

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.

VACCINATION VIEWED POLITICALLY.

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN, in a letter to Mr. Henry Pitman, writes—

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

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

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

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

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

before God and man. Parents who become martyrs by resisting the law, deserve a sympathy akin to those who are martyrs of religion."

POCK-MARKED FACES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

HENRY PITMAN.

Manchester.