

When doctors disagree, a vision of vaccine / by Alfred Milnes.

Contributors

Milnes, Alfred, 1849-1921.

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

Publication/Creation

London : E.W. Allen, 1886.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/j3vcdcek>

Provider

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Library & Archives Service. The original may be consulted at London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Library & Archives Service. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

WHEN DOCTORS DISAGREE,

A

VISION OF VACCINE.

BY

ALFRED MILNES, M.A. (Lond.), F.S.S.

Agin to impress on the poppylar mind
The comfort an' wisdom o' goin' it blind.

HOSEA BIGLOW.

Ἵνα τι γέλοιον εἰπῶ καὶ περὶ γελοίου πράγματος.

ST. GREG. NAZ.

London :

E. W. ALLEN, 4, AVE MARIA LANE.

—
1886.

Price 4d.

London :

PRINTED BY GEORGE REYNOLDS, 23, STEPNEY GREEN, E.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
WHEN DOCTORS DISAGREE: A VISION OF VACCINE	5

APPENDIX—

THE VISION INTERPRETED	27
------------------------	-----	-----	-----	----

The following Vision was narrated, on March 24th, 1886, to the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination. By request, the explanatory Appendix was added, and the paper prepared for publication.

When Doctors Disagree.

IT is easy but monotonous work to answer medical men on the subject of Compulsory Vaccination, or for that matter, any other vaccination. If a man will but apply his own intelligence to the question, divest his mind of what he thinks doctors ought to know or should know, or must surely know, and be content with inquiring what they DO know as represented by what they DO say, then a single hour's instruction will suffice to supply such a man with a key to fit every fetterlock that vaccine theory has hung about the limbs of our ancient liberties. For instance, no man who has once really mastered the fact that the pre-Jennerian death-rate in small-pox cases was 18 per cent., will ever again give credence to the statements put forth that the unvaccinated now die, for want of vaccination, at 49, 50, or 64 per cent of cases. But however necessary it may be to thus instruct in the alphabet of the subject, Public Vaccinators, Medical Officers of Health, Members of Parliament, and all others equally ill-informed on its rudimentary aspects, it must inevitably at last become tiresome to an audience such as I am called on to address this evening. It therefore occurred to me that, since the process of answering the doctors is getting wearisome, I might perhaps be permitted for once to take a holiday, and allow the doctors to answer one another.

It is many years since such an apple of discord was thrown into the ranks of the medical profession as the collection of queries and answers published under the name of "Transactions of the Vaccination Inquiry," edited by Dr. Makuna. Yet this publication after all only concentrates into a small compass divergencies which have been of as long standing and as wide diffusion as Vaccination itself.

* * * * *

So far I had written when I fell fast asleep, and dreamed. I found myself at once in the midst of a very imposing assembly. The multitude there gathered in conclave looked well to do, and by the fact that many held in their hands a hat with a stethoscope neatly reposing in the crown of it, I judged that I had come unbidden into some medical conference. In this view I was soon confirmed, when I found Dr. BUCHANAN showing by the aid of a blackboard and chalk, that if you take 5 from 7, 3 will remain, and that figures which double themselves are practically stationary, and declaring, in answer to one who seemed to be objecting, that he despised the arithmetic of the Board Schools, and that they did things *his* way at the Local Government Board. In another part of the room, Dr. W. B. CARPENTER was explaining how small-pox came to be present in and absent from Malta at one and the same time; and in a third corner, SIR LYON PLAYFAIR was instructing a group of what seemed like medical students, in the History of Epidemics, and showing how the Black Death of 1348 was manifestly due to the breaking out of the Wars of the Roses in 1455.

MR. ERNEST HART I found in front of a map of Brazil, pointing out the town of Ceara and with a touching air of truthfulness, assuring all whom he could persuade to listen to him, that in that town 40,000 persons died of small-pox in a single year, out of a population of certainly not more than 30,000. He seemed to mistake me for a medical man, for he repeated the assertion to me as I passed him. I allowed that such an event was curious, but assured him I had heard it before, and had no intention of forgetting it. DR. BRANTHWAITE, Medical Officer of Health for Willesden, I also recognized; but the others seemed to stand rather aloof from him, and I overheard a disparaging whisper about him to the effect that he had so far forgotten himself as actually to meet in public debate, one of those rascally anti-vaccinators. I noticed that he was trying to console himself with a volume of Catlin's "Native Tribes of North America," which he was endeavouring to read upside down. DR. DRYSDALE was standing in front of the fire declaiming against theological persecution, till some one reminded him tartly that persecution of that kind was not the subject they were met to consider. DR. ARTHUR HILL HASSALL was displaying a specimen of what looked like ointment to several gentlemen round him. "This," he said, "is a 'Small-pox Obliterator.' I can highly recommend it for removing the traces of that disease." Somebody objected that doctors have to tell the public that since vaccination has been the rule there are no pock-marked faces to be seen, and that the sale of such an article might interfere with the acceptance of vaccination. "My dear Sir, there's plenty of room for both," was Dr. HASSALL's answer. "It's four-and-sixpence a pot," he added, catching my eye; and I moved on in mute

admiration of his colossal head for business. It was evidently a meeting of medical men, convened for some purpose connected with Vaccination; but the humours of the scene were not all comic. In one corner a woman, poorly but decently clad, was standing with a baby in her arms, and the tears chasing one another down her cheeks, interviewing a Public Vaccinator. "Can't this one be let off it, Sir?" she pleads, between her sobs; "indeed, Sir, it killed my other one." "Fiddlesticks!" is the answer. "What's a child or two to you?—you're young enough to have plenty more." In another direction, DR. STEVENS was conducting a careful inquiry into a case of alleged injury from Vaccination; at least, so I was informed by an official of the Local Government Board, without whose aid I should not have suspected it. "Now, MRS. KERRIDGE," he said, "what did the poor little thing die of?" "Sir, it died of Vaccination." "My good soul, no child ever died of Vaccination." Then turning to MR. RUSSELL, who was close by, he continued: "The mother of the child KERRIDGE has not the remotest idea of attributing its death to Vaccination." MR. RUSSELL said nothing, but bowed and retired. I afterwards learned that this was the way in which a "score off Hopwood" had been prepared for the House of Commons, and that Dr. STEVENS's words, obediently parroted by Mr. RUSSELL, had there been received with loud laughter. Just then the door opened, and a lady and gentleman entered. They were evidently persons whose position entitled them to the consideration of such an assembly, though both were young. The lady bore in her arms a baby, but as both mother and infant were richly dressed, nobody suggested to *her* that a child or two was no matter, even though she might truly have been described

as young enough to have plenty more. A glance at the little bare arm showed me that vaccination had not yet been performed. From the apparent age of the child, however, the question is clearly becoming urgent, and the parents seem to have come to this conference to obtain from its collective wisdom the best possible advice as to the impending operation.

Firm in the faith every Englishman seems to be born in, that “the doctor must know best,” this young couple commence aiming inquiries right and left amongst all the assembled medical men. And first the mother asks, as she looks wistfully at the fair rounded flesh of her infant, how many of those nasty sore places it will be necessary to make on her baby’s arm, in order to ensure protection from small-pox. This terribly unscientific and sentimental way of putting it, medicine tolerates as best it may, since we have not yet *evolved* maternal love and anxiety out of the category of human attributes. The answers the mother will get, I found myself thinking, will be couched in very different language, displaying all the precision and unanimity of well ascertained scientific truth. “Madam,” replies Dr. TRIPE, of Hackney, “I consider that there should be three, or better still four, well foveated cicatrices.” “Oh no, Madam,” says Dr. SANDWITH, “five good cicatrices should be desired in the first instance.” “Quite unnecessary, my dear Madam, I assure you,” declares Dr. ADAM, of Liverpool; “indeed the system is brought into disrepute by such excess. I have never vaccinated in more than two places.” “Indeed, Madam, these gentlemen are wrong,” remonstrates Dr. DEBENHAM, of the Commercial Road; “I fear it will be difficult to obtain your permission, but I greatly prefer six vesicles.” “Stuff-and-

nonsense," breaks in the pugnacious voice of Dr. DRYSDALE. "I'm Chairman of this recent Committee of Inquiry, and I tell you one good scar is as good as many." "Beware, my dear Madam, of such dangerous advice," says Dr. DIXON, of Bermondsey; "to make the subject really safe, as many marks should be put upon him as would be the case in a modified form of small-pox." "That may be good advice practically, Madam," says Dr. BOND, of Gloucester, "but it fails in theoretical precision. It is better to say that protection is in direct proportion to the number and size of the cicatrices; trust your baby to me, I will raise it to the level of absolute salvation in an apotheosis of tattoo." But here interposes a voice in quite another key. "Madam," says Dr. HARMAN, of Dublin, "if these gentlemen appear to contradict one another, it is because you have asked them the wrong question. Now I disregard the quantity of the cicatrices altogether, I only insist on the cicatrix being well and deeply defined." "And large, Madam," adds Dr. MEADE, of Bradford. "Not at all," replies Dr. PRICHARD, of Bristol; "the great thing is to obtain a round cicatrix; the size is of no consequence." "No, nor the shape either," puts in Dr. BRAIDWOOD, of Liverpool. "All this is wide of the mark," declares Dr. BARCLAY, of Chelsea, "the great thing is that the cicatrix made should be old fashioned." But he has stumbled on an unlucky word to use to a young mother, and Mamma flatly declares that, come what may, the most beautiful baby that ever was shan't be made old-fashioned, that it shan't; and so declaring, she retires from the discussion, leaving her husband to make a few further inquiries. The husband, not unjustifiably, seems to reflect that, eminently respectable as the

speakers have so far been, the real leaders of the profession *quoad* Vaccination have not yet delivered themselves. In them at all events he will find authority and unanimity. From Germany there comes CURSCHMANN, the great authority on small-pox and Vaccination, whilst for England we have Dr. SEATON, author of the recognized Handbook of Vaccination, and Dr. R. J. LEE, the Senior Physician to the Children's Hospital in Great Ormond Street. The works of these gentlemen are readily accessible, in fact they lie handy on the table near, and the father resolves to consult them, and be guided by the unanimous opinion of authorities who must command the respect of the whole medical profession. Turning to CURSCHMANN, he finds him writing, "If Vaccination is made with incisions, from four to six usually suffice for each arm."* Little pleased to discover that the highest science seems thus to require no less than twelve punctures, our paterfamilias turns somewhat sadly for confirmation to Dr. SEATON, and is surprised and relieved to find him saying, "No practitioner will have done his duty in any case in which he is called upon to vaccinate, unless . . . he has taken care to vaccinate sufficiently, that is, to produce, so far as in him lies, four or five genuine good-sized vesicles, such as result from separate punctures."† Not sorry to find that the English authority seems more merciful to the luckless infant than the German, paterfamilias, deeply impressed with the vaticinations of evil with which SEATON thunders at the perpetrators of imperfect Vaccination, turns to Dr. LEE's recently published Lectures on the Diseases of Children, and is there doomed to find that

* Curschmann in Ziemssen's Dictionary of Medicine, Vol. II, p. 415.

† Seaton in Reynolds's System of Medicine, Vol. I. p. 291.

the most eminent scientists are no nearer agreement than the ordinary practitioners. "Vaccination," writes Dr. LEE, "should be performed in one point only."*

By this time our infant's father finds himself considerably perplexed, and much inclined to think over the answers he has received. But by this time also the mother seems to have recovered from Dr. BARCLAY's terrible hint at being old-fashioned. At all events she plunges anew into the question. "Then how," she asks, "will you vaccinate my child,—what will you do it with?" "It cannot be better done than with a common lancet," answers Dr. SEATON.† "I use a rotary needle vaccinator," says Dr. NEALE. "Never mind about its being rotary," says Dr. DARWIN, "I use a carpet needle." "Nay, this is but a clumsy contrivance," says Dr. GRAHAM WEIR; "it is not for me to speak of my own merits, but if you look in the *Echo* newspaper of the 24th of May, 1883, you will there find a medical student by name BARNES pointing out to you that if only my three-pronged scratch is used, all will be well." "But a three-pronged scratch sounds very dreadful, Dr. WEIR," objects the mother, not unnaturally. "Yes, Madam," says Dr. SHEEN, of Cardiff, "so it does. Leave the matter to me. I will make three marks with a specially made instrument five-eighths of an inch in diameter." "An instrument five-eighths of an inch in diameter! Horrible!" and the mother takes again to flight, before Dr. SHEEN can explain that he meant to allude to the size of the marks, not of the instrument, and leaving him to vainly regret that grammar is not his strong point. And now our paterfamilias, dropping the question of the instru-

* Lectures on the Diseases of Children, pp. 53—4.

† Reynolds's System of Medicine, Vol. I., p. 284.

ment, seeks information as to the method. The scientific unanimity of medical authorities is illustrated again. Vaccination by puncture with the lancet, putting it well in, is advocated by Dr. SEATON. With scratching, going by no means too deep, and not so as to draw blood, is Dr. DARWIN's recommendation. Single scratches, cross scratches, parallel scratches, lattice-work scratches, scarification with the edge of the lancet, with glass, or by the application of ammonia*—each of these plans finds favour with numerous vaccinators, whilst proposals are even seriously made by Dr. SWAN, of New York, for the internal administration of the vaccine contagium.

In the matter of the lymph to be used, it is natural that our baby's mother should be very particular. "What kind of lymph will you recommend?" she asks, as soon as she has recovered from the shock of Dr. SHEEN's grammar. "Humanized lymph, Madam, direct from arm to arm," is Dr. SEATON's answer. "Nay, Madam," says Sir THOMAS WATSON, "on the humanized lymph system there has fallen an ugly blot. You had better have the child vaccinated direct from the calf." "Is then calf lymph safer for my baby than arm-to-arm vaccination?" she inquires. "By no means," answers Dr. CEELY,† "so far from producing fewer ailments and cutaneous eruptions in the predisposed, it would, as being more irritating, produce more." "Possibly," says Dr. DRYSDALE, "but then you remember, Madam, I advised only one insertion of lymph; and if you follow my advice you will have a surer protection for your little one, because you know, human lymph is not what it used to be,—it is deteriora-

* Roberts's System of Medicine.

† Quoted by Seaton, Handbook of Vaccination, p. 337.

ted." "Oh dear no," says Dr. ROBERTS,* "there is positive proof that lymph does not deteriorate after passing through any number of individuals." "It all depends on what you mean by calf-lymph," says Dr. W. B. CARPENTER: "Some calf-lymph is the product of what is called retro-vaccination, the inoculation of heifers from the human subject,—but that is no good at all." "No good!" shouts the German Commission in a body, "why we have just recommended it to the whole German Empire!" "You had better let *me* supply the lymph, Madam," suggests Mr. BADCOCK, of Brighton. "I secured an excellent supply some time ago by inoculating a cow with human small-pox. I must not tell you the details, for you are a lady, and would probably consider them unutterably disgusting. That however, is, pardon me, only your unscientific ignorance. I have perpetuated the stock ever since, and have supplied it in large quantities to the Local Government Board, and" . . . "Oh you have, have you?" says Dr. CHARLES CAMERON, looking as fierce as a doctor ever does look in the presence of a young married lady. "Then I should like to know what has become of it. Are you not aware that recent and searching experiment has demonstrated that your lymph is not vaccine lymph at all, but small-pox lymph, and capable of propagating that disease in its most virulent form by infection?" † "But indeed, Dr. CAMERON," pleads poor BADCOCK, "they are using it largely in Government vaccinations in England; and in Ireland a member of the Galway Board of Guardians offered to supply a calf for the carrying out of my plan there." "I know he did," is

* System of Medicine, 6th Edition, p. 165.

† "Times," November 24th, 1879.

CAMERON'S hot answer, "and the Irish Local Government Board threatened all concerned with a prosecution under the law against small-pox inoculation, and quite right too." "I reckon there is no need for you two gentlemen to go raising airthquakes over your small-pox lymph," breaks in a voice with a Yankee twang. "My name's Martin. I hail from Boston city, that's where I hail from. I and my son have raised a lymph that does the thing slick. We do our vaccination on a large scale in our country, and I operate on whole cities at a time; and when an epidemic turns up, I just set my foot on it and straighten it out. My lymph is a calf lymph, and what is more remarkable, it never by any chance produces any erysipelas, that miserable complication, the pest of vaccinators. Say now, stranger," Dr. MARTIN continues, addressing the father, "Hadn't you better let me get this business over, and vaccinate your youngster right away?" "Well," answers the father doubtfully, "I should be most happy, only I have just, while you were talking, been looking into Jenner's 'Inquiry,' and I there find that he says, on page 7, that there is a spurious cow-pox, which is incapable of producing any specific effect on the constitution, and that the pustules of that spurious and non-protective disease are known by the very fact of which you make such a boast, that they are unattended by any erysipelas. Now I should be sorry for my child to suffer for nothing, so I hardly see my way to sanctioning the use of a lymph which your immortal author of vaccination has declared useless." "That is very well said, Sir," puts in Dr. SHORTHOUSE, "only you are too polite to these calf-lymphers. They are just a set of crazy enthusiasts. Let them look at the beautifully executed plates published by Mr.

CEELY, of Aylesbury, and see there the effects of inoculation direct from the cow. Why, some of the pictures are something frightful."

"Do you mean then that there are any really serious dangers connected with calf-lymph vaccination?" the mother asks in some consternation. "Well, no, Madam," says Dr. ELDER:—"I am chief Health Officer of the State of Indiana, and we have just been holding an inquiry into this matter. The various health officers under my superintendence are practically unanimous that calf-lymph is safe with the trifling exceptions of its occasionally producing erythema, ulcerous-looking sores, phlegmonous abscesses, sloughing ulcers, dermatitis, lichen, troublesome ulceration, extensive inflammation, and eruptive fever. And of course you must not forget, if you are thinking of having recourse to humanized lymph, that I have myself seen more than one case wherein well-marked constitutional syphilis has followed its use." "Madam," says Dr. LEONARD WOOLDRIDGE, "Observe the beautiful substance in this little bottle. I have just succeeded in isolating it from the perfectly fresh tissues of the calf." "Then is this the absolutely safe vaccine, Dr. WOOLDRIDGE," asks the mother. "By no means, Madam," is the reply. "This is a substance a very small portion of which injected into the blood of any animal will produce instant death." But the mother does not kindle at the scientist's enthusiasm. In fact I thought I detected her in a rapid glance at her sleeping infant, and something very much like a shudder. "Then how do you examine or test the lymph so as to ensure the use of none save such as it is safe to employ?" is her next question. "There is no test, Madam," answers Dr. LYDDON, of Norwich. "If

harm results, or if your baby should become diseased in consequence of the operation, then we shall know that there must have been something wrong with the lymph." "Or with the child's father," says Sir DOMINIC CORRIGAN. "Or its mother," adds Mr. JOHN SIMON, with a wink at Sir DOMINIC, but in a tone of voice which does not reach the father's ear.

By this time the young mother seems more than half inclined to hesitate. She looks at the door by which she entered, and clasps her baby a little closer to her. "Baby is not quite three months old yet," she says, half to herself, "I don't think that is quite old enough." "Madam," says Dr. SEATON,* "no age is too early for vaccination,—the loss of a day may be the sacrifice of a life." "Have no uneasiness, Madam," says Dr. CURSCHMANN; "any time from five to fourteen months will do admirably, provided the child be not teething." "But all children are teething between five and fourteen months, are they not, Dr. CURSCHMANN?" asks the mother. "Madam," replies CURSCHMANN, rather coldly, "I have to report to you the teachings of science—I have no concern with what the vulgar call common sense." "And Dr. CURSCHMANN is obviously right in one way," interposed a gentleman who was unknown to me, but whose voice attracted me at once. It was a peculiar voice, and especially peculiar in that assembly as having in it a tone of genuine sympathy for the obviously thickening cloud of perplexity that now shadowed the young mother's brow. I noticed a copy of a paper peeping out of this gentleman's pocket, and with some difficulty read thereon the title, "Students' Journal and Hospital Gazette;" and it occurred to me that this was not

* Reynolds's System of Medicine, Vol. I. p. 281.

improbably the Editor of that Journal. "Right in one way at all events," he repeats, "for Dr. CURSCHMANN means that by postponing vaccination till after the first year we give time for the worst of all hereditary taints, if present, to manifest itself. But in England we do not allow time enough. At one hospital I have myself found that about 50 infants were admitted to the out-patient department within a month suffering from manifestations of syphilitic disease, and in many cases vaccination had been performed, and in some lymph had been taken, without, as far as I could learn, the vaccinator suspecting that disease was present." "Then do you consider there is a real objection to the vaccination of very young children?" inquires the mother. "Not a bit," breaks in Dr. BALLARD. "It is true that when I was a young man I wrote a prize essay on vaccination, in which I said that vaccination was a very serious matter, and by no means to be trifled with or made light of, and in which I quoted the direct testimony of BOUSQUET, that in such very young children the intestines sympathize, and enteritis or diarrhœa may result. But since then I have been appointed to the Local Government Board, where it is part of my profession to defend the vaccination of infants in workhouses before they are six days old, and of the mothers the day after their confinement; so you know, as circumstances alter cases, I repeat, not a bit." But this speech does not seem to be well received, and looking full into the face of her he is addressing, Dr. BALLARD reads an expression there which appears to make him uncomfortable. "They are only paupers, you know," he adds, in a tone as near to apology as the Local Government Board can be expected to go, "and if you don't vaccinate them sharp they may get

away, and never be vaccinated at all." But this does not seem to mend matters, and the lady showing no inclination to renew the conversation with him, another voice comes in, that of Dr. BATTEN, of Gloucester. "It will be best I think for all concerned to postpone the vaccination of your child till the end of its second year, that is, unless there should be immediate danger from small-pox in the neighbourhood." "Of course," says the child's father, "you say this subject to all the respect for Dr. BALLARD's opinion which that opinion deserves." There must have been something peculiar in the emphasis laid on these last words, for they are rewarded by Mamma with a little ripple of laughter, and Dr. BALLARD is heard to damn sentimentality very much under his breath.

"I suppose you are all agreed as to the place where you will insert this most desirable lymph when you *have* found it," is the next query. "Certainly, Madam," say many voices together. "We all vaccinate at the insertion of the deltoid muscle, but as you don't know where that is, we may say that it is on the outer front of the arm, about mid-way between the elbow and the shoulder." "Alas, Madam," says a gentleman with a military look about him, "I wish we could obtain a return of the number of men in the army who have died, or had their arms amputated, since the promulgation of this most unfortunate and most erroneous rule. I protested against it in the *Lancet** a quarter of a century ago. I fear the amount of injury produced by it will never be known."

"And if after all this my child is safely vaccinated, for how long will the protection last?" is Mamma's next inquiry. But here, before she can receive a

* Letter of "Military Surgeon," in the *Lancet*, July 7th, 1860.

medical answer, her husband, who has been so long silently watching the discussion, puts in a word. "Nay, little wife," he says, "surely that is an unnecessary question. You remember my grandfather was in the House when the £30,000 was voted to Jenner expressly on his assurance that what renders the cow-pox virus so extremely singular is, that the person who has been thus affected is *for ever after* secure from the infection of the small-pox; neither exposure to the variolous effluvia, nor the insertion of the matter into the skin, producing this distemper." "You are quite right, Sir," says Mr. THORPE PORTER, of the Dublin Small-pox Hospital. "I have no faith in revaccination. It is quite unnecessary, and dangerous besides." "With that," says Dr. SEATON, "I cannot agree. It is true that frequent revaccinations, repeated again and again, are utterly useless and foolish. One thoroughly good primary vaccination to start with, and one careful revaccination after puberty, are all that is necessary for the complete protection of the population against small-pox." "Something more than that," says Sir WILLIAM JENNER. "Revaccination should be performed whenever an epidemic occurs, and also at seven years of age." "At seven years of age, by all means," says Dr. GUY, "but I much doubt the expediency of revaccination during severe epidemics." "And certainly at 14 years," adds Dr. TRIPE, of Hackney. "And at 21," adds Dr. BERNARD O'CONNOR, "and by vaccination I mean a continuous process—what Dr. WARLOMONT, of Brussels, would call vaccinization. That is, you must continue vaccinating the child every four months till you produce no effect." "Revaccinate every 10 years," urges Dr. OAKES, of Birmingham. "There is little chance of avoiding serious outbreaks

of small-pox until we have thoroughly efficient annual revaccination," declares Dr. COLLINGRIDGE*, Medical Officer of Health for the Port of London. "Then if I am to follow your advice, Dr. COLLINGRIDGE, conjointly with that of Dr. BERNARD O'CONNOR, my child is to be kept permanently unwell to avoid its being taken ill," says the mother, with evidently increasing dissatisfaction. "Quite right, Madam," says Dr. PRINGLE, "I have been working miracles with vaccination in India, and I declare revaccination to be an unphysiological and unpathological blunder."

"And suppose my baby should begin to suffer from its vaccination, what will you do?" the mother goes on to inquire. "Oh, you take care of your baby, Madam, and it will be all right," says Dr. MASON, of Sudbury, with a laugh; "there's no need to *do* anything." I had heard nothing of this light-hearted person since the time of the disasters at Great Cornard. "You might bathe the arm with warm water, and apply cold cream," says Dr. CHALMERS. "That is what I advised for LILIAN ADA WILLIAMS, though I must confess it did no good, and the child died all the same." "Prevention is better than cure, Madam," says Dr. SINCLAIR:† "You should protect the vesicles with a vaccine-shield." "No indeed, Madam," says Dr. SNELL, of Nottingham,‡ "that is just the thing you ought not to do. The vaccine shields restrict the circulation, and rub off the scabs, and are a fruitful source of danger."

"I wonder, gentlemen, what this vaccinia is that you propose to inoculate our child with." It is now again the father who speaks, and there seems to be a growing

* Report published in 1881.

† *British Medical Journal*, December 24th, 1884.

‡ " " " January 10th, 1885.

gravity in his voice. "Oh, it is simply a modified small-pox," says Mr. SIMON. "I have often pointed out that the vaccinated are secure from small-pox because they have in fact had it. Dr. GASSNER, Mr. CEELY, and Mr. BADCOCK, are all of my opinion, and have all acted on it." "You are utterly wrong," declares Dr. WARLOMONT, of Brussels. "The Lyons Commission left not a doubt that from inoculated small-pox nothing could be derived but small-pox. It would be as reasonable to sow barley and expect to reap wheat as to convert small-pox into cow-pox by implanting it in cattle." "The Lyons Commission were wrong," says Dr. DRYSDALE—"I hate dogmatism." "You can avoid it if you study my works," says Dr. BRISTOWE; "for I maintain the complete diversity of the two diseases in my first edition, and their complete identity in my third."

"But how does the protection work?" comes the short query, in an impatient tone. Here we seem for a moment to arrive at a consensus of opinion, for a dozen eager voices at once explain that it is by the using up or exhaustion of the pabulum or fitting food on which alone the micro-organism productive of small-pox can thrive. But when the clamour subsides, I recognize the voice of Dr. KLEIN, the great physiologist. "You are all wrong," he remarks coolly. "The exhaustion theory must be given up. Resistance to infectious disease is due to the fact that healthy tissues secrete a poison inimical to germs. This secretion is aided by vaccination. That is the true theory."

"Gentlemen," says the father, and the intonation of his voice commands silence. His wife sees in his eye a look she has not known there before, the utterly indescribable look which makes the thoroughbred

Englishman, when really roused, the most formidable species of the human animal extant. With the instinct of her sex she draws nearer to him, and he puts his right arm round her. "Gentlemen, this is not science. I came here to learn what medical science could tell me as to the vaccination of my child, and the protection against small-pox consequent thereupon. Neither as to its nature, nor its mode, its treatment nor its consequences, can you tell me any single thing about it with any approach to unanimity. Yes, gentlemen, I repeat that this is not science. I shall now leave you to your conference, in the hope that you will be guided to sufficient humility to abandon your practice of enforcing on the poor an operation, of whose utility you have failed to convince one who, like myself, it is beyond your power to coerce." "God bless you, sir," says a timid voice as he pauses for a moment. "If there were more noble hearts like yours in England, times would be better for us poor folk." The speaker is the poor woman whom I had found crying in a corner when I first came in. "Fear not, my good woman," is the kindly answer. "Your time is coming soon." "Gentlemen," he continues, "if any three of you should ever come to agree about vaccination, please let me know, and I will reconsider my position—that is, if I am still alive. For the present I shall trust to fresh air, healthy living, and pure blood, and my child will remain unvaccinated."

But these words work a miracle. Perfect unanimity, of sentiment at least, is at once evolved from chaos. Shouts of execration arise on all sides. "You are a disgrace to humanity" screams DR. BARROW of Ryde. The British Medical Association now distinguish themselves, particularly those who have not hitherto spoken

for fear of exposing their ignorance of the subject. "Keg of gunpowder"; "bad drain," "public nuisance"; "open sewer"; "nitroglycerine"; "dirty dustheap"; are shouted promiscuously. "Go and be a murder-league" yells Mr. TALBOT, the member for Oxford University, who seems to have popped in on purpose to represent sweetness and light. "Omissional infanticide," shrieks SIR LYON PLAYFAIR. "Mad dog, police," bellows a magistrate of Stratford through the window and takes to instant flight, pursued by his own imagination. "Hope you'll die of small-pox in six months," roars Dr. DINGLE, of Bunhill Row. "You're a murderous and unscrupulous knave," howls Dr. BLAKE, of Bryanston Square. "He only wants a silver watch," shouts Dr. SEATON derisively, and the remark is received with guffaws. "It's not that," says MARSON, coming close up to the father: "He wants to have the family as small as possible that he has to work for—that's what's at the bottom of it." The mother clings to him scared at the uproar, and baby wakes and adds its protest. His right arm never leaves her, but MARSON is within reach. The deadly insult is still hot on the slanderer's lips when swift, straight, and unexpected like the lightning, flashes out a down-right English knock-down blow—

*

*

*

*

*

*

No, it was only a sneeze, and I am awake and my fire is gone out. Ladies and gentlemen, I am a poor hand at visions. A dry student of dry facts all my life—my dreams are framed with no more romantic materials. It is for you to interpret such visions. It is for us all to remember that the slanderer went unpunished, and the poor of this land are still groaning under a law cruelly enforced beyond all parallel in other countries, and whose justification is sought in such a scientific basis as this. It must be ours to ask how long shall such laws last—ours to resolve that so far as in us lies they shall end swiftly and at once.



"Philosophers, Philanthropists, Politicians, Papists and Protestants, Poor Law Ministers and Parish Officers,—while you have been theorising and discussing, debating, wrangling, legislating, and administering—Good God! gentlemen, between you all, where has Ginx's Baby gone to?"

APPENDIX.

THE VISION INTERPRETED.

(The "Transactions of the Vaccination Inquiry," edited by M. D. MAKUNA, and published in 1883, are here referred to as "Vaccination Inquiry." The names of the medical men supplying information to that Inquiry have each a number attached, and that number is here quoted.)

PAGE 5.—*Eighteen per cent.* REES'S Encyclopædia, and the works of JURIN and DUVILLARD give an investigation of a number of cases of pre-Jennerian small-pox, amounting in all to 24,996 cases, with a percentage mortality of 18. With these results numerous other authorities agree.

Forty-nine. "Out of 1,512 unvaccinated, 745, or 49 per cent. died."—Mr. Branthwaite in the debate with Mr. Milnes, "*Is Vaccination Desirable?*"* quoting from Metropolitan Asylums Board Statistics.

Fifty, or sixty-four. "In Boston amongst the unvaccinated it was 50 per cent., in Philadelphia 64." (*Ibid.*)

If then, the unvaccinated before Jenner's time died at 18 per cent. of cases, whilst they are reported now to be dying at 64 per cent., we have a perfect right to take 18 from 64, and insist on being informed who it is that is killing the other 46.

PAGE 6. *Dr. Buchanan.* In the Report of the Medical Officer of the Local Government Board for 1883 an attempt is made to show that the vaccinated of England and Wales are twenty times as numerous

* *Is Vaccination Desirable?* Verbatim Report of a Debate on the 17th March, 1885, between H. BRANTHWAITE, F.R.C.S., and ALFRED MILNES, M.A. E. W. ALLEN, Ave Maria Lane. 1885. Price 4d.

as the unvaccinated, with a view to proving the small-pox death rate of the latter class to be 200 times as great as that of the former. It is there written:—

“If from the 883,744 births returned for 1881 deduction of the deaths without vaccination be made, it appears that of the surviving 806,273 children there were registered at the time of the return, 94·9 per cent. as successfully vaccinated.”

This assumes that all the vaccinated children survive; and gives only $883,744 - 806,273 = 77,471$ as the total deaths of children born in that year. But in 1881 the deaths “under one year” were 114,976; and though this would *include* some deaths of children born in 1880, it would *exclude at least as many* of the 1881 births which would die in 1882 under one year of age. Hence we have this interesting contrast:—

Dr. BUCHANAN.				THE FACTS.			
Born	883,744	Born	883,744
Dead unvaccinated	77,471			Died <i>at least</i>	114,976
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Surviving	...	806,273		Surviving	...	768,768	
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Dr. BUCHANAN	806,273				
THE FACTS	768,768				
<hr/>				<hr/>			
Difference between Dr. }				...			
BUCHANAN and the Facts }				37,505			
<hr/>				<hr/>			

“The Board see no reason to doubt the correctness of the statement of their Medical Officer.”—*Local Government Board to Mr. A. WHEELER, January 27th, 1885.*

Practically stationary.—“The appearance of increase dates from 30 years ago, since which time the rate of mortality registered as from syphilis has been practically stationary.”—*Report of Medical Officer of Local Government Board, 1884, p. vii, note.*

The deaths from syphilis, per million born, of

children under one year of age are thus given in Parliamentary Return No. 392, 1880:—

Years.	Deaths per Million Births.	Years.	Deaths per Million Births.
1855	... 912	1867	... 1,615
1856	... 881	1868	... 1,733
1857	... 989	1869	... 1,760
1858	... 1,044	1870	... 1,794
1859	... 1,128	1871	... 1,652
1860	... 1,121	1872	... 1,707
1861	... 1,146	1873	... 1,658
1862	... 1,217	1874	... 1,736
1863	... 1,351	1875	... 1,827
1864	... 1,471	1876	... 1,780
1865	... 1,544	1877	... 1,746
1866	... 1,565	1878	... 1,851

The Return goes no further. But 1,851 is more than double of 912.

Dr. Carpenter: "Compare this with the case of Malta, with which I took pains to acquaint myself during my scientific visits to the Mediterranean in 1870 and 1871. I was then assured by one of its principal physicians that, notwithstanding the freedom of communication between Valetta and all ports in the Mediterranean, the large population of the island had been for many years totally exempt from small-pox; the liability to which had been (as he believed) practically extinguished by the universality with which vaccination had been there practised for many years, under the rule of a benevolent despotism."—*Letter to the Spectator, April 23rd, 1881.*

"At Malta, in the years 1870 and 1871, I was in medical charge of Royal Artillery, in number all told of about 430. Small-pox broke out in a very severe form in Valetta and Vittoriosa, the towns in which the troops were chiefly quartered."—*Letter signed "Surgeon-Major," in the Westminster and Chelsea News, July 16th, 1881.*

Black Death. "Just as "Black Death" followed in the train of the Wars of the Red and White Roses, so

did malignant small-pox follow the camps of the French and German armies in 1870."—*Speech in Parliament of the Right Hon. Sir Lyon Playfair, K.C.B., June 16th, 1883, Authorized Edition, p. 13.*

PAGE 7. *Ceara*. "Mr. ASHBURY, the senior Member of Parliament for Brighton, in the course of a recent yachting cruise, visited the seaport town of Ceara, in the Brazils. Finding that an epidemic of small-pox had recently partially depopulated the town, Mr. ASHBURY inquired into the facts. He found that in one cemetery alone, the burials of persons dead of small-pox amounted to 27,064 from August, 1878, to June, 1879. In December, 1878, no fewer than 14,375 persons who had died of small-pox were buried in this cemetery, and one day as many as 812 such persons were interred. He had not time to obtain the official returns from the other cemetery, but he was informed, on good authority, that the burials there during the same period were about 13,000. Thus out of a population not exceeding 70,000 persons, no fewer than 40,000 deaths from small-pox had taken place."—ERNEST HART, *The Truth about Vaccination*,—p. 4.

Dr. CARPENTER also told this same story on the occasion of the debate in the Steinway Hall, February 3rd, 1882. But the story was struck out from the published report of that debate, in accordance with the following Letter from Dr. CARPENTER to Mr. WILLIAM WHITE, Editor of the "Vaccination Inquirer":—

"56, Regent's Park Road, Feb. 26th, 1882.

"I quite acquiesce in your keeping back Mr. ASHBURY's statement; for I took the precaution—feeling considerable doubt about the asserted population of 70,000—to apply for information on this point both to my friend Mr. BATES, the Secretary of the Royal Geographical Society, who himself spent some time in Brazil, and to the Secretary of the Brazilian Legation. And it seems there could not have been either the previous population or the proportional

mortality stated by Mr. ASHBURY in Ceara, in spite of the very explicit document he has sent me."

In the semi-official work on Brazil, published in 1866, by Mr. WILLIAM SCULLY, Editor of the "Anglo-Brazilian Times," we read, p. 248, "Fortaleza, or Ceará, the capital of the province . . . is the port for the foreign trade of the province, and has about 20,000 inhabitants."

Catlin. "We were sent to Catlin about the North American Indians, but we did not have a quotation of the remarkable passage in Catlin, in which he points out that the recently vaccinated North American Indians were exactly the ones who suffered most, such cases being almost invariably fatal, and in which he distinctly says that those in whom the vaccination was of earlier date managed somehow to escape altogether."—*Mr. Milnes in the above-quoted Debate with Dr. Branthwaite.* The passage alluded to is in Vol. II. p. 161.

Small-pox Obliterator. The author was recently offered a pot of this concoction at the price of four-and-sixpence, in a well-known London hairdresser's. On the pot was a testimonial from Dr. ARTHUR HILL HASSALL.

PAGE 8. *Young enough to have plenty more.* "A poor mother who had lost one child by vaccination, told me that the surgeon, in pressing her husband to give up a second, replied to her remonstrances and entreaty: 'What does the loss of a child signify to you? You are young enough to have plenty more.' He believed that his fingers had the grip of the father's throat. Shall we enter on a medical argument with men who hold this position?"—*Letter of Emeritus Prof. F. W. Newman to the Annual Meeting of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, May 1st, 1882.*

It may be objected that this is only an isolated instance of brutality, in no wise telling against compulsory vaccination in itself. So it was urged in the Southern States that the occasional flogging a slave to

death was an isolated excess, in no way detracting from the general benefits—to society as a whole and the negro in particular—of the “peculiar domestic institution.” The reply is obvious in each case. The *system* is wrong which makes such an outrage *possible*. It is the vainest of hopes that the men whom we set to execute the law will *all* be better and more tender than the laws they execute.

Mrs. Kerridge. “Dr. STEVENS called on me yesterday. He said to me, “What did the poor little thing die of?” I said, “Sir, it died from vaccination.” He said to me, “My dear soul, no child ever died from vaccination.” He said, “What about the eruptions?” I said, “My child had eruptions on the chest and other parts of the body.”—*Extract from the written statement made by Jane Charlotte Kerridge, signed August 1st, 1883.*

“In reply to another question by the same hon. member [Mr. HOPWOOD] Mr. RUSSELL said that the Board had caused inquiry to be made into the cases of the two children, C. J. KERRIDGE and F. E. HOWDEN, who, it was alleged in the question, died from eruptions in consequence of vaccination. It was found that both children had died from diarrhœa. The mother of the child KERRIDGE had no idea of attributing its death to vaccination, and the child had no eruptions.”—*Daily News, August 17th, 1883.*

PAGE 9. *Dr. Tripe.* “I consider that there should be three, or better still four, well foveated cicatrices.”—*Vaccination Inquiry, No. 17.*

Dr. Sandwith. “Five good cicatrices should be desired in the first instance.”—*Ibid. No. 78.*

Dr. Adam. “I consider that too much is done by the Public Vaccinators in producing such extensive cicatrices. I have never vaccinated in more than two places. The system is also brought into disrepute by this excess.”—*Ibid. No. 56.*

Dr. Debenham. “I prefer to have six vesicles. It is

with great difficulty that I can obtain permission in most cases in this neighbourhood.”—*Ibid.* No. 207.

PAGE 10. *Dr. Drysdale.* “I hold that one good scar is as good as many.”—*Ibid.* No. 17.

Dr. Dixon. “I believe that every person is susceptible to small-pox, and vaccination is a mild form of small-pox, and if as many vaccination marks were put upon a subject as would be the case in a modified form of small-pox, that subject would be safe from small-pox.”—*Medical Report of Dr. Dixon to the Bermondsey Vestry in Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Advertiser*, May 14th, 1881.

Dr. Bond. “My own experience leads me to the conclusion that the protection given by vaccination is as a rule directly proportioned to the number and size of the cicatrices.”—*Vaccination Inquiry*, No. 68.

Dr. Harman. “I disregard the quantity of cicatrices . . . but if the cicatrix is not well and deeply defined, I revaccinate.”—*Ibid.* No. 53.

Dr. Meade. “I do not think that the amount of protection is increased by the number of cicatrices. I believe two or three large well-marked scars as good as a dozen.”—*Ibid.* No. 28.

Dr. Prichard. “The cicatrices should be well-marked and round. There is no advantage from large size.”—*Ibid.* No. 30.

Dr. Braidwood. “I think little stress should be laid on the character or size of the cicatrices.”—*Ibid.* No. 26.

Dr. Barclay. “One of the old-fashioned old cicatrices sometimes afforded perfect immunity.”—*Ibid.* No. 3.

PAGE 12. *Dr. Neale and Dr. Darwin.* Vaccination Inquiry, Nos. 16 and 67.

Dr. Sheen. “I make three marks with a specially made instrument $\frac{5}{8}$ -inch in diameter.”—*Ibid.* No. 77.

PAGE. 13. *Dr. Seaton.* “The lancet should not be

held level with the skin, but at an angle of 45° or thereabouts, and made to enter the cutis. If the lymph be thus *put well in*, it is retained by the valvular character of the puncture, and the elasticity of the skin; and any fear that the bleeding which ensues will cause the vaccination to fail is quite chimerical.”—*Reynolds' System of Medicine, Vol. I. p. 283.*

Dr. Darwin, Vaccination Inquiry, No. 67.

An ugly blot. “There has fallen an ugly blot. It is too certain that one objection really formidable does exist—that the operation 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, and the fruit and Nemesis of its vices. On this distasteful subject I shall simply appeal to the printed testimony of Mr. JONATHAN HUTCHINSON, than whom we have not among us a more able and accomplished pathologist. Such facts as he has demonstrated, constitute the only rational excuse for objecting to Compulsory Vaccination. I can readily sympathize with, and even applaud, a father who, with the presumed dread or misgiving in his mind, is willing to submit to multiplied judicial penalties, rather than expose his child to the risk of an infection so ghastly.”—*Sir Thomas Watson, Bart., M.D., F.R.S., in Nineteenth Century, June, 1880.*

Deteriorated. “It appears to me that the preventive power of vaccination was greater at the beginning of the century than it is now.”—*Dr. Drysdale, Speech at the Steinway Hall Debate, February 3rd, 1883.*

PAGE 14. *Retrovaccination.* “By heifer-vaccination I mean vaccination continuously from the original cow-stock, not passing through the human body at all; not what is called retro-vaccination—the inoculating of heifers from the human subject; for that I believe is of

no good at all.”—*Dr. Carpenter, at the Steinway Hall Debate.*

“Es ist gestattet an stelle der sogenannten genuinen Vaccine die Retrovaccine zu benutzen.”—*Recommendation of the German Imperial Commission.*

Unutterably disgusting. “Taking advantage of the liking which many domestic animals have for their backs to be rubbed, the cowherd would engage the cow’s attention by that device, which also would cause her to raise her tail; and thus Mr. BADCOCK found that he could proceed deliberately to insert his lymph in the thinly haired skin in the neighbourhood of the vulva. This lymph has been circulated throughout the civilized world. It continues to be held in esteem in Brighton. The late Mr. MARSON used it for many years.”—*Mr. Hodgson, M.R.C.S., in the British Medical Journal, November 26th, 1881.*

To anyone who considers the necessary relation of the defæcation and micturition of the animal to this lymph inserted “in the neighbourhood of the vulva,” during the five or six days required for the full development of the vesicle, the phrase in the text will hardly seem too strong.

PAGE 15. *A Prosecution.* “Small-pox virus taken from a calf would communicate that disease to a human subject, and be thereby a fertile source of propagating the disease, and would moreover render the operator liable to prosecution under the fourth section of the 31 and 32 Vict. cap. 87.”—*Letter of the Local Government Board of Dublin to the Guardians of the Galway Union, February 10th, 1879.*

Dr. Martin, of Boston, wrote in 1878 of “Erysipelas, that miserable complication, the pest of vaccinators.” At the meeting of the British Medical Association at Ryde, in 1881, he joined in the discussion, saying in effect:—

“He was called upon at times, at the very shortest

notice, to vaccinate whole cities, and when he left America he had just completed the vaccination of New Haven. The custom was to send to him or his son wherever small-pox broke out with orders to vaccinate at once the whole population. This he immediately did, with the result that the epidemic was stopped in a week. Vaccination with this cow-pox was never followed by small-pox or erysipelas, and never caused the slightest harm."

Dr. Shorthouse. "Some crazy enthusiasts recommend that lymph be taken direct from the cow. They cannot surely have seen those frightful pictures of the disease so produced which were published by Mr. CEELY, of Aylesbury, some thirty years ago. Mr. CEELY is the highest authority in the world on this subject, and carried out numerous experiments at the instance of the Provincial Medical Association. Those experiments were carefully and minutely observed, and their results faithfully and graphically recorded in two volumes. Those observations and experiments are illustrated by a great number of beautifully-executed plates, drawn from life. Some of the pictures are very vivid, whilst others are something frightful. There is one which gives a picture of the back of the hand and arm of a youth who got inoculated accidentally whilst milking a cow. There is another which depicts a corroding ulcer on the thumb of a man who got inoculated in the same manner. If these enthusiasts inspected the pictures, I think they would be induced to pause before they advocated the practice of inoculation direct from the cow."—*Letter to the Croydon Chronicle, January 6th, 1877.*

PAGE 16. *Dr. Elder.* In 1883 a "Report on Small-pox" was drawn up by E. S. ELDER, M.D., Secretary and Executive Officer of the Indiana State Board of Health. A circular containing 13 questions was addressed to all the Officers of Health in the

State, and the Report collects the answers returned. Amongst these questions were:—

Q. 10. What unpleasant effects of vaccination did you observe, if any?

Q. 11. Did those unpleasant effects follow the use of bovine or human virus?

Answers are printed from 19 medical men in all, and of these no less than 14 bear witness to injuries greater or less. Of the 14, 10 attribute injuries to bovine lymph, 2 to human lymph, and 2 to both. The diseases enumerated in the text are simply collected from amongst the answers of the 14.

Dr. Wooldridge. “Perhaps the most interesting result obtained has been the isolation of a substance from perfectly fresh animal tissues, the injection of a solution of which into the blood causes instant death. The most convenient sources of this substance are the testes and thymus gland of the calf; but it also occurs in other tissues.”—*Report of the Brown Institution for 1885. See also the Practitioner for March, 1886.*

No test. “In my opinion the only way to judge whether lymph is pure or not is by its results as to erythema. The result is the only guide. That answer would apply to other diseases besides erythema.”—*Evidence of J. H. Lyddon, M.R.C.S., at the Inquiry into the Deaths from Vaccination at Norwich. Return to House of Commons, No. 385, October 24th, 1882, p. 45.*

“Generally I agree with what Mr. LYDDON has said. In my opinion the purity of lymph can only be tested by results.”—*Evidence of Dr. Guy, the Public Vaccinator, Ibid. p. 46.*

PAGE 17. *Sir Dominic Corrigan*, examined by Mr. HIBBERT: “But supposing that after vaccination syphilis appears in a child whose parents have not been known to be tainted with the disease, how do you account for such a case as that?” “I should require positive proof that neither father nor mother had

syphilis; and in such cases I could not believe assertions, or sometimes even the person's oath." . . . *Blue Book Report of the Select Committee on Vaccination*, 1871, p. 230.

For Mr. SIMON's corroborative opinion see page 286 of the same Blue Book, and for the cruel practical effects of this opinion amongst the poor see the report of ADDISON's case on page 135,—a case where a child, syphilized by vaccination, is described as having "hereditary syphilis" in the label over its cot in the hospital; and the charge adhered to till disproved at the inquest, from which inquest the father was excluded.

Dr. Curschmann. "If caution is exercised in vaccinating, that is if the operation is not performed upon too young, feeble, or sickly children, *nor during the period of dentition*, nor at very unfavourable seasons of the year, the bad results will be so extremely rare that in comparison with the advantages of the method they will appear of trivial importance."—*Curschmann in Ziemssen's Cyclopædia of the Practice of Medicine, English Translation, Vol. II., p. 407.*

"Respecting the children, it is advisable to select lymph from such as are not too young; in no case before the expiration of 5 months, and better still after the first year."—*Ibid. p. 409.*

PAGE 18. "At one hospital . . . disease was present." These words are quoted *verbatim* from the *Students' Journal and Hospital Gazette*, of May 26th, 1883. The article continues:—

"How is it possible for a vaccinator who is ignorant of the history of the child's parents to detect syphilis when there is no lesion on the child's body? In many cases hereditary syphilis does not show itself in a permanent form until long after the usual period of vaccinating an infant, and in such cases vaccinators cannot be on their guard."

This "Student's Journal" is honourably distinguished

amongst medical papers by its tone on the vaccination question. Believing in and upholding the virtues of vaccination, it yet argues the matter with a truthful and sympathetic recognition of the real difficulties in the way. *O si sic omnes !*

Dr. Ballard. At the inquest held on January 11th, 1883, touching the death of LILIAN ADA WILLIAMS, vaccinated at a week old in St. Pancras Workhouse, and dead three weeks later, Dr. BALLARD was asked by the Coroner, "Do you see any objection to the early vaccination of children?" and Dr. BALLARD replied, "*Not a bit.*" The jury found that "the death was caused by suppurative meningitis following ulceration of vaccine vesicles on the arm; and they were of opinion, from the results of the *post mortem* examination, that the vaccination of the child ought to have been postponed."

In 1868 Dr. BALLARD published his Prize Essay, "On Vaccination, its Value and alleged Dangers." Therein we read:—"BOUSQUET, however, held that the cutaneous excitation was apt to show itself in the form of erysipelas or roseola, &c., and in infants very young indeed, that the intestines sympathized, and that enteritis or diarrhœa might result."—Page 90.

"The lesson which these accidents impart to us is this: that vaccination is not a thing to be trifled with, or to be made light of; it is not to be undertaken thoughtlessly, or without due consideration of the condition of the patient, his mode of life, and the circumstances of season and of place."—*Ibid.* p. 93.

[This last passage it is interesting to compare with the case of LILIAN ADA WILLIAMS above alluded to, whose vaccination Dr. BALLARD defended in court. The "condition of the patient" was that of an eight months' child. "Mode of life," none:—babies do not learn a mode of life in their first week. "Circumstances of season," the depth of winter and a pauper mother. "Circumstances of place," the amenities of a work-

house. "Any objection then to vaccinating this child?" "Not a bit."]

PAGE 19. *Dr. Batten.* "I very strongly feel that it should be postponed till the second year (assuming that variola is not present in the district)."—*Vaccination Inquiry*, No. 34.

PAGE 20. *Mr. Thorpe Porter.* "With reference to revaccination, I have no faith in it. Not one of the 36 attendants at the South Dublin Union sheds has taken small-pox. Only 7 of the number were re-vaccinated, and as the remaining 29 enjoyed the same immunity, wherein is the necessity of the operation? I have known gouty inflammation, abscess of the breast, angio-leucitis, &c., to result from the operation. I cannot in the face of such facts approve of it. Moreover the sense of the profession is against it."—*F. T. Porter, M.R.C.S., in the Medical Press and Circular, March 27th, 1872.*

Dr. Seaton. "These broad facts will have shown the great importance of the practice of revaccination, attesting at the same time the utter uselessness and folly of repeating this operation again and again in the same individual, as seems to have become a recent fashion whenever epidemics of small-pox arise."—*Reynolds's System of Medicine, Vol. I. p. 301.*

For SIR WILLIAM JENNER on Revaccination, see Blue Book Report of Select Committee on Vaccination, p. 260; for Dr. GUY, see *Vaccination Inquiry*, No. 41; for Dr. TRIPE, *ibid.* No. 17; for Dr. OAKES, *ibid.* No. 197.

Dr. Bernard O'Connor. "Vaccination should be repeated every four months until no result is obtained. Revaccination should be performed at the 7th and 21st years."—*Ibid.* No. 199.

PAGE 21. *Dr. Pringle.* "Without the need of any

recourse, either to calf-lymph, or that which appears to me the most unphysiological and unpathological expedient termed revaccination every seven years, or whenever there is a small-pox scare."—*Letter to the Times, October 6th, 1885.*

Dr. Mason. In October, 1883, three children, vaccinated by Dr. MASON, Public Vaccinator of Great Cornard, Suffolk, died of the effects of the operation. The following is from the statement of ELLEN GRIGGS, mother of the third child who died :—

"I sent a message to Dr. MASON that my baby was 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. . . . 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 5th, twelve days after her first sickness, and three weeks after her vaccination."

Dr. Chalmers. "On the 28th the baby was ill, and on the 29th witness took it to Dr. CHALMERS, who advised that the arm should be bathed with warm water, and cold cream applied. The child got worse, and was taken to the doctor five times within seven days, and then it died."—*From the Mother's evidence at the Inquest on the death of Lilian Ada Williams. See p. 18 and Note.*

PAGE 22. *Mr. Simon* maintains this position at length in the Board of Health Papers on the History and Practice of Vaccination, 1853, pp. xiv.—xvi., reprinted in the Blue Book Report of the Select Committee on Vaccination, 1871, pp. 351—2.

Dr. Warlomont and Dr. Drysdale. See the corres-

pondence on Vaccine Lymph in the Medical Press and Circular, July 13th, 1881.

Dr. Bristowe. "It seems clear, therefore, that cow-pox is small-pox, modified and deprived of its virulence by transmission through the cow."

"Basing our opinions on some experiments of CHAUVEAU, we adopted the opposite view in the first edition of this work. We have since then reconsidered the evidence on both sides, and are now satisfied that no simply negative evidence can invalidate the positive results obtained by Messrs. CEELY and BADCOCK, especially when we bear in mind that, as is admitted by all, small-pox is not readily inoculated on the cow"—*Dr. Bristowe: Theory and Practice of Medicine*, p. 162, and note.

Dr. Klein. "There is another theory, commonly spoken of as the Antidote Theory (Klebs). According to this, the organisms growing and multiplying in the body during the first attack produce, directly or indirectly, some substance which acts as a sort of poison against a second immigration of the same organism. I am inclined to think that this theory is in harmony with the facts."—*Micro-organisms and Disease*, p. 185.

PAGE 23. *Mr. Benjamin Barrow*, F.R.C.S., J.P., Mayor of Ryde, thus replied to a card from *Mr. Young*, Secretary of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination:—"Your card on Vaccination tells nothing. Your reasoning is fallacious. I consider your Society as a disgrace to humanity. Yours faithfully, B. BARROW, Ryde, I. of W., July 29th, 1881."

PAGE 24. *Mr. Talbot*, in a speech to the members of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, on July 11th, 1881, said, "Anti-Vaccination Leagues may properly be called Murder-Leagues."

Sir Lyon Playfair. "He produces omissions of his own and his neighbours' children by neglect of duty."—*Speech in Parliament, June 19th, 1883.*

Mad Dog. In a vaccination case in the Stratford Police Court, the defendant was gravely informed by the Bench that the Legislature had decided that an unvaccinated child was more dangerous to society than a mad dog.

Dr. Dingle.

"61, Bunhill Row,
Sept. 21, 1881.

SIR,—Your post-card to hand, for which many thanks. Don't trouble yourself to send any more to people who understand the matter. All the good I wish the Society is that every member may die of small-pox within six months. I would not vaccinate one of them on any account. Yours truly,

W. A. DINGLE, L.R.C.P., Lond.

To Mr. W. YOUNG, Secretary,
London Society for the Abolition of
Compulsory Vaccination."

Dr. Blake.

"7A, Wyndham Place, Bryanston Square, W.
Jan. 18th, 1883.

To the Secretary of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination.

To my mind, the person who offers obstacles to carefully performed Vaccination, is a blockhead—or must be a murderous and unscrupulous knave. Too many such rascals are, I fear, to be found in my profession.

A. H. BLAKE,

L.S.A., L.R.C.P. Ed., M.R.C.S.; L.M.R.C.S., &c."

Dr. Seaton.

Question 5,382. (J. T. HIBBERT).

I suppose you know that amongst the class of people who do hold that opinion [that vaccination does the children harm] penalties have been inflicted

to compel them to have their children vaccinated?

Dr. SEATON. Yes; I should like to be able, if I could, to get hold of the number who really hold that opinion; that is to say, who hold it of themselves, and not because the opinion has been suggested to them, and because they are put forward in a position which to some is almost an enviable position, that of being made public characters; I have heard of people having silver watches given to them under those circumstances.

Question 5,383. (J. T. HIBBERT.)

You would not say it was a very enviable position to be put in prison, would you?

Dr. SEATON. I do not know that it would not be so if the imprisonment was to result in a silver watch.—*Blue Book Report of the Select Committee on Vaccination*, 1871, page 303.

Marson.

Question 4,174. (J. T. HIBBERT.)

I suppose that you are quite aware that there is a strong feeling, and a great objection on the part of a number of people, against Vaccination?

Mr. MARSON. Yes, I know there is; but I nearly always find that it is the father who objects, and not the mother, and it makes it very suspicious.

Question 4,175. (J. T. HIBBERT.)

What do you mean?

Mr. MARSON. The father would like the family as small as possible that he has to work for; I am afraid that that is at the bottom of it.—*Blue Book Report of the Select Committee on Vaccination*, 1871, page 241.

IS VACCINATION DESIRABLE?

Price 4d.

VERBATIM REPORT OF A DEBATE AT WILLESDEN, MARCH 17, 1885,
BETWEEN

BRANTHWAITE, F.R.C.S. Edin., and ALFRED MILNES, M.A. Lond., F.S.S.

With diagram, 6d.

THE MITIGATION THEORY OF VACCINATION:

An Account of the Statistics collected during the Smallpox Epidemic of 1872-73,
by Dr. Keller, Medical Director of the Austrian State Railways.

BY ALFRED MILNES, M.A., (LOND.)

VACCINATED OR UNVACCINATED—
WHICH HAS THE ADVANTAGE? The
ly adequate and trustworthy com-
parison of the Vaccinated and the Un-
vaccinated that we know of was
lected by Dr. KELLER, Head Physi-
an of the Austrian State Railways,
ring the years 1872 and 1873. The
ilways then employed 37,000 officials,
rvants, and workmen, who, with their
ives and families constituted a popu-
tion of 55,000 to 60,000, among whom
ccurred 2,452 cases of smallpox. These
ses of smallpox Dr. KELLER carefully
assified as Vaccinated and Unvaccina-
ed, according to age, and the general

result showed that smallpox was un-
unaffected by Vaccination, unless to
disadvantage. Mr. MILNES has repro-
duced Dr. KELLER's statistics in lucid
form, with impartial commentary. Peo-
ple who draw conclusions in favour of
Vaccination from the factitious returns
of our smallpox hospitals, drawn up by
officials determined to make out a case
for Vaccination at whatever cost, should
be served with Dr. KELLER's Statistics,
who (whilst no opponent of Vaccination)
stood true to fact with the equitable
indifference of science. — *Vaccination
Inquirer.*

By ALFRED MILNES, M.A.

speech at the Great Leicester Demonstration, 23rd March,
1885. Third Edition, 1d.

E. W. ALLEN, 4, AVE MARIA LANE, E.C.

By WILLIAM TEBB.

COMPULSORY VACCINATION IN ENGLAND

WITH INCIDENTAL REFERENCES TO FOREIGN STATES.

ONE SHILLING.

Not only crowds but Sanhedrims are infected with public lunacy.—DRYDEN.

CONTENTS.

VACCINATION RESULTS.

VACCINATION IN THE WORKHOUSE.

VACCINATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

VACCINATION IN THE POST OFFICE.

VACCINATION IN THE POLICE FORCE.

VACCINATION IN THE ARMY.

VACCINATION IN THE NAVY.

VACCINATION IN THE PRISONS.

VACCINATION IN LIFE ASSURANCE.

VACCINATION AMONGST EMIGRANTS.

Dr. ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE.

"Compulsory Vaccination in England," is an admirable little book. The sections on Vaccination in the Army and Navy, are themselves absolutely conclusive as to the uselessness of vaccination, and its hurtfulness.

Mr. ISAAC PITMAN, Bath.

My sense of the value of the book may be estimated by the fact of my having purchased and distributed 100 copies amongst the members of the medical profession in this city and neighbourhood.

Mr. HENRY RICHARD, M.P.

I have read your able pamphlet with attention and great interest.

Our Legislators on the Vaccination Question. A Record of Parliamentary and Extra-Parliamentary Utterances and Opinions during Eight years. 56 pp., with Preface. 6d.

Testimonies concerning Vaccination and its Enforcement by Scientists, Statisticians, Philosophers, Publicists, and Vaccine Physicians. 6th edition. 4d.

By Dr. GARTH WILKINSON & WILLIAM YOUNG
Vaccination Tracts. In One Vol., with Preface and Supplement. 2s. 6d.

By Mrs. JACOB BRIGHT.
An Evil Law Unfairly Enforced. 3d. per dozen.

E. W. ALLEN, 4, AVE MARIA LANE, E.C.

By WILLIAM WHITE.

Crown 8vo., 628 pp., 6/-.

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

IN A SERIES OF MATTER-OF-FACT CHAPTERS.

All the world assenting, and continually repeating and reverberating, there soon comes that singular phenomenon, which the Germans call Swarmery, or the "Gathering of Men Swarms," and what prodigies they are in the habit of doing and believing, when thrown to that miraculous condition.

Singular, in the case of human swarms, with what perfection of unanimity and quasi-religious conviction the stupidest absurdities can be received as axioms of Euclid, nay as articles of faith, which you are not only to believe, unless malignantly insane, but are (if you have any honour or morality) to push into practice, and without delay see done if your soul would live!—THOMAS CARLYLE.

Mr. White is certainly an ugly customer for the doctors to meet. He does not trouble himself much about rhetoric, but his facts are such that we really do not think he can be answered. He is a grave and solid controversialist, who reasons like a mathematician.—*Sanitary Fair.*

We may fairly call this sturdy volume the anti-vaccinator's bible. It is a determined and well-informed impeachment of the vaccination theory, bristling with facts, and enlivened by the most biting sarcasm. The author has

searched all nooks and crannies of the subject, analysed the figures and arguments of the upholders of vaccination, and his conclusion is, that "Vaccination is a medical monopoly, established, endowed, and enforced—a tyranny to be overthrown."—*Chester Chronicle.*

Although this is only a matter of fact history of vaccination by a noted anti-vaccinationist, the work has been done with such consummate skill both as to compilation and literary ability, that the book will stand comparison with the most interesting of novels. —*Greenock Telegraph.*

Sir Lyon Playfair Taken to Pieces and Disposed of;
likewise Sir Charles Dilke: being a Dissection of their Speeches in the House of Commons, on June 19, 1883, in Defence of Compulsory Vaccination. 2nd edition, 6th thousand. 1s.

It is a very dainty pamphlet of two hundred pages, so printed that it is a luxury to read. There are six pages of index, which will give one idea of its fulness of matter. Mr. White does all his work in a workmanlike way, and his work is no exception. He gives the two speeches of Playfair and Dilke in full, and fully answers them. They are literally taken to pieces and disposed of. Read William White on Playfair and Dilke. It is the end of controversy. Reply is impossible.—*Herald of Health.*

The official vindication of vaccination was contained in Sir Lyon Playfair's speech backed up by Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. White has

taken the various points of both speeches, item by item, and has replied to them with a clearness and effectiveness which must go far to shake the foundation of vaccination itself; whilst, in our view, it effectually disposes of the plea for compulsory vaccination.—*Northamptonshire Guardian.*

A remarkably well-written book of a practised hand. The subject is an unlovely one and the proverbial "both sides" have much to say; but this book ought to interest, amuse, and inform both sides. It everywhere tells of patient thought, industrious research, and a keen mind.—*The Truthseeker.*

E. W. ALLEN, 4, AVE MARIA LANE, E.C.

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

BY WILLIAM WHITE

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION

THE STORY OF A GREAT DELUSION