

Vaccination useless and injurious : a lecture delivered in the Temperance Hall, Sheffield, on February 11th, 1869 / by Geo. Sexton.

Contributors

Sexton, George, active 1857-1887.
University of Leeds. Library

Publication/Creation

Sheffield : William Fox, [1869]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/wymw5hum>

Provider

Leeds University Archive

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The University of Leeds Library. The original may be consulted at The University of Leeds Library. 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>

VACCINATION

USELESS AND INJURIOUS.

A LECTURE

DELIVERED IN THE

TEMPERANCE HALL, SHEFFIELD,

ON

FEBRUARY 11th, 1869,

BY

GEO. SEXTON, M.A., M.D., F.Z.S.,

ETC., ETC., ETC.

"PHYSICIANS, IN DESPAIR OF MAKING MEDICINE A SCIENCE, HAVE AGREED TO
CONVERT IT INTO A TRADE."—*Dr. Akenside.*

PRICE TWOPENCE.

SHEFFIELD: WILLIAM FOX, SNIGHILL.

UNIVERSITY
OF LEEDS
BROTHERTON
COLLECTION

UNIVERSITY
OF LEEDS
BROTHERTON
COLLECTION.

9-3-6 SEX

PREFACE.

THE following lecture was delivered in the Temperance Hall, Sheffield, to an audience of about 3000 persons, and judging from the enthusiastic reception it met with, the sentiments expressed must have been in accordance with the views of a large number of those present. There must, therefore, be in Sheffield, many who believe the Compulsory Vaccination Act to be an unjust piece of legislation, and who are anxious to see it repealed. On the other hand, the advocates of vaccination are also somewhat strong, and possess the advantage of having on their side, the two daily papers. It is said, that some of the staff of each have a pecuniary interest in the continuance of the present system. This, I am loth to believe, having had many years' personal experience of journalism myself, and knowing that the Press is generally free from this kind of veniality. One fact, however, cannot be overlooked, which is, that these two papers that are in the habit of abusing each other like pick-pockets on most topics, were both agreed on this, to suppress the report of the lecture, though delivered to one of the largest meetings that had been held in the town for some time. No doubt they had a perfect right to do this if they chose; but still we cannot shut our eyes to the spirit of unfairness displayed in so doing. Of even this, however, I should not have complained, because such a course of procedure is so manifestly unjust, that it generally defeats the end had in view. But what I have to complain of is, that the editors of these papers—or their satellites—as soon as I had left the town, indulged in a kind of personal abuse of myself, not open and straightforward, such as a manly enemy would employ, but couched in insinuations which are always more hurtful than an honest attack and not nearly so easy to rebut, either by word, or by that more powerful remedy to which it sometimes becomes necessary to have recourse in these cases. I care nothing for legitimate criticism—however hostile it may be to myself—but slander I detest. I have often been on the unpopular side on many other questions besides this one, and am content to endure the odium that the advocacy of unpopular views always

brings in its train, but not to endure calumny and false accusation at the hands of men who have not the courage to meet me face to face, nor to sign their names to their productions that contain the charges made.

I am prepared to debate the views expressed in the following pages with any living man, but when an opponent descends to personality instead of employing reason, it argues much for the unsoundness of his views, the deficiency of his intellect, and the badness of his heart. I am glad to know, however, that in most of the towns in England and Scotland, the newspapers, to whatever extent they may disagree with the views of any public advocate, will treat him fairly, and deal with his argument instead of attacking his reputation, private or professional; and that Sheffield is an exception to this is, to a great extent, the fault of those who take the same view of the Vaccination question that I do. They are powerful enough and rich enough, if they united together, to start a third paper, in whose pages they could obtain fair play, and thus be able to meet their opponents on equal terms.

GEORGE SEXTON.

Glasgow, March, 1869.

VACCINATION.

A LECTURE.

A well-known writer on Medical and other subjects has admirably remarked—"Any improvement in medicine must be accompanied, in proportion to its extent, by a like improvement in the moral world. We know the dependence of the mind, not only on the health of its immediate instrument, the brain, but also on the health of the entire frame; and it would be out of the question to look for a healthy and vigorous progress, either in art, science, morality, or religion, from a people amongst whom disease holds sway." There are but few, I think, who will not agree with these sentiments, and hence the great importance which most of us rightly attach to sanitary questions. The subject that I have to speak to you on to-night is one which demands the most careful consideration, and the most deliberate attention. The highly objectionable legislative enactments that have taken place in connexion with it, have forced it upon your notice, whether you cared to study it or not, and have pressed so heavily upon you, that if in some cases your feelings have operated more powerfully than your reason, it cannot much be wondered at. An Englishman is born with a love of freedom, and with an abhorrence of everything in the shape of a despotism, whether of a political or a social character, so that when he feels the iron heel of a tyranny trampling out the smallest portion of his liberties, he is bound to resist it with all the energy that he can command. When I agreed to deliver this lecture I had no idea of the excitement that the subject was causing in the town; nor, of course, could I anticipate the proceedings that have taken place before the Magistrates to-day. I appear before you as totally unconnected with the "Anti-Vaccination Society,"—or, indeed, any other society,—having been solicited to appear here to-night by a few private gentlemen, who feel, as I do, the great importance of having right views on this subject; and who consider that there is much more at issue in the question than the compliance or non-compliance with a short Act of Parliament. It is a question in which the health of the entire community is involved, and no one can ignore it and be guiltless. Our children's lives are at stake in this matter, and, as fathers, we dare not be silent. I and the Anti-Vaccination Society are therefore agreed that it is time we resisted and repealed the objectionable Compulsory Vaccination Act. Beyond this, we are each responsible for our own course of procedure.

Anyone who reads the public journals cannot but be struck with the unfairness with which we, who object to vaccination, are treated. We are continually spoken of as the advocates of small-pox,—the apologists for a disease that destroys all the beauty of the individual, even when it spares the life,—the defenders of a plague that hurries thousands of children (including, of course, our own) to a premature grave—and the persistent opponents of a good and useful scheme for improving the health, and lessening the mortality of the community. We are supposed to have no care for our fellow-creatures, and no

love for our own children, but to be positively actuated by a desire that a filthy and fatal disease should spread its ravages through the length and breadth of the land—the land, too, in which we ourselves reside, and whose dangers and disasters we must therefore share. Now, what wretched nonsense is this! Let me tell these scandal-mongering scribes that we have as much love for our children as they have for theirs, are as much as themselves concerned for the good of the state, and are equally desirous of seeing the whole of society free as well from small-pox as from all other diseases. It is because we do not believe vaccination to have any effect in lessening the ravages of this malady that we regard it as useless; and because we are convinced that it tends to spread and perpetuate other very dreadful diseases that we give it our unqualified opposition. It never seems to occur to these people that we can be actuated by any other feeling than a wrong one; whilst their own motives are, of course, of the very purest character. We are crotchety; they are rational. We are prejudiced; they most impartial. Our views are silly whimsicalities; theirs profound breathings of wisdom, before whose brilliant light Solon or Lycurgus would have to extinguish their small lamps. Only to-day I was noticing a paragraph that is going the round of the papers, copied from the *British Medical Journal*, which winds up as follows:—"We think that, with the overwhelming proof before us of the efficacy of vaccination, it is quite time that some means should be devised for putting a stop to the injurious agitation which is being carried on by those mischievous and ignorant persons who style themselves the Anti-Vaccination League."

"The overwhelming proof of the efficacy of vaccination" is exactly what we have not before us, and what we challenge the whole British Medical Association, in whose organ this statement appears, to produce. The moment these so-called proofs are examined, they fade away into thin air, and in their place we can discover nothing but unreasoning dogma, and a tyrannical Act of Parliament. "Overwhelming proofs" did you say, Mr. Editor? Yes, there are proofs overwhelming enough, but not of the efficacy of the filthy operation in question; but that vaccination is no protection whatever against the disease for which it is said to be an infallible prophylactic; and that it has tended most terribly to increase other and even more fearful maladies. We are "mischievous and ignorant." Of course! How could we be otherwise since we refuse to be crushed beneath the wheels of this medical Juggernaut? Are we to be allowed to exercise no private judgment in a matter that concerns the health of our families, without being called "ignorant;" and no free speech to express the honest convictions at which we have arrived, after careful examination, but we must be branded as "mischievous?" We had thought that, at least in medical theories, society had advanced beyond the assumption of infallibility by a clique, and the demand that all persons should give their assent to the *ipse dixit* of any man or set of men; but we find we are mistaken. So, as we dare to think and speak for ourselves, we must be put down. Some scheme must be devised for putting a stop to us; we must have our mouths closed as well as our hands tied. Kind and considerate Editor. Are you not content with sending your emissaries into our houses, invading the sanctity of our private homes, and dragging our children away to be inoculated with a filthy and poisonous virus, but you must want to place the gag in our mouths, so that we may not be able even to protest against the pleasant operation? The days when an Englishman's house was his castle, were before the Compulsory Vaccination Act; and they who sing "Britons never shall be slaves," have surely not made the acquaintance of the Editor of the *British Medical Journal*.

But we don't intend to be put down, nor to have our mouths stopped. On the contrary, we mean to repeal this unjust and iniquitous Act of Parliament. Thousands of earnest men in the country have made up their minds on this

score; and the large assembly that I see before me testify that it will not be long before our labours will be crowned with success. Sheffield is making a bold stand in this matter, and she deserves all honour for the resistance that some of her sons are offering to this most despotic act of the legislature. We only ask to be left alone. We have no wish to compel others to act in accordance with our views; and we decline to be forced to act in accordance with theirs. Those who choose to practice vaccination may do so without let or hindrance from us, but we must be free to follow our own judgment in the matter. If any person believes in the efficacy of the cow-pox to protect his children from the small-pox, or any other disease, let him have them vaccinated every New Year's Day if he be so inclined; but we protest against being compelled to follow his example, seeing that we don't entertain the same opinions. I know it is said, in answer to this, that the State has the right to look after the health of its subjects, and that, therefore, if vaccination be a prophylactic against small-pox, it becomes the duty of the legislature to enforce it, so that the disease may be "stamped out." I was arguing with a gentleman on this subject a day or two ago, when the conversation that occurred was somewhat as follows. "You see" said he, "if inoculating with vaccine lymph will prevent the development of small-pox, I have a right to compel you to have your children operated upon, because, by your neglect, mine may suffer." "How?" I asked. "Why," he replied, "your house may become a hot-bed for small-pox, and if you live next door to me, it may extend to mine, and my family may take it." "Oh, they may, may they?" I exclaimed, "Why your children are all vaccinated, and therefore can't take it." He laughed, and replied "Well, you have me there, I hadn't thought of that." You see this very argument admits that vaccination is no protection, and therefore refutes itself, since the only plea set up in favour of the Act being compulsory is the protection afforded by the operation.

As far as vaccination itself is concerned, it is simply a medical theory, that should be discussed like any other pathological doctrine, in the light of facts. Dr. Jenner himself recommended candid enquiry into the subject. His modern followers have been, however, very slow to learn this lesson. He remarks in the preface to his Second Treatise—"I am pleased at seeing the investigation so generally entered into; and I hope that the spirit with which this important inquiry will be prosecuted may be tempered with that calmness and moderation which should ever accompany philosophical researches." And a few pages on, in the same book, he has another admirable sentence, viz:—"Ere I proceed, let me be permitted to observe that truth, in this and every other physiological inquiry that has occupied my attention, has ever been the object of my pursuit; and should it appear in the present instance that I have been led into error, fond as I may appear of the offspring of my labours, I had rather see it perish at once than exist and do a public injury." There are but few of the present race of vaccinators who will speak thus calmly and impartially on this question. They treat us as though we had no right to enquire into the matter at all, but were bound to take their decision as infallible truth, which it were next to blasphemy to call in question. And hence the iniquitous Act of which we have such just cause to complain. Whether the theory of vaccination be true or false, this legislative enactment is a piece of tyranny that should be resisted. And it is against this that we protest so strongly. For my own part, I hold vaccination to be, as I have stated in the advertisement announcing this lecture, "useless and injurious." I believe the theory of Jenner to be entirely false, and the operation pernicious in the extreme, which I shall endeavour presently to prove to you; and I should therefore take every opportunity that presented itself of stating as much, even were this law repealed. But still it is against this Act that we are called upon to wage such unflinching war. And we have, in this latter respect, many persons with us who do believe

that cow-pox is a prophylactic against small-pox, and who frequently vaccinate, more especially amongst the homœopathic practitioners; the theory of vaccination being held by them to be illustrative of the doctrine *similia similibus curantur*.

Yet it is in reference to the compulsory part of the scheme that our opponents are so dogmatic, and so violently abusive. They can scarcely ever refer to us without calling ill names, and speaking of us as hardly worthy of their notice. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer—the Right Hon. R. Lowe—a man whose talent all must admire, and who, in many respects, deserves well of the country, made a speech in the House of Commons in favour of the Vaccination Acts Amendment Bill, on July 10th, 1861, a portion of which was as follows:—“He regretted that there should be any discussion on the subject. Compulsory vaccination was the law of the land, by the Act of 1853, and the bill before the House was merely a re-enactment of a clause expunged, in 1859, from the Public Health Act, 1858, with his consent. His having consented to the repeal of this clause was a source of bitter reflection to him, because he believed that, if retained, it would have saved thousands of lives; but had he not done so, the bill itself would have been lost. He was now determined to repair his error, and convince the opponents of vaccination that their sordid and brutal prejudices should not interrupt the operation of the law.” Of course it must be regretted that any person had the audacity to discuss the subject, and was not content to take the whole matter for granted on the *ipse dixit* of a gentleman of Mr. Lowe’s standing. But there is an old-fashioned notion in this country in favour of discussion, and it is generally believed to be a safer method of arriving at the truth, than following blindly, even a contributor to *The Times*. A man who objects to discussion is out of place in the British Parliament. He should have been born to a throne in a country where there is an absolute monarchy; and failing that, should become the pedagogue of a village school, and thus have only ignorant boys to deal with. Men, in England, are very apt to debate, especially when something of questionable value is being thrust down their throats. They can always, however, be abused afterwards for so doing, and of this privilege Mr. Lowe availed himself. He called the honest opinions of those who had the effrontery to differ with himself “sordid and brutal prejudices.” The old tale of “No case, abuse plaintiff’s attorney,” Mr. Lowe has, no doubt, heard of, and in this instance he seems to have acted on the same principle. The terms that he employed were, however, somewhat unfortunate when applied to the opponents of vaccination, as distinguished from the vaccinator. “Sordid and brutal prejudices!” Letting the word “prejudice” pass, what is the meaning of “sordid”? If you turn to a dictionary you will find it described as “foul, filthy, mean, vile, base, covetous,” &c. Now, assuredly it is the Vaccinators, and not the Anti-Vaccinators who answer this description. The process of vaccination is foul and filthy enough, heaven knows; and as to the covetousness, it is surely more applicable to those who have £250,000 a-year at stake in the matter, than those who have nothing. The opponents of vaccination have no pecuniary interest either one way or the other: the vaccinators are at present in the receipt of £250,000 a-year, which they lose when vaccination becomes abolished. Which of the two is most likely to be sordid, you can judge for yourselves. Then, as to “brutal,” that means, I believe, belonging to a brute. Now the vaccinators inoculate persons with virus obtained from the cow, and I presume the cow is a brute. Is it they or we, therefore, that are brutal? “Sordid and brutal prejudices.”

“I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word.”

Before the discovery of vaccination, we had inoculation. The difference between the two is simply this, that in the one case the person is inoculated

with the small-pox virus, for the purpose of producing that disease—it being imagined that in such cases the attack is much more favourable than if contracted by the usual means of infection—and in the other, the virus of the cow-pox is employed in the inoculation, that being held to be a prophylactic against small-pox. To Lady Mary Wortley Montague we owe the introduction of inoculation. She seems to have learnt it in Turkey, and introduced it into this country in 1722. As a matter of course, like everything new, it was violently opposed at first, then tolerated, afterwards advocated, and at last pronounced essential to the well-being of the commonwealth. An hospital for practising it was established in 1746, and eight years later, the Royal College of Physicians, who had previously been opposed to the operation, became converted to the new theory, and issued a declaration—"That experience had refuted the arguments that had been urged against this practice," and that they "considered it highly beneficial to mankind." In this matter, as in every other, the faculty follows in the rear of public opinion. A new theory is mooted, the medical profession denounce it as quackery and brand its advocates as *charlatans*. It goes on, converts are made, public opinion becomes reconciled to it, and the Colleges discover that after all there is a deal of truth in it, and that it must be taken under their especial guardianship. And if, as in vaccination, it should after all happen that the whole theory is wrong, the faculty will still cling to it, determined that as they were the last to embrace it, so they will be the last to give it up. But what a sad reflection this is upon a learned profession, whose business it should be to discover truth and mould public opinion to it, instead of having to wait till some non-professional has made the discovery, and convinced society of its utility. The use of almost every drug at present employed in medicine, was found out either by some old woman, or by an uneducated man; and the Colleges only introduced it into the pharmacopœa after the public at large had decided to resort to it as a therapeutic agent.

Well, inoculation became general, and the result may be easily imagined,—the small-pox spread its ravages through the length and breadth of the land. Those persons who might have escaped it in the natural way, took it artificially, and few were exempt. And here let me remark is to be found the explanation of a circumstance about which we are often questioned by those who deem vaccination a blessing. Fifty or sixty years ago they tell us the proportion of pock-marked persons was very much greater than at present, about one in every five or six then having his face disfigured by these unsightly pits. This surely cannot be wondered at, even if it were so, since people inoculated themselves with the small-pox lymph, and thus produced the disease in their constitutions, when they might probably have escaped it altogether. It could therefore only be expected that the results of the malady would be thus apparent. Since the disgraceful practice of inoculation has been discontinued, of course small-pox has been less prevalent, and pock-marked people, as a necessary consequence, less frequently met with. But neither the one nor the other has had anything to do with vaccination, as I shall hereafter prove to you. During the short triumph of inoculation, the mortality from small-pox was terrible, it having been shewn that above one person out of every fourteen born, died from that disease.

Then came the great and glorious discovery, as it has been termed, of vaccination. Jenner appears to have been pursuing his professional studies, at Sodbury, at a time when the small-pox was very prevalent in the district. It seems that a country girl came one day to seek his advice, and the conversation happening to turn upon the small-pox, she remarked—"I cannot take that disease, for I have had the cow-pox." This incident, we are told, made a great impression upon Jenner's mind. Why it should have done so, it is not easy to say, since he might have heard in any part of the country a thousand

other theories equally rational, propounded by the same class of persons, with reference to the cure or prevention of nearly all the diseases named in Cullen's Nosology. He might have learnt that a little saliva and the repeating of some mysterious jargon, would effectually drive out the fire in the case of a burn or a scald; that the dragging a child, feet foremost, under a bramble that had struck out two roots, was an infallible remedy for whooping cough; that the carrying a small bone in one's pocket, was a prophylactic of cramp; and that a child's caul would effectually prevent the fortunate possessor of it from being drowned. Every district abounds with these superstitions, and this country girl's notion of cow-pox being a preventative of small-pox, might, for anything Jenner then knew, be of the same character. However, he set himself to work to discover how much truth there was in the theory, and ultimately arrived at the conclusion that the lass was right, and that consequently the proper means to prevent the small-pox was to inoculate with cow-pox virus. He therefore vaccinated for the first time on May 14th, 1796. The publication about the same time of his "Observations on Cow-pox," may be said to have been the commencement of that tide which afterwards set in so powerfully in favour of this filthy practice, but which we are happy to say is now ebbing fast.

Truth crush'd to earth, shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers.

Now what is this disease called cow-pox, that is considered such an effectual preventative of small-pox? Why it is in reality what is termed the grease in the horse's heel. Jenner seems at first to have imagined that the small-pox originated in this very disease, and hence probably supposed that to inoculate with it was to produce the small-pox itself, in a milder form and in a modified condition. His words are—"There is a disease to which the horse is frequently subject. The farriers have termed it 'the grease.' It is an inflammation and swelling of the heel, from which issues matter possessing properties of a very peculiar kind, which seems capable of generating a disease in the human body, which bears so strong a resemblance to small-pox, that I think it highly probable it may be the source of that disease."

Now, I presume, most of you know what the disease is that is called "the grease" in the horse. It consists of an enlargement and swelling of the heels of the animal, from which exudes a quantity of filthy purulent matter, of a disgusting appearance, and having a most offensive smell. Jenner says this matter possesses "peculiar properties." The only properties that I have ever seen it to possess, are those which are common to the discharge of all old ulcers. It is as nasty and as foetid as the dirtiest person could desire. Those of you who have never seen it, I should advise, if you have any taste for that kind of thing, to go to the knacker's yard and carefully inspect two or three old horses that are in this condition, and whilst you gaze upon the large and hideous looking excrescences on their heels, and indulge your olfactory nerves with the odour of the dirty matter that is escaping from these sores, remember that this filthy discharge is the true vaccine lymph which you are expected to allow to be introduced into the blood of your children. Surely in vaccination the perfection of nastiness has been reached. But say you—"It is not the grease in the horse, but lymph from the cow that we employ." Well, what is really employed in vaccination we shall see presently. Suffice it to say, that the discharge from the greasy heels of the horse was the original matter to which Jenner attached such importance. He frequently employed it just as it had been obtained from the horse's heels, and when he had procured it from the cow, it was the same matter still, only having been modified by passing through the body of that animal. The mode in which the so-called cow-pox is produced he tells us—"In this dairy country, a great number of cows is kept. The

office of milking is performed indiscriminately by men and maid servants. One of the former having applied dressings to the heels of a horse affected with the grease, incautiously milked the cows with some particles of the infectious matter adhering to his fingers. The disease thus communicated to the cows, and from the cows to the dairy maids, spreads through the farm until most of the domestics and the cattle feel its unpleasant consequences. This disease has obtained the name of the cow-pox."

Thus, then, the cow-pox is simply the result of the matter that had exuded from the greasy heels of the horse being carried to the cow, and setting up in her system a disease similar to that by which it had originally been produced. It "makes its progress," says Jenner, "from the horse to the nipple of the cow, and from the cow to the human subject."

Now bear in mind, that the only genuine vaccine lymph is obtained by this process, and therefore if the virus employed be procured by any other means, the doctrine of Jenner is not carried out. There is a kind of cow-pox which is observed sometimes in the cow, of an idiopathic character, and which has not therefore been produced by the discharge from the greasy heels of the horse; but Dr. Jenner warns us against this, and tells us that it does not possess the qualities of the true disease. Pustules may appear on the nipples of the cows, and even the hands of the servants engaged in milking may be affected thereby. Indisposition may occur in the human subject whilst the virus is being absorbed, but still this is not the genuine disease from which the true prophylactic to small-pox is to be obtained.

Jenner remarks—"This disease is not to be considered as similar in any respect to that of which I am treating, (*i.e.*, the disease produced from the greasy heels of the horse,) as it is incapable of producing any specific effects on the human constitution. However, it is of the greatest consequence to point it out here, lest the want of discrimination should occasion an idea of security from the infection of the small-pox which might prove delusive."

Thus you see, that to vaccinate with the matter obtained from the cow, unless the disease in the cow had been the result of infection from the horse, would be, according to Jenner, perfectly useless, as it would afford no protection whatever against small-pox. This is a point which cannot be too strongly impressed on your minds. In order that there shall be no mistake, Jenner remarks in another place—"That the source of the infection is a peculiar morbid matter arising in the horse, I feel no room for hesitation, being well convinced that it never appears among the cows (except it can be traced to a cow introduced among the general herd, which has been previously affected) unless they have been milked by some one who at the same time has the care of a horse affected with diseased heels."

Now it is perfectly clear that, according to this theory, there can be no protection against small-pox in any system of vaccination where the virus has not been the result of grease in the horse; and it might be advisable to ask those modern disciples of Jenner, who take public money under the pretence of carrying out his principles, and who pass despotic Acts of Parliament on the ground of the protection against small-pox promised by the originator of vaccination, if his system was carried out, from what source they obtain the ichor that they use so plentifully. Grease in the horse is a disease that is not nearly so prevalent now as it was formerly. It has rapidly declined in consequence of improved stabling, as small-pox and all other fevers in the human being will decline under improved sanitary regulations. It is very questionable whether the genuine cow-pox of Jenner is to be anywhere found at the present time. You may converse with twenty farmers and not one of them will have seen it. Farm labourers and cowkeepers know nothing about it, and as to medical men being acquainted with it, that is quite out of the question. Public vaccinators go about with their lancets dipped in they know not what, prating

about Jenner's noble discovery, though they ignore his entire theory, and pocketing the fees that are obtained from the public purse. If you ask them from what source they obtained the virus with which they seek to inoculate your child, they tell you that they are the best judges of that matter. If you object to the operation, unless you can be satisfied that Jenner's principles are being carried out, they point you to the Act of Parliament. If you still refuse, they summon you before the magistrate, and fine or imprison you. If you succumb, and your child dies,—well, they write a certificate and it is buried; and surely that is enough to content you. Such men can say, in the language of Garth,—

“While others meanly ask'd whole months to slay,
I oft despatch'd the patient in a day;
With pen (lancet) in hand, I push'd to that degree,
I scarce had left the wretch to give a fee:
Some fell by laudanum, and some by steel,
And death in ambush lay in every pill;
For save or slay, this privilege we claim—
Though credit suffers, the reward's the same.

The probability is that the true vaccine lymph of Jenner, is no longer to be met with, and hence the whole theory of vaccination, as he propounded it, breaks down. The modern cow-pox is said to be produced by inoculating the cow with small-pox virus. Thus you have two children, whom we will call Mary and Jane. Well, Jane has the small-pox, and whilst the disease is at its height, you open one of the pustules, dip a lancet into the fluid that is contained in it, and then proceed to inoculate the old cow. The cow breaks out with the small-pox or cow-pox, whichever you like to call it—perhaps if you called it both it would be more correct, small-cow-pox or cow-small-pox—and then you obtain some virus from one of the pustules on the cow, and inoculate Mary with it. This is modern vaccination. But even this it is difficult to carry out, because you cannot get the cow to take the small-pox. Mr. Marson, Surgeon to the London Small-pox Hospital, inoculated a large number of cows from the human subject, without any result. The source, therefore, from which the vaccine lymph is obtained in these days, it is difficult to conjecture. Of course the taking it from one child and introducing it into the system of another, is simple enough; but one would think that it occasionally wanted replenishing from the original stock, to prevent it from becoming deteriorated.

The impurities transmitted from one child to another, by this disgusting process, is fearful to think of; and it is really astonishing that any mother who loves her little ones, will submit to such an operation. In truth, it only shews how little thought is bestowed upon matters of the greatest moment, by those most especially concerned. Surely if a mother reflected upon the nature of the operation, misnamed vaccination, she would endure any penalty rather than allow her child to become the victim of so disgusting a process. Yes, but, she remarks, I always have my children vaccinated from a healthy child, and consequently your observations don't apply to me. Mothers have made this statement to me scores of times and therefore it is clear that they imagine their security to consist in being certain as to the state of body of the child from whom the virus is obtained. Now just look at this idea for a moment. The child was healthy from whom the vaccine matter was taken with which your infant was inoculated. Good. But what was it that you took from that healthy child? Virus from a sore that had been produced by matter taken from another child. And what guarantee have you as to the health of that third child, or of the one still further back from whom it was vaccinated? Clearly you can have none; and therefore there is no security whatever in this favourite position taken by the British mothers, the result of the teachings of public vaccinators and their allies.

But suppose the lymph employed be really genuine. Then it consists of the filthy discharge from the heels of the horse, to which I have already referred, either directly so obtained, or after having passed through the body of the cow, which, I take it, cannot have improved it very much. But this is not the worst part of it. The greasy heels of the horse are now tolerably well known to be simply a result of a constitutional disease in that animal,—a symptom of a deeply rooted malady. Wherever they occur, there is always a dry, hacking cough, abdominal respiration, and other symptoms of disease of the respiratory organs. And *post mortem* examinations fully bear out the conjecture to which these symptoms lead, viz.: that the animal is suffering from lung disease. Dr. Collins, in his admirable little work on vaccination, gives the following description of the malady:—"I have seen the fatty excrescence cut off and burnt with nitric acid, and other local treatment had recourse to, but the grapey-looking mass gradually increased, the whole of the limb of the animal being implicated, and the fetor from the breath very offensive, especially in the latter stage of the disease, when the animals were obliged to be slaughtered. The *post mortem* appearances, by the way, must not be lost sight of, and are, in a pathological sense, very instructive. 1st,—There was a general ænemic look of the body, wasting of the tissues, and an unusual thickening or fulness of the lymphatic glands. 2nd,—Lips, tongue, and gums covered with peculiar cankerous-looking ulcers, and much swollen, the whole mucous membrane much softened and covered with dark livid spots, ulceration of the larynx and trachea. The lungs highly congested, and large cavities ramifying through the substance of the organ, filled with purulent matter, corresponding in every particular, both in fetor and character, to that exuding from the greasy heels, and which is seen in the last stage of consumption in the human subject." And I may remark that I can fully bear out this statement from observations of my own. The facts then stand thus: vaccinate your child with the real vaccine lymph of Jenner, procured in its purest form, and you are simply inoculating its system with a matter which owes its origin to pulmonary consumption. Can you wonder, then, at the enormous increase of

"That dire disease whose ruthless power
Withers the beauty's transient flower?"

Well, now, as to the mode of performing the operation, and the time at which it should be carried into effect. These are points upon which great difference of opinion prevails, and about which the vaccinators are all at sixes and sevens with each other at the present day. There should be no mistake in a matter of this kind; everything should be as clear as a problem in Euclid in the case of so important an operation, because to perform it at the wrong time, or in an incorrect manner, may—in fact, does—according to the statements of its advocates, render it completely useless. In an article on this subject in the *London Journal of Medicine*, the following passage occurs:—"In all cases where a child has been exposed to the contagion of the casual smallpox, we should perform the operation of vaccination forthwith, in the hope that the milder may anticipate the more malignant malady. The results of our interference will, however, prove to be various, according to the period at which it takes place. Where the vaccine lymph is inserted during the incubative, but still latent, stage of smallpox, the effect, as stated by Gregory, is, that the latter disease runs through its course unmodified, whether the cow pock, as is most usual, either does not advance at all, or at least tardily and imperfectly, or whether, as may more rarely be observed, it passes through its usual process, at the same time as the casual disease. Cazenave and Schedel, however, state that in vaccinating an infant exposed to variolous contagion, the smallpox will sometimes adhere to its usual progress, but more frequently assume a modified type; and that occasionally even a confluent form of the

disease will pursue its regular course, concurrently with the vaccine eruption. At any rate, the prudent course, in case of exposure to variolous infection, is at once to vaccinate, in the hope that the germ of the casual disease may not yet have been imbibed."

Now this is really completely upsetting the whole theory upon which vaccination is based. If the vaccine disease and the smallpox can not only both exist together in the system, but can pursue their course "concurrently," why, how in the name of all that is rational can the one be a protection against the other? We have always been told that the cow pox lymph being present in the blood, renders the development of small pox impossible; but here they are both together, not in an antagonistic form, but as friendly as a couple of lovers. In fact it would appear from the statement, that the one may "assume a modified type" in consequence of the presence of the other—that there is a possibility of their blending together in the most amiable manner imaginable—probably by their union giving rise to some intermediate disease which partakes of the characteristics of both, but which is in reality neither the one nor the other. It was surely to people who teach such doctrines as this, that Butler referred, when he said

"Who weave fine cobwebs fit for skull,
That's empty when the moon is full;
Such as take lodgings in a head,
That's to be let unfurnished."

The operation must be performed according to the Act of Parliament within three months after the birth of the child; yet, herein, a great authority advises that no child should be vaccinated before the termination of the first year, and gives his reason, that during that period of life, there exists in the constitution, something resistive of the protective influence. Dr. Benjamin Ridge (the discoverer of two new structures in the young of man and animals, which he called the "Membrana Meconii" and the "Rete Vasculare,") who has written largely on this and other subjects, remarks:—"In determining the proper time for vaccinating a subject, due consideration must be had of the constant state of transition characterising infant life, owing to the rapid processes necessarily ensuing in the bodily system of a child during the first year of its existence. And here the laws of those vital elements dwelling in the newly-discovered structures, the meconic membrane and the rete vasculare, demand a candid and impartial attention. At the time when I made known their discovery it will be seen that I connected their existence with a future regard to this great subject, and deemed it right then to say that no child should be vaccinated until three or four months old. From subsequent reflection and experience I am now prepared to extend that time to nine or even to twelve months as the safest period. Indeed, I have for several years past deferred the performance of vaccination until about the last-named period, appointing the time of the first teething, or the weaning of the infant when teething has occurred early, as the time for vaccination. I say nine or even twelve months, because it is impossible to say at what precise age a child may have arrived at that condition of body which, from close observation and experience, I have been led to consider as most appropriate for the reception of the vaccine virus." Now, what is to be said of this? The Act of Parliament compels you to take your child to be vaccinated at a time when, according to some of the best authorities on the subject, the operation is useless, because the system is not susceptible of becoming affected with the poison. Would it not be as well for these vaccinators to settle the differences amongst themselves before they use compulsion towards other people. Let us know, for certain, at what age the operation should be performed, so that no mistake may happen on that score. This, mark you, is a matter of the very greatest importance, and no doubt or difference of opinion should prevail

on the subject. For my own part I should say, if it must be compulsory, postpone it as long as possible; let it be performed some time or other before a man is ninety years of age; but let him please himself about it up to that time. Depend upon it, the earlier it is done the more mischief will arise from it. If it be true that children of a certain age are not susceptible of its influence, then so much the better, as they will probably escape some of the evils that follow in its train; but my experience has convinced me, that there is but little ground for this belief.

Then as to the mode in which the operation should be performed. Hear the great discoverer himself. "Whether it be yet ascertained by experiment that the quantity of variolous matter inserted into the skin makes any difference with respect to the subsequent mildness or violence of the disease, I know not; but I have the strongest reason for supposing, that if either the punctures or incisions be made so deep as to go *through* it, and wound the adipose membrane, that the risk of bringing on a violent disease is greatly increased. I have known an inoculator whose practise was 'to cut deep enough (to use his own expression) to see a bit of fat,' and there to lodge the matter. The great number of bad cases, independent of inflammations and abscesses on the arms, and the fatality which attended this practice, was almost inconceivable; and I cannot account for it on any other principle than that of the matter being placed in this situation instead of the skin." The inoculator who "cut deep enough to see a bit of fat," must have been a worthy disciple of Jenner, one of whom his master ought to be proud. In the case of a lean emaciated person, one wonders how deep he would cut, and, whether failing to find "a bit of fat" in the arms, he would proceed to try his operation upon any other part of the body. But the question that arises is this; ought the lymph to be inserted into the skin, or deep in the subcutaneous tissues? And this question appears to be still unanswered. Now, if evil results will follow from vaccination, if the operation be not properly performed, is it not very important that a decision should be come to as to what part of the body this lymph is to be lodged in, and full instructions given to public vaccinators in the matter so as to avoid mistakes? There may be still surgeons who "cut deep enough to see a bit of fat," and in doing so, produce "inflammations and abscesses on the arms," and what is worse, death; and who is to call them to account for so doing? On the other hand, if the deep incision be proper, then the lodging the matter in the skin may be injurious. Dr. Jenner having mentioned other methods of vaccination equally objectionable, but, to enumerate which, would take up more time than I can spare in this lecture remarks—"Yet, to repeat my former observation, I cannot account for the uninterrupted success, or nearly so, of one practitioner, and the wretched state of the patients under the care of another, where, in both instances, the general treatment did not differ essentially, without conceiving it to arise from the different modes of inserting the matter for the purpose of producing the disease. As it is not the identical matter inserted which is absorbed into the constitution, but that which is, by some peculiar process in the animal economy, generated by it, is it not probable that different parts of the human body may prepare or modify the virus differently?" This must strike every intelligent medical man as being egregious nonsense. "Not the identical matter inserted, which is absorbed into the constitution," but something else generated from it by some mysterious and occult process. Why this renders the whole affair a thousand times more unsatisfactory than ever. When we were told that cow-pox was produced by the absorption of cow-pox virus, and that this disease was a preventative of small pox, we could understand some little of the theory that was attempted to be set up. But to be told that the vaccine lymph is not absorbed at all, that the system simply takes up some new material, which it has itself manufactured out of the old,

and that this new product still gives rise to the old disease, is to make great demands upon our credulity. Then, "different parts of the body may prepare or modify the virus differently." Very good. But, as all practitioners vaccinate in the arm, and as the results of the operation are so various in different constitutions, it would appear, that in some, the operation should be performed in the arm, and others in the leg, and so on. And who, we may enquire, is to be the judge as to the part of the body to be selected for this interesting experiment. If the practitioner, the tyranny of the Compulsory Act is hereby greatly increased: if the patient, the law is easily rendered void. Besides, if the "different modes of inserting the matter" may give rise to "uninterrupted success" in one case, and the most frightful results in another, it becomes very important that some general rule should be laid down for the guidance of public vaccinators, and that they should not be left to pursue their course blindly, as at present. Suppose, for argument's sake, that vaccination is true as a theory, yet, who is to calculate the frightful evils that must result—according to Jenner, himself—from its being carried into practice in so unsatisfactory a manner as is done at the present time.

A well known physician, who has issued a publication on the subject, told me one day that he accounted for the fact that vaccination was frequently unsuccessful in protecting against smallpox, on the ground, that children were only vaccinated in one arm. He had never known, he said, of a person taking smallpox after vaccination, who had been vaccinated in both arms. I replied, that I had very many. This theory must be based upon the supposition, either, that in vaccinating the child on one side, that side alone is protected, or, that the quantity of virus introduced is not sufficient. In the latter case it would be easy to meet the difficulty by introducing a larger quantity of lymph without operating on the other arm, and in the former, the theory could only be proved true by the smallpox, in such a case, attacking only half the body and making its appearance solely on the non-vaccinated side. But this talking of smallpox as though it were a local disease, really displays a great amount of ignorance. You may depend upon it, that whenever it occurs, it arises from constitutional causes; that it has its origin much deeper than the skin, and that local treatment will have but little effect upon it. Vaccination on both arms will have about the same result as vaccination on one. The poison, whether of smallpox, of cowpox, or of any other kindred disease, having once reached the blood will soon bring the entire system under its influence.

Another point worthy of consideration here is the present advocacy of re-vaccination. The Act provides that this is to be resorted to where necessary. Where necessary! But it should never be necessary, if the vaccination hypothesis has any value. The person inoculated with the cowpox virus, should be for ever protected against smallpox, or the entire theory breaks down. This was at all events the doctrine of Jenner. His words are—"What renders the cowpox virus so extremely singular is, that the person who has been thus affected is for ever after secure from the infection of the smallpox." Now, mark,—"for ever after secure." Then how can re-vaccination be ever necessary? And the fact that it is, that is to say, that those who have been vaccinated do, notwithstanding this grand prophylactic, suffer from severe attacks of smallpox, shews, I think, the entire absurdity of the whole doctrine. Besides, of what use is re-vaccination? If the performance of the operation once has done no good, it will be difficult to shew that repeating it twenty times can have any better result, except on the principle that several nothings make a something.

It is objected to this, that the vaccination is protective for a certain length of time, and that after the expiration of that period, fresh virus must be introduced into the system, the old having probably been thrown off or rendered

inoperative by the changes continually taking place in the animal economy. If so, we have a right to ask—What length of time it will retain its power? Some time since, there was a talk about re-vaccinating every seven years, on the supposition—an erroneous one—that the entire body becomes changed in that time. But I have seen—and I have no doubt so have many of you—children suffering from smallpox, and by no means in a mild form, in much less than seven years after they had been vaccinated. A gentleman I was speaking to the other day thought seven years too long, and he suggested, therefore, re-vaccination every three years. But persons have the smallpox frequently, in less than three years after vaccination. What is to be done in these cases? I suppose next they will resort to re-vaccination every year; and if that should fail, as it unquestionably will, will go on shortening the time till in the end you will be expected to have your children vaccinated every morning before breakfast. The truth is, the whole theory is a gigantic delusion. I heard the other day of a young man who was vaccinated as a child. When at about 13 or 14 years of age, he became a gentleman's servant, and was vaccinated again; and after that joined the army, and for the third time underwent this delightful operation, and had the smallpox after all. Surely such a man deserves to have for an epitaph those lines that are said to grace the tombstone of an Italian Count—

"I was well,
Wish'd to be better,
Took physic, and died!"

But the smallpox is raging in this and other towns. Yes; and it is likely to rage, despite all the vaccination in the world, unless you attend more strictly to sanitary regulations. Fresh air, good food, and pure water, will prove the real prophylactic against smallpox, as well as against all other fevers and epidemics. I was greatly surprised at reading in one of your newspapers to-day, a statement made by Dr. Willshire with regard to the relative prevalence of smallpox here and at Ecclesall. Dr. Willshire is a man of whom I have the highest opinion. I was a pupil of his in Charing Cross Hospital Medical College, and I know of no living physician whose judgment I would rely on as soon as his, in the diagnosis of disease; but he must have spoken hastily, when he ascribed the prevalence of smallpox in Sheffield to the fact that the Guardians were not sufficiently active in prosecuting those who neglected to comply with the Act; and its absence in Ecclesall to the activity of the Board there. Does not Dr. Willshire know that the sewage of Ecclesall comes direct to Sheffield and remains here in an open moat, giving off its poisonous effluvia, to generate all kinds of diseases,—smallpox of course amongst the rest. And even if vaccination were the true preventative of variola that it is held to be, still you would do but little good in enforcing it whilst this state of things remain. If this disease did not break out, others would that are quite as terrible and quite as fatal. Improve your drainage,—that is the most important point to begin at,—and when that is done, smallpox, in common with all other diseases of a similar kind, will disappear. The grease in the horse's heel is the result of bad stabling, uncleanness, and neglect; and smallpox, its twin brother, arises mostly from bad drainage, foul air, and impure water. No doubt it is in some measure subject to the same laws as other epidemics, and at one time breaks out more violently than another, just as cholera does; but in both cases, the ill-drained and ill-ventilated neighbourhoods will suffer most.

I have not time here to go into the history of this disease, nor indeed in a lecture of this kind is it necessary; suffice it to say, that it was terribly fatal—and no wonder—when inoculation was practised. Moore, in his history of the smallpox, published in 1815, says—"Last year, near a thousand persons died of smallpox in London; six hundred and thirty-eight in the city." Of

course it has decreased since the filthy practice of inoculation was given up, and since improved sanitary measures have been introduced, and will no doubt ultimately die out, as other diseases have done before it, when the conditions are no longer favourable for its development. Vaccination will never stamp it out.

The eruption on the skin, about which there is so much talk, and to get rid of which seems to be the entire end and aim of the vaccinators, is simply the outlet of an internal malady, and should be viewed as a good sign rather than a bad one, when the disease is really present. It is not at all uncommon in exanthematous diseases, for the children suffering from them to be subject to terrible convulsions, which disappear as soon as ever the eruption comes out. The skin symptoms are therefore favourable rather than otherwise. Certainly no one likes to be pockmarked; but assuredly the preservation of beauty is not the highest end of life; for the body contaminated with a dreadful poison, destroying all the energies, enfeebling the vital powers, and entailing suffering throughout life, is much more to be dreaded, to my way of thinking, than to have one's face pitted with the smallpox. Better, however, to have neither, and that can possibly be accomplished, but not by vaccination.

Vaccination is one of the greatest shams of the age, and it is surprising that intelligent men should tolerate it for a single day. The whole of its pretensions vanish the moment you investigate them. No single shadow of an argument worth anything can be urged in its favour. Some great shams have at least one or two good qualities to recommend them, though on the whole they may be bad, but this has none. It is simply a dirty, disgusting, filthy operation, when viewed at the best, and when its results are considered, it is terrible to contemplate. I put it in the mildest light when I said it was useless and injurious, and that we shall prove it to be by its own advocates.

I.—VACCINATION IS USELESS.

Now bear in mind that Dr. Jenner's theory was as I have told you, that a person once inoculated with the cowpox virus could never afterwards take the smallpox, and we have a perfect right, if we choose, to test vaccination by this standard. I read you one passage from Jenner on this question; I will now give you another. He says in his third treatise—"The scepticism that appeared even among the most enlightened of medical men, when my sentiments on the important subject of the cowpox were first promulgated, was highly laudable. To have admitted the truth of a doctrine at once so novel and so unlike anything that ever had appeared in the annals of medicine, without the test of the most rigid scrutiny, would have bordered upon temerity; but now, when that scrutiny has taken place, not only among ourselves, but in the first professional circles in Europe, and when it has been uniformly found in such abundant instances that the human frame, when once it has felt the influence of the genuine cowpox in the way that has been described, is never afterwards at any period of its existence assailable by the smallpox, may I not with perfect confidence congratulate my country and society at large on their beholding, in the mild form of the cowpox, an antidote that is capable of extirpating from the earth a disease which is every hour devouring its victims—a disease that has ever been considered as the severest scourge of the human race?"

Now to show only a single case of smallpox after vaccination, is completely to destroy this theory, and I need not tell you that there are such cases, because I feel sure that many of you have been eye witnesses of them, and indeed their existence is not denied, even by the most ardent advocates of vaccination. A few weeks ago, I went up to London from this town, and hearing that an old friend of mine had his four children all ill, I called upon him. On enquiring how they were, he asked me if I knew what was the matter with them. I replied that I had heard they were suffering from

scarlatina. No, he said, they are all down with the smallpox, but I have not made it known, for fear it should drive away my customers. On seeing the children, I found that in two of them the disease had assumed a confluent form and presented a most threatening aspect; in the other two it was much more mild. "Have they been vaccinated?" I enquired. "Two of them," he replied, "the other two, I am sorry to say, I neglected to have done." "And which two," I asked "have been vaccinated?" "The two oldest," he answered. "Well," I said, "considering that those two have got the disease in its very worst form, and are in a far more dangerous condition than the others, I don't know why you should be sorry that vaccination has not been extended to the whole four." The end of this case was, that one of the two children that had been vaccinated died, and the other recovered, but is terribly pock-marked. The two that had been neglected to be vaccinated were speedily restored to health, and no trace of the disease, at the present day, can be observed in their faces. Of course I don't want to convey the idea that it was through the vaccination that the two eldest children had the disease in so bad a form; that fact was probably due to some other cause; but at least the case proves that the vaccination afforded no protection against smallpox; and this is borne out by the experience of all who have paid attention to the subject. More than forty years ago, Dr. Gregory (then physician to the Smallpox Hospital, and therefore with ample opportunities for judging) wrote of vaccination thus:—"The hope entertained by its illustrious and amiable discoverer, that it might ultimately exterminate smallpox from off the face of the earth, appears vain and unfounded." And vain and unfounded it has indeed proved to be. And those who once entertained the fond hope that any such grand result should arise through such agency, begin to find that they

—————"have been too long
Dupes of a deep delusion."

And Dr. Gregory's after-experience tended but to confirm his previous opinion, for in a letter that he wrote to the *Medical Times*, in June, 1852, he remarks:—"Smallpox does invade the vaccinated, and the extirpation of that dire disorder is an event as distant as when it was first heedlessly, and in my humble judgment, most presumptuously anticipated by Jenner." I agree entirely with Dr. Gregory here, and would add, that if such a greatly to be desired event should ever happen, as the extirpation of smallpox, it will not be brought about by vaccination.

The *Lancet*, now so violent in its abuse of those who do not subscribe to the Jennerian theory and allow their children's blood to be poisoned by the introduction of filthy diseased matter, could write most calmly on the subject a few years since, as the following extract will show:—"In the public mind, and in the profession itself, doubts are known to exist as to the efficacy and eligibility of vaccination—the failures of the operation having been numerous and discouraging." This was written in 1853, when the first Compulsory Bill was before Parliament; and sixteen years have but added extensively to those failures, and changed the doubts into entire disbelief as to the efficacy of the operation. Yet, now, the *Lancet* pours forth a torrent of that abuse of which it is so great a master, on the heads of all those who stand by its own opinions of sixteen years ago. Dr. Greenhow, of North Shields, writes:—"It is a well known fact, that smallpox, after vaccination, has become of much more frequent occurrence during the last few years." So you see, that instead of recent experience tending to strengthen the belief in vaccination, it is calculated to shake it on every hand. We only ask for facts to be allowed to speak, and we have no fear for the result; but the truth is, our public vaccinators are very much like the man of whom an old anecdote relates, when told facts were against his theory, replied—"Then so much the worse for the facts."

In an admirable letter that appeared in the *Medical Gazette*, of Nov. 6th, 1830, written by Mr. J. S. Chapman, Assistant Surgeon to the 11th Light Dragoons, and dated Cawnpore, May 4th, 1830, we have related some important facts as to his experience of smallpox in India. The letter was addressed to Dr. Gregory, and the following extract is important:—"Smallpox has been playing the very deuce at this station. There appears to be no positive security against the disease, either by vaccination or by smallpox inoculation, and I have seen several cases where the patients have caught smallpox twice, and have each time been very severely marked; and in two instances have died of the second attack of smallpox. Certainly by far the greater number of our smallpox cases have occurred in persons vaccinated in India some twelve or fifteen years ago." Here you see it is clearly shewn that vaccination afforded no protection whatever against smallpox, and yet in the face of this, you have persons such as insurance agents and aldermen of your borough, men who cannot be supposed to know anything about pathology or therapeutics, with that self-conceit which only ignorance inspires, prating about the glorious boon of vaccination, and declaring that we who object to it are really the advocates of smallpox, and desire that our fellow-creatures should suffer from the dire effects of a terrible pestilence.

Dr. Rennie, in his work entitled '*Peking and the Pekingese*,' says—"Since 1820, vaccination (introduced from Canton) has been practised to a limited extent amongst the population: probably about one-fifth may be vaccinated. At one time it was believed to afford protection, smallpox not having been so common after its introduction. Of recent years, however, confidence in it has considerably diminished, owing to the frequency with which those are attacked who have been vaccinated."

Dr. Copland, a man whose *Cyclopædia* will remain for many years a monument of his extensive experience, great learning, profound research, and untiring industry, says—"At the time of my writing this, just half a century has elapsed since the discovery and introduction of vaccination; and after a quarter of a century of most transcendental laudation of the measure, with merely occasional whisperings of doubt, and after another quarter of a century of reverberated encomiums from well-paid vaccination boards, raised with a view of overbearing the increasing murmurings of disbelief among those who observe and think for themselves, the middle of the nineteenth century finds the majority of the profession, in all latitudes and hemispheres, doubtful as to the preponderance of advantages, present and prospective, to be obtained either from inoculation or from vaccination.

Sir J. Y. Simpson, a man standing at the very top of the profession and one of the most unbiased and unprejudiced of medical observers does "not believe that either vaccination or drugs can give absolute security to any population, against the inroads of smallpox. When every care has been taken, the vaccinated person has been known to be attacked by smallpox. In an epidemic of the disease, such cases are extremely common." And if so, we ask—Of what value is the vaccination?

But one grows tired of quoting authorities to prove so palpable a fact—a fact which is every day becoming more and more recognised, and which, despite public prosecutors, public vaccinators, and others interested in the spread of the delusion, will ultimately be universally recognised.

The mortality arising from smallpox is something frightful to think of, despite all the vaccination, and is in keeping with the mortality resulting from other diseases, the cause of all being very much the same.

From Sir J. Y. Simpson we learn that "During the ten years from 1856 to 1866, above 51,000 individuals died of smallpox in Great Britain; and if we calculate approximately from the population, above 12,000 more in Ireland, or upwards of 60,000 in the United Kingdom. In the ten years, from 1856

onwards, there died, in the United Kingdom, from scarlatina, above 280,000; from measles, above 130,000; and from hooping cough, above 150,000."

Now, it is not difficult to see that this terrible state of things arises, to a great extent, from bad sanitary arrangements, and that the remedy to be applied is not vaccination, but good food, fresh air, pure water, well-drained towns, and well-ventilated houses. Smallpox arises in the same way as scarlatina, measles, hooping cough, &c.; similar causes produce them all, and similar remedies must be resorted to, to get rid of them. Why all this bustle and chatter about smallpox, and no word of scarlatina—a more terrible and more fatal disease, and the mortality arising from which, is more than double that caused by smallpox? Why but because there is a pet theory at stake in the one case and none in the other!

Some ten years ago, Dr. Letheby made special observations on 93 cases of smallpox, and published the result in a letter to the *Times*. Out of 34 persons that died, 21 of them had been vaccinated. What then becomes of the boasted protection against smallpox afforded by this operation? Surely it is high time that people began to reflect on this matter, and not allow themselves longer to be led by the nose by an interested clique.

Now, take the statistics of the Smallpox Hospital, and see how far they support the views that I am advocating. It appears that more cases were admitted in 1867 than in any year, except 1866, since the foundation of the institution; and this despite compulsory vaccination and the prosecution of those who do not feel disposed to comply with the Act. During the five years 1863-7, over which the present epidemic has extended, 7,317 patients have been admitted.

In 1863 the numbers were.....	1536
1864 ditto	830
1865 ditto	1249
1866 ditto	2069
1867 ditto	1626

The yearly average during the various epidemics, was as follows:—

In 1851-2	741
1854-6	773
1859-60	1030
1863-7	1463

Thus, you see, the number of persons admitted into the Smallpox Hospital per year, is greater during the present epidemic than during any of the previous ones, notwithstanding the great extent to which vaccination is practised now, compared with what it was formerly. Of the 1626 admissions in 1867, 21 were not affected with smallpox; therefore, deducting these, there remained 1605. Now, how many of the 1605 think you had been vaccinated? There should have been none if the theory of Jenner be sound. But there were some, and how many? Why—"tell it not in Gath"—out of the 1605 persons admitted into the Smallpox Hospital, suffering from smallpox, in 1867, 1350 had been vaccinated, and only 255 were unvaccinated. And yet we are told that vaccination is a protection against smallpox. Nor was that year an exception to the rule that generally prevails. In 1866, out of the 2069 cases admitted, 1612 had been vaccinated.

In 1867, there were 3 cases after a previous attack of smallpox, 2 cases after both vaccination and smallpox, and 4 cases after inoculation. The number of deaths in 1867 was 206, being in the proportion of 12.9 per cent.; or, after deducting 13 deaths due to coincident or superadded disease, 12 per cent.

The ratio of vaccinated cases to the whole admissions—a most important fact—stands as follows:—

In 1851-2	66.7	per cent. vaccinated.
1854-6	71.2	" "
1859-60.....	78	" "
1863-6	81.1	" "
1867	84.1	" "

Thus, in each succeeding epidemic, the number of vaccinated persons who have to be taken to the Smallpox Hospital, is greater than in the preceding one. How anyone can, in the face of these facts, published by the friends of vaccination, believe in Jenner's theory, is to me a mystery. At least, there is but one way of accounting for it, which is—by taking into consideration the interest at stake. For, as Dryden says—

“ Where interest fortifies an argument,
Weak reason serves to gain the will's assent:
For souls already warp'd, receive an easy bent.”

It is sometimes objected that if the vaccinated do take smallpox, they have it in a milder form. Well, they die of it. I don't know whether you call that a mild form of a disease which terminates fatally. For my own part, I don't. But this position really gives up the whole theory of Jenner, which you will remember was that the vaccinated were protected thoroughly against the ravages of smallpox. He said nothing about milder forms of the malady; that was the old doctrine of inoculation, and totally foreign to the principle of vaccination, and is only now resorted to as a subterfuge by those who don't know how to get out of the difficulty in which numerous facts place their theory. But I may remark that this is not the case, that—*ceteris paribus*—the vaccinated and the unvaccinated alike suffer and alike die.

The following case is worthy of your attention, as bearing somewhat upon this question, and also shewing you what dangers may arise from the pernicious practice of vaccination. It is copied from the *Lancet*, of July 28th, 1866, by Dr. Collins. I extract it from his excellent work on vaccination, which should be read by every person in the country.

Dr. Charteris, Assistant Surgeon of St. Giles' Infirmary, writes thus to the *Lancet*, July 28th, 1866:—“ During the last three weeks there has been in the parish of St. Giles, an outbreak of smallpox, which evidently threatens to assume an epidemic form. It appears to attack indiscriminately those vaccinated and those unvaccinated; the disease in those protected being generally very mild, while in those who are not, this is by no means the case. The history of the eight fatal cases I have had, present, I think, peculiar points of interest. In all these vaccination was performed. The children seemed healthy on the day of vaccination, but on the subsequent day, the smallpox eruption appeared, the disease proceeding *pari passu* with the maturation of the smallpox vesicle. On the ninth day of the disease, with one exception, all died. Such a termination in these cases has led me to believe that a fatal antagonism is exercised on the system when the child is under the influence of vaccination and smallpox. I now hesitate to perform vaccination when there is the slightest chance of the child having been exposed to the contagion of smallpox; and in seven cases, where I have thus refrained, and allowed the disease to proceed in its usual course, the termination has not been fatal. The history of one of these fatal cases is very singular. Smallpox had attacked two members of a family living in the upper floor of a house in Lincoln Court. A woman living on the second floor came to me two days after the disease had broken out, and had her child vaccinated. Four well-filled vesicles was the result, I observed, when she came to me on the eighth day with the child. The child and mother both seeming remarkably healthy, I was on the point of filling some tubes with the vaccine matter, when a most providential reluctance seized me, and after puncturing the vesicles, I allowed

the woman to go away. The same day I vaccinated, with matter taken from another child's arm, twenty children. On the following morning, the mother came again with the child, wondering what the *rash* was on the child's forehead. Scarcely believing my own eyesight, I saw that it was the eruption of variola. For five days the child appeared to progress favourably, though the eruption was of the confluent form, but on the sixth day it refused to take the breast, and on the morning of the seventh day of the disease it died. This case shews that smallpox was lurking in the system at the time I vaccinated the child, and that the successful vaccination in no way exercised, as it usually does, any modifying influence over the disease. At the same time it appears to me very strange that this influence was not exercised when one complete day had elapsed after the vaccine vesicle had come to its maturity, before the smallpox eruption appeared. The case, besides being interesting *per se*, shews how very cautious medical men and public vaccinators should be in taking vaccine matter from any child when the smallpox is rife. I have no doubt that had I vaccinated the twenty children I previously mentioned, from this child's arm, every one of them would have taken smallpox, and most probably all would have died."

Now, I ask you, as free and independent Englishmen, whether you do not consider it a pretty state of things, that a man should be allowed to force his way into your house, against your will, and thus endanger the health and lives of your sweet babes? How coolly this Dr. Charteris speaks of sacrificing twenty children, which nothing but an accident prevented, according to his own shewing. What if a few children are slaughtered! Never mind; the law must be obeyed, and public vaccinators pocket their fees. And is it in England, where even drunken revellers sing "Britons never shall be slaves," that this state of things exists? To the disgrace of our statute book, it is so. But the vast assembly that I see before me, and the enthusiasm with which you have received the truths I have told you, seem to say that it shall not be the fault of Sheffield if it remain so much longer.

"There 's a fount about to stream,
There 's a light about to beam,
There 's a warmth about to glow,
There 's a flower about to blow,
There 's a midnight blackness changing
 Into grey:
Men of thought and men of action,
 Clear the way!

II.—VACCINATION IS INJURIOUS.

I have shewn you that vaccination does not afford a shadow of protection against the smallpox, and therefore, that it is utterly useless as a prophylactic against that malady,—that consequently, no justifiable reason can be given why it should be performed upon children against the wishes of those who have the right to be considered the guardians of their health, and that compulsory vaccination is therefore a tyranny that every one should strenuously resist. But as Hamlet says,—

"Thus bad begins,
But worse remains behind."

If it can be proved that, in vaccinating your children, you are running the risk of introducing into their bodies a number of other diseases, some of them even worse than the smallpox itself, it will surely then follow that it is time we repealed this despotic Act of Parliament.

It will not, I presume, be disputed by the most ardent advocate of vaccination, that evil results—in some instances, fatal—occasionally follow this operation. The late Sir Culling Eardly lost his life through vaccination, and

his case is by no means an isolated one. When the smallpox broke out among the soldiers in the Camp at Shorncliffe, in 1860, re-vaccination was resorted to, and the consequences are familiar to many of you. Thirteen of the poor fellows who had been made the subject of this operation, died, and others were compelled to have their arms amputated to save their lives. In the South of France, vaccination was performed on the soldiers, at the instigation of the Academy of Medicine, and the result was terrible in the extreme, so much so, that the Emperor was compelled to interfere and cause the practice to be discontinued.

Dr. Copland writes thus: "Half a century has brought us to the position that we are, doubtful which to prefer—vaccination with its present benefits and its future contingent dangers, or inoculation with its possible present dangers and its future advantages." Here is an admission on the part of one who believes that vaccination does confer a present good, that its future dangers are so great, as to render it doubtful, whether it has a superiority over the old and brutal system of inoculation. Now, when we take into consideration the fact that the "present benefits" of this operation are as imaginary as the blessings supposed, at one time, to be derived from charms and amulets, the conclusion as to whether it is wise to risk the "future contingent dangers" is obvious enough.

But apart from the evils likely to ensue directly from the operation—and I have myself seen some terrible cases of that kind—there is another and even greater danger involved, viz.:—the chance of introducing into the system the poison of some other malady, and then to leave behind that which will entail a lifetime of suffering. I am aware that some have argued, that it is impossible to communicate another disease with the vaccine lymph, however much affected the person may be from whose system it is taken, but upon what principle this theory is maintained, I have always been at a loss to discover. The operation that imparts one disease, the cowpox, may impart a dozen others if the elements of them be present. But whatever may be said of the theory, there can be no mistake about the facts.

The virus employed in vaccination is as I have already shewn, consumptive matter. It had its origin in the greasy heels of the horse, and that grease the result of a lung disease. What wonder then, that if by inoculating the body of a child with this ichor, the seeds of consumption are implanted at the same time. And who shall say that this is not the chief cause of that fearful increase of tubercular disease that has taken place of late years. Dr. McCormac, in his work on the subject, speaks of consumption as "a malady which constitutes nearly a third of all chronic diseases, and perhaps a fifth of the actual mortality of the human race." And although this may be somewhat overstating the case, yet every medical man knows how terribly this disease has increased recently. We gather the following from the Registrar General's Report: "The 53,734 deaths by phthisis of persons, the greater part of them adults, prove the great importance of a careful study of the causes of this disease. At the age of 20 and under 25, the deaths of young women from all specified causes, were 8,477, and of these 4,290 (being more than one-half) died of phthisis."

The *Medical Times and Gazette* for January 1st, 1854, informs us that consumption "has widely spread since the introduction of vaccination, and within 10 years (ending 1853) has slain its 68,204 victims in the metropolis alone." Professor Bartlett, lecturer on the theory and practice of medicine in the University of New York, remarks:—"In 208 children who had been vaccinated, 138 died of tubercular consumption and 70 of other maladies; in 95 who were not vaccinated, 30 only died of tubercular consumption, and 65 of other diseases." Vaccination is, therefore, simply an agency for the propagation of consumption; and you who think to protect your children

from smallpox by this means, must not be surprised, if, in after years, you fall victims to a worse malady.

Dr. Jenner always held that inoculation with the smallpox virus was productive of consumption, and this was one reason that he gave for the superiority of vaccination. But if tubercular disease could be communicated from one person to another, by inoculation, there is surely no reason why the same result should not arise from vaccination, especially when the two diseases—smallpox and cowpox—are so nearly allied. And that it was so, even in Jenner's day, he should have learned from the facts that came before his notice. His oldest son, Edward, when a year and a half old, was inoculated with smallpox, and passed through the disease with but little constitutional disturbance. Some other members of his family were operated upon in the same way afterwards. The result was that the whole of these died of consumption. James Phipps, a strong healthy lad, eight years of age, was inoculated by Dr. Jenner with cowpox, on May 14th, 1796, and passed through the disease in a satisfactory manner. Afterwards, variolous matter, taken from a pustule, was inserted by several incisions without producing any effect. He afterwards died of consumption. There is, therefore, an abundance of evidence to shew that there is an intimate relation between vaccination and consumption.

Then take scrofulous affections. Dr. Jenner, in his third treatise, says:—"Every practitioner in medicine, who has extensively inoculated with the smallpox, or has attended many of those who have had the distemper in the natural way, must acknowledge that he has frequently seen scrofulous affections, in some form or another, sometimes rather quickly shewing themselves after the recovery of the patients. Conceiving this fact to be admitted, as I presume it must be by all who have carefully attended to the subject, may I not ask whether it does not appear probable that the general introduction of the smallpox into Europe has not been among the most conducive means in exciting that formidable foe to health? Having attentively watched the effects of the cowpox in this respect, I am happy in being able to declare that this disease does not appear to have the least tendency to produce this destructive malady!"

But the same arguments that would be used to shew that the smallpox had a tendency to produce scrofula, might be employed with equal force to prove that the cowpox was likely to be productive of the same result. That Jenner did not observe the latter, whilst he saw many cases of the former, can be easily explained. His faith in his new theory was calculated—as always happens in such cases—to blind his eyes to facts which told against him; and secondly, vaccination was in its infancy at that time, and had not been observed sufficiently long to enable anyone to say what the consequences arising from it really were. We have an abundance of facts now to guide us in the matter, and these all point to the conclusion that vaccination is one of the most fruitful sources of scrofula that we are acquainted with. And, indeed, that it should be so is only rational, when we remember that the virus itself is of a scrofulous character. I have known many cases where children have been perfectly healthy till they were vaccinated, and from that time they have become affected with all the symptoms of scrofula, which continued unabated despite all the treatment that has been resorted to for the purpose of effecting a cure.

Mr. Stuart cites a case of a male child who had enjoyed good health prior to being vaccinated, from which time he was always afflicted with blotches and ugly eruptions, until he had the smallpox after an interval of three years, from which time he was perfectly healthy as before.

The disturbance that takes place in the system of the child, consequent directly upon the vaccination, is sometimes very serious. Mr. Shaw, in the *New York Medical and Surgical Journal*, says—"I have known most fearful

convulsions brought on by it, and that in children apparently in the firmest health." And there is not a medical man in existence who has had any experience in vaccination, but has seen cases of a similar kind. Dr. Pearce, in his admirable Essay on Vaccination, relates the following:—"Mr. Joseph Firth had a child vaccinated in 1848, which died in 14 days from the effect of the vaccination. He was afterwards summoned by the Registrar, in reference to another child. He told the magistrate that he had had one child killed by vaccination, and he feared that if forced to have another vaccinated, it would also be killed. He was forced to comply, and in less than three weeks the child, though previously perfectly healthy, died of fits similar to attacks of which some of the family of the child from whom the vaccine matter was taken were subject."

What is this but murder, legalized, but, nevertheless, deliberate and wilful murder? Surely this one case is enough, even were there no others, to rouse every Englishman into energetic action to repeal so despotic and iniquitous a law. And we are called all sorts of ill names, abused in newspapers, vilified in public and scandalised in private, denounced as foes to the well-being of humanity, considered as wretches hardly good enough to be kicked, destitute alike of character, principle, and honour, and all because we object to sacrifice our little ones to this modern Moloch. Be it so—*veritas odium parit*—we are content, believing that in the end right will come uppermost and truth will prevail. But let me tell those who spend so much of their time in slandering us, that their conduct serves their cause but ill, for it tends to make us more energetic, and causes us to work all the more earnestly and with greater determination, to end a state of things which is a disgrace to a civilized community.

There is another disease—one of a character which can hardly be dealt with before a public audience—one of the most loathsome that can affect humanity, and which we are accustomed to view with as great a degree of repugnance as the leprosy of old. What say you to having your children's constitutions contaminated with this? Even that will be accomplished by vaccination. This terrible malady is greatly on the increase, the deaths from it in 1864 being no less than 1,550; and I have no doubt that this is due greatly to vaccination. A dissolute debauchee becomes the father of children, whose constitutions are tainted with the impurity resulting from his crimes, and are thus doomed, through the hereditary taint, to lead a life of pain and suffering. Well, you obtain from the blood of these poor unfortunate victims of disease matter with which you inoculate your healthy child. Can you wonder that after that your own loved one should sicken, and fall a victim to maladies of which there were no traces in his constitution before? How often do we hear the cry—the oft-repeated old, old story—"Oh, sir, my child was quite healthy till I had it vaccinated, but since then it has never been well!" Go and enquire amongst those persons that come daily into contact with you, and you will soon discover how often this is the case. I have seen the poor little suffering wretches one mass of sores and ulcers—veritable infantile Jobs—causing you to shed tears of pity as you gazed on them; and on enquiry as to the origin of the disorder, have received for reply, again and again, the sickening story—vaccination, vaccination.

That syphilis can be thus communicated the following authorities, all favourable to vaccination, testify. I quote them from Dr. Collins.

Mr. Ackerley, of Liverpool, writes,—“I have no doubt that syphilis has been communicated from a diseased to a healthy child by means of vaccination.”

Dr. Bamberger, of Warzburg, says,—“I am, indeed, convinced that contagious disease, syphilis for instance, is communicable with the lymph in vaccination; nay, such a case has even happened a short time ago in a town but a few miles from this place. After due enquiry into all the circumstances of the case, the practitioner was found guilty by the court of justice, and condemned to prison for several months.”

Mr. Complin says,—“Syphilis, I consider, might be communicated.”

Mr. Startin is of opinion that the true Jennerian vesicle, in a subject suffering under constitutional or acquired syphilis, may be the means of transmitting this disease, “which,” he says, “he has seen many times transferred from such a vesicle.”

In the *Lancet* of December 15th, 1866, the following paragraph appears:—“**SYPHILIS EXTENSIVELY PROPAGATED BY VACCINATION, IN FRANCE.**—In a western department of France (Morbihan) some villages have been the theatre of severe syphilitic symptoms upon more than thirty children, who had all been vaccinated from a little girl with six punctures in each arm, the child herself having been operated upon from another who had been vaccinated from lymph preserved between two plates of glass, obtained from the authorities. This misfortune created so much sensation that the Academy of Medicine, of Paris, sent down two Commissioners—Messrs. Henry Roger and Depaul. These gentlemen have just presented their report to the Academy, and this important document ends with the following considerations:—1. Several of the children whom we have examined are undoubtedly suffering from secondary syphilis. 2. We see no way of explaining this contamination but by vaccination; and we are confident that the cases we have seen were really syphilis engendered by vaccination. 3. As to the origin of the virus, it is very probable that the poison is traceable to the lymph, preserved between two pieces of glass, supplied by the authorities. As primary symptoms were also observed among the children, M. Ricord begged the Commissioners to insert that fact in their report, which these gentlemen agreed to do. Here we unfortunately have again repeated the sad occurrences which took place at Rivalta (Italy) a short time ago.”

These are the results arising from Jenner's glorious discovery. Is it not time that we stopped this stream of contagion from flowing on and overwhelming humanity in its dirty waters? Talk about the evils of pock-marked faces. Are there any fathers or mothers present amongst the many assembled here to-night that would not a thousand times rather that their children's faces should be disfigured by the pits of smallpox, than that their constitutions should be destroyed by this loathsome disease. If there be such, they do not deserve the name of parents. Not, mark you, that the alternative is necessary, because both may be avoided. I only speak of the choice that would be made, supposing it were.

The mortality is, notwithstanding all our improved sanitary regulations, still frightfully high in some large towns; and, in truth, on the whole, the death rate increases faster than the population. The following statistics tell a painful tale:—The mean death average in twenty-eight years (*i.e.* from 1838 to 1865) was 2.238 for every 100 living. If we take the first eight years in the table, *viz.*, from 1838 to 1845 inclusive, the average will be found to be 2.176; and in the last eight years, *viz.*, from 1851 to 1865, the average had increased to 2.257, a heavier death rate than the mean of the whole twenty-eight years, although in 1849 (the cholera year) the death rate reached 2,512.

This is a lamentable state of things, and measures should at once be taken to remedy it. Let the money that is now expended in vaccination be employed in improving the dwellings of the poor, and some good results may follow. When you tell us that smallpox is less prevalent now than formerly, we reply, what if it were? the death rate is not; and smallpox is only one of a large class of diseases arising from similar causes. Even could you stamp out one of those by some patent process, you would only increase the rest, whilst the conditions remained unaltered. Smallpox, like all other diseases of a similar character, runs a certain course and then disappears. Like the plague, it may some day pass away, independently of all means that we may employ for getting rid of it; but its place will be supplied by some other, and perhaps

worse malady, unless the circumstances under which it appeared are changed. Dr. T. Massey Harding remarks—"In 1798 smallpox was gradually on the decline, and, in all probability, would have continued to do so without vaccination." Without vaccination, if at all, for we have seen that that operation has not had the effect of checking it, since those upon whom it has been performed are as liable to smallpox as the rest.

Dr. H. Johnson observes—"It is important to bear in mind that the great epidemic was at its height in 1796, so that Jenner's ideas were promulgated just exactly at that moment when the scourge was declining."

If this be so, one can easily explain the gradual decrease of smallpox. Certain it is that vaccination has had nothing to do with it, except in so far as it supplanted inoculation, which, as I have already shewn, was a terrible means of propagating the disease. But what I want to impress upon your minds is this—that the stamping out of any one of these diseases, even if it could be accomplished, would prove of but little benefit; because, unless the conditions were changed, it would but serve to increase another, and thus the mortality would still remain the same.

Dr. West, Physician to the Hospital for Sick Children, says: "Measles is next to smallpox, the most contagious of all fevers. The child, who sixty years ago would have died of smallpox, is now preserved from that only to catch, perhaps to die, of measles. An increased number of deaths from the latter disease was the unavoidable consequence of the comparative extirpation of the former." How absurd it is, therefore, to talk of "stamping out" any one particular disease belonging to a class which have their origin in the same circumstances! Stamp them all out by removing the causes that gave them birth, and you will do a service to humanity. This will be to accomplish a grand work—all else is a sham, and not worthy of notice.

" Medicus dedit qui temporis morbo moram
Is plus remedii quam cutis sector dedit."

When it was first proposed to render vaccination compulsory, Sir Robert Peel objected that such a proceeding would be opposed to the mental habits of the British people, and to the freedom of opinion in which they rightly gloried, and that, therefore, he would be no party to such compulsion. How have we fallen since that time! Now the mass of the people submit as tamely to this despotic Act, by which they, or at least their children are driven like cattle to the slaughter, as though the voice of heaven had commanded it. Is there no spirit left in the British people, that they allow themselves thus to be trampled on by a despotism a thousand times worse than a political tyranny, and far more baneful in its consequences? I appeal to you as men, as fathers, as guardians of the health of your children, to raise your voices, as one man, against this monstrous injustice. Let no man represent you in Parliament who does not stand pledged to vote for the repeal of this iniquitous Act. Seats have often been lost on questions of far less moment.

"No less a sum," says Dr. Collins, "than £250,000 is expended annually by the Government officials and Poor Law Guardians for vaccination alone, and yet my professional brethren crave for more. Mr. R. Griffin, surgeon, of Weymouth, writes thus to the *Lancet*, July 28th, 1866, when in lamenting the withdrawal of the Vaccination Bill of last session, says—"the Bill was not perfect; had it become law would have given the profession some twenty or thirty thousand pounds per annum more than they now have."

Given the profession some twenty or thirty thousand pounds! Yes;—at the expense of the health and lives of the rising generation. And you will tamely stand by and look on whilst your children are being poisoned by the contagion of all sorts of filthy diseases, and when it is done, put your hands into your

pockets and pay for it. Can it be possible that it is Englishmen who are thus hoodwinked? Dr. Squirrel thought it "shocking to a humane mind, that a poison should be introduced into the human constitution, without the plea of necessity, or the support of reason or experience." But not only is this tolerated, but we are content to pay for it afterwards, to the tune of £250,000 per year!

The public mind is, however, we are happy to say, becoming enlightened on this point. Men are waking up from the drowsy lethargy in which they have too long been resting. The eyes of humanity are being opened to the true state of the matter. Cheap works are being circulated—thanks to the untiring energy of such philanthropists as the Messrs. Gibbs and other men of like spirit—far and wide, giving information that must in the end produce a beneficial effect. Brave and spirited workers, like Mr. Ironsides, your chairman of to-night, are up and doing, and are not to be daunted by a little persecution and mud pelting. The cause is going forward, and in the end we shall achieve a victory all the more gratifying because it has been won with difficulty. And for vaccination, I shall conclude by applying to its advocates and practitioners the language of Crabbe:—

"But man, who knows no good unmix'd and pure,
Oft finds a poison where he sought a cure;
For grave deceivers lodge their labours here,
And cloud the science they pretend to clear.
Scourges for sin, the solemn tribe are sent,
Like fire and storm they call us to repent;
But storms subside and fires forget to rage:—
These are the eternal scourges of the age."

WORKS BY DR. SEXTON.

Second Edition, reduced to 5s., (published at 10s. 6d.,) beautifully bound in blue Cloth, gilt lettered, the

POETICAL WORKS OF THE LATE ALFRED JOHNSTONE HOLLINGSWORTH. With Portrait and Memoirs of the Author. Edited by GEORGE SEXTON, M.A., M.D., F.R.G.S., &c.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"The poetry of this mysterious author is extremely forcible and energetic, abounding in satire, but full of intense thought; each line contains food for the imagination, and the rhythm is bold and dramatic."—*Observer*.

"The book will excite a strong feeling of interest. We have indicated but by no means expressed its painful character."—*Examiner*.

"The book is altogether a great literary curiosity. There are abundant traces of deep poetical feeling in Hollingsworth's 'Childe Erconwold,' and no less evidence of his acquaintance with the literature and antiquities of the Germanic and Scandinavian races."—*Notes and Queries*.

"The poem is by no means an ordinary conception. There is much that is fresh and heartfelt in the inspiration, that we cannot refrain an expression of regret that such hopeful excellence never reached maturity. We go entire with Dr. Sexton in his denunciation of the 'ranting wordy spasmodics' of the age."—*Constitutional Press*.

"Dr. Sexton deserves much credit for his edition of Mr. Hollingsworth's poems. He certainly has spared no pains to put the author in as favourable a light as possible before the public. The mystery which surrounds the Poet's career is skilfully told in the Memoirs, so as to enlist the reader's sympathy at the very outset. 'Childe Erconwold' seems to be the work of a powerful mind, full of our old Anglo-Saxon literature."—*Morning Chronicle*.

"This is a very extraordinary book. It is the production of a person equally extraordinary, whether we consider his birth, his fortunes, or his death."—*Weekly Times*.

"It is not at all surprising that a second edition of these poems should be called for, and it is gratifying to find it presented in a form so worthy of the subject. The volume is beautifully printed on fine vellum paper. The fine bold expressive Saxon in which the author delighted to indulge, forms a strong contrast to the mass of namby-pamby poetry with which the public is too frequently of late years inundated."—*Morning Post*.

"The poem, not only from the singular circumstance of the unhappy author, but from its own merits and originality, deserves to reach a third and many other editions. It is one of the few remarkable books we have lately seen."—*Tait's Magazine*.

"'Childe Erconwold' contains very many beautiful passages of exquisite poetry."—*Reynolds's Newspaper*.

"Of all recent aspirants for the Poet's crown, Mr. Hollingsworth has certainly put forth the most substantial pretensions."—*Era*.

"It exhibits high powers of imagination to which the variety of its metre gives abundant play."—*Illustrated News of the World*.

"Endeavouring to judge of Hollingsworth by his works rather than by his personal history, we cannot but believe that he was a true poet, and that literature lost in him a writer who, had he been spared, would have done her honour."—*Illustrated London News*.

LONDON: AUSTIN & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.

WORKS BY DR. SEXTON.

Cloth Lettered, Price One Shilling.

THE HUMAN HAIR AND BEARD, and DISEASES OF THE SKIN. Two Lectures.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"We place this little volume in the department of science; but it is quite as amusing as instructive. The Lecture on the Diseases of the Skin is a popular Treatise on an important topic, so handled as to be intelligible to the general reader, and much useful knowledge may be gathered from it."—*The Critic*.

"This is an amusing little book, describing, with much humorous vivacity, the mode in which nations have worn the Hair and Beard from the earliest ages. Dr. Sexton writes in the gayer style, not without occasionally indulging in sober reflection."—*Morning Chronicle*.

"An amusing and instructive little work, written in a popular style, containing some excellent suggestions as to the Treatment of the Skin, Hair, &c., accounting for baldness, greyness, and other premature symptoms of age."—*Reynolds's Newspaper*.

"Dr. Sexton is at once scientific, impulsive, partisan, and traditional. He begins with enumerating national arrangements of the hair, such as the Chinaman's tail and the Papuan's wire cage—the moustache dear to Shakspeare—the *collier à la Grec*, by the aid of which Mrs. Trollope's *Major Allen* subdued that florid *Dalila*, the *Widow Barnaby*. After this, Dr. Sexton proceeds to tell us the rate at which the hair grows. 'Most shaving men,' says he, 'aged eighty, must have mown down twenty-seven feet of beard during their lives—almost enough to stuff a mattress.' Thirdly, he gives us statistics of black, brown, auburn, and lint-white heads, numbering how many hairs pate and poll can carry. The blonde, being the finest, is stated to be the thickest crop. Next we have the anatomical structure, and from that sweep on to the poets. Our lecturer has clearly his prepossessions, not to say prejudices—eschews the raven, endues the nut-brown, revels in the golden; in this sympathising with the '*Biondina*' of Venice, who was wont, in the days of Palma and Titian, to bleach the dark die of nature out of her hair, so as to make her coronal fair and fashionable. After this we find ourselves engaged in an onslaught on the hair-dressing tribe, 'with all their trumpery;' deep in the difficult questions of powder, pomatum, washes, &c.; and called on to study that ill-understood phenomenon, grey hair—a wintry sign, as dear to the poets as the veriest armful of golden tresses which fell heavy on the shoulders of *Nœra*."—*Athenæum*.

Now Ready, Price Fourpence.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF THE FIVE SENSES. A Lecture.

Now Ready, Price One Shilling.

CHASTITY AND ITS INFRINGEMENTS. A Treatise on the Follies of Youth and the Vices of Manhood.

This work is not crowded with the technicalities of ordinary professional books, nor does it present the crudeness that characterises the so-called popular books on the subject. It has already been translated into four languages, and received the highest encomiums of the press, the public, and the profession.

LONDON: AUSTIN & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.

WORKS BY DR. SEXTON.

HOLLINGSWORTH AND MODERN POETRY. AN ESSAY.
To which is appended selections from Hollingsworth's Poems in the Anglo-Saxon language. Price One Shilling.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Dr. Sexton's Essay is interesting alike for its advocacy of truth, as the ultimate test of beauty, and for the sterling knowledge of books and bookmen which peeps out on every page."—*Biological Review*.

"Dr. Sexton has succeeded in the task of making us familiar with the poet, and of fully appreciating his works; the poet who is fortunate enough to have an editor as zealous, jealous, and able as the editor of *Hollingsworth's Works*, need not be apprehensive of the coldness or neglect of the world."—*Constitutional Press*.

LIFE ASSURANCE: ITS ASPECTS AND ITS CLAIMS.—
Price Sixpence.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"We must admit that it is a production of singular ability."—*The News*.

"The arguments it contains in favour of Life Assurance are the soundest, strongest, most convincing, we have ever had placed before us. They are unanswerable."—*Constitutional Press*.

**SMOKING NOT INJURIOUS. A DEFENCE OF TOBACCO
AGAINST VARIOUS ASSAILANTS.—**Price Sixpence. (New Edition.)

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Dr. Sexton contends that the moderate use of Tobacco neither injures the body nor clouds the intellect, and that most of the statements made by the opponents of smoking are gross exaggerations or hideous caricatures."—*Morning Post*.

"The Doctor is evidently the most talented champion the weed can boast of at the present time, and comes down in sledge-hammer style upon its opponents."—*Morning Chronicle*.

"Dr. Sexton's Lectures on the Great Tobacco Controversy are full of information on a topic which has lately engrossed much attention, both from smokers and non-smokers."—*Morning Advertiser*.

"Dr. Sexton endeavours to show (and very plausibly so, we must admit,) that inhaling the fumes of the fragrant weed is not at all injurious to the health, but, on the contrary, greatly beneficial."—*Atlas*.

ALPHABET OF PHRENOLOGY. A Sketch of the various Organs of the Head according to Phrenology, etc. Price Twopence.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE HUMAN RACE. (New Edition.)
A Lecture. Price Fourpence.

NAPOLEON III.—A LECTURE. Price Twopence.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MACBETH. A Lecture delivered before the Psychological Society of Glasgow, on May 4th, 1869. Price Fourpence.

LONDON: AUSTIN & Co. 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.

Any of the above works may be had by sending the amounts, in Stamps, direct to the Author, 366, Argyle Street, Glasgow.