

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.

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 1848 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 1853, 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 riak," and praises the father who will go to prison rather than permit it. Yet Sir Thomas Watson so hugs 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 unpalatable,—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 figment 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.

THE VALUE OF MEDICAL CERTIFICATES AND STATISTICS.—An article on "Certificates of Death," by Mr. Henry May, Health Officer to the Aston Union, Birmingham, says: "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 fever. 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."

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 not do 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 20 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.