccination pamphlets and papers. The question was in a state which he thought the House could not altogether pass by.” Mr. Gladstone, once having made up his mind as to the urgency of reform, is not the man to go from it, though, as with all other statesmen, his intention may be thwarted for a time by powerful vested interests. Next in importance, and carrying weight whenever made, are the trenchant utterances of the Chancellor of
the Duchy of Lancaster, Mr. John Bright, who
says, "The law which inflicts penalty after
penalty on a parent who is unwilling to have
his child vaccinated is monstrous, and ought to
be repealed." The Secretary of State for the
Home Department, Sir William Harcourt, in a
reply to a deputation at Derby during the early
part of this year, said, "The question of com-
pulsory vaccination is entirely one of evidence,
and I will give the statements which have been
made my careful attention. All I can say is
that I will keep my mind open to conviction.
If it can be shown that vaccination does not
diminish small-pox the compulsion cannot be
justified. As to other diseases being conveyed
by the vaccine, it is very probable that such is
the case, even when great care is taken; but it
is a question of the balance of advantages,
which can only be decided upon an investiga-
tion of the full evidence." The Chief Secretary
for Ireland, the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, said
in the House of Commons in 1877, "The law which
enforced vaccination did not meet the case of the
rich, and it no doubt did bear rather hardly
on the poor. Hence there were anti-vaccina-
tion societies." Then we have the opinion of
the Vice-President of the Council on Education.
The Right Hon. A. J. Mundella, in reply to a
deposition of opponents to compulsory vaccina-
tion in the town of Sheffield, said, "My wife
recently expressed a wish that I should be re-
vaccinated; but I refused. I will not be re-
vaccinated. I believe there must be some danger
in the operation." The Under-Secretary of
Foreign Affairs, Sir Charles Dilke, said in a
letter to Mr. Thomas Baker in March last, "I
have no hesitation in saying that I shall certainly
support any motion in favour of an inquiry into
the working of the Compulsory Vaccination
Act." These are all members of the present
Government, and it was upon such opinions,
with others of the same tenor, that I ventured
the prophecy alluded to in the Réveil Médical.
Well, no sooner, is the present Government
installed when the Right Hon. J. G. Dodson,
the head of the Vaccination Department, gave
notice of their intention to bring in a Bill to
abolish multiple penalties, and thus do away
with much of the severity which characterises
the present Acts. Immediately the announce-
ment was made the medical Trades Union, see-
ing their prestige in danger, got up petition
after petition, and deputation after deputation,
to the President of the Local Government Board
to induce the Government to withdraw the
Bill, which they characterised as a measure for
spreading small-pox; but it was noticeable that
all the deputations were either composed of
medical men, or had been got up by them, and
none of the speakers at these deputations ever
attempted to answer the damaging facts against
vaccination, as revealed by the recent Parlia-
mentary Returns (No. 438 Vaccination Mortality
and No. 6 General and Infant Mortality,
July 3rd, 1879), but contented themselves
with abusing the anti-vaccinators as a set of
ignorant fanatics. When a defendant has
no case he abuses the plaintiff's attorney.
Mr. Dodson at length became rather disgusted
with the unreasonable hostility shown by an
interested profession to the Government Bill,
and on the 2nd of August, in reply to a deputa-
tion of medical men, with whom was Mr.
Spottiswoode, the President of the Royal
Society, he concluded his remarks with a rebuff
which they probably will not readily forget.
He said that "the opinions of medical men
were entitled to much weight, but they were
not entitled to outweigh all other opinions,
particularly the opinions of those who have to
administer the law." There are 20,000 registered
medical practitioners in England, who, accord-
ing to an estimate made by Sir Theo. Chambers,
the Recorder of the City of London, receive
emoluments to the extent of two millions a
year, directly or indirectly, by compulsory
vaccination; though it is probable that these
figures include the professional fees arising out
of the mischievous sequel of vaccination.
It has been estimated that the adoption of
the Government Bill would have reduced
these emoluments by one half, and we must not
be surprised therefore at this determined opposi-
tion, or as being told, in the words of Mr. Ernest
Hart, that the Bill has filled the entire medical
profession "with alarm and regret." Hinc iles
lacrymes. Nor is it bearing harshly on the
honour of a noble profession to estimate the
opposition partly in relation to self-interest, as
since the world began all professions are more
or less biased by similar influences. Mr.
Herbert Spencer, probably the most acute
observer in England as to the causes of things,
points out that one of the chief "distorting
influences existing in the medium through
which facts reach us, results from the self-
seeking, pecuniary or otherwise, of those
who testify. We require constantly to bear
in mind that personal interests effect most
of the statements on which sociological con-
clusions are based, and on which legislation
proceeds. Everyone knows this to be so where
THE VACCINATION INQUIRER.

THE PARIS CONGRESS.

From Prof. F. W. Newman.

Dear Sir,—The medical vaccination men either ignorantly or basely always neglect to notice—

1. Our arguments from Moral Right.
2. Our arguments from Constitutional Right.
3. Our arguments of a decisive character from their own Statistics.

Under the last I specify—

(a) Years of prevalent small-pox are not years of increased mortality. This fact settles the controversy against them.
(b) Illness and death by small-pox have increased since they made vaccination compulsory.
(c) Vaccination (so-called) induces other diseases, which they are helpless to prevent.
(d) They themselves recommend vaccination to be repeated, and cannot tell how often it is needed; for their own statistics force them to admit that its preventive force may not stand out against an epidemic next year.

When we add—

(e) That they refuse even to experiment on the methods of treating small-pox which are alleged by actual trial to make the disease very tractable by certain herbs, by hot baths of water and by hot air—persisting themselves in the old methods which lead them to believe small-pox to be an awful danger instead of a salutary vent of evil.
(f) They take no means to investigate the vera causa of small-pox with a view to prevent it in the only common-sense way.

(g) That their predecessors who spread small-pox by inoculation, and Jenner who believed small-pox after vaccination was impossible, have alike been proved wrong by fact.

My belief is, that the present Parliament will condemn compulsion, if the whole case be laid before it. We must refuse all compromise.

Sincerely yours,

F. W. Newman.

FROM DR. GARTH WILKINSON.

To the President and Members of the International Congress on Compulsory Vaccination.

76 Wimpole Street, Cavendish Square, W.
London, December 2nd, 1880.

Sir, and Gentlemen,—I am unable to attend the sittings of your Body, but cannot refrain from expressing my hearty concurrence with the Sacred Cause you are about to plead.

Nowhere in the World is there a greater fusion of the Social, Political, and Scientific Idea than in Paris: nowhere is that Idea capable of a greater fire, and of becoming a more burning and shining light than in Paris. It is well then that men of all nations should resort thither, to be kindled with the enthusiasm that reigns as a constant power in the heart and lungs of France. May all your deliberations be directed for good.

The present function of Ideas, and of the instruction they impart, is the repression of
Wrong, the redress of Iniquity, and the Repeal of Evil Laws. That function you are urgently called upon to put in force.

A wider, and deeper, and subtler Social Evil than universal Compulsory Vaccination is scarcely conceivable; on the physical side, universal pollution; on the side of manhood, womanhood, and childhood, with their several dignities, it is to the extent of its reach, degradation and extinction. The cradle is born to an immediate medical hell.

Politically, Compulsory Vaccination is an innermost stab of Liberty which piercing its heart, will find its courage and heaven-born principles and convictions in other directions an easy prey. State medicine can do what it likes with us, if we once let it do this.

Scientifically, Science murders itself here. It befools the whole world to make it sweet and clean. It demonises Medicine, and prepares it to be the Supreme Quack and grand Apollyon or Destroyer of the Human Race. These are now proved facts from incontestable data.—Your affectionate and obedient Confrère,

J. J. GARTH WILKINSON.

FROM MR. ALEXANDER WHEELER.
Darlington, 8th December, 1880.

Dear Mr. Tebb,—I am sorry I cannot join you at that which I believe to be a great Congress of sanitary reformers, especially as it would have enabled me to see Paris and the friends we have there in this cause. I wish you success, and I look with pleasure to this Convention not only because it is the sign of a great movement in Continental opinion, but because I hope Paris will become the centre of a movement for freeing officials especially from the evils and risks of re-vaccination.

It is only natural that English medical men should be slow to oppose the Jennerian dogma. Jenner was an English doctor; but the doctors of the Continent need not yield him any blind allegiance. Their duty is to teach the world that it is a great crime to invade a healthy body with the virus of disease. It is a great wrong done to the person diseased, and it is a wrong done to society to set up any disease which we can avoid.

Our cry is for health; there are diseases enough to afflict the poor, and add to the struggle for existence. Banish the cow-pox of Jenner, and there will be one great affliction less for society to bear.

A time will come when this diseasing of all infants in the tender months of early childhood will be looked upon with feelings of shame. Then your doings and the work of this Congress will be that of which we shall find men proud, and at the recollection of it they will rejoice.—Yours very truly,

ALEXANDER WHEELER.

FROM MR. WILLIAM YOUNG.
72 Mansfield Road, London, December 6th, 1880.

Dear Mr. Tebb,—I regret that I shall not be able to attend the Anti-Vaccination Convention in Paris. However, I shall be there in spirit, and heartily wish that those philanthropists present may be able to devise some plan to suppress the murderous and disease-producing practice of vaccination. Should they succeed in doing this they will earn the thanks of universal humanity, and their names will be held in grateful remembrance when that of Jenner has been consigned to that oblivion to which it is even now fast hastening amid the execrations of thousands who have fallen in themselves, or those dear to them, the baneful effects of the practice.—Yours in the cause of parental freedom,

WILLIAM YOUNG.

VACCINATION IN CALIFORNIA.
462 First-street, Oakland, California.
27th November, 1880.

I am one of those who speak from bitter experience, having buried a boy who died from the effects of successful vaccination. I say so deliberately, for I have the testimony of the physician verified by a post mortem examination. Although the physician is one of the most successful in this city, and a vaccinator, he did not hesitate to state in the presence of witnesses what was the true cause of my child's death.

There has recently been an outbreak of small-pox in Oakland and San Francisco, and as usual the credulous and superstitious are offering themselves to unscrupulous M.D.'s, who promise to protect them at the rate of from one to three dollars apiece. Some of the doctors state that the ordinary matter is one dollar a vaccination, whilst the pure bovine virus is three dollars!

Opposition to vaccination is increasing every day. We labour under many difficulties in procuring information, especially trustworthy statistics. All the health officers are vaccinators, and in their reports they dexterously conceal whatever seems to show the ill effects of uselessness of vaccination. For instance, during the recent epidemic in Oakland we were unable to obtain from the health officer any statement as to the numbers of the vaccinated and the unvaccinated, but merely a bald report of the cases of diseases and death; and this in the second city of California with 35,000 inhabitants. My wife and I feel that we should spare no effort to save others from the suffering we have endured, and as I have lived in Oakland since 1854, and occupy a somewhat prominent position, our experience is regarded with much interest; and there are very few who listen and investigate who consent to be vaccinated themselves or suffer those over whom they have control to submit to the infliction.

WILBUR WALKER.

VACCINATION IN SPAIN.—Mr. Wm. Tebb, of London, writes us as follows:—I am happy to say there is no compulsory vaccination law in Spain; and the American Consul informs me that there is here a strong objection to vaccination altogether. Our apient doctors would conclude that the population is being decimated by small-pox—but the contrary, the epidemics are less virulent than in the best vaccinated States."

National Independent.
THE SAN FRANCISCO WASP.

THE Vaccination Inquirer.

The San Francisco Wasp is a journal of great ability and large circulation, and has published a series of well-informed and vigorous articles against vaccination by Mr. Clarence M. Hunt. In an editorial of 30th November, we read—

"It is too early to congratulate ourselves on our escape from small-pox. Should atmospheric conditions continue unfavourable, we may yet see a real epidemic. So far, there have been but very few cases of genuine variola. The absurd and dangerous practice of vaccination works a double evil, as it gives people a fancied security, which has no basis in fact, and thus prevents them from taking useful sanitary and hygienic precautions. However, the practice will, we suppose, have to run its course, as have bleeding, and salivating, and purging, and the thousand other errors, which have, in their time, been as hotly defended by the medical bigots. Vaccination would hardly have remained fashionable so long as it has, were it not for its exceeding profitableness. The recent scares must have thrown at least $50,000 into the pockets of our local physicians. Think of it! Fifty thousand dollars paid out within ten days for filthy matter, the secretion of a sick animal. And then go and smile at the folk of simple natives, who swallow powdered toads, and wear amulets. But then the majority of the doctors approve of it! Ah, yes! And the doctors have been so invariably correct, in everything they have saddled upon suffering humanity, during the past two thousand years, have they not? All our subscribers should read and circulate amongst their friends the articles on Vaccination, which are now appearing in the Wasp. They show up this disgusting fraud in its true light."

LORD WALSINGHAM TO MR. YOUNG.

When the Vaccination Act (1871) Amendment Bill was before the House of Lords in 1874, Mr. Wm. Young wrote to Lord Walsingham, who had care of the measure, remonstrating with him on its oppressive character. His lordship replied as follows—

"22 Chester Street, 30th July, 1874.

"Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th inst, and to point out to you in the remarks I made in the House of Lords on the second reading of the Vaccination Act Amendment Bill that I distinctly stated that it was in no degree the intention of the measure that prosecutions in cases of conscientious objections to compulsory vaccination should be carried to the extent of persecution. I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WALSINGHAM."

Lord Walsingham was very simple if he believed his intention would be used to interpret the Act. His words have been cited before many magistrates, who dismiss them as irrelevant, and proceed to fine conscientious objects without mercy, insisting that the Act means nothing if it does not mean prosecution (or persecution) until vaccination is performed.

THE VACCINATION REASON WHY.

Few persons are aware of the extent to which the ratepayers are taxed to support that "fallacy of the faculty," Vaccination; many indeed believing that the services rendered by doctors in dispensing the nostrum of the "immortal Jenner" are purely gratuitous. A perusal of the following statistics will convince such of their error.

The Boards of Guardians in England and Wales, are the Local Vaccination Authorities of the Kingdom. They have at work under them, first, for the performance of the Vaccinations, more than 8,000 medical practitioners, acting as Public Vaccinators, and secondly, for the non-medical part of the business, about 1,400 so-called Vaccination Officers.

The total cost of Public Vaccination is made up of three items:— 1. Vaccination fees and expenses, the payment of which falls on the Poor-rate. 2. Awards, or bonuses, in consideration of the excellence of the work done by the Public Vaccinators; which work they have already paid for doing under Item 1. 3. The salaries of the itinerant Medical Vaccination Inspectors of the Local Government Board.

Vaccination Fees and Expenses, arranged in periods of five years:—

For the five years ending Lady Day—

1845, ... ... ... £2104,718
1850, ... ... ... 190,644
1865, ... ... ... 179,175
1870, ... ... ... 218,983
1875, ... ... ... 267,089
1880, ... ... ... 279,571
1885, ... ... ... 447,864

For the four years ending Lady Day—

1879, ... ... ... 850,519

£1,957,978

Names and Salaries of the Medical Vaccination Inspectors of the Local Government Board; chief supporters of the Vaccination delusion. (From Whitaker's Almanack, 1881.)

Annual Salary.

Medical Officer—G. Buchanan, M.D. £1,500
As. Med. Officer—J. N. Radcliffe, Esq., 1,000

Inspectors.

H. Stevens, M.D., ... ... ... £800
R. T. Thorne, M.D., ... ... ... 800
F. H. Blaxall, M.D., ... ... ... 600
C. J. Beard, M.D., ... ... ... 600
E. Ballard, M.D., ... ... ... 600
H. Airy, M.D., ... ... ... 600
W. H. Power, ... ... ... 600
H. F. Parsons, ... ... ... 500
J. Spear, ... ... ... 500
A. B. Farn, Assistant Inspector of Vaccine Lymph, ... ... ... 400

Annual Total, ... ... ... £8,800

WM. YOUNG.
ADVERTISEMENTS.

VACCINATION TRACTS.

1. Letters and Opinions of Medical Men.
2. Facts and Figures, showing that Vaccination has failed to
   stamp out, arrest, or mitigate Small-pox.
3. & 4. Opinions of Bishops, Politicians, Publicists, Statist-
   ticians, and Sanitarians.
5. Cases of Disease, Suffering, and Death, reported by the
   Injured Families.
6. The Vaccination Laws a Scandal to Public Honesty and
   Religion.
7. Vaccination a sign of the Decay of the Political and Medical
   Conscience of the Country.
8. The Propagation of Syphilis to Infants and Adults by
   Vaccination and Re-Vaccination.
9. Vaccination evil in its Principles, false in its Reasons, and
   Deadly in its Results.

In 1 Vol. Cloth, with Preface and Supplement, pp. XXX, 2s. 6d., post free.

The same Tracts in German, with Index, &c.---
Encyklopädie des Impfens und Seiner Folgen sowie eine Untersuchung des Vorgeschlagenen Impfens mit Kalbe-Lymph. Price 5s.

SPEECH OF P. A. TAYLOR, ESQ., M.P.
Delivered in the House of Commons, 11th June, 1880, on Dr. Cameron’s Resolution respecting Animal Vaccine.

4d. per Dozen, post free.

LONDON SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION
and E. W. ALLEN, 11 Ave Maria Lane, London, E.C.

4d. Each or 2s. per 100.

HOW BABY WAS KILLED.
Reprinted from the "Weekly Times."

THE VACCINATION REASON WHY.
Cost of Public Vaccination in England and Wales. Compiled from the Reports of the Local Govern-
ment Board by WILLIAM YOUNG. Price ONE HALFPENNY.

In Press,

A VOLUME OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN
ANTI-VACCINATION LITERATURE;
Comprising the Titles, &c., of upwards of 300 Books, Pamphlets, Tracts, and Memoirs.

Price 1d.

COMPULSORY DISEASE:
An Historical Sketch of the Rise and Spread of the Vaccine Dogma, addressed to the International
Congress of Anti-Vaccinators at Paris, December, 1880.

By H. D. DUDGEON, Quarrdond.

Price 1d. Each.

VACCINATION UNNECESSARY IN THE PRESENT STATE OF
MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE,
AND
VACCINATION; Or, Infant Poisoning and Murdering by Act of Parliament.

By SAMUEL BADOIR, M.D. & M.A.

LONDON SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION,
GRAY’S INN CHAMBERS, 20 HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON, W.C.

THE VACCINATION INQUIRER AND HEALTH REVIEW.
Monthly, price 2d., or by post, 2s. 6d., or 10 copies, 20s. per annum, from the Publisher, E. W. ALLEN,
11 Ave Maria Lane, London, E.C. Manchester: JOHN HEYWOOD.
ADVERTISEMENTS.

THE
London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination,
GRAY'S INN CHAMBERS, 20 HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

I.—The Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.

II.—The Diffusion of Knowledge concerning Vaccination.

III.—The maintenance in London of an Office for the publication of Literature relating to Vaccination, and as a Centre of Information.

The minimum Annual Subscription constituting Membership is 2s. 6d. Every opponent of Compulsory Vaccination in the United Kingdom is earnestly invited to join and cooperate with the Society.

Chairman of Committee.
WILLIAM TEBB, Esq., 7 Albert Road, Regent's Park, N.W.

Treasurer.
CORNELIUS PEARSON, Esq., 15 Harpur Street,
Red Lion Square, W.C.

Hon. Secretary.
WALTER HASKER, Esq., Gray's Inn Chambers,
20 High Holborn, W.C.

SMALL-POX is a member of the group of diseases described as zymotic, which originate in unwholesome conditions of life, and in common are diminished and prevented by the reduction and removal of those conditions.

In times when the laws of health were imperfectly understood, the fanciful discovery was made that by poisoning the blood with the virus of small-pox or cow-pox, a future attack of small-pox might be escaped. While many kindred superstitions in medical practice have been discredited and forgotten, Vaccination, because it was endowed by the State, has survived, and has entered into legislation, and is enforced with fine and imprisonment. It is in vain for Nonconformists to plead that they do not believe that Vaccination has any power to prevent or to mitigate small-pox: they are told they may believe what they like, but that vaccinated they must be, for the benefit of the rite is settled beyond dispute, and that only fools and fanatics venture to question what has been irrevocably determined.

It is to attack and overthrow this monstrous tyranny that the LONDON SOCIETY has been established. The members desire to enlighten the public mind as to the history of Vaccination, as to its injury in communicating and intensifying other diseases, and as to its failure to avert the malady against which it is invoked.

Some, too, whilst disinclined to discuss Vaccination as a medical question, or to surrender confidence in its prophylaxis, are opposed to its compulsory infliction. They maintain that every remedy should be left to justify itself by its own efficacy, and that of all prescriptions the last which requires extraneous assistance is Vaccination; for its repute is based on the fact that its subjects are secure from small-pox, and in that security may abide indifferent to those who choose to neglect its salvation. Even nurses in small-pox hospitals, it is said, when efficiently vaccinated and re-vaccinated, live unaffected in the various atmosphere. Therefore, they hold that to compare an unvaccinated person to a nuisance, as is frequently done, is to make use of an epithet that implicitly denies the virtue asserted for Vaccination: a nuisance being a voluntary danger or annoyance which another cannot conveniently avoid. They also hold that to establish any medical prescription, and to create interests identified with that prescription, is to erect a bar to improvement; for it is obvious that any novelty in the treatment of small-pox must, in the constitution of human nature, meet with resistance from those whose emoluments are vested in the established practice.

The LONDON SOCIETY, therefore, claims to enlist the energies of those who resist Vaccination as useless and mischievous, and of those who, true to their faith in liberty, would leave its acceptance to the discretion of the individual. In the controversy into which they enter, they propose to employ all the familiar agencies wherewith in England revolutions are effected in the public mind and in Parliament; and they appeal with confidence for the sympathy and support of their compatriots. The Vaccination Acts under which they suffer have not been enacted with the full cognizance of the nation, but have been forced through indifferent Parliaments by the persistence of medical faction. The members of the SOCIETY are confident that as soon as the truth about Vaccination is fully known and appreciated, the freedom they contend for will be conceded without fear, and that posterity will view with amazement the outrage upon human right and reason that is, present committed under the shadow of English liberty.
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It would be interesting to know who writes the manifestoes of the Local Government Board relative to small-pox in London. Of course it is a medical man intent on the promotion of medical trade, but we should like to have his name. His advice to vaccinate infants within six days of birth is of Herodian wickedness, and has been vigorously denounced at several Boards of Guardians, especially by Mr. Ross of Holborn, and, to their credit be it said, by several doctors. On the other hand, Dr. Lloyd of Lambeth reports that as far as he can manage, all children in the parish infirmary are vaccinated twenty-four hours after birth! As several Guardians have pointed out, for every vaccination effected 2s. 6d. is paid, and the temptation is irresistible. Eight paupers or paupers' brats make 20s., and, whatever the consequences, there's the money! At Chelsea the public vaccinator has been complaining to the Vestry that he gets no pay for revaccinating boys and girls under fifteen years of age, and suggesting that in presence of the existing epidemic, the Vestry should reduce the age for revaccination! Thus is the commercial aspect of vaccination plainly manifest.

The increase of small-pox in London is likely to raise the question of monster hospitals for the disease. The Hampstead Hospital is closed pending the result of an appeal to the House of Lords, and the other metropolitan hospitals are fully occupied. The difficulty of finding sites is very great, for every neighbourhood protests against being constituted "a centre of infection." Nothing indeed can be worse than the collecting of patients from all quarters of London and subjecting mild cases to the influence of the most malignant. It is admitted that in the epidemic of 1870-71 the deaths in the Hampstead Hospital were more than double what they would have been had the patients been left in their homes; but such was the insane horror of the disease, that those who fell sick were got out of the way at any cost. The best chance for a patient is to be nursed at home; but if home-nursing is inconvenient or impracticable, then an hospital is the alternative, and small parish hospitals would be far preferable to immense establishments where every patient is immersed in an overpowering variolous miasma.

At present there are about fifty deaths in London weekly from small-pox, or, say, one in every 60,000 inhabitants. In his treatise on Sociology, Mr. Herbert Spencer uses the severe epidemic of 1871 as an illustration of the manner in which panic produces an entire incapacity for forming a rational estimate of peril, saying—

"During the small-pox epidemic, which so unaccountably spread after twenty years of compulsory vaccination, a lady living in London, and sharing the general trepidation, was expressing her fears to me. I asked her whether, if she lived in a town of 20,000 inhabitants and heard of one person dying of small-pox in the course of a week, she would be much alarmed. Naturally, she answered, no; and her fears were somewhat calmed when I pointed out that, taking the whole population of London, and the number of deaths per week from small-pox, this was about the rate of mortality at that time caused by it. So perturbing was the emotion, that an unusual amount of danger to life was imagined at a time when the danger to life was smaller than usual. For the returns showed that the mortality from all causes was rather below the average than above it."

What was true in 1871 is true to-day with the difference, so far, of a less extensive epidemic; but so long as small-pox panics pay there will be no lack of panic-mongers.

Mr. Treb at a Conference of the London Society related his experiences at the Paris Congress, and conveyed a cheerful impression of the greater readiness to discuss vaccination on the Continent. The policy of our English vaccinators is to overpower scepticism and suppress resistance with the assumption that their prac-
tice is beyond rational dispute. As Mr. Ernest Hart put it, the benefits of vaccination are as certain as anything in mathematics. How long this policy is likely to prove effective remains to be seen. A newspaper correspondence, wherever fairly conducted, invariably results in the triumph of the anti-vaccinators. They know far more of the history, statistics, and results of vaccination than their adversaries, whose appeals to mere medical authority go a very little way toward inducing conviction. In this respect the vaccinators remind us of the Cheshire cheesemakers who, when challenged by those of Ayrshire, replied that having a name with the public for the best cheese, they did not see what they were to gain by putting it in peril. With 92 per cent. of the population vaccinated, why should vaccinators imperil their position by discussing the virtue of vaccination?

It is said in France that the wildest clergicals are not priests, but clerically minded laymen; and we may say the same of our vaccinators. The most rabid are editors of newspapers, M.P.'s, and people who know nothing experimentally of vaccination, but who fancy it in "correct" and "scientific" to profess faith in the practice unqualified by a single doubt. Thus Mr. W. H. Michael, Q.C., in an address on "The Law in Relation to Sanitary Progress" before the Sanitary Institute committed himself to the statement that small-pox is "controlled exactly in proportion as vaccination is well and thoroughly performed"; that "in those countries where vaccination is enforced with the greatest care and precision the disease is almost obliterated"; that vaccinated doctors and nurses attend "hundreds and thousands of cases of the most virulent small-pox with complete impunity"; that out of 3,000,000 vaccinations carefully investigated less than 50 cases of injury were proved; and that "deaths from small-pox diminish in exact proportion as the scars left by vaccination attest its efficient performance." Obviously Mr. Michael had been crammed, and had no sense of overdoing his part; nor that if required to produce evidence for his "audacities," he would break down disgracefully.

Consistently with this arrogant ignorance, Mr. Michael is not only in favour of repeated fines for resistance to vaccination, but, where fines are of no effect, of enforcing the rite *et armis*; "for the sooner the subject is deprived of the liberty to spread misery, disease, and death among an innocent and helpless community, the better for all classes of her Majesty's subjects." We are not unfamiliar with this threat, and our answer is, "Try the prescription." Why do not some of the vaccination Jingoes draw the requisite Bill and introduce it to the House of Commons? Mr. Michael, having the courage of his conviction, might try his hand. He could not do us better service. The compulsory law, as it exists, is everywhere opening men's eyes to the Jennerian imposture, and if re-enforced with the police, and if soldiers were dispatched to reduce places like Leicester and Keighley to medical obedience, we should at a stroke secure the liberty we strive for. But those who are responsible for vaccination, and whose interests consist in its maintenance, are of a more prudent temper; and if they had their way, would relax the law rather than tighten it. The Bill introduced by Mr. Dodson last Session to abolish multiple penalties was neither promoted by anti-vaccinators nor devised for their advantage. But fire-eaters like Mr. Michael are usually as short-sighted as they are intolerant.

Cock-and-bull stories in favour of vaccination are innumerable, and the gravity and persistence with which they are repeated are amazing. The *Times*, for example, considering that "when people at home are crying out louder and louder against compulsory vaccination, the more plain, unmistakable facts that can be marshalled against them the better," proceeds to cite a couple of such "facts" from the Indian Sanitary Report for 1878-79. The first is, that in the town of Ganhati, in Assam, forty-seven persons died of small-pox *"owing to the bitter hostility of the people to vaccination."* The second is, "that certain Thakur families in the North West Provinces allowed the vaccination of their daughters, but refused to allow their sons to be operated upon; consequently during the prevalence of small-pox many male children died, while the females all but escaped the disease. Profiting by this experience, the boys are now submitted to vaccination, and the girls witheld." Jenner, when bothered by vaccination failures in England, used to appeal plaintively to its infaillible efficacy in China and Peru, and here we have the same innocent tactics repeated! We have evidence at hand on every side, that vaccination does not prevent small-pox, and yet we are asked to forewear our experience on the score of reports we cannot verify; and of reports, too, of a pattern identical with scores that at home have been proved to be untrue!
M. Pasteur is going ahead. He has been inoculating dogs, rabbits, guinea-pigs, and fowls with the saliva of a boy who died of hydrophobia, and though some of the animals remained unaffected, yet it is believed he has created a new disease, which will protect from hydrophobia as vaccination protects from small-pox. Thus we may hope that science will presently render us disease-proof. We shall be inoculated with the entire series of zymotics, and thenceforth live indifferent to sanitary precautions. Such is the pleasant prospect revealed by the newest lights of science!

THE VACCINATION REASON WHY.

Specimens of the Awards made to Public Vaccinators, under Section 5 of the Vaccination Act of 1867, in recognition of the excellence of the work done.

Let it be well noted that the recipients of these Awards are Doctors, and that the Inspectors who make them are also members of the same Trades Union.

### PROVINCIAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Union and Number of Recipients</th>
<th>1875</th>
<th>1876</th>
<th>1877</th>
<th>1878</th>
<th>1879</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ s</td>
<td>£ s</td>
<td>£ s</td>
<td>£ s</td>
<td>£ s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, 1</td>
<td>275 14</td>
<td>220 4</td>
<td>229 17</td>
<td>271 5</td>
<td>985 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton, 2</td>
<td>155 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>133 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>135 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street, 2</td>
<td>116 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesall, Bierlow, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portas Island, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltford, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### METROPOLITAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Union and Number of Recipients</th>
<th>1875</th>
<th>1876</th>
<th>1877</th>
<th>1878</th>
<th>1879</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ s</td>
<td>£ s</td>
<td>£ s</td>
<td>£ s</td>
<td>£ s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethnal Green, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsbury, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoxton, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylebone, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mile End, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive, St, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancras, St, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower, St, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreditch, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitechapel, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These bonnas or awards were first granted in 1868, in which year they amounted to £2,753; in 1873 they had increased to £6,187; in 1876, to £11,994; and in 1879, to £16,906. Total for 12 years—£115,879. There is no dogma or practice, however absurd, that could not be enforced where such means are at the disposal of officials who carry out the law. The gold is the best argument in the service—in fact, almost the only one left; and this device of paying for the work a second time, in the shape of "awards," is a keen stroke of policy; and a sure way of perpetuating this traffic in disease and death. As George Dawson says—

"Doctors are paid to vaccinate, paid again for doing it well, and paid again for attending to the sickness produced by this blood-poisoning. When will people see that vaccination is unnatural, sinful, filthy, and dangerous, and that doctors are blinded by self-interest and professional pride from admitting themselves to be wrong, so long as it pays to do wrong!"

WILLIAM YOUNG.

ENGLISHMEN are at times flattered by being spoken of as "law-abiding." This is not a compliment. To be law-abiding, without agitation or protest, when a law is unjust, is criminal supineness and cowardice.—*Midland Free Press*, 25th December, 1869.

Stephen Jenner.—Mr. J. Chalmers Morton appeals to the readers of the *Times*, 27th Jan., on behalf of "Mr. Stephen Jenner, now in his 85th year, living at Heathfield, near Berkeley, grandson of Dr. Edward Jenner's youngest brother. He was in his childhood the subject of many of the test experiments by which his great uncle discovered and established the safety conferred by vaccination. In his youth he was his uncle's favourite associate. He has led a blameless life, and the explanation of his poverty can be given to anyone who asks for it. It is a pitiable thing that one so nearly related to so great a human benefactor should be dependent in his extreme old age on a gift of 10s. a week to save him from destitution."

CARE AND CONSCIENCE IN OPINION.—Suspense is not pleasant where we are eager to know; but I would rather live a sceptic and die an infidel than adopt a groundless opinion, or erect an empty theory. When you have proved the ground on which you stand to be firm and solid, stand as fast as a stone; but whilst the appearance of uncertainty remains, be as doubtful and distrustful as a sceptic. The great danger is that of rushing to an opinion to escape the trouble of further reflection and inquiry, or becoming as foolishly fond of our spurious conceptions as if they were legitimate truths. It is necessary, therefore, to deny ourselves, to check and mortify our self-love, and to watch with suspicious care the natural deceitfulness of the heart. Every bigot identifies himself in some shape or other with the cause of his bigotry: it is his own cause, and that is the sole reason of his blind partiality.—*James Gilchrist. The Intellectual Patrimony*. London: 1817.
THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION.

CHAPTER XXIV.

COBBETT AND VACCINATION; OR, COMMON SENSE VINDICATED.

Everybody appeals to common-sense, but what is common-sense? It is a question difficult to answer; and yet as we propose to show that Cobbett’s opposition to vaccination was justified by common-sense, we are bound to give some definition of the term.

Common-sense is reason as evolved from common experience. What the multitude of men have found to be true in the course of life, that is common-sense, which to question or resist is, folly or fanaticism. This vulgar and vigorous rationality is often summoned to service where it has no vocation. For example, when it was first taught that the earth was a sphere and that its inhabitants had antipodes, the revelation was denounced as contrary to common-sense; but it is obvious that in such a case (which represents myriads) it was wrongly invoked; the form of the earth being at the time outside common cognisance. As soon, however, as it was realised by experience that the earth was spherical and inhabited in all its quarters, then its rotundity became incorporated in the constitution of common-sense.

The realm of common-sense we therefore hold to be limited by its origin in common experience, and in matters above or beyond that experience, its dicta are illegitimate, and synonyms for presumption and prejudice.

William Cobbett was essentially a man of common-sense. His power lay in his community with the experience and reason of his countrymen; and, like all of us, he had the defects of his virtue. He continually applied his vulgar judgment to the criticism of men and matters beyond the range of its competence, and the result was a luxuriance of arrogance and contempt for which at this day we must resort to Mr. Ruskin for a parallel.

Such being the case, we have to inquire, What was the worth of Cobbett’s opinion in the matter of vaccination? The attempt is sometimes made by vaccinators to withdraw their practice from popular discussion. They say it is a medical question for medical men; but the assertion provokes suspicion rather than confidence, for mystery is an invariable note of imposture. It is fair, we allow, to say of any abstruse knowledge that it can only be apprehended by those whose faculties are trained for its apprehension; but what is there abstruse about vaccination? With little trouble, everybody may know as much about it as anybody. It is the simplest of surgical operations. It is almost as easy as taking pills — instead of putting poison down the throat it is inserted into the skin. The operation may result in any number of pathological complications, but whether such complications be admitted or denied, what vaccination is prescribed for, namely, the prevention of small-pox, comes within the range of common observation. What, therefore, we have to answer is, that Cobbett’s common-sense was competent to deliver judgment upon vaccination.

Moreover, the circumstances of the time compelled an opinion: silence or neutrality was impossible. England was swarming with vaccinators. All the fussy folk who had a taste for doing much good at little cost were plying the cow-pox lancet. Encouraged by Jenner, they got vaccine, inoculated a victim, and propagated the virus from arm to arm. Here we may let Cobbett speak for himself—

“...This nation is fond of quackery of all sorts; and this particular quackery having been sanctioned by King, Lords, and Commons, it spread over the country like a pestilence borne by the winds. Speedily sprang up the Royal Jennerian Institution, and branch institutions issuing from the parent trunk, set instantly to work, impregnating the veins of the rising generation with the beastly matter. Gentlemen and ladies made the commodity a pocket companion; and if a cottager’s child were seen by them on a common (in Hampshire at least) and did not quickly take to its heels, it was certain to carry off more or less of the disease of the cow. One would have thought that half the cows in the country had been tapped to get such a quantity of stuff.”

Nor was vaccination merely forced on Cobbett’s attention as a popular craze. He had to deal with it as a possible compulsory infliction. At a public meeting in 1808, Wilberforce and Dr. Clarke advocated the prohibition of small-pox inoculation and the enforcement of vaccination; and Cobbett, in a letter addressed to Wilberforce, rebuked the arbitrary project in a strain impressive and dignified as of Burke himself. He wrote—

“It seems there are prejudices against cow-pox which it is necessary to destroy by force. That there are prejudices, and very strong ones too, I am ready to allow, but I cannot agree that these prejudices should be eradicated by force; nor is it perhaps fair to use the degrading term as expressive of the dislike which so large a portion of the community entertain to the practice you are so anxious to compel them to adopt. The charge of prejudice has been pre-

ferred but too often, and with but too fatal success against every one opposed to change. The truth is that whoever has been found to object to innovation, however wild in itself, however destructive in its consequences, has constantly been accused of prejudice; and as prejudice thus used implies a mixture of ignorance and perverseness, and as few persons are willing to be thought ignorant and perverse, the impudence is employed to coerce assent where reason hesitates.”

He then aptly applied the repudiated recommendation of inoculation with small-pox as cause for hesitation in assenting to inoculation with cow-pox—

“There was, you must well remember, a strong and general objection, which for a long time prevailed, against inoculation with small-pox; and you cannot have forgotten that this objection was termed prejudice, and the persons entertaining it were regarded as illiterate, ignorant, or perverse; yet it now appears from the Address of your Royal Jennerian Society that it would have been well for the human race if the prejudices of those illiterate, ignorant, or perverse persons had universally obtained; for you now tell us that ‘inoculation by spreading the contagion has considerably increased the mortality of small-pox.’ With an example like this before our eyes, Ought we not to be very cautious how we adopt your new system of inoculation with cow-pox?”

Then turning upon Wilberforce in his favourite character of constitutional Englishman, he proceeded—

“Give me leave to ask you, Sir, how you reconcile a proposition to enforce this novel practice with the spirit of that Constitution of which you profess to be so great an admirer, and with that freedom of speech which you wish to be regarded as one of the principal supporters? What I am opposed to, and what I am alarmed at, is the proposition to obtain an Act of Parliament which would in its operation be nothing short of compulsion on every man to suffer the veins of his child to be impregnated with the disease of a beast—a measure to be adopted in no country where the people are not vassals or slaves.”

Lastly came these remarks which at this day have force and application greater even than when written—

“I like not this never-ending recurrence to Acts of Parliament. Something must be left, and something ought to be left, to the sense and reason and morality and religion of the people. There are a set of well-meaning men in this country, who would pass laws for the regulating and restraining of every feeling of the human breast, and every motion of the human frame: they would bind us down, hair by hair, as the Lilliputians did Gulliver, till anon, when we awoke from our sleep, we should wonder by whom we had been enslaved. But I trust, Sir, that Parliament is not, and never will be, so far under the influence of these minute and meddling politicians as to be induced to pass laws for taking out of a man’s hands the management of his household, the choice of his physician, and the care of the health of his children; for, under this sort of domiciliary thraldom, to talk of the liberty of the country would be the most cruel mockery wherewith an humble and subjected people were ever insulted.”

Cobbett, be it observed, thus addressed Wilberforce in 1808, when vaccination was as yet imperfectly tested, and its advocates were in the full blast of enthusiastic persuasion that to be Jennerised was to be made proof against small-pox for ever. When Cobbett had again occasion to write about cow-pox, six years had passed away, bearing with them the phantastic certainty with which vaccination had been imposed upon public credulity. Nevertheless the practice was not abandoned: quackery once alive and lucrative, dies hard: but it was discredited, and its apologists exercised their ingenuity in devising explanations and excuses for its manifest failures. The Royal Jennerian Society had split between Jenner and Walker, and application to Parliament was resolved upon for two purposes—first, to save Jenner from poverty; and second, to provide funds for the maintenance of vaccination, voluntary subscriptions having fallen off irretrievably. In short, vaccination had broken down, and the House of Commons was called upon to save it from extinction. There were wire-pullers in the House and out of the House who were compromised by their patronage of Jenner and his imposture, and they had the craft and the power to transfer the responsibility of which they were sick to the national exchequer. With this explanation, we shall understand the following article from the Register of 18th June, 1808. Cobbett wrote—

“This experiment with cow-pox, which has cost the nation £30,000 to Dr. Jenner, is now, it seems, to have an Act of Parliament to give it currency. Mr. Rose has brought in a bill for the purpose of establishing a central institution in London for the distribution of cow-pox matter, which bill in all appearance will pass; and this disgusting and degrading remedy will cost the nation another £4,000 or £5,000 annually, though it has been clearly proved not to have answered the purpose intended. This, however, I regard as cheap when compared with the menace of Mr. Fuller, who, in the debate, proposed a compulsory law on the subject. He took up the old idea of Mr. Wilberforce, who was for a law to prevent parents from having their children inoculated with small-pox unless they chose to send them to pest-houses, or to some place at a considerable distance from all inoculating stations. This cruel and tyrannical proposition I

* Political Register, 22nd January, 1808.
opposed at the time; and I am happy to perceive that it is now almost universally exploded."

Whilst Cobbett could not arrest the action of Parliament, he was short-sighted in considering that the proposed endowment of vaccination was merely a question of the loss of a few thousands a year. We are saddled with vaccination at this day, its costs and mischiefs, by reason of the vote for the National Vaccine Institution in 1808. As soon as an annual subsidy is placed on the estimates, interests are created, which not only perpetuate themselves, but constantly tend to enlargement; and such interests, once created, can only be got rid of when proved useless by agitation out of doors and persistent pressure on the House of Commons.

Referring to a notorious outbreak of small-pox among a vaccinated population at Ringwood in Hampshire, Cobbett continued—

"I should like to have heard Mr. Rose’s statement of the circumstances at Ringwood, whence, he says, it is evident that the failure arose from the use of improper matter. That many persons, who had been inoculated with cow-pox, caught small-pox and died at Ringwood, is a fact that even the Royal Jennerian Society cannot deny; and this being the case, what man in his senses will put any faith in the efficacy of cow-pox as a preventive of small-pox? The thing is done. It has failed, and it is vain to endeavour to prop up its reputation; for, in a few years, it will become proverbial as humbug."

A prophecy, it will be said, that has not been fulfilled. True; but in Cobbett’s time it advanced far to fulfilment. All the unqualified promises under which vaccination was brought into practice, were one by one surrendered under the compulsion of experience. The mass of the people remained unvaccinated; the zeal for vaccinating the poor abated; and the practice continued among the middle and upper classes on the humblest pretexts—as that which might hinder or mitigate small-pox, and in any case do little harm. We have to recollect that the mania for vaccination which now prevails is a revival of a prescription which our forefathers had tested and found wanting. Vaccination fell into neglect, not because there was indifference to small-pox, but because it did not prevent that disease.

The excuse for the first failures of vaccination was, that spurious cow-pox must have been employed—spurious cow-pox being the artful invention of Jenner to cover disasters; artful, and yet absurd, for how could cow-pox exist spuriously any more than small-pox? The precise fact, that spurious cow-pox was the dodge of an unscrupulous quack was unknown to Cobbett, but he was sharp enough to recognise imposture, and thus wrote—

"The pretext of spurious matter is the weakest defence that ever was set up, because it is evident that such will always be an excuse. The Methodist pike who told his shoal of gudgeons that if they had faith, they might jump into a chalk pit without so much as straining their ankles, answered all their reproaches with saying, that their broken bones were owing to their own sin in not having faith, and referred, for proof, to one among them who had accidentally escaped unhurt. All who catch small-pox and die have been cow-poxed with spurious matter, and all who have not yet caught small-pox, after the cow-pox operation, have had the pure matter; and so it will be, to be sure, to the end of the chapter."

"Who is to collect this genuine matter, and whence is it to come? Who shall tell whether he inoculate with cow-pox or King’s evil? Or with many other disorders, one of which I will not name, but which I do hope, that fathers and mothers who have given their children that greatest of blessing, a pure stream of blood, will not forget when they are about to cause that blood to be impregnated with matter taken from the ulcerous bodies of others."

In this latter warning, we have to remark Cobbett’s prescience. He knew that it was impossible to transfer organic virus from arm to arm without transferring more than was intended, inclusive of the dreadful disease he indicated. Vaccinators naturally denied the possibility of such extra transmission; for if they had admitted the possibility, they must have ceased to vaccinate. M. Ricord has put the alternative plainly—

"The obvious fact is, that if ever the transmission of disease with vaccine lymph is clearly demonstrated, vaccination must be altogether discontinued."

The clear demonstration demanded by M. Ricord has been abundantly supplied; and what at one time was considerably questionable, is now openly confessed. Mr. Brudenell Carter, writing in the Medical Examiner, 24th May, 1877, testifies—

"I think that syphilitic contamination by vaccine lymph is by no means an unusual occurrence, and that it is very generally overlooked because people do not know either when or where to look for it. I think that a large proportion of the cases of apparently inherited syphilis are in reality vaccinal; and that the syphilis in these cases does not show itself until the age of from eight to ten years, by which time the relation between cause and effect is apt to be lost sight of."

And we have Sir Thomas Watson’s memorable declaration in the Nineteenth Century, June, 1878—
"I can readily sympathise with, and even applaud, a father who, with the presumed dread or misgiving in his mind, is willing to submit to multiplied judicial penalties rather than expose his child to the risk of an injection so ghastly."

Thus belated, thus after infinite mischief to the public health, the Nestor of Medicine appears and solemnly allows that the warning of William Cobbett, given seventy years before, was a true warning, and that worthy of praise are the wise parents who give it heed.

Cobbett, grateful for escape from compulsory vaccination, overlooked, we said, the danger perpetrated through the endowment of the practice. He was overjoyed at Canning's emphatic declaration, that "he could not imagine any circumstances whatever that would induce him to follow up the most favourable report of the infallibility of vaccination with any measure for its compulsory infliction." Hence he continued—

"I am glad to perceive that the Ministry took care to intimate their decided hostility to any law for propagating cow-pox by force, by the aid of pains and penalties. This being the case, I care little about Mr. Rose and his Cow-Pox Institution. Those who choose to have their children impregnated from that shop, will be at liberty to do so; and those who wish to avoid it, may. This is all right; though it may be very foolish for Government to interfere in such a matter. I think we may thank the events at Ringwood for the ministerial protest against compulsory measures. It would have been curious enough to see people paying penalties for being so obstinate as not to consult their own health, or that of their children!"

What Cobbett thought would be "curious enough" we witness daily. English liberty, if it has advanced in some directions, has gone back in others since Cobbett wrote. Parents are now haled before magistrates, fined and imprisoned, because (knowing that vaccination cannot avert small-pox, whilst it may seriously injure the health of their children, and even cost them their lives) they refuse to submit to the infliction. Never, however, was there a more impious invasion of liberty than compulsory vaccination, and yet we have free and enlightened Englishmen who excuse and defend it! These are the Pharisees of Liberalism, blatant over tyranny, extinct or foreign, but dull to similar tyranny within their own domain. They garnish the sepulchres of the prophets of freedom, but (in their petty measure) repeat the deeds of those who persecuted and slew them.

Lastly, in the article from which we have been quoting, Cobbett assumed that the resort to the House of Commons for money was evidence that the enthusiasm for vaccination was abating. He wrote—

"The present application to Parliament is a pretty good proof that Cow-Pox is beginning to be blown upon. The Royal Jennerian Society wants funds. The subscribers have fallen off; and so application to the public purse has become necessary. Why have the subscribers fallen off? Their humanity has not waxed cold. It were slander, indeed, to suppose that. But I suspect that their faith has waxed cold; and when that is the case, zeal soon slackens its operations, more especially when these operations consist chiefly in the expenditure of money."

The fact was, that as vaccination failures multiplied, Jenner tried, more suo, to make a scape-goat of Walker, the Resident Incubator of the Royal Jennerian Society. There was a dreadful row, and a secession of the better part of the members with Walker, who set up the London Vaccine Institution. Those who adhered to Jenner were not of the philanthropic and subscribing order, but they had political influence, and used it to get rid of their liabilities, first in obtaining a vote of £20,000 for Jenner, and second in the establishment of a National Vaccine Institution with a subsidy of £8000 a year.

So far Cobbett in his Register, where he had no occasion to discuss vaccination again; but toward the end of his life, 1829-30, he produced a series of papers entitled Advice to Young Men, in which he reiterated and enforced his protest against the Jennerian imposture—

"I contended," he wrote, "that the beastly application could not, in nature, be efficacious in preventing small-pox, the truth of which assertion has now been proved in thousands upon thousands of instances. For a long time, for ten years, the contrary was boldly and brazenly asserted.... But small-pox, in its worst form, broke out at Ringwood, and carried off, I believe (I have not the account at hand), more than a hundred persons, young and old, every one of whom had had the cow-pox 'so nicely.' And what was then said? Was the quackery exploded? Not at all: the failure was imputed to unskilful operators: to the staleness of the matter: to its not being of the genuine quality. Admitting all this, the scheme stood condemned; for the great advantages held forth were, that anybody might perform the operation, and that the matter was everywhere abundant and cost free.

"But these were paltry excuses; the mere shuffles of quackery; for what do we know now? Why, that in hundreds of instances, persons cow-poxed by Jenner himself, have taken the real small-pox afterwards, and have either died from the disorder or narrowly escaped with their lives! I will mention two instances. The first is Sir Richard Phillips,
whose son, several years after Jenner had given
him the inspiring matter, had a very hard
struggle for life, under the hands of the good
old-fashioned, seam-giving, and dimple-dipping
small-pox. The second is Philip Codd, Esq., of
Rumsted Court, near Maidstone, whose son had
a very narrow escape under the real small-pox,
and who also had been cow-poxed by Jenner
himself. Mr. Codd I have known, and have
most sincerely respected, from the time of our
both being eighteen years of age. When the
young gentleman, his son, was very young, I,
having him on my knee one day, asked his kind
and excellent mother whether he had been
inoculated. ‘Oh, no!’ said she, ‘we are going
to have him vaccinated.’ Whereupon I, going
into the garden to the father, said, ‘I do hope,
Codd, that you are not going to have that beastly
cow-stuff put into that fine boy.’ ‘Why,’ said
he, ‘you see, Cobbett, it is to be done by Jenner
himself.’ What answer I gave, what names and
epithets I bestowed upon Jenner and his
quackery, I will leave the reader to imagine.

‘Now, here are instances enough; but every
reader has heard of, if not seen, scores of others.
Young Mr. Codd caught small-pox at a school;
and if I recollect rightly, there were several
other vaccinated youths who did the same at
the same time. Quackery, however, has always
a shuffle left. Now that cow-pox has been
proved to be no guarantee against small-pox, it
makes it milder when it comes! A pretty
shuffle, indeed, this! You are to be all your
life in fear of it, having as your sole consolation,
that when it comes (and it may overtake you
in a camp or on the sea) it will be milder! It
was not too mild to kill at Ringwood, and its
mildness, in the case of young Mr. Codd, did
not restrain it from blinding him for a suitable
number of days.

‘I shall not easily forget the alarm and
anxiety of Mr. and Mrs. Codd on this occasion—
both of them the best of parents, and both of
them punished for having yielded to fashionable
quackery. I will not say justly punished; for
affection for their children, in which respect
they were never surpassed by any parents on
earth, was the cause of their listening to the
danger-obviating quackery. This, too, is the
case with other parents; but parents should be
under the influence of reason and experience,
as well as under that of affection; and now, at
any rate, they ought to set this really dangerous
quackery at naught.’

Such was Cobbett’s case against vaccination,
and we ask, Was he not justified in his opposition?
He saw Vaccination introduced to the
world as an infallible preventive of small-pox,
and he lived to see the claim gradually mini-
mised until reduced to that of making small-
pox milder! Even thus abated, he had to
stigmatise the claim as a last shuffle of quackery.
It is asserted to this day, that vaccination makes
small-pox milder, but the pretence is exploded
whenever we demand, How do you know? In
any case, or in any number of cases of small-
pox, Who can define the severity that has been
reduced by vaccination? any more than if we
were to assert that vaccination intensifies small-
pox, it would be impossible to confute us. We
can only meet unverifiable assertion with
indifference or contempt. If it pleases people
to believe in metamorphosis of the constitution
of the moon in green cheese, the wise leave
them to the enjoyment of their humour. On
the other hand, we have to remark, that small-
pox is a disease of wide range of intensity, from
an ailment almost trivial to one invariably
fatal; and this wide range of intensity was as
characteristic of the disease before as since the
the introduction of vaccination. On what pre-
text then are mild cases of small-pox attributed
to the influence of vaccination? There are mild
and malignant cases of small-pox alike among
the vaccinated and unvaccinated, and not un-
frequently when the vaccinated and unvaccinated
are found in approximate conditions, as in the
same household, it is the unvaccinated who are
most lightly afflicted, or who make the better
recovery.

It often helps to a clearer apprehension of
a position if we endeavour to conceive its opposite.
We have seen Cobbett as an opponent of vacci-
nation: let us try to think of him as its advocate.
Suppose he had joined with the polite and
learned mob in hailing Jenner as the saviour of
mankind from small-pox, and assured the
readers of the Register that they would be
secure from the disease for ever if inoculated
with cow-pox—an easy and harmless operation.
Then after a while imagine him reporting
that he had been misled—that the operation
was not so easy as represented, nor always so
harmless. By and by he would be the bearer
of a more serious revelation. Some of the
vaccinated, warranted secure, had taken small-
pox, but such misadventures, he would explain,
were due to the use of a wrong sort of cow-pox
of which there was a spurious variety. But the
suggestion of spurious cow-pox creating alarm
and discouragement of vaccination, it would be
necessary for him to counteract the declaration
with the avowal that by spurious cow-pox was
not meant spurious cow-pox, but simply irreg-
ularities in the action of the genuine virus on
the arms of the vaccinated. But even these
excuses would be insufficient. It was not
difficult to ascribe small-pox after vaccination
to careless practice, or to virus that was not the
right sort of cow-pox; but when small-pox was
found to occur in numerous instances after
Jenner’s own vaccinations and those of the
most accomplished practitioners, What was to be said? Why, what was said, that when vaccination did not prevent small-pox, it made it milder!

Imagine, if we can, Cobbett's honest and vigorous intelligence retreating through this slush of apology and prevarication! Yet through such slush every follower of Jenner had to trudge.

We are not intent on setting Cobbett forth as a model of wisdom. We simply maintain that his common-sense was adequate to the judgment of vaccination, and that it was exercised righteously. Of physiology and hygiene he was as ignorant as his contemporaries; but if a lotion were sold to prevent toothache, and it did not prevent toothache, it would be safe to denounce its vendor as quack, even though the vendor happened to be the Royal College of Physicians and the Royal College of Surgeons. The causes of disease were unconsidered in Cobbett's days. It was not asked why people suffered from small-pox and other fevers, nor whether fevers were avoidable. Such maladies were accepted like bad weather, and encountered by medical dodges, or by charms like vaccination, the most irrational and nasty being taken for the most effective. Cobbett himself, if he did not believe in vaccination, believed in inoculation with small-pox. He had his children poxed in infancy, and when he argued against vaccination, it was in the confident possession of a surer prophylactic. Taking small-pox for a probable calamity that could only occur once in a life-time, it seemed to him expedient to incur the disease when convenient, and to have done with the dread of it. How far he was mistaken in this course we need not stay to debate. Suffice it to say, that he thought he could make sure that small-pox was small-pox, whilst what cow-pox might be none could tell, especially after transmission through arms and constitutions unnumbered and undescribed.

The causes of small-pox, we said, were unconsidered in Cobbett's days. It never even entered into Jenner's head that the disease might be a consequence of bad conditions of life; nor did he try to explain why the malady was on the decrease (in London at least) ere he appeared with his magical prescription. The decrease was claimed for vaccination, but it had set in before vaccination was heard of, and was continued among those who never received it. No sanitary improvements had been effected to account for the abatement of the disease. To what, then, was it due? We answer, to a progressive change in the diet of the people—to the substitution of tea for malt liquors, and to the displacement of arid fare by potatoes. The food of city folk up to the close of last century was closely akin to that of men at sea, and their scorbutic habit of body was notorious—a habit that rendered acute or chronic whatever disorders they were subject to. The remedy came of inclination and necessity rather than of intention. Tea was instinctively preferred by women, and the dearth of provisions compelled resort to the potato, easily grown and grateful to the palate as a mitigant of the saltiness of beef, bacon, and fish. If any are disposed to dispute the fact of this revolution in the popular dietary, they may be referred to Cobbett. He witnessed the change, and persistently denounced it. Tea-drinking was to him an abomination. It was a slatternly indulgence, costly to the poor, and injurious. Potatoes were as detestable. They were trash as compared with bread; wasteful, dirty, and unfit to satisfy a man's appetite. It is true that tea and potatoes are poor forms of food, but the one as a substitute for beer, and the other as an antiscorbutic, were eminently useful. It is not said that small-pox is caused or prevented by food, proper or improper, but that the character of food may predispose to the disease, and intensify it; as is manifest on ship-board. Hence it is (in the absence of other adequate influences) that we ascribe the abatement of small-pox which set in toward the close of last century to the better blood of the people ameliorated by that increased consumption of tea and potatoes, against which Cobbett so blindly and vainly testified.

A last word about Cobbett. His prejudices had nearly always a creditable root. He hated potatoes because they were strenuously recommended by Wilberforce and other good and goody people as cheap food for the poor. Now Cobbett's contention was, that not cheap food, but political justice was the true remedy for popular misery. It was very nice of Wilberforce and his friends to be kind to the poor, but, said Cobbett, if they were first just, the poor might dispense with their kindness. If the poor had their own, they might have beer instead of tea, and bread and beef instead of potatoes, with much else beside. Cobbett was often enough in error, but behind all his perversities lay ardent good-will for the welfare of the greatest number of his countrymen; and the consideration now enjoyed by working men is largely due to his dauntless spirit and unwearied exertions in presence of what appeared omnipotent opposition.
**DARLINGTON, 13th December, 1880.**

*To the Right Hon. J. G. Dodson, President of the Local Government Board, Whitehall, S.W.*

Sir,—As it is impossible that the Vaccination question can be settled without further legislation, and in the hope that a bare statement of some unquestionable facts may aid in the solution of it, I annex to this letter the evidence of upwards of twenty Hospital Reports of recent years.

The only remark I wish to add in respectfully requesting your consideration of this evidence, is this, viz., that whatever may be the condition of those classed as "unvaccinated" in these reports (and "unvaccinated" is a vague term as employed therein), yet the point to note, is the complete evidence as regards the liability of the vaccinated to the disorder, which the State has undertaken to secure them from. I am, sincerely,

**ALEX. WHEELER.**

**HOSPITAL SMALL-POX.—Facts from Hospital Reports, showing that Vaccination does not affect the fatality.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital Report, or Authority and Date</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Percentage of Deaths to Cases</th>
<th>Number of Cases Recorded as Vaccinated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Jennerian Cases.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. Jurin and Duvillard, 1700 to 1768, ...</td>
<td>24,594</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>Not a single case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees' Cyclopédie, 1779,</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals,</strong></td>
<td>24,994</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Jenner performed his first Vaccination, May, 1796.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Jennerian Cases—all from Hospital Reports.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highgate, Marson, 1886 to 1851,</td>
<td>5,652</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>8,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, Dr. Welsh, 1871,</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do, do., 1872,</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do, do., 1873,</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do, do., 1874,</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do, do., 1877,</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, Dr. Meares, 1876-1877,</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>No account—most.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow, Dr. Russell, 1870-1872,</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan, 1870-1872,</td>
<td>14,808</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>11,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homerton, Dr. Gayton, 1871-1877,</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>4,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol, 1875-1876,</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do., 1877,</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>No account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool, 1875-1876,</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do., 1870-1877,</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampstead, 1870-1878,</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham, 1878,</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin, Hardwicke, 1877,</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do., Cork Street, 1876-1880,</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell, 1879,</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford, 1879,</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan, excluding Fulham, etc.,</td>
<td>8,457</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>6,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 1876 to 1879 (W. Jebb),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals,</strong></td>
<td>48,248</td>
<td>8,928</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>84,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fatality prior to Vaccination,**

**Fatality in Recent Years,**

---

*Note.—A large number of "doubtful" cases are not included in the 84,428 vaccinated cases.*
RESULTS OF THE RECENT PARIS INTERNATIONAL ANTI-VACCINATION CONGRESS.

In the address on the Sayings and Doings at the Paris Congress at the second Conference of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination held on the 7th February, Mr. Tebb stated that a Une Note Collective has been prepared, and would be sent to the Chiefs of all Governments, also to Deputies and Members of Parliament in all countries where Vaccination is enforced.

The result of the deliberations at the Congress was to demonstrate the following propositions:

First, that small-pox epidemics did not increase the general death-rate; when small-pox was rife there was less typhoid fever, scarlet fever, measles, whooping cough, and other zymotic diseases; generally speaking the total mortality increased, as small-pox mortality diminished.

Second, that the diminution of small-pox mortality at the beginning of the present century could not have been due to vaccination, unless vaccination acted vicariously, as Jenner’s discovery was but very little practised. When that result was claimed for it, not more than 1½ per cent. of the entire population in England were vaccinated, and in 1812 it was less than one per cent. of the population on the Continent. The diminution of small-pox was due to the cessation of small-pox inoculation, and small-pox ceased to prevail when it ceased to be propagated.

Third, that the official returns showed that in proportion as vaccination had been enforced, small-pox had increased.

Fourth, that the small-pox hospital returns, both in Europe and America, demonstrated that vaccination had neither prevented nor mitigated the severity of the disorder, but rather increased the mortality amongst those attacked. The fatality amongst the hospital patients in the last century averaged 16 per cent., whereas the fatality during the epidemic of 1870-72 was 18.66—about 18 per cent. of the patients attacked.

Fifth, that since vaccination had been rendered obligatory infantile syphilis (under one year old) had been increased in England, according to a Parliamentary return, dated February 25th, 1880, from 472 per million of births in 1847 to 1,746 per million in 1877, or fourfold; and that all other intractable diseases, such as pyemia, scrofula, erysipelas, and bronchitis, were augmented in like proportion. In England the increase of all such diseases was 20 per cent., notwithstanding an expenditure of 300 millions sterling since 1850 in sanitary works. Another Parliamentary return (No. 488) Session 1877 demonstrated that 25,000 babies were yearly sacrificed by diseases excited by the vaccination lancet.

FROM A LONDON HOSPITAL.

Dear Mr. Tenn,—How I should like to be with you fighting against one of the greatest delusions that ever possessed the mind of man! I am here with rheumatic fever, as helpless as a baby, and full of pain. From what I now feel, I can imagine what a poor, sweet, healthy, little vaccino-syphilited child must suffer at the hands of the cruel, wicked, God-dishonouring, infant-slaughtering, vaccinating Doctors. Thank God, my children are unvaccinated, and I fought hard to keep them so (and paid fines). Now were I a poor man, and my wife and family had, through the broad-winner being stricken down, to seek parish relief, one of the first questions would be, “Are all your children vaccinated?” And the wife being a truthful woman, and fearing God rather than man, would answer. “No”—what would then happen? The enraged Guardians and their minions would either refuse relief, or force them into the House, and having them there, would compel vaccination. These thoughts trouble my mind much, not for myself, but for the families of poor virtuous anti-vaccinators, who are stricken down as I am. It does trouble me when I reflect that vaccinators not only have blundered, from silly Jenner downwards, but when they have found themselves at fault, have not confessed their error, but have piled excuse on excuse, theory on theory, and raised scare upon scare to hold the people in ignorance, and draw from them fees. Those who examine vaccination for themselves never fail to discover that it is a mystery of iniquity and nothing else. Lies however die hard. Keep at the good fight then, and God hasten the day when England shall be free from these odious vaccination laws!

4th February, 1881.

J. M. N.

There is scarcely room for doubt that vaccination is a mode of propagating fatal diseases.

—Dr. T. L. Nichols in Herald of Health.

FINANCE OF VACCINATION.—Various statements, many of them exaggerated, are made of the medical gains from Vaccination. What is got out of Vaccination, directly and indirectly, is matter of speculation, but we may know with some approach to precision the cost of public Vaccination—the Vaccination of the poor; and this Mr. Young has clearly set forth in a tract entitled The Vaccination Reason Why. It appears that at present the fees and expenses of public Vaccination in England and Wales amount to about £80,000 a year—a handsome endowment of quackery! As George Dawson observed, “Doctors are paid to vaccinate, paid again a bonus for doing it well, and paid again for attending to the sickness produced by this blood-poisoning.” At the Animal Vaccine Conference, Dr. Stevens asked, “What interest can I be supposed to have in Vaccination beyond the public good?” whereon a bystander exclaimed, “We shall next have the Archbishop of Canterbury asking what interest he can have in Christianity?” The interest of Dr. Stevens in Vaccination is £800 a-year as Inspector, and easily earned money it is.

WHY DID HE DIE.—The Hon. Horatio Nelson S. Hood, commanding her Majesty’s sloop Pegasus, died on the 3rd February at Shanghai of small-pox, aged 88. Vaccinated and revaccinated, why did he die of small-pox?
IMPEENDING
EPIDEMIC OF VACCINATION.
[From The Medical Tribune, New York, Feb. 1881.]

The New York State Board of Health seems eager to show plausible reason for its existence. They have just reported epidemics of scarlatina, diphtheria, and small-pox. For the former they have no specific except vaccination; which would be equally certain to abate the latter, if faithfully applied. But for this they have only vaccination. It pays the doctors better, and naturally, is urged accordingly. We may therefore look out for an epidemic of vaccination as destructive of public health as any in existence.

Even those who know better than to submit their children to be poisoned with the dirty blood-disease of cow-pox, whether bovine, humanised, or syphilised, will often submit in mental and moral laziness. Our ablest physicians quiet down their conscience, take the fee, and perform the operation; because, as in liquor-selling, somebody will do it. Perhaps the dogma of the survival of the fittest may be true; and if so, vaccinated families, like those of drunkards and syphilisitics, will run out, leaving the intelligent and pure-blooded to have the honour of being the ancestors of the "Coming Race."

Vaccination does not, cannot, never did arrest an epidemic of small-pox. It is an unscientific practice, without physiological or philosophical justification. The vaccinated suffer most from the ill of civilisation, the nameless diseases, and thousand physical discomforts which render life a burden, and make so many suffer a hell on earth, in untold forms and multiplied woes. So long as doctors are well paid for vaccination, we shall have it, but not longer. An advancing enlightenment will put a stop to it. The daylight of science will drive it into the cess-pool, with other medical superstitions, named only with scorn. As lovers of mankind, and haters of egregious folly and wrong-doing, we heartily wish it were daytime now.

A GOOD EXAMPLE.—We read in the British Friend—"At Ulley Greenhead, Keighley, on 27th of Eleventh Month, 1880, Gulielma, wife of Robert Alspoh Milner, a son, who was named Robert Ewart, who will remain, like all their other children, unvaccinated."

WHAT DID JENNER DISCOVER?—I am much interested in Mr. White’s manner of stating this question in his Story; and it seems to me it might be brought to a clear issue if we inquired, For what could Jenner have secured a patent? It is certain he could not have patented inoculation with cow-pox, for that was well known. The claim, I apprehend, would have to be reduced to inoculation with cow-pox from arm-to-arm; though per contra, it might be alleged, that inoculation from arm-to-arm with mild forms of small-pox was in vogue. Anyhow whatever could be patented would be a trifling technicality, altogether unworthy to secure Jenner a place among the world’s benefactors.

A PATENT AGENT.

FROM ST. THOMAS,
DANISH WEST INDIES.
St. Thomas, 15th January, 1881.

My Dear Sir,—Your valued favour to hand with 100 copies of my illustrious namesake’s speech in Parliament, for which all good angels bless him! Since my last letter, small-pox has made its appearance in St. Thomas, and we are shut out from the other islands by a rigid quarantine. It is in a mild form, however, and so far we have had no deaths in about twenty cases, which have been isolated. From the time it became known that I intended to stand out against vaccination, no vigorous measures have been attempted, and anti-vaccinators have been let alone. Small-pox was brought here by a young man from Porto Rico, where it prevails all the year round. Porto Rico is one of the loveliest of the Antilles, and is inhabited by a most kindly people, who detest their rulers, under whose despotism they have the benefit of compulsory vaccination, along with the endurance of illimitable till.

It is particularly noticeable that when small-pox is more prevalent than usual in Porto Rico, our medico, instead of enforcing quarantine against that island, begin to vaccinate right and left; which to my mind appears like an invitation to the disease, which it usually accepts. I daresay they think they do well, but anyone who has seen cases of Barbados leg, elephantiasis, or leprosy, common in these countries, would think twice before allowing a child to be vaccinated with virus that might transmit these loathsome affections.

Many parents, dreading such infection, procure what they are pleased to describe as "pure lymph from Europe," not knowing that purity in such a connection is a myth devised by fee-loving doctors. In St. Domingo and Hayti, where vaccination is not enforced, there is little or no small-pox. "Singularly so," said a friend of mine from Hayti. "Not at all," I replied; "for the disease has nothing to feed upon in the absence of a blood-poisoned vaccinated population."

All who have taken small-pox thus far in St. Thomas are vaccinated. The unvaccinated, mirabile dictu, have escaped. The terror of the vaccinated is pitiable when compared with the serenity of the father of an unvaccinated child, who is thoroughly posted up on the vaccination question.

CHARLES E. TAYLOR.
To WM. THES, Esq.

THE ALASKANS.—In taking the census of Alaska (the extreme north-west territory purchased from Russia by the United States) some of the inhabitants said the only difference they experienced under their new allegiance was exemption from the visits of official vaccinators armed with compulsory powers.

The New York Medical Tribune for February concludes an article on the recent Paris International Anti-Vaccination Congress thus:—"A good beginning has been made of a movement which, we trust, will never pause until the soul practice of diseasing human beings by statute and precept shall utterly cease."
VACCINATED TO DEATH.

The following sad story has made the round of the newspapers without contradiction:—The troop of Esquimaux which Herr Hagenbach has been leading about for the entertainment of sight-seers in the cities of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, is now extinct. After their successful performances in Berlin, where Professor Virchow made them the subject of study, they were carried off to Darmstadt, where a girl belonging to the troop died. They were moved next to the manufacturing districts of Westphalia, where they lost a woman and a child; the latter from small-pox. At Crefeld they ended their service in Germany, and their "proprietor" resolved to carry them to France. The survivors—five in number—arrived in Paris. Herr Hagenbach was waited upon by the sanitary officials, who informed him that he could not be allowed to open his performance until all his company had been duly vaccinated. The terrified Esquimaux had to submit twice to the painful ordeal. In spite of the double precaution the experiment failed utterly. The five Esquimaux sickened of small-pox in spite of scrupulous and careful vaccination—the anti-vaccinationists will perhaps say because of it. They all died; and so no single member of this poor company of strangers will return to give his Northern kinsfolk an account of the marvels of the civilised South.

GOOD SENSE AT WATERFORD.

At the Waterford Board of Guardians on the 22nd of January, Dr. Whitty reported a child named Jacob, whose parents had three times positively refused to comply with the law and have it vaccinated.

Mr. Rogers—Was not Jacob the name of the man who refused to comply with the law in Limerick?

Chairman—Yes; he went to America sooner than comply with the Act.

Mr. Strangman—Why does this Waterford Jacob refuse to have his child vaccinated?

Mr. Clappett—Because he has no faith in vaccination; and he is right in having no faith. Medical statistics prove conclusively, that vaccination is accountable for a large per centage of infantile mortality.

Clara—Gentlemen, would it not be well to compel him to obey the law?

Chairman—I think myself that vaccination should be optional, not compulsory.

Mr. Clappett—Certainly. That also is my opinion.

Clarke—What order will you make on this report of the Doctor?

Mr. Clappett—Mark it read. The Board decided to take no further action against the parents.

Simplicity.—There is an outbreak of small-pox in Chicago, and the editor of the Chicago Tribune expresses that many severe cases have occurred among the vaccinated and re-vaccinated.

FROM LIMERICK.

A few years ago some members of my family took a fancy for re-vaccination, and suffered more or less in consequence. My son informs me that for three or four weeks he was really ill, that his arm was dreadfully swollen, and that he was hardly able to go about. A daughter recovered easily, but was subsequently attacked with large glandular swellings under the arm, and eruptions upon the scalp. A second daughter suffered in another way, and, I believe, has never been in good health since. I knew nothing at the time of their intention.

In the September Inquirer, it is stated that Mr. Joshua Jacob, of this city, had sold his business and left Ireland. He has removed his family to America, but he has not sold his business; and in a letter to a newspaper, he states that he is its sole proprietor, and is personally carrying it on for the support of his family. I was talking to him a few days ago, and he may be seen daily in his shop.

R. H. DYRE, M.R.C.V.S.

Limerick, 12th February, 1881.

MR. G. COTTER BEALE'S CASE.

At the Riverstown Petty Sessions, County Cork, on 26th January, Mr. George Cotter Beale was summoned for refusing to have his child vaccinated.

The Chairman, the Rev. James Freke—I am very sorry, Mr. Beale, to have this case coming before us again. I wish you could see your way to obeying the law which has been made for the general good of the community. The country requires the law to be obeyed for its own safety. I suppose you have nothing to say.

Mr. Beale—I respectfully ask your worship to defer the hearing of the case until the promised Government measure is introduced to Parliament. The question of vaccination is of growing importance. An anti-vaccination Congress has just been held in Paris, and you would do well, I think, to hesitate where so much is in doubt.

Chairman—Yes, but in the meanwhile the existing law must be obeyed.

Mr. J. T. O'Connell, solicitor—The law is likely to be modified by Parliament, but even as it stands your worship has full discretionary power.

Chairman—If there is any chance of revised legislation, we would suggest that the Guardians should not again press this charge.

Dr. Ryan—The Guardians would not prosecute in this case, only the people living round Mr. Beale will not now have their children vaccinated at all.

Mr. Beale—The other day the Waterford Guardians declined to prosecute a conscientious objector to vaccination.

The Bench, however, was obdurate, and Mr. Beale was fined 10s. and costs.

I consider the present mode of carrying out the Vaccination law most cruel and unwarrantable.—W. H. James, M.P.
THE WASP OF SAN FRANCISCO.

The small-pox in San Francisco has subsided in other forms of syphilitic disease, and to the editor of the Wasp great credit is due for his fearless and forcible exposure of the folly of resorting to vaccination for safety. In a recent number he says he has received many letters and pamphlets from England, which prove, first, how wide is the circulation of the Wasp, and, second, how strong is the feeling which exists in the country of its origin against a practice which is an outrage upon nature and common-sense. Here is the last editorial on the subject under date 29th January—

"Our druggists and physicians have a large stock of small-pox, and the thought of its remaining unsold causes them to become quite virulent. Hence those touting appeals to 'come up and be killed,' which some of our contemporaries are publishing. With most trenchant logic, the case is cited of an unvaccinated family, some members of which had taken small-pox. This is held up as an awful warning to such as dare to be sceptical of the Jennerian 'discovery.' We were not aware that any had ever claimed complete exemption from small-pox for the unvaccinated. We notice that at the last meeting of the Board of Health the subject of vaccination was brought up and it was estimated that no vaccinated persons had died modified to none that had been successfully vaccinated. Next time it will probably read none who have had small-pox. The case of a well known merchant is another example of the danger of vaccination. Some months ago, contrary to the advice of his friends, he was vaccinated, and from that day his health perceptibly declined. Being advanced in years, his vital power was insufficient to throw off the poison, as more vigorous constitutions might have done. Mortification ultimately set in and he died."

"From the manner in which these fanatical dogmatists write about vaccination, we might imagine that the Almighty had created man imperfect, and that it required Jenner to give him the finishing touch. The people have, however, been considerably opened of late to the baseless pretensions of these medical empirics. They shall be still further opened. The virus vendors must rue themselves to the end of keeping their stocks on hand. Better a thousand times that they should rot than impregnate the systems of thousands that live and other thousands yet unburned. We counsel our readers not to permit themselves to be misled by interested advocates of this most beastly practice. Let them examine and judge for themselves. Of this they may be assured—vaccination will not protect from small-pox if the constitution is charged with impurities, and thus susceptible; whilst on the other hand, it may engraft disease far more deadly than that from which it is sought to escape."

JENNER APOTHEOSIZED BY A GERMAN PHYSICIAN.

"The Germans are more ready to adopt new ideas. At a rate in this country Vaccination is opening their eyes to the folly and wickedness of it quicker than we are. One German canton of Switzerland has already repealed its Compulsory Vaccination law, and the whole of Germany seems likely to do the same. A distinguished German physician not long ago thus apostrophised the English inventor of vaccination—"Thou English Doctor Jenner, thou hast brought into confusion the laws of nature; thou hast made the people ailing; thou hast killed unnumbered innocent children; receive the Devil's thanks from German soil."

LEICESTER.—We read in the Globe of 21st Feb. —"Mr. P. A. Taylor is reported from Leicester to be 'sanguine that the present Parliament will see the death of the compulsory clauses of the Vaccination Act. It will certainly see the death of a good many of Mr. Taylor's constituents if the epidemic which is spreading in London gains a footing in Leicester. We read that the magistrates, having dealt with 100 cases of disobedience to the law last week, have still 2,000 summonses before them. When the population has been decimated, the surviving dupes of the mischievous agitation of which Mr. Taylor is the mouthpiece will, perhaps, own that they have been misled. "The dupes" know very well what they are about. They do not pretend that refraining from vaccination will avert small-pox, but simply that they will encounter the disease more successfully with vitality diminished and blood deprived by vaccine poison. "Decimation" is a pretty word much favoured by vaccinators; but what is meant by it? Even with all their ignorance, they cannot literally believe that any English population ever was, or is likely to be, decimated by small-pox.

MODERN DERRA ANCIENT SUPERSTITIONS.—Though the belief in Jenner and his cow-pox is a superstition of the day, which is banished from the statute book by the Act of 1853, yet we must not understand that there has been no improvement since the old times, for that is not the case. The improvement may not be great, still there is some; at any rate we do not burn our anti-vaccinationists alive, or kill them as they did the witches, even down to comparatively recent times. Mr. Leckey tells us that so late as 1704 a blacksmith in a seaport town had long been ill, declared he was bewitched by an old woman, whereby the populace, encouraged by the clergyman of the parish, stretched a rope at a great height over a ship and the shore, tied the old woman by the heels to the middle of it, and then swung her about until she was dead. Now, in these days, that is, the general public, are certainly not so cruel. Popular superstition says, that if a particle of matter, got originally from a running ulcer of a diseased beast, be mixed with the blood of an infant, it will be safe from one of the forms of fever as long as it lives. But when a parent, a little wiser than his neighbours, refuses to permit his child to be inoculated, the Medical Officers of the Leicester, done, we do not tie him by the heels and swing him about till he is dead; we only fine him or send him to prison. Thus, when superstitions fears are aroused, the general public is undoubtedly less cruel than it used to be.—H. STRICKLAND CONSTABLE in Fashions of the Day.

SMALL-POX IN THE NAVY.—In a letter to the Freeman's Journal, Mr. P. Davis, Jun., observes,—"The navy is by no means charmed against small-pox. Dr. Seaton gives its percentage mortality at a figure which is three times the small-pox mortality of the general population for the same period—1850-64; and Sir J. Clarke Jervoise showed, in his evidence before the Commons' Vaccination Committee in 1871, and his assertion was in no way challenged, that there was not a ship in her Majesty's navy where they had not had small-pox after vaccination. It will be remembered, also, that during the Zulu war the transport service was seriously inconsidered by ravages of small-pox. The papers reported alarming outbreaks of that scourge on board at least three of the troopships, the Tenedos, the Shah, and the Bosphorus, and that notwithstanding the most rigorous precautions as to vaccination."