

THE
VACCINATION INQUIRER

AND HEALTH REVIEW.

HE WHO KNOWS ONLY HIS OWN SIDE OF THE CASE, KNOWS LITTLE OF THAT.—*J. Stuart Mill.*

VOLUME THE FIRST.

APRIL 1879 to MARCH 1880.



LONDON:
EDWARD W. ALLEN, 11 AVE MARIA LANE.
1880.



The Vaccination Inquirer

And Health Review.

No. 1.] — 6.

APRIL, 1879.

[PRICE 2d.

CONTENTS.

PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1	To Our Readers.....	6	Scientific Quacks.....	11
2	Atrocity of Vaccination.....	6	Compulsory Vaccination. By Mon- cure D. Conway, M.A.....	12
2	Calf Lymph worse than Human Lymph.....	9	A Common-Sense View of Vaccina- tion. By Henry Fitzman.....	12
3	The Story of a Great Delusion. By William White.....	10	St. Pancras Persecutors.....	13
6	Imprisonment for Medical Heresy....	10	Irish Vaccination.....	14
			Pure Lymphers, or Foxers.....	11
			"Porter de l'Eau à la Rivière".....	12
			Persecuted but Unconquered.....	12
			An American Experience.....	12
			Vaccination of the Poor.....	13
			"Government Prosecutions for Medi- cal Heresy".....	14

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 civilisation. 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 unsuccess; but he says, also, that *so far from being likely to produce fewer ailments and cutaneous eruptions in the pre-disposed, he knows from his experience that it would, as being more irritating, produce more.*"