



University of
BRISTOL

Vaccination condemned by medical men, and medical men condemned by vaccination

Author(s): Toye, E. W.

Source: *Bristol Selected Pamphlets*, (1884)

Published by: [University of Bristol Library](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/60242364>

Accessed: 14/09/2014 09:02

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Digitization of this work funded by the JISC Digitisation Programme.



University of Bristol Library and are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
Bristol Selected Pamphlets.

<http://www.jstor.org>

13

VACCINATION
CONDEMNED BY
MEDICAL MEN;

AND

MEDICAL MEN
CONDEMNED BY
VACCINATION.

BY E. W. TOYE.

"A nation has no ears when the blood of its children has
been shed."

UNIVERSITY
OF BRISTOL
LIBRARY

LONDON :
"THE CHARITY RECORD" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET, E.C.
1884.

PRICE THREEPENCE.
(Terms for Copies for Distribution may be had on application.)

X-10-449669-9

P R E A M B L E .

MANY persons support Vaccination on the plea that the medical profession are almost unanimously in its favour. I shall, therefore, prove that that plea is unsubstantial. I shall then further show that medical men are by no means agreed on this subject; that they essentially differ as to both the mode and manner of Vaccination; that the opinions of many of the medical supporters of this cruel superstition are totally unreliable, coming—for the most part—from persons pecuniarily or otherwise interested; and, moreover, that an increasing number of influential and experienced medical men have condemned the practice.

It is not my intention to censure the faculty as a whole. If it were, I could not do it more effectually than have some of their own profession. It would be absurd and also unjust for me so to condemn them, for I am cognisant of their invaluable services to mankind—particularly of late years, in connection with special hospitals. It is, however, my intention to hold up to public contempt, scorn, and ridicule, those prominent members who publicly insist upon compulsory Vaccination, and wilfully and persistently ignore the proofs of its inefficacy and cruelty; those who, through fear of losing the favour and patronage of the profession, give—in cases of death from Vaccination—false certificates, knowing them to be false; and those who endeavour to injure the practitioners who dutifully certify death from Vaccination, when that is the case. The medical profession, as a body, adopt and practice Vaccination chiefly for two reasons: First, because, as students—on the same rule that clergymen, before entering the Church of England, must subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, whether or not they believe them—they are obliged to subscribe to the Vaccination theory; and, secondly, because, when in practice, parents unwillingly go to them—although the Government does not guarantee the lymph they use—rather than to the

Public Vaccinator, whose lymph "the Government *did its best* to secure should be free from suspicion." So says Mr. Russell, of the Local Government Board; and however difficult to comprehend what he means, who will not accept his word in faith and fear? He gets his information from the same source as does Sir Charles Dilke—viz., the paid Vaccination experts. This Government-recognised Vaccination is the very operation carefully shunned by nearly every parent who can afford to engage a private doctor.

Before I conclude I will give, respecting the Public Vaccinator's work, some facts as to the hurried, careless, cruel, and dangerous performance of the operation, which may well terrify parents, and justify—nay, make it their duty to offer—resistance to the inhuman Act of Lord Lyttleton, which has made slaves of parents and martyrs of their offspring. They cannot evade the Act, in the full force of which its author did not believe. He had as much or as little faith in the Public Vaccinators, as I expect Sir Charles Dilke has. Lord Lyttleton was asked whether, if the Local Government Board officers advised him to send his infant humbly attired to the Public Vaccination Station, he would undertake such a risk. When thus put to the test of his belief, he jesuitically replied, "My impression is that the Act does not require anyone to send their children to the public station. I think everyone can get it done in the way he prefers." But, by all the powers of the Local Government Board, it must be done! The parents are not rich, and the credit of the profession must be saved, if children are slaughtered. True, there are plenty of them, and, if vaccinated into the grave, they will not increase the difficulty of dealing with a surplus population. Sir Charles Dilke has stated that he has been repeatedly vaccinated. Comparatively few adults suffer from small-pox, and, in fact, the vast majority rightly deem it unnecessary to be re-vaccinated. Vaccination is specially for children. But let that pass. I ask Sir Charles, Were the operations performed on him by Government Public Vaccinators? That is the question. If not, let him cease his boasting. Having referred to Lord Lyttleton, I may here say a few words about the origin of his worse than barbaric, compulsory Act, and express the hope that Sir Charles Dilke will not be like its author, who, although repeatedly and earnestly appealed to, perversely refused to argue the question. His example is faithfully followed now by the vaccinating fanatics. The first Act to make Vaccination compulsory was passed in 1853. Lord

Lyttleton, who introduced it, was asked to consider whether the compulsory legislation had not caused persecution and increased the general death-rate. He evasively replied, "I should consider it an entire waste of time"; and then added, "When I brought in the Bill of 1853, it was on the *assumption* that the scientific world was agreed upon it." And this man's unwarrantable and daring assumption has caused the massacre of thousands of innocents, and will cover his name with infamy. Excepting the offspring of the few courageous and devoted parents who suffer the breaking up of their homes and martyrdom by imprisonment, the children of the working and poorer classes undergo bodily pain—frequently disease and death—owing to the passing of this Bill in the House of Lords. Towards the end of last Session an attempt was made by this House to pass a Petroleum Bill. This, like the Vaccination Act, was in the nature of panic legislation—always to be suspected and often dangerous. The former affects only the limbs and lives of tender little babes and their poor parents' love; and so it has for years been enforced with all the pains and penalties of accumulated fines and imprisonment, to the accompaniment of ignorant denunciation by doctor and magistrate. But the latter affected the interests of a trade, who instantly organised an effective resistance, and so the Bill was dropped like a hot coal. Indeed we are a nation of shopkeepers!

PARLIAMENTARY TREATMENT OF THE QUESTION.

It is desirable to acquaint the public with some important and discreditable facts as to the Parliamentary discussion, and the division upon Mr. Peter Taylor's motion last June. At the outset, an unfair attempt by a count-out was made to prevent the subject coming forward at all. This being unsuccessful and the discussion inevitable, the greater number of those who voted listened to and applauded the sophistries of Sir Lyon Playfair, but declined to stay and hear Mr. Taylor's powerful indictment against their unreasonable theory. Their absence fortunately will not be lost sight of by their constituents at the next election. It is to be regretted that Mr. Gladstone set these members a bad example. Because of his high official position and influence, and the fact that he had professed a desire to be convinced before voting for compulsory Vaccination, he is more to be blamed than any other member. Of the few present during this indictment was Mr. Warton, whose senseless ejaculations and impatience while such vital truths were being told, was illustrative of the fanatic "who knowing only his own side of the case, knows little of that." The Press—especially the London daily and the Medical Press—with its characteristic unfairness and want of prescience, very briefly reported the speeches against, but devoted much space and clap-trap comment to those in favour of Vaccination, calling attention to the division list as a conclusive proof that the country had pronounced for the continuance of compulsory Vaccination. It would be difficult to point to a greater fallacy. "Every schoolboy" knows that only a small proportion of the population—and they the wealthier classes who are not sufferers by the iniquitous Vaccination laws—are represented in Parliament. The fallacy is made more clear by the noteworthy fact that the eighteen members who supported Mr. Taylor represented nearly one-ninth of the registered electors, and one-twelfth of the population of the United Kingdom. These eighteen worthy opponents of medical tyranny are as follows:—Sir Thomas Chambers, Q.C., Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and Messrs. Arthur Arnold, John Barran, Rowland Blennerhassett, Jacob

Bright, Thomas Burt, Arthur Cohen, Joseph Cowen, William T. Craig, Robert Ferguson, J. R. Hollond, C. H. Hopwood, James Howard, Henry Labouchere, Thomas Roe, J. E. T. Rogers, and P. A. Taylor. The defeat, although disastrous and discreditable to certain persons, was not an expression of the opinion of the country, and is not to be regarded as irreparable. Now, as to the sophistical speeches of Sir Lyon Playfair and Dr. Cameron. Sir Charles Dilke may be passed by. He did not neglect the "traditions" of the department, and was an excellent mouthpiece of the Local Government Board. His hirelings' statements will be elsewhere analysed.

Sir Lyon Playfair was contemptibly unfair; for, after hearing Mr. Taylor state, that since 1871 he had done his best to atone for his error in signing a report defending the "excellence" of Vaccination, yet from the unthinking members he raised cheers by quoting against Mr. Taylor the fact of signing that report. That was unfair, unmanly, and tricky. More than that—it was unworthy—or was it worthy—of the House of Commons' champion of Vaccination. What followed was worse. Going back twelve years, he stated that, "since 1853 seventeen millions of children had been vaccinated in this country, and it was very doubtful whether there were three or four specific cases where this disease (syphilis) had been produced." Against his "very doubtful" I will by-and-by quote positive statements of reliable medical men. He did not deny "that, as a result of the irritation produced by Vaccination, skin diseases might occur." Having, in the place of argument, tried to frighten the House by his night-mare description of small-pox—which description does not agree with that of another great Vaccinator—Dr. Farr—this champion, of course, stated that protection was wanted against the spectre he had raised. As do the priests, so do the medicine men—they rule by faith and fear. Happily, these old weapons are fast becoming rusty, blunted and useless. The Royal College of Physicians was then quoted as having reported that small-pox was not so violent after as before Vaccination. This is the College which once reported that "inoculation was a certain cure against small-pox,"—and inoculation was, in 1840, made a penal offence. To his hyperbolical account of the effects of small-pox—which, by the way, is reckoned but the 35th cause of death upon the death list—I will before I finish oppose some "ghastly risks" and cruelties of Vaccination.

Sir Lyon Playfair also gave some statistics to prove that the enforcement of compulsory Vaccination had reduced small-pox.

This fallacy of his he knows has been refuted again and again. Speaking, then, of small-pox following the train of the German and French armies at the war of 1872, he tried to score a point by alleging that, whereas 23,469 of the French died of small-pox, because they were not vaccinated, among the Germans the deaths did not exceed 263. This allegation has done duty among the rabid vaccinists for the last ten years. It has appeared several times in the *British Medical Journal*, and that journal and Dr. Playfair have given as their authority Dr. Colin. And Dr. Colin has pointed out that there is not a word about the matter in his book that is quoted from, and that the figures are fictitious. And what is more, it has been proved that the French Army were all re-vaccinated! This unfounded statement about these deaths to which fanatic vaccinists have clung so tenaciously is a rod for their own backs; for that 23,469 soldiers "protected" by Vaccination should fall victims to small-pox, is about as crushing a refutation of the efficacy of Vaccination as its opponents could wish. This persistent adherence to inaccuracies, and tardy admission of—or refusal to admit—being wrong is a sign of mediocrity, and would be amusing were it not so serious a matter—one of life and death, in fact. Others of Sir Lyon Playfair's statistics were equally erroneous. As to the benefits he attributes to Vaccination, a Parliamentary return of 1880—which, when challenged he dared not allude to—shows that the death-rate of infants from vaccinal diseases was greatly increasing.

Now for Dr. Cameron's speech. The *Times* report says, "he did not believe there was danger in Vaccination from the human subject, but *if there were* it might be obviated by taking the vaccine from the calf." I think it was a fish-hawker, who, when an incredulous purchaser was too dull to understand how a living was to be made by selling fish at a loss, replied, "Oh, it's the quantity as does it." And Dr. Cameron's calf lymph is the stuff—if you only take enough of it! Dr. Cameron wrote, in 1879: "I suspect that isolated examples of syphilitic infection through Vaccination are much more common in this country than is generally supposed;" and said, "In France, where the chief of the National Vaccination Service clings less closely to this theory (the impossibility of communicating syphilis), he saw the danger much earlier; and in 1867 published a list of upwards of 160 cases of syphilitic infection through Vaccination, which had been brought under his notice in little over a year."

PROPOSITIONS.

I will now proceed to my task of proving the following propositions :

I.—That medical men, whose investigations and experience respecting Vaccination should make their opinions acceptable, condemn (a) Vaccination generally, and (b) particularly as conveying syphilis and other diseases.

II.—That the medical advocates of Vaccination are in hopeless confusion and disagreement ; that their statistics and statements are untrustworthy ; and their certificates frequently false.

III.—That the medical faculty who support Vaccination do so ignorantly, or from mercenary motives, avoid argument, and misrepresent the statements of anti-vaccinators.

I.

VACCINATION CONDEMNED BY MEDICAL MEN.

IN this condemnation of Vaccination, I give a few notes, because I believe they will help to convince my readers that the persons named should be credited in preference to pecuniarily-interested and other persons, whose reputation, resting upon the base and baseless fabric of a medical superstition, will crumble to pieces with the fall of that arbitrary theory. This question of Vaccination is not one in which there are not two opinions ; for the medical experts themselves are in antagonism, and have divers and diverse views thereon. It is, therefore, the duty, especially of the Premier and Sir Charles Dilke—because of their official positions, and consequent influence—to do all they can to facilitate rather than place obstacles in the way of inquiries intended to elicit the truth in the matter. In the meantime, unless they advise the people of the admitted dangers of Vaccination, they are responsible for the compulsory infliction of suffering, disease, and death upon babes, who cannot—and of poor, slave law-ridden parents, who

in the face of fine and imprisonment, dare not—resist the lancet and the lymph of the well-fed vaccinators. These officers' wretched work is made additionally lucrative by money grants for so-termed "successful" Vaccination. Is it not preposterous to talk of "successful" Vaccination, when common sense tells one that an operation to be "successful" should make the person vaccinated proof against an epidemic. Submitted to such tests, Vaccination has succumbed and utterly failed. Dr. Robinson, the Birmingham public vaccinator, besides his fee of 1s. 6d. per head (which some guardians desired to raise to 2s.), has for the last six years received, annually, bonuses of between £200 and £300 from the Local Government Board for "successful" Vaccination; and—I say, consequently—a terrible outbreak of small-pox recently occurred in this most thoroughly and "successfully" vaccinated town. At the bidding of medical men, and upon Lord Lyttleton's Bill, the Government burden the ratepayers with the heavy expense of enforcing, at the cost of life and limb, the vagaries of a profession, and punish parents who, desiring to keep their children healthy, feel it their duty to resist the law. What right has any Government to insist that the opinions of a portion of a certain profession shall be forced upon those who, thinking for themselves, doubt the soundness of those opinions? I am as fairly entitled to reject the advice and prescription of the medical profession, in respect of Vaccination, as I should be the recommendation of any number of tailors, supposing they insisted that I should wear a particular cut or pattern of breeches. The well-paid, and, because of their cooked statistics, unscrupulous experts, are not worthy to be named in the same breath as the following medical authorities, who utterly condemn the pernicious and cruel theory:—

Dr. John Epps:* "The vaccine virus is a poison. Nobody has a right to transfer such a *mischievous poison* compulsorily into the life of a child."

Dr. T. L. Nichols:† "There is no doubt *thousands* have been mortally poisoned by Vaccination."

Dr. Joseph Hermann:‡ "When one has treated hundreds of cases of small-pox, one comes to the decided conclusion that

* Director of the Jennerian Institute for 25 years.

† A medical author of repute.

‡ From 1858 to 1864, Chief Physician at the Imperial Hospital, Vienna.

Vaccination has not the remotest effect on the outbreak, course, or issue of the disease." "Vaccination is *the greatest mistake and delusion in the science of medicine*; a fanciful illusion in the mind of the discoverer; a phenomenal apparition devoid of scientific foundation, and wanting in all the conditions of scientific possibility."

Dr. B. Cornell:* "*Vaccination has been a curse, instead of a blessing, to the race.* To no medium of transmission is the widespread dissemination of cutaneous diseases so largely indebted as to Vaccination."

Dr. A. H. Caron:† "It is long since I have positively refused to vaccinate at any price. *Vaccination is a bauble*, gilded over, indeed, by Act of Parliament, with which doctors rock—too often to a fatal sleep—the gullible children of the world."

Dr. Collins:‡ "After 20 years' experience as a public vaccinator, I am convinced that no amount of care nor attention to detail, nor cautious selection of lymph, can obviate the risk of Vaccination being followed by erysipelatous inflammation: in fact, *there is no certainty in the operation.*" He also says: "He had known persons who had been vaccinated and re-vaccinated suffer *dreadfully* from small-pox."

Dr. J. J. G. Wilkinson:§ "The introduction of Vaccination, the persistence in it, and its elevation into a compulsory law, may be cited as a cardinal instance of blindness to the most general considerations of health on the part of the medical profession."

Dr. C. T. Pearce:|| "Vaccination is a violation of God's law, and a contaminator of the body. The increased death-rate of children is coeval with the extension of Vaccination. So far from the practice being protective against small-pox, the liability in adult life is greater in the vaccinated than in the unvaccinated."

Dr. Vernon:¶ "I never saw a child under one year of age recover from small-pox."

* President of the New York Homœopathic Medical Society.

† Member of many learned societies.

‡ Of the Edinburgh Royal College of Physicians. By refusing to vaccinate he lost a practice of £500 a-year.

§ An author of great repute.

|| A late writer who devoted many years to the investigation of the subject, and one of the best statisticians of the day.

¶ Of Southport.

Dr. Coderre:* “*The notion of introducing a purulent virus into the human system is so revolting to physiological science that it is surprising more caution has not been exercised in adopting it. It would not have been so had not the necessities of medical men prejudiced their minds against the truth.*”

Dr. Hubert Boëns:† “*Vaccinators must know that by Vaccination they do not avert small-pox, whilst they injure the health of children without any compensation whatever.*”

Dr. H. Oidtmann:‡ “*Shortly before the war, the whole of the French Army were vaccinated. This general Vaccination tended rather to extend the disease than to protect from it.*”

Dr. G. F. Kolb:§ “*With the stern proofs before us of the inability of Vaccination to protect, when we reflect upon the undeniable and fearful mischief which the operator so often inflicts upon his victims, the conclusion forces itself upon us that the State is not entitled to put in force an enactment so directly subversive of the great principle of personal right.*”

Dr. Gregory:|| “*The idea of extinguishing small-pox by Vaccination is as absurd as chimerical, as irrational as arrogant. The susceptibility to small-pox grows with years in those that are vaccinated; the opposite is the case with those not vaccinated.*”

Dr. Skelton,¶ who considers Vaccination as a species of madness, which first filtered through the brain of Jenner, adds: “*Not England alone, but every part of the civilised world, more or less, went mad; and humanity is now reaping its reward—not in the extirpation of small-pox, as promised by the fanatics, but in the increase of diseases more frightful in their character, and in their general results more fatal.*”

* Professor of Materia Medica at Victoria University, and 30 years physician at Montreal.

† Belgian Academy of Medicine, and author of many works on Vaccination.

‡ Chief Physician at Verdun and St. Quentin's Hospitals during Franco-German War.

§ Of the Royal Statistical Commission of Bavaria.

|| Physician for many years to the Small-Pox Hospital.

¶ Licentiate in Medicine and Surgery, London and Edinburgh.

Dr. W. Hitchmann:* "Vaccination could not bring good to old or young, male or female. Re-vaccination was the true cause of many deaths registered under other ailments."

Dr. Stowell:† "Vaccination is not only an illusion, but a curse to humanity. More than ridiculous, it is irrational to say that any corrupt matter taken from boils and blisters of an organic creature could affect the human body otherwise than to injure it. I know *more than a hundred physicians who think like me.*"

Drs. George and F. E. Hoggan say: "The frequent announcement of lymph having been microscopically tested, and proved to be pure, we, as specialists in microscopical pathological investigation, stigmatise unhesitatingly as an *impudent fraud* on a credulous public. There is *no* indication for knowing vaccine lymph to be pure, or only what it is represented to be, by means of the microscope."

Prof. Ennemoser: "A more infernal mystification the world has never experienced. The belief in witches can only be compared to it."

In 1872, in Montreal, 21 physicians publicly protested against compulsory Vaccination, because "such practice is pernicious, and incompatible with individual liberty and professional honour."

A tithe of such professional evidence ought to amply suffice to condemn this State-aided and lucrative superstition. The foregoing medical testimony could, however, be largely supplemented, and would be so supplemented if I thought such additional testimony would have any weight with those who agree only in this—that there must be Vaccination of some kind or other; that the vaccinators are not sufficiently remunerated to enable them to "properly" do their work; and that, until some settlement is arrived at as to what efficient vaccination is, parents may weep, and churchyards be filled by the vaccinated victims.

* President of British Medical Reform Association.

† Twenty years a vaccine physician.

VACCINATION A VEHICLE FOR DISEASE.

I now come to the horribly serious aspect of this question, and one which is naturally attracting much—and will attract more—public attention—viz., the liability of syphilis and other diseases being conveyed by Vaccination. That there is such a liability the following medical authorities deponeth:—

Sir Thomas Watson, Bart., in 1880, said: “It is too certain that the operation (Vaccination) may, in some few instances, impart to the subject of it the poison of a hateful and destructive disease (syphilis) peculiar to the human species.”

Mr. Brudenell Carter, in 1877: “Syphilitic contamination by vaccine lymph is by no means an unusual occurrence, and a *large* portion of the cases of apparently inherited syphilis are in reality vaccinal.”

Prof. Ricord, M.D. (Paris), 1862: “If ever the transmission of disease with vaccine lymph is clearly demonstrated, Vaccination must be altogether abolished.” A year later, after investigation, he publicly stated his conviction “that syphilis could be transmitted by Vaccination.”

Dr. Cornell: “Cutaneous diseases have increased in frequency, severity and variety to an alarming extent. . . . To no medium of transmission is this so largely indebted as to Vaccination.”

Dr. Jules Guérin, one of the most eminent physicians in Paris: “A number of medical men consider Vaccination and Re-vaccination to be in itself one of the *causes of small-pox*.”

Dr. Copeland: “Vaccination favours the prevalence of several forms of scrofula.”

Dr. Gregory: “Pure lymph, being the product of consumption, carries the seed of contamination with it, whether it be syphilis, scrofula, mania, or any other disease.”

Dr. Collins had “*often* seen children with syphilitic eruptions after Vaccination, whose parents were free from taint.”

Dr. L. T. Nichols: “Syphilis, scrofula, and probably every kind of blood poison can be taken by Vaccination, which, so far from being a protection from small-pox, seems to have been one of the chief causes of the late epidemics. It is never safe to take matter from another body into our own; we risk taking all

its diseases. There is no doubt *thousands have been mortally poisoned by Vaccination.*"

Dr. Garth Wilkinson, in April last, referring to a death of a child from Vaccination, said: "There are *hundreds* of cases running a parallel course, and testifying to lymphatic poisoning in the victims."

Dr. Brereton mentions that two children of foreign parentage in Hawaii are reported as having contracted leprosy through Vaccination. One died shortly after.

Dr. R. H. Bakewell, Vaccinator-General of Trinidad, "had seen several cases of leprosy which could be attributed to no other cause than Vaccination."

Dr. Pearce: "Eleven young persons, four of them women, engaged in a house of business at the West-end of London, were vaccinated by order of their employer. Those eleven victims were syphilitised from the child selected at one of the London State vaccine stations."

Dr. Seaton says of animal lymph: "So far from being likely to produce fewer ailments and cutaneous eruptions in the predisposed, I know from my own experience that animal lymph will, as being more irritating, produce more."

The following recent occurrence at Great Cornard, in Suffolk, is but a sample of hundreds of cases which, owing to the difficulty of obtaining an inquiry, never come to light. Several children died after Vaccination: One, Louisa Griggs, was vaccinated by a person who was *not* a qualified medical man.* Another, Ethel Emily Griggs, was vaccinated by the public vaccinator, Dr. Mason, who denied Jenner's view that erysipelas commonly followed Vaccination. Now, let the mother tell the horrible story: "The instrument he used had three or four points. He gave baby's arm a prick with this, and screwed it round in the arm." This was on October 16. "On the 17th she was very fretful, and would take no food. Sunday, the 26th, being a lovely day, I had her out for an airing, as she continued very restless. That night she was so bad I got no sleep. On Monday she was worse, and I had to leave her in bed. For the first time, she screamed when I put my arm round her to raise her. Up to this time I had not observed any sores, but her body was much

* A writer in the *Lancet* recently said, respecting unqualified medical men, "The State should prosecute such charlatans,"

swollen. There were little ridges, and I could feel knots under the skin. Then inflammation began on the left—the vaccinated—arm, and spread to the side, which looked as if it had had mustard plaster on it. I had no rest with her again on Monday night; and so on Tuesday morning, when Mrs. Hills took her baby for examination, I sent a message to Dr. Mason that my baby was very ill. When Mrs. Hills came back, she told me the *doctor laughed*, and said my baby would be all right if I took care of it. Baby, however, gradually got worse. Her left hand was swollen as big as an orange. I then called in Mr. Fletcher. When he saw the baby he shook his head, and ordered her body to be fomented with gin rags. On Thursday, fits came on, and screaming. The fits continued, and she screamed so violently that she lost her voice. Her little lips moved, but there was no sound. On Saturday Dr. Mason saw her, and on Sunday, when it was evident she was dying. She died on Monday, November 5. The certificate of death I have not seen, but I am told it is filled up ‘Erysipelas.’ It ought to be, ‘Strong Inflammation, caused by Vaccination.’ Three days before death, baby’s hip and back began to mortify. The body was much swollen after death.”

Readers, if public vaccinators receive bonuses for “successful” Vaccination, should they not be rewarded for work of this description? And further, as the Guardians of Clapton (where small-pox is spreading, although the district is well vaccinated) have resolved that parents shall be interviewed and have impressed upon them the desirability of Vaccination and Re-vaccination, should they not at the same time make known the fearful dangers following the operation? As it is not very likely the Guardians will give this additional information, it would be a most charitable deed if some person of means would provide funds to disseminate among parents some such facts as are contained in this chapter.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, it will not be inappropriate if I point out that, horrible as is Sir Lyon Playfair’s far-fetched description of the ill effects of small-pox, there are infinitely worse results to be feared from Vaccination. A “Vaccine Disaster Record,” by Mr. Baker, of the Inner Temple, gives particulars of 400 out of *thousands of deaths* from Vaccination. Some of the deaths occurred within a few days; others after years of suffering. The following instances of the terrible and prolonged tortures of the vaccine slaughter-house eclipse the stories of the Inquisition;—

"Remarkably strong boy. Soon a mass of eating ulcers ; bones rotting out. Continuous suffering for 16 years !"

"Mortification. Burst *before* death !"

"Filthy blotches ; a skeleton. Suffered 9 months."

"Completely poisoned. Constant suffering for 13 years."

"Running sores. Four years and two months incessant pain."

"Constant diarrhoea."

"Mass of rottenness."

"Rotting away. An indescribable sufferer for 8 years."

"Eruption eating up the face."

"Arm nearly rotted off."

"Black holes ; mortifying ; erysipelas ; arm rotting off."

A large number of the poor victims had *small-pox* after Vaccination ; some had syphilis and other loathsome diseases ; some fits ; others became blind, or insane, or paralysed. But so horribly sickening and agonising are the details, that I refrain, or I could fill pages of equally revolting results of Vaccination. What I have written I oppose to Sir Lyon Playfair's overdrawn picture of the effects of small-pox. If only one such case as I have quoted were ascertained to have been consequent upon Vaccination, it ought to suffice as a justification for those who do not believe in the alleged benefits of the operation being exempted therefrom. It should then be optional. But, as I have instanced, it is not only one or a few, but "horror on horror's head accumulate" from this State-sanctioned, endowed, and enforced dogma.

II.

THE MEDICAL BABEL.

My next division relates to the helpless and hopeless confusion among the faculty respecting Vaccination, and to the facts that their statements thereon are untrustworthy, and their certificates frequently false.

First, as to the confusion among the profession as to when Vaccination should be performed, what should be used, and how and at what period it should be done. Acting on the same principle—or rather, want of principle—as a certain member of Parliament, who, in discussing the Affirmation Bill, contended that no one should be entitled to a seat in the House of Commons "unless he believed in some God or other,"—the medical fraternity

are only united in insisting that the heretics must be made to profess belief, or submit their children to some Vaccination or other.

Dr. Jenner, the high-priest, stated that "one mark in the arm was a protection from small-pox for life." The words he used about his discovery or invention were that it "protected for ever," and would "stamp out small-pox in Europe in thirty years."

For two generations the medical dogma was that one vesicle was enough to protect from small-pox.

Now, that from four to twelve vesicles are thought to be necessary, Dr. Tripe says, "the number of insertions of lymph are often too few."

Dr. A. Ransome says: "Four good marks are necessary."

Dr. Colin considered that "inoculation should be periodically renewed, in order to maintain immunity during the entire life."

Dr. Warlomont, a distinguished Belgian vaccinist, actually practises "vaccinisation,"—viz., Vaccination of persons again and again until vesicles cease to form after the insertion of virus.

If this were universally carried out, great would be the pecuniary gain to the operators.

Dr. Drysdale contends that "one good scar is as good as many."

Dr. Tomkins (of the Fever Hospital, Manchester) recently said: "If done every five years, it (Vaccination) would absolutely protect if properly done." In the same speech he contradicted this by observing: "Vaccination does not protect absolutely, I admit." "You pay your money and you take your choice," said the showman, when asked which was the lion and which the lamb.

Dr. T. F. Bond thinks "the protection given by Vaccination is, as a rule, directly proportioned to the *number* and *size* of the cicatrices." Is not this, my readers, supremely absurd?

Others say, vaccinate every seventh, every third year, and some even urge annual Vaccination. So hopelessly divergent are their views that, apparently, the only way to help them out of their difficulty and please them, would be by being continually operated upon in the slaughter-house of vaccinators. They may think what they choose, but for their actions they should be held responsible. How much longer are doctors and soldiers to murder legally and thus be exempt from the just punishment meted out to other destroyers of human life!

With the discordant notes of the profession as to the *manner* and *matter* I now briefly deal,

In the early part of the century the Royal College of Physicians reported that inoculation was "a certain security against small-pox," that it was "an infallible cure for the small-pox."

Saith the prophet Jenner: "*There* is the true protective virus," and he pointed to the heels of a disordered, diseased, and consumptive horse. This man, who, because his theory met with opposition in 1811, wrote: "The town (*sic*) is a fool, an idiot," had, in 1799, congratulated his country "on their beholding in the mild form of the cow-pox, an antidote that is capable of extirpating from the earth a disease which has been considered the severest scourge of the human race." Its accomplishments have not conformed with its alleged qualities. This autocratic doctor—who spoke of two members of his profession who condemned Vaccination as "hissing serpents"—subsequently greatly modified, and, really and completely, upset his own first theory; for in 1809 he had descended to this absurd position: "What if 100 or 500 persons have small-pox after cow-pox, as many can be produced who have had small-pox after small-pox."

But enough of this pecuniarily successful quack of quacks.

Dr. O'Connor tells how Vaccination is publicly performed. I heard him recently say: "There is a great deal of negligence in the performance of Vaccination. Many of the public vaccinators are inefficient, and if I were the Government Inspector I would cashier the lot of them. From what I have seen of some of these paid local vaccinators—one in London and several in different parts of the country—I say that any medical student who has vaccinated half-a-dozen cases would have taught them how to vaccinate properly. *Many of the children who have received so-called Vaccination, have never been vaccinated.*" And this Dr. O'Connor advocates vaccination and believes that Vaccination is only safe when repeated and repeated until the system ceases to respond to the insertion of virus.

"Some crazy enthusiasts recommend that lymph be taken direct from the cow," observes Dr. Shorthouse.

Dr. Seaton knows from his own experience that animal lymph would, as being more irritating, produce more ailments and cutaneous eruptions in the predisposed than human lymph.

Dr. Tomkins (of Manchester), who says: "No chemical analysis can be made of lymph," when asked if there are any means of knowing whether the lymph on the charged ivory point is pure, replied: "Of course, the man receives this from a source which he does not see or know, and he *cannot guarantee it.*" As

to the alleged merits of human and calf lymph, he is again very accommodating, for he observes: "One is as right as the other. They are both *supposed* to have the same source; but the human lymph is modified by passing through so many generations." "*It does not matter what lymph is.* There is no need to argue about that, *if* it will do what *we* want." This may suit the Manchester Fever Hospital authorities; but with his "if's," and "we's," and suppositions, I consider his teaching worse than uncertain and unsafe.

The *Lyon Medicale*, in 1879, said of an outbreak of glanders from which a number of children were believed to have suffered in Italy: "The local doctors vaccinated with animal lymph thirty-eight children, all aged less than twenty months. Whilst they were awaiting the incubation of the vaccine pustules, they soon perceived that they had inoculated one of the most horrible of maladies, and that they were the involuntary authors of a *real massacre of the innocents*." Then follows a terrible description of the effects of the inoculation.

The doctors' organ, the *Lancet*, has ridiculed the contention that calf-lymph would protect from syphilis. On the other hand, Dr. Cameron, with his calf lymph nostrum, believes that in vaccinating from arm to arm, the most terrible of diseases may be inoculated. This blind leader of the blind, together with Dr. Drysdale, Dr. G. Wild, Dr. Brown, and others, advocate the abandonment of humanised lymph for calf lymph, and says that it will afford full protection. It is pecuniarily more profitable to give up one's reason and independence than one's practice and pay, and so the Local Government Board vaccinators are following Dr. Cameron like lambs, although there was a time when they disapproved of his quack calf lymph remedy. In 1879 the same doctor said: "Either the protective virtues of Vaccination are mythical, or there is something radically wrong in our national system of Vaccination."

Dr. Stevens, a Local Government Board Vaccination Inspector, however, has stated that: "He had seen more vaccinated children than any man alive, or who had lived, 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." So by all the powers and "traditions of the office" of the Local Government Board, the little innocents shall be vaccinated with something, somehow, and somehow!

On the subject of the early Vaccination of poor children, and

the re-vaccination of their mothers in infirmaries, Dr. Whitefoord writes: "The too early Vaccination of infants and parturient paupers, is as unjustifiable as it is cruel."

The St. Pancras medical officer, Dr. Dunlop, however, thinks otherwise, for he vaccinated a pauper infant six days old and it died, and he re-vaccinated the mother a few hours after her confinement. This is what the *Student's Journal and Hospital Gazette* said of the affair: "It is almost incredible that any medical man should venture to introduce the vaccine virus into the system of a woman only a few hours after her confinement, but from Dr. Dunlop's admissions it would appear to be a usual practice with him. One would think that the ordinary dangers of the child-bed would be sufficient for Dr. Dunlop and his patients to battle against; but no, he is apparently ready to run any risk, or encounter any danger, that is, I take it, providing the person whose health and life is at stake, is a pauper inmate of the workhouse under his charge. I would ask Dr. Dunlop if he would vaccinate his own wife—if he has one—or anyone whose life he valued, the day after confinement. I venture to hope he would not; then why should persons whose poverty compels them to seek the shelter of the workhouse be treated differently? One feels humiliated that a member of our profession should have permitted himself to be the active agent in carrying out such a practice."

Dr. Dunlop probably performs Vaccination as well, or as ill, as is possible under the difficulties attending a large number of operations; but Dr. G. H. Merkel has described how, when large numbers have to be vaccinated, it is done. Those who peruse the following I hope will not forget what Dr. O'Connor said about our public vaccinators. According to the law of the United States every emigrant must be vaccinated, and this is Dr. Merkel's account of how it is done on board ship: "The surgeon sat on a box in the store room, lancet in hand, and around him were huddled as many as could be crowded into the confined space. Old and young, children screaming, women crying, each with an arm bare and a woe-begone face, and all lamenting the day they turned their steps towards the land of the free. The lymph used was of unknown origin, kept in capillary glasstubes, whence it was blown into a cup into which the lancet was dipped. No pretence of cleaning the lancet was made. It drew blood in very many instances, and it was used upon as many as 276 persons during the first day.* I

* The vaccinating lasted three days,

inquired of the surgeon if he had any fear of inoculating disease, or whether he examined as to the health or disease before vaccinating. He replied, he could not stop for it. Besides, no choice in the matter was left him. The law demanded the Vaccination of each and every one, and he must comply with it or be subjected to fine."

UNTRUSTWORTHY STATISTICS AND STATEMENTS.

That the statistics and statements of professional vaccinators and their leading advocates are unworthy of credence, is the question now to be considered.

Dr. Buchanan has stated that in London 12,000 infants were *saved* annually, by Vaccination, from death by small-pox. How, I ask, can that be possible, when in the very worst time before Vaccination, small-pox did not in any year carry off more than 4,000, including infants and adults?

Dr. W. B. Carpenter presumes to say "his figures are not disputed by his opponents." That is untrue. The celebrated 23,469 deaths, which he relied upon as one of his most important statistics, have frequently been disproved, and he has had to acknowledge that he made a mistake about them. Dr. Carpenter, in a letter of April 23, to Sir Lyon Playfair, quotes statistics of Vaccination to show, in respect of Canada and the United States, that compulsory Vaccination, wherever established, has produced good results. Now, hear Dr. Coderre, of Montreal, who surely has a better opportunity of knowing the facts than Dr. Carpenter.

Dr. Coderre says: "Dr. Carpenter's reference to the Canadian, French, the Irish, and the 'unvaccinated' are characterised by *gross inaccuracy*. The same remark applies to his statement respecting the City of Montreal."

Dr. Playfair states that the death-rate of the past century from small-pox in England, was 3,000 per million. For this there is no evidence, and his figures are disputed. However, he goes on to say that small-pox had decreased; and that in 1854, prior to compulsory Vaccination, the death-rate was only 305 per million. This, it should be remembered, despite the opinion of medical men that the protection of Vaccination wears out. Well, then, compulsory Vaccination came into force, and the decrease went down to 223 between 1855 and 1871, and to 156 from 1872 to

1882. Thus, the decrease was upon his own showing actually slower with than without compulsory Vaccination.

The unreliability of Dr. Playfair is here still more clear. In 1871, he said of Scotland, that the compulsory Vaccination laws were able to stamp out small-pox in the country. In 1872 and 1873, a small-pox epidemic caused 3,572 deaths. Sir Lyon Playfair in answer to this crushing refutation of his figures, says that "stamping out" is not "keeping out." Evidently so. However, one thing may, by and by, be stamped and kept out, and that is, the reputation of "Dr." Playfair, who is a somewhat eminent chemist, but not a medical man. There is no need to deal with other equally untrustworthy statements.

In October last, the Registrar-General, in his weekly return of the medical certificates supplied to him gave this fact: "The 1,438 deaths included three from small-pox—they were three unvaccinated children—all from 3, Medland-street, Stepney." Mrs. Snook, living at this house, declares "the statement is not true." Three of her children had small-pox and two died, but they had been "all *beautifully* vaccinated."

It is notable and lamentable that, not only Dr. Tripe, but other ardent advocates of Vaccination, cook their statistics to support their theory. They insert in their tables the year in which the small-pox malady is light—of course, attributing the result to Vaccination, and omit the years of epidemics, when small-pox is heavy. It is a fact that, in the three epidemics since 1853, the deaths from small-pox increased far beyond what would be expected from the increase of population. For instance, in the epidemic years of 1857-8-9 there were 14,244 deaths; in the years 1863-4-5, 20,057 deaths; and in the years 1870-1-2, 44,840 deaths. Dr. Tripe, who is the medical officer of health for Hackney, in an official statement to the Local Government Board, actually omitted from the table all the statistics with regard to Vaccination and small-pox for the 100 years between 1771 and 1871. Was it because the statistics omitted would—if given—have shown a great increase of small-pox in consequence of inoculation? In face of these facts, Dr. Wood—once the president of the Royal College of Physicians, which considered beneficial to mankind the practice which is now a penal offence—said: "I do not think a person has a right to keep a child unvaccinated any more than a fierce dog." Dr. Corrigan, too, a member of the Vaccination Committee of 1871, said: "An unvaccinated child was like a bag of gunpowder, which might blow up a whole

school." Dr. Wood further said: "There is no reason to believe that the protection afforded by Vaccination has diminished." Let Dr. Tripe reply. He, two years ago, said: "Before the, now almost usual, custom of arm-to-arm Vaccination was generally carried out, there was very much bad Vaccination, and persons were, consequently, imperfectly protected."

That the statistics and statements quoted in support of Vaccination by its medical advocates are untrustworthy, Dr. Buchanan, Dr. Lyon Playfair, Dr. Carpenter, Dr. Tripe, and others have made clear. It is also apparent, from the frequent change of front, as to the *modus operandi* of Vaccination. I will, however, quote from a letter in *The Charity Record*: "A word of caution now, as to the statistics in support of Vaccination. Some ardent, unscrupulous, and over-zealous vaccinationists have stated upon hearsay, that at Ceara, in the Brazils, 40,000 out of a population of 70,000 died in about a year from small-pox. This, like many of their statistics, is a mare's-nest."

I will introduce the important subject of certificates given by medical men in case of death from Vaccination by an extract from the same letter. The writer remarks: "More discreditable even than the unreliability of the statistics, and the distorted figures of vaccinationists, is the fact brought to light, again and again, at inquests—that when deaths occur from Vaccination, medical men will not give correct certificates." A medical journal, sometime since, said: "Everyone knows that death certificates are, in many cases, utterly fallacious and misleading, and are so, because it is desired to conceal the true cause of death." This is what a medical officer once said on the subject, and the remark is as true now as ever:—"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 not the whole truth, and assign some prominent symptom of the disease as the cause of death."

"As instances of cases which may tell against the medical man himself, I will mention erysipelas from Vaccination, and puerperal fevers. A death from the first cause 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."

"The lists of the unvaccinated are recorded in a biassed spirit,

because when a child dies of confluent small-pox, the authorities give their cause the benefit of the doubt, and, no marks being recognisable, pronounce the child unvaccinated. Where no marks are found they declare the child unvaccinated, notwithstanding the protest of the parents to the contrary. It has been found, too, that in a great majority of cases, children, whose deaths have been registered as 'died of small-pox, unvaccinated,' the fee has been previously claimed for those children as having been successfully vaccinated."

In connection with the Norwich Vaccination Inquiry, four children were found to have died from Vaccination, and yet the medical certificate had shown only one death as resulting therefrom and in the case of eight deaths at Gainsborough from Vaccination, not one of the certificates gave Vaccination as the cause.

Dr. J. E. Coderre says, "Certificates of death are not to be trusted. I saw a child suffering from small-pox subsequent to Vaccination, yet the certificate ran as follows: 'Death from small-pox—not vaccinated.' I inspected this certificate."

Some facts about the recent deplorable results of Vaccination in Deptford—which is illustrative of what is occurring in other parts of the country—are especially to the point here. Five out of 21 children vaccinated from the same child by the public vaccinator, Dr. Kavanagh, were afterwards certified by Dr. Fisher, medical officer of the district, to be suffering from syphilis. And now mark what follows the temerity of this bold bad man. The Local Government Board comes to the rescue to save the reputation of its public vaccinator. In accordance with the "traditions of the office," an "official investigation"—whatever that means—is made, and the Board Inspector writes to and for the time thus comforts Dr. Kavanagh: "I think his (Mr. Fisher's) conduct truly scandalous and he is, in my opinion, on that ground alone totally unfit to hold his present office, not for his siding with the anti-vaccinators, [Oh dear, no!], which he has a perfect right to do if he likes, but for the statement respecting the infant whose disease he entered as *syphilis*. This was either knowingly false, or believed to be true. If the latter, his ignorance shows him to be quite unfit for his post; if the former, dismissal is not enough punishment. I wish the parents were in a position to indict him for perjury." Only imagine, my readers, a district medical officer being actually *permitted* by a Local Government Board Inspector to think as he "likes." I was once under the impression that one's thoughts were uncontrollable. Observe, too, the kindly

feeling in the perjury suggestion. This is not all. Dr. Kavanagh complains that Dr. Fisher was actually paid by the Anti-Vaccination League to report as to the state of the children. Dr. Kavanagh (who of course disinterestedly and without fee or reward does his cruel vaccinating), then said that two of the children—Gilbert and Freshwater—were perfectly free from eruptions. And, lo and behold, hardly had the doctor spoken, Gilbert must needs die, and an inquest was held on the body of the poor babe. The bereaved mother then stated that: "The deceased, born on April 11, was a fine healthy child; she was vaccinated on July 23, by Dr. Kavanagh. On the following Sunday she had an eruption upon her, and on the Monday, the child being a mass of corruption, she took it to Dr. Kavanagh's surgery, and saw his assistant, who gave her some lotion and powders. Dr. Kavanagh came on Tuesday. She had the child in her arms and had been up all night with it. It was in such a dreadful state that she had applied castor oil to it. He came again on Wednesday and saw the child, and she told him her husband had said she was to take it to a magistrate; but he said she was not to make a bother about it, he would fetch a physician down and pay all expenses." Dr. Makuna and Dr. Forsyth attributed death to double pneumonia. The Jury, however, added to their verdict of "Death from double pneumonia," this rider: "We regret the loose manner in which Dr. Kavanagh appears to have performed his duty as public vaccinator." Rather than be in the position of Dr. Kavanagh, backed up by Sir Charles Dilke and the Local Government Board with all its traditions, I would prefer that of Dr. Fisher with dismissal from his official post and threatened indictment for perjury hanging over his head.

I think no more instances respecting certificates are required. Those cognisant of the history of lunacy cases, and the ease with which certificates are obtained from some medical men, will, doubtless, agree with me as to the value of those documents. Like counsel's opinion, their value and contents are to be measured by the pence paid.

When such lies as Dr. Coderre points out are resorted to in order to mislead, one is inclined to think it not impossible for others of those members of the medical profession who so fervidly insist upon Vaccination to be equally guilty. Anyhow, this untruthfulness should—and with disinterested thinking men will—suffice to discredit the figures and facts of vaccinists.

I should like, however, to make it plain that the whole question, when fairly looked at, assumes quite a different aspect to that

given to it by vaccinators. It is admitted by the medical journals and by members of the profession, that false certificates are given; it is known that medical men fear being tabooed and boycotted if they certify that children die from Vaccination. I have proved—and it has been proved over and over again—that the statements of Dr. Buchanan and others as to the saving of lives by Vaccination are fallacious. If, for one year, the medical profession would in this matter be honest; if the Local Government Board would use its power to prevent misrepresentation and facilitated inquiry respecting deaths occurring shortly after Vaccination; if, at least, some portion of any diminution of small-pox were attributed to improved sanitation; and if some portion of the deaths from small-pox were attributed to the poverty-stricken condition of the poor—then Vaccination would be for ever discredited.

III.

MERCENARY MOTIVES.

IN respect of Vaccination and Total Abstinence, medical men are similarly situated; and, about the latter, Dr. Alfred Carpenter made this damning admission: "The medical man would do what is right if the public made it *worth his while*. All medical men *cannot afford* to be total abstainers, because, if they were, they would be *tabooed and boycotted*."

That a similar fear influences the profession in connection with Vaccination is only too evident from the fact that they are bound to subscribe to the dogma before they can get their diploma. Mr. Peter Taylor, M.P., asked some medical students to examine the question, and not to take the traditions of their predecessors. They cravenly replied: "We cannot afford it. We have our livelihood to make, and we must take the course open to us. We are *made to say these things, and to assert the truth of Vaccination before we are allowed to pass*."

Oh, this medical tyranny! Could mental thralldom further go?

The pecuniary interest in keeping afloat the cruel superstition will be, to some, apparent by a mere statement of the immense cost to the country of the 4,500 public vaccinators, inspectors,

and other officers. The medical practitioners acting as public vaccinators, and the non-medical inspectors, receive annually about £100,000; and the awards for superior Vaccination in 1882 amounted to over £14,000. The Vaccination in 1882 of 516,000 children cost £111,460, or nearly 4s. 6d. each. Besides this, the faculty receive more liberal payment from the wealthier class, who have their children vaccinated at home. That it is "worth their while" to do what is *wrong* is the opinion even of some eminent members of the faculty; for, says—

Dr. Longstaffe (of Edinburgh): "The public vaccinators have received immense sums of money for sustaining this *monstrous fraud*. Has ever a *quack remedy* produced so much gain?"

Professor Hamernik (of Prague): "Where vaccinators have possibly an interest in multiplying operations, care and attention are no longer possible."

Dr. J. E. Coderre, surprised that there was not more caution before the notion of introducing a purulent virus into the human system was adopted, adds: "It would not have been so, had not the *necessities of medical men prejudiced their minds* against the truth."

Dr. W. Hitchman (Liverpool): "Vaccination could not bring good to old or young, male or female, and was only intended to *fill the pockets of Vaccination doctors* with hundreds of pounds per week."

Dr. J. Dodson considers "the *mercenary motives actuating the bulk of the medical profession*, and the persistent determination of State-paid officials to *close their eyes to plain facts*," as two of the three influences operating in New England against the repeal of the compulsory Vaccination laws.

Dr. Dunlop, the notorious vaccinator of St. Pancras, receives a shilling for every "successful" Vaccination; and he recently startled the public by making known—not only the little-dreamt-of fact that weak women are re-vaccinated a few hours after their confinement—but that he had re-vaccinated 1,500 of such poor creatures, and consequently had vaccinated about as many poor puny babes. If the operations on the children alone are reckoned, the shillings would number 1,500, or £75; or, counting the re-vaccination of the women, £125. This lucrative practice, therefore, seems "worth while" keeping up; besides, by so doing, one can avoid being "tabooed and boycotted." True, the law requires that the vaccinated shall be in a healthy condition; but then there is no responsibility upon the State department or its

paid officials—no fine or punishment for imparting disease, or causing death or injury for life ; and the work is very easy.

Sceptical persons may ask whether it is likely that the class of women who have to resort to the infirmary to be confined, or the children they bear—especially when only a few days old—are in a fit state for the painful and beastly operation of Vaccination ? It is, however, easy to assume that they are—especially if one has “his livelihood to make.”

The large sum paid to public vaccinators, together with the award of 1s. or 1s. 6d. for each child “successfully” vaccinated, is proof that many medical men derive a considerable portion of their income from the Vaccination of the children of parents who have no faith in the Government lymph ; and it shows that there is a great pecuniary interest in defending this horrible theory of the medical priesthood.

A further indication of the mercenary motives of the Vaccination practitioners, is the continual clamour in the medical and their other organs for increased fees, in order that Vaccination may, as they say, be *safely* and *properly* performed. That in itself is an admission that at present it is not either safely or properly performed. But it must be done, nevertheless. As Mr. Gladstone once said of the cry for increased remuneration, “This is a serious and stiff proposal with respect to the operation of this law.” A bad workman, we are told, complains of his tools ; but here are bad workmen and bad tools. I doubt not, if they had the power, the medical priesthood would follow the example of their clerical brethren and exact a tithe from all—orthodox or dissenters. No wonder with the large sums they already receive, and the hope of a much larger amount being devoted to this superstition, that it is thrust upon hospital students, and that the bulk of the profession afterwards persistently *profess belief* in such a profitable theory. Although their pecuniary prospects would be injured, and they would incur the wrath of the medical autocracy, if they expressed doubt in the efficacy of Vaccination, still, in the case of the lives of little infants, “with no language but a cry,” one would have thought the profession would not be slaves, but have the courage to make searching inquiries into other than official figures and statistics.

A word or two from Voltaire may not be out of place here : “Miserable human beings, whether in green robes, or in turbans—whether in black gowns or surplices, or in mantles and bands, never seek to employ authority where nothing is concerned but

reason. Seven cardinals, assisted by certain minorite friars, threw into prison the master of thinking in Italy (Galileo), at the age of 70; and made him live upon bread and water because he instructed mankind in things of which they were ignorant. Having passed a decree in favour of the categories of Aristotle, the above junto learnedly and equitably doomed to the penalty of the gallies whoever should dare to be of another opinion from the Stagyrte, of whom two councils had burnt the books. Further, a Faculty, which possessed very small faculties, made a decree *against* innate ideas; and afterwards another *for* them, without the said Faculty being informed, except by its beadles, of what an idea was. In neighbouring schools, legal proceedings were commenced against the circulation of the blood. A process was issued against inoculation, and the parties cited by summons."

I would here appeal to students and young members of the profession to be something more than "dumb driven cattle." Think for yourselves. Be not like the students of priestcraft, who are taught—not to ascertain what is the truth—but, how best to defend the old creeds and dogmas. Yours is a subject affecting the bodily welfare of mankind, and of incomparably more importance than the many century-woven and musty cobwebs of theology, the unravelling of which, even if that were possible, would not be a substantial benefit to anyone. Yours is essentially a subject for scientific investigation, and it is your right—nay more, in the interests of humanity, your duty—to ascertain all the facts you can for yourselves, and so elucidate the truth.

My final point relates to the manner in which the arguments of the opponents of Vaccination have been met, or rather avoided. There is no better criterion of the weakness of a cause than the fact that its supporters shirk fair argument. Honest men are always open to conviction, and, instead of avoiding, are desirous of hearing and carefully weighing the arguments of their opponents before coming to a decision. In fact, that is the only way to arrive at the truth. But this goal is evidently not the one to which vaccinators direct their gaze. They rather turn their back to it. That the leaders of the medical profession will not argue, but persistently suppress the evidence against Vaccination in order to bolster it up as long as possible, I will now prove.

I take it that the *Lancet*, the *British Medical Journal*, and,

to some extent, the *Times* also, represent the medical faculty. This, then, is their mode of procedure. The *Medical Observer*, in 1810, recorded over 500 cases of persons having small-pox by Vaccination, and 97 fatal cases, and 150 cases of injury after Vaccination. And yet Dr. Ernest Hart, the editor of the *British Medical Journal*, has carefully omitted these failures of Vaccination from his book entitled, "The *Truth* about Vaccination."

The *Times*, the *Standard*, and the *Spectator*, among other papers, eagerly give publicity to incorrect statements respecting Vaccination, but refuse to notice replies thereto. It is to the dissemination of falsehood, the futile attempt to strangle truth, and other contemptible devices that vaccinators resort in order to keep the pernicious system upon its tottering legs.

The *Lancet* not only refuses to insert communications of writers who oppose Vaccination, and also the advertisements of anti-Vaccination literature, but goes the length of saying that the facts of Dr. Buchanan—which have been refuted over and over again—"afford ground for the strongest special pleading in favour of Vaccination." This bad advice is acted upon by other medical journals, and by such papers as the *Times*, *Standard*, *Telegraph*, *Morning Post* and *Globe*, which are doing their utmost to keep alive the wretched cause, which would have expired ere now, but for the suppression of truth, the misrepresentation of facts, and an acceptance—without inquiry—of the untruthful statements of interested medical autocrats. By such means has their pernicious dogma so long held sway; but, by letting in the light, the people will see that this nostrum is upheld by blind faith, falsehood, fear, and fraud, and they will soon demand its abolition. In this matter of the health and well-being of the community, this medical tyranny—this insistence upon a particular practice because it is assumed to be believed in by a majority—is treating as unreasoning men those of the profession who dare to think for themselves rather than blindly accept as truth everything taught by the medical associations. Unless the profession are allowed the use of their reason, they are but slaves and machines to carry out the dictates of a tyrannical majority. If there is one branch of science more than another in which freedom of thought is necessary, it is the science of medicine, as its chief object is—or should be—the relief of mankind from sickness, suffering, and disease; and this object cannot be accomplished if there is a restraint and hindrance upon inquiry and endeavours to ascertain the truth. The past and present history of the medical profession

bear ample record that it is by no means infallible. The Royal College of Physicians is now declared to have been penally wrong in regard to inoculation. The faculty once insisted upon bleeding, with as much force and fury as they now insist upon Vaccination. Alluding to the bleeding to death of Byron, the *Lancet*, last May, said : "In this day we look with wonder at the medical art, which in twenty-four hours could bleed three times a fasting man, then blister him, and, finally, supplement the so-called treatment with two strong narcotic draughts. Practice then, would be *mala praxis* now. It is thus we live to learn, and learn to forgive those who precede us, *as we for our ignorance hope to be forgiven.*" What a humiliating confession of the utter unreliability of the nostrums of these self-elected priests of the body ! It should not, however, be forgotten, that whilst they "live to learn," their little innocent victims learn to die, and that, too, in great numbers.

Some of my readers may consider the foregoing language at times intemperate. Placed side by side with the utterances of the leading spirits of Vaccination, from Jenner to Dr. Playfair, I do not think I shall suffer by the comparison. In any case, this is a mere question of style. My chief concern has been to prove, by facts and figures of the doctors themselves, a case against the too prevalent notion that Vaccination has the almost unanimous support of the medical men. And, in this endeavour, I have been greatly assisted by the speeches of Mr. Peter Taylor, M.P., and the works of the late much-lamented Dr. Pearce, and of the Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.

