

**[Letters to the Water Cure Journal, and other papers, by John Gibbs : being the sequel to "Letters from Graefenberg" / by the same author].**

**Contributors**

Gibbs, John, of Camberwell.

**Publication/Creation**

1847-1856

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/r5d5dag5>

**License and attribution**

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](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>





Supp. 59300/13



*John Gibbs.*

Letters

and

the Water Cure Journal  
Articles

for the hints to  
on it

That Water Cure

Patent, 13th November 1855

For By Laws

Phy. Rights

being

the sequel to

Letters from your family

by

the same author

1855

London

347784



Letters &

to the

Water Cure Journal, ~~and~~  
~~and~~ other papers,

by  
John ~~W.~~ W.;

~~1847-8-9-50-~~

being  
the sequel  
by  
to

J. G.  
"Letters from Goupenberg,"  
by the  
same author.

~~185~~  
London. 1847-8-9-50-1-2-3-4-5-6

~~185~~

Dedication..

Preface.





| Contents.                                               | Page. |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Mues and Recovery of Priapity. —                     | 1     |
| 2. Cure of Fever by Hydropathy. —                       | 4     |
| 3. Attempt to suppress an Essay on the Water Cure. —    | 10    |
| 4. The Abreibung in Fever. — — —                        | 46    |
| 5. No. of deaths at Graft. in 1846-7. —                 | 19    |
| 6. The (proposed) M <sup>t</sup> . Registration Bill. — | 20    |
| 7. Asiatic Cholera. — — —                               | 26    |
| 8. Facts versus Fiction. — — —                          | 33    |
| 9. Observations on Catarrhal Affections —               | 38    |
| 10. A Case of White Swelling. — — —                     | 54    |
| 11. Case of general debility. — — —                     | 56    |
| 12. Case of Dysipelas — — —                             | 59    |
| 13. Case of Varicose Veins — — —                        | 62    |
| 14. Cursory Remarks on Constipation. — — —              | 66    |
| 15. A few facts. — — —                                  | 79    |
| 16. Aids to the Taxis in Hernia — — —                   | 82    |
| 17. Providential Incident in Scarlet Fever. —           | 87    |
| 18. Biographical Sketch of Haridge — — —                | 91    |
| 19. Plain Rules for Patients — — —                      | 93    |



| Contents                                                                    | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 19. Graefenberg Statistics                                                  | 94   |
| 20. Death of Vinzenz Priessnitz                                             | 96   |
| 21. Hydropathic Hospital.                                                   | 97   |
| 22. Review; Smeethurst's Hydrotherapia                                      | 97   |
| 23. ——— Lane's Life at the Determent & Butcher's Confessions of a Determent | 104  |
| 24. Hydropathic Literature up to 1857.                                      | 110  |
| 25. Hydropathic Directory for 1857.                                         | 111  |
| 26. The Compulsory Vaccination Bill.                                        | 112  |
| 27. Biographical Sketch of Clavidge (2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition)               | 113  |
| 28. Medical Liberty                                                         | 118  |
| 29. The Compulsory Vaccination Act Amendment Bill                           | 119  |
| 28. The "Medical Circular" & "Our Medical Liberties"                        | 121  |
| 29. Compulsory Vaccination                                                  | 122  |
| 30. Matthew Relief Fund                                                     | 126  |
| 31. English Liberty                                                         | 127  |
| 32. Our Medical Liberties & the Critic                                      | 128  |
| 33. Medical Liberties of the Subject                                        | 131  |
| 34. The Maine Law (1 <sup>st</sup> letter)                                  | 132  |
| 35. The Maine Law (2 <sup>d</sup> letter)                                   | 136  |
| 36. The Maine Law (3 <sup>d</sup> letter)                                   | 139  |
| 37. The Compulsory Vaccination Act                                          | 140  |



| Contents                                            | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|
| 38. The Compulsory Vacc. Act & Med. Bills           | 140  |
| 39. Smallpox & Vaccination                          | 140  |
| 40. Prescott and his opinions                       | 141  |
| 41. A Scientific Fact & a Philanthropic Ideal       | 143  |
| 42. The Maine Law                                   | 144  |
| 43. Compulsory Vaccination (1 <sup>st</sup> letter) | 146  |
| 44. Compulsory Vaccination (2 <sup>nd</sup> letter) | 150  |
| 45. Compulsory Vaccination (3 <sup>rd</sup> letter) | 156  |
| 46. Maine Law                                       | 160  |
| 47. The Medical Registration Bill                   | 161  |
| 48. Do Do Do Do                                     | 163  |
| 49. "Winkley" and "Skinner's"                       | 166  |
| 50. The Medical Bills                               | 168  |
| 51. <del>of signature</del>                         | 168  |
| 52. Vaccination                                     | 169  |
| 53. The new Com. Vac. Bill                          | 170  |
| 54. Medical Registration                            | 171  |
| 55. The Shy System                                  | 172  |
| 56. Vaccination (Expenditure)                       | 173  |
| 57. Sanctions                                       | 174  |
| 58. Mathew Testimonial                              | 175  |
| 59. Extracts from Votes of the Commons              | 176  |
| 60. The new Med. Bill                               | 177  |
| 61. Important Prosecution                           | 179  |
| 62. Vaccination Grants - 1                          | 179  |
| 63. Form of Return                                  | 180  |
| 64. Compulsory Vaccination & inoculation            | 181  |



|    |                                                        |     |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 65 | The Genl B <sup>d</sup> of Health                      | 182 |
| 66 | Compulsory Vacc. & fl B <sup>d</sup> of H <sup>l</sup> | 184 |
| 67 | Antiprejudice & Vaccination                            | 184 |
| 68 | Vaccination (2 articles) -                             | 184 |
| 69 | <del>Vaccination</del>                                 | 190 |
| 70 | Cowp & Cowpox                                          | 192 |
| 71 | French Habits & Vaccination -                          | 194 |
| 72 | Vac. & B <sup>d</sup> of Health                        | 194 |
| 73 | The New Med Bills & B <sup>d</sup> of Health -         | 195 |
| 74 | Vaccination                                            | 197 |
| 75 | A Dialogue                                             | 201 |
| 76 | The Poisons Bill                                       | 204 |



*Illness and Recovery  
of  
Vincent Priessnitz. —*

---

*To  
the Editor of the  
Truth-Teller.*

ILLNESS AND RECOVERY OF VINCENT PRIESSNITZ.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours of the 28th inst., I beg to say that our Cork friend is in error in believing that I have received from Mr. Priessnitz a detailed statement of his recent illness. I never sought any such information from Mr. Priessnitz, but, having received from other parties letters containing the particulars of his

2, 31



## ILLNESS AND RECOVERY OF VINCENT PRIESSNITZ.

illness and recovery, I merely wrote to him expressing my sentiments on the occasion, and received a reply which, as it chiefly contains expressions of personal feelings and references to private matters, does not furnish any extracts which could interest your readers. However, I can supply you with some details of Mr. Priessnitz's illness; which details I have obtained from authentic sources, and especially from a letter from a gentleman residing at the time under the same roof with Mr. Priessnitz.

Mr. Priessnitz's illness occurred so far back as the 27th of January. On the previous day his eldest daughter, who is very young, was married to a Hungarian gentleman, and having danced till three o'clock in the morning of the 27th, at a grand ball which was given on the occasion, and being overheated and fatigued, she was suddenly taken ill, when she retired to her room, where she was attended by Mr. Priessnitz, who prescribed for her the wet sheet friction followed by a foot-bath. About eight o'clock the same morning she left her father's roof for her new and distant home. The same day Mr. Priessnitz went as usual, after breakfast, to visit his patients at Freiwaldau, and while there he perceived a numbness and loss of power in his right arm; but apparently he made light of the warning, for on his return home he took the cold bath and went to dinner in the saloon. Immediately after dinner, and while the greater number of the patients were still in the saloon, he was found in a state of insensibility at the door of his secretary's room. His breast and feet were instantly chafed with hands wetted in cold water, and, in the course of a few minutes, a shallow tepid bath having been prepared, he was placed therein by his secretary, Herr Böhm, assisted by Herr Matecki, a Polish gentleman who has been a long time in the establishment. In this bath Mr. Priessnitz was rubbed for half an hour by eight men, and cold effusion was also repeatedly applied to the head. Having shown signs of returning consciousness, he was taken out of the bath and placed upon the bed, where he had a relapse, but not of so long duration as the first attack. He was again rubbed in the shallow tepid bath as before, for half an hour; and when again taken out of it and replaced in bed, he fell asleep, and slept for twelve hours, at the end of which time he returned to consciousness, and was able to converse with his daughter, who had been recalled to him. For a week afterwards he took, *thrice* daily, three successive wet sheet packings, followed each time by the shallow tepid bath. For



3

*Illness & Recovery of Priessnitz.*

another week he took every morning, for fifteen minutes, the shallow tepid bath and the cold bath in combination,—that is, going repeatedly from one to the other, beginning and ending with the tepid bath.

Mr. Priessnitz is extremely sensitive and susceptible of all the gentler and finer feelings, and his illness, from which he has so happily recovered, may be traced to mingled and conflicting emotions, arising from the natural agitation of a parent on the marriage of his child—the anxiety consequent on his daughter's sudden illness—and excessive grief at parting for an indefinite time from one whom he so dearly loves.

Trusting that this statement of facts may tend to remove erroneous impressions, I am, Dear Sir, your's sincerely,

3, Camberwell, May, 31, 1847. JOHN GIBBS.

---

4

CURE OF FEVER BY HYDROPATHY.

---

CURE OF FEVER BY HYDROPATHY.

*W. A. Ford*  
To the Editor of the *Independent*.

MY DEAR SIR,—Having had my attention directed to a late number of the *Independent*, which contains an extract from a Belfast paper, recording a cure of a case of fever by hydropathy, I beg to say that there is nothing in that statement in the least degree surprising to any one at all acquainted with the usual result of the treatment of fever according to Mr. Priessnitz's system; the only thing that would surprise a person thus



## CURE OF FEVER BY HYDROPATHY.

informed would be the record of a death attendant upon such treatment.

You were kind enough, on a former occasion, to give insertion to a letter of mine containing the details of the mode of treatment pursued at Grafenberg in fever; but as it is very possible that the statement of those details did not reach the public ear with the force with which it might fall upon it in the present unhappy state of things, I venture to request a portion of your space, although I have nothing to add to what I formerly said upon the subject.

That stage of fever which is attended with chilliness and shivering, should always be combated by frictions with a wet sheet. For this purpose the sheet should be prepared in the following manner:—Having been steeped in cold water, it should then be well wrung out; this is best effected by passing it round a bar, which may be a fixture, and by employing another bar as a lever. In the treatment of various chronic cases the sheet is wrung out to the utmost; but it need not be wrung out to this extent in cases of fever, but only so far as to deprive it of the character of a dripping sheet. When the sheet is ready, the patient must step out of bed, and the sheet must be thrown over his person, including the head, from behind, and friction must be employed all over the person by the patient and the attendant. The friction is to be, not with the sheet, but with the hand passed briskly up and down over the sheet, and is to be continued for from three to five minutes, according as the sheet is warmed, and is to be followed by friction in a dry sheet. This method is to be pursued as long ~~as desirable~~; sometimes one or two wet sheets will be sufficient, sometimes it will be necessary to pursue the treatment for half an hour or more; after which the patient may return to bed.

In the hot stage of fever, the patient should be wrapped in a wet sheet prepared in the same way, but much more wrung out than the one just described. This wrapping, or packing, as it is technically called, is thus accomplished: a blanket is spread on a mattress, the wet sheet is spread on the blanket, and the patient is laid on his back on the sheet, his arms being extended by his sides; one side of the sheet is applied closely to the person from the nape of the neck to the soles of the feet, one corner being passed round the neck and secured under the back; the other side is applied in a similar manner, and the lower ends are doubled in

and re-  
peatedly  
that is to  
say, until  
the chilli-  
ness gives  
way



#### CURE OF FEVER BY HYDROPATHY.

under the feet. The blanket is applied in a similar way outside the sheet, and one or more blankets doubled may then be laid lengthwise over all, and closely tucked in all round. As soon as this sheet becomes heated it is to be exchanged for a fresh one. In some cases the sheet will heat as fast as it can be applied, while in other cases it may be left on as long as ten or twenty minutes; but the duration of the application, as well as the quantity of bed-clothes employed in packing, are to be regulated by the amount of heat which it is desirable to extract. When the temperature of the patient is sufficiently reduced, and the skin becomes softer and healthier, the patient may be left much longer in the sheet, from fifteen minutes to half an hour; and when taken out of it should be rubbed all over by a couple of persons for from five to ten minutes in a bath containing about six inches depth of water, of the temperature of about seventy-nine degrees Fahrenheit; or, if a bath cannot be had, friction in a succession of two, three, or four dripping sheets may be substituted. While in the bath a fusion of cold water on the head should be used about once every minute. In chronic cases, partial or topical applications of the wet sheet packing are often employed, but in fever it is proper to envelope the whole person. For headach a wet compress, without a dry one over it, should be bound round the brows and renewed as it heats. The bowels may be regulated by enemata of pure water, the first two or three of the temperature of about seventy-nine degrees Fahrenheit, the subsequent ones cold. The heating compress may generally be worn with benefit round the body; this compress should be of tolerably thick diaper, should extend from the breast to the hips, and should go three times round the body, the inner folds being wrung out of cold water, and the two outer folds being dry. In drinking water the patient need only consult his own inclination.

These are the processes of the water cure treatment, which may be safely and beneficially applied by any person capable of distinguishing fever from B or a bull's-foot; but the treatment pursued in dangerous cases, and which I have now to describe, can be safely applied only by experienced persons. When fever is so high, as it sometimes will be, that it will not yield to the wet sheet packings, then the patient should be put into the shallow bath described above, in which he should be rubbed by two or more persons until the temperature and circulation approximate to the healthy standard; and when there is delirium, the patient should be thus



# CURE OF FEVER BY HYDROPATHY.

treated until the delirium subsides, or until the armpits become of the same temperature as the rest of the body, beyond which it would be unsafe to leave the patient in the bath; but when the temperature of the axilla rises again, he may be replaced in the bath, if necessary. This bath should also be applied when the lungs are affected, and frequent frictions with wet hands, and the heating compress should be applied to the chest. In every case in which the shallow bath is used, it should be coupled with affusion on the head. In gastric fever, long, sitz baths with much friction to the back and abdomen, should be employed.

In a letter which I have just received from a friend in Ireland, my correspondent writes: "I have only heard of one medical man in the north of Ireland who, when attacked by the fever now prevalent in our unfortunate country, had the courage to try what he called a cold water cure. He said that he was quite sure that the remedy was very good, but that he was afraid of making experiments on any of his patients; however, he insisted on trying the treatment in his own case. His medical friend vainly endeavoured to dissuade him from his mad purpose, but he dismissed him, telling him that he was not so mad as not to know what he was doing. You will be amused at his plan. I am told that he kept two men pouring water over him. That is all I could learn of his method of applying the remedy, but he succeeded so well that in three days he was out driving." This gentleman had recourse to the treatment formerly pursued with great success by Dr. Currie and many others, in many cases of fever, but which the doctor found not only to be inefficacious but absolutely dangerous in various stages of the disease. Dr. Currie says, "The safest and most advantageous time for using the aspersion or affusion of cold water, is when the exacerbation is at its height, or immediately after its declination is begun; and this has led me almost always to direct it to be employed from six to nine in the evening; but it may be safely used at any time of the day, *when there is no sense of chilliness present, when the heat of the surface is steadily above what is natural, and when there is no general or profuse sensible perspiration.*" Dr. Currie was fully alive to the deficiencies of his system—if that can be called a system which comprises but a single remedy, totally inapplicable to many stages of even that disease in the treatment of which it was most strenuously recommended—and he repeatedly and emphatically warns against the employment of cold or even tepid affusion in fever, when there is any sense of chilliness, or

*tepidy (15-16°)*



8

CURE OF FEVER BY HYDROPATHY.

when the heat of the surface is less than, or even only equal to the natural heat, or where there is general or profuse sensible perspiration. The inventive genius of Priessnitz has supplied the deficiencies which the sagacity of Currie detected and which he lamented; and in the wet sheet friction we have a safe and efficacious remedy suitable to all those stages of fever in which Currie condemns the employment of affusion. Besides, that part of Priessnitz's system—for his is a system providing a different remedy for each different stage of fever—that part of his system, the wet-sheet packing, is decidedly superior to Currie's practice, inasmuch as the temperature can be *gradually* lowered to the desired point in the wet sheet; and thus the regulation of it is more completely in the hands of the practitioner than it is when heat is *suddenly* and *violently* abstracted by that *hap-hazard* application—affusion.

*Recovery*

As *dysentery* is also a disease unhappily prevalent at this season, a few words of advice relative to it may not be considered out of place. Enemata of pure water and cold sitz baths are to be freely employed. The primary action of the sitz bath is that of a purgative. Two or three, or at most four, sitz baths, during each period of twenty-four hours, will generally be sufficient. For griping, friction should be employed in the sitz bath, or with wet hands. The body compress, already described, should be constantly worn, except when the patient is in the sitz bath, or undergoing friction. For the treatment when febrile symptoms are present, the reader is referred to what has been said above on the subject of fever. In this disease, as in fever, the patient may be allowed to drink water according to his own inclination.

If the treatment here set forth were generally adopted in fever and dysentery, I am firmly persuaded that we should not have to mourn over the frightful mortality which is now desolating the land; and, if I shall learn that the publication of this letter shall prove the means of rescuing but even one of the humblest of my countrymen from an untimely grave, I shall feel far more than rewarded for the time and labour bestowed upon its composition; and I am satisfied that you, too, will feel fully compensated for the space which it will consume in the columns of your *Independent Journal*.

I am, my dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

LEAMINGTON, CAMBERWELL, June 18, 1847. JOHN GIBBS.





10

ATTEMPT TO SUPPRESS AN ESSAY

CORK SCIENTIFIC AND LITERARY SOCIETY.—  
ATTEMPT TO SUPPRESS AN ESSAY ON THE  
WATER CURE.

To Dr. WILLIAM M'LEOD.

*of the Water Cure Journal*  
DEAR SIR,—It is difficult to determine whether the popular or professional prejudice opposes the greater obstacle to improvement in whatever branch of science it may be attempted; but every reformer feels that, united, they present the most vexatious and formidable barrier to the progress of discovery and the extension of truth. This much too may be safely asserted, that many of the most fatal errors which have ruled the popular mind have emanated from the schools and colleges, and have lingered the longest in the dusty cells in which they had their birth. Nowhere has the spirit of reform effected less than in the profession of physic; and on no subjects are the generality of men so ill-informed as on those which most nearly concern their temporal well-being, namely, the laws which regulate the animal economy in health and disease. It was therefore that I hailed with joy and gratitude the appearance of the first number of the *Water Cure Journal*, a journal which aims at the enlightenment of *all* classes of the community. For similar reasons I have also derived much gratification from an attendance at four recent sittings of the Cork Scientific and Literary Society, at which an Essay on Physical Education, by Mr. Ralph Varian, was read and discussed.

The essayist pointed out several of the leading defects in general education, and suggested means of remedying them. He dwelt at some length on the medical virtues of water when



## ON THE WATER CURE.

properly employed, and on the evils resulting from the present system of drugging; and concluded by directing the attention of the society to the urgent necessity that exists for the establishment of baths and washhouses and hydropathic establishments, in the towns of Great Britain and Ireland. The conclusion of the paper was received with marked applause.

A few extracts may not be unacceptable to your readers:

"Of the three great branches of education—physical, moral, and intellectual—the physical, in modern times, has been most neglected. This is not as it should be. As moral and intellectual training must be founded on physical development, the philosopher and the mechanic have alike an interest in the investigation of the principles on which this latter is based. Congregated as we are in towns constructed in ignorance of the laws of health; and bending, as we do in rivalry for the means of food, clothing, and luxury, over the counter or the desk; crowded, for the cheapening of labour, as our mechanics are, in close and dingy workshops—the body has become to us much less than clothing. Nature's pure stimulants—the oxygen of the atmospheric air and the spirit of the water-spring—are exchanged for tobacco and the dram. And this desertion of nature's stimulants produces the sinking of the frame—the craving for gross feeding which does not satisfy, and for heating drinks which only create a thirst.

"We are growing up a sickly race, theorising of moral and intellectual culture. Truer to nature was the wisdom of the ancients, which first sought to strengthen the frame, and which is embodied in their immortal line—

"'A sound mind in a sound body.'

"With the physical education we have to do before we can approach the moral or intellectual. The child is put into our hands, and we impress upon it the foundations of physical health, strength, weakness, or deformity, long ere it is capable of a moral or intellectual idea. A child peevish from ill health cannot readily be taught the virtue of good temper; however you may slap, or shake, or coax, or lecture, as your wisdom may dictate, still the mental evil will be superinduced by the physical. A hurled foot, a humped back, an unsightly face, received in the accidents of infancy, may lay the foundation of a misanthropic temper. An accidental shock of the nervous system in youth may give a tendency in after life to imbecility or madness. And so on through the various modifications of sound and injured organization; from the very first they act on the mind and the heart, figuratively and literally—on the brain and on the blood-propellor, on the intellect and on the affections.

"The distaste for water as a drink, which is engendered in early life both by precept and example, is amongst the worst evils



12

ATTEMPT TO SUPPRESS AN ESSAY

of our present system. The natural relish for this gift of heaven is lost through disuse and by the destruction of the delicacy of taste consequent on the use of undue stimulants.

Indeed, so desirable does it seem that alcoholic drinks should be banished from this nation until such time as nature acquires its true balance, and the craving for undue stimulation which has been inherited dies out—that we must hail with infinite satisfaction the WATER CURE as a mode of treating disease.

"The water cure I hold to be the most valuable discovery of modern times. Truth is old; the water cure was known in ancient times, not fully but partially, and it was almost lost sight of until it appeared with renewed life and augmented power in Silesia, under Priessnitz at Gräfenberg. It has now attracted such universal attention that it cannot again be lost. Men and women will become the intelligent conservators of their own health instead of the slavish servants of a mystical system. The simple element, pure water, which refreshes in morning and noonday draughts, with an appearance of considerate kindness forces its way from the rock, intercepts the common path, and even in the parching desert is distilled from earth and air, where the melon fills itself with cooling liquid. Is it a thing incredible that this element, in the varied applications of the water cure, should produce results of healing and restoration miraculous to the vulgar mind?

"The health of life is the result of *destruction* and *production*. When these powers have lost their balance, disease is the result. If the particles which compose the body be destroyed more rapidly than recreated, decline, various diseases, and ultimate death are the consequences. When the building-up process is the more rapid, when it outstrips its due bounds, then unsightly excrescences and internal swellings occur, or a fulness of blood is produced, a state always attended with danger. Under the more active processes of the water cure, the alterations of the bodily system progress as rapidly in one month as in twelve months of ordinary life. During this rapid change, an opportunity is presented of constructing a more perfect and beautiful organization. The body growing in the pure air, feeding on wholesome food, imbibing water from crystal springs, eating, drinking, exercising, sleeping, and waking, freed from artificial and wicked restraints,—can scarcely fail speedily to improve. Should it not, still no yielding, but only the more strenuous effort is required at our hands. Diseases which have been inherited, or which have been for years in possession of the citadels of life, we are disheartened if we cannot expel in a few months."

Having quoted from Dr. Hufeland and Dr. Edward Baynard, and alluded to the opinions of Currie and various others, the essayist gave Liebig's theory of the action of cold on the living organization, and remarked:



ON THE WATER CURE.

"Thus we can perceive, from the clear explanation of Liebig, why it is that the judicious application of cold water supplies all the good effects of bleeding and blistering. And this it does much more pleasantly and safely. For bleeding often saves a man from death by inflammation only that he may die of decline; and blistering and torture are synonymous; and while local inflammation may be lessened by a blister, a tendency to inflammation is produced all over the system by the irritation and excitement of the pain."

The essayist proceeded to remark on the defects in the physical education of the poor:

"If the physical education of the wealthier classes be defective, much more so is that of the poor. Even the physical opportunities of those of them who inhabit the country, where we have been in the habit of supposing them surrounded by every facility for sound organizations, are so defective, that periodical disease clears the country of a vast proportion of its population. Living for ten hours a day in dingy, smoky styes, ill clad and poorly fed, widely-spread mental imbecility is the result.

"Even a sufficient supply of pure water is not generally within the reach of our peasants. Seldom can you get a drink of clean water in their cottages. The wells which in ancient times were built, deepened, and improved, are now half filled with rubbish and overgrown with weeds.

"And in the facilities for physical development do the poor of our towns fare better? Crowded into dingy apartments in narrow lanes, how can the children of our artisans grow up into vigorous and determined men? Without means to procure water to clean window, floor, or face, and without sufficient change of linen or cotton garments, the dark hues by which they are surrounded must inevitably retain the pestilential vapours of the sinks of disease which are near their dwellings.

"No wonder that the inhabitants of the rooms and garrets should spend so extravagantly as they do their little and hard earnings on those stimulants—tea, tobacco, whiskey, and physic."

The essayist having drawn attention to the recent establishment of public baths and washhouses in various towns, and having lamented the slight attention hitherto bestowed on such matters, thus concluded:

"But I may be allowed to conclude with the hope that by the quiet efforts of such societies as this, and an advancing taste for a useful literature, that knowledge will imbue the community which at no distant day will secure the formation of such establishments as well as of hydropathic hospitals for the treatment of acute and chronic diseases, the foundation of good sewerage, the



14  
ATTEMPT TO SUPPRESS AN ESSAY.

construction of comfortable houses, the opening of close lanes, the building of wells and fountains, and the adoption of all other regulations which may promote the physical development of the people."

In the Cork Scientific and Literary Society an essay is read without interruption on one evening, and re-read and discussed on a subsequent evening or evenings. On this occasion an officer of the society waited on Mr. Varian to require him to omit, on the second reading, those parts of the essay relating to hydropathy, or to withdraw the essay altogether. This dictation was firmly resisted by Mr. Varian, and it is but just to add, that the President of the society, who is a medical gentleman, when appealed to on the subject, said that the essay ought to be discussed. The President absented himself on the evenings of discussion, but the attendance of ladies and gentlemen was extremely numerous. The opposition on the part of a few members was most factious and insolent, but it was completely baffled by the good sense and gentlemanly bearing of the chairman pro. tem., and of the body of the members. It was clamorously contended that the subject of the essay was unfit for public discussion, although, on a former occasion, when the subject was new in Cork, and the public not so capable of estimating it, a medical gentleman read before the society an essay ~~on~~ hydropathy. On the present occasion the water cure was denounced as a humbug, and its friends and advocates as fools and knaves. The talented essayist clearly combated various objections, and was ably supported by Dr. Barter, Dr. Curtin, Counsellor Macguire, Mr. J. S. Varian, and Mr. Macguire, sen. Your correspondent also briefly addressed the chair on the same side; as did likewise Mr. W. Atkins and Mr. A. Varian, who detailed their personal experiences. I regret that I cannot furnish you with even an outline of the able speeches, especially of Counsellor Macguire, the Editor of the *Cork Examiner*, and of Drs. Curtin and Barter. The discussion excited very great general interest, and at its termination many regrets were expressed that it had not been further prolonged. Altogether it has effected much good; it has made some converts, and it has set many

against



15  
*on the Water Cure.*

inquiring into the merits of a system upon which, previously, they would not deign to bestow a thought.

The opponents of the water cure affect to rank it amongst popular delusions, and are forward to prate about the proneness of men to run after novelty. It is true that there are always some restless spirits enamoured of change for its own sake; but as regards the mass of mankind, it is much to be deplored that for long centuries they have bowed down their intellects and unthinkingly surrendered their reason to tyrant authority; the most pernicious errors which have fastened on the mind have been strengthened by the approbation of the learned; men have become so accustomed to think by proxy, that they shrink with impatience from the trouble of investigation; self-love is wounded, and human pride arms itself against any innovation on time-honoured error, and the enunciation of a new truth has ever provoked persecution. But a change is coming—man is being awakened from the lethargy of ages—the spirit of free inquiry is “moving over the face of the waters”—and systems, lovely in their proportions, beautiful in detail, and glorious in comprehension, are being evoked out of the chaotic elements of the past.

I am, dear sir, yours very faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

Cork, December 10, 1847.

---



16

THE ABREIBUNG IN FEVER.

ON THE USE OF THE ABREIBUNG IN FEVER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—As you have done me the favour to republish some letters of mine on the treatment of fever, I am emboldened to request permission to make a few supplementary remarks.

Observation has led me to attribute in no slight degree the success of Priessnitz in the treatment of fever to the free and judicious use of the abreibung, or wet sheet friction, in the earlier stages of that disease. Every one is aware of the evils resulting from suppressed perspiration, and many are the remedies employed; but I do not know any remedy which, in the cold stage of fever, can compare with the wet sheet friction in promoting cuticular circulation and restoring the functions of the skin.

Let me adduce one or two facts in illustration and support of this opinion.

A gentleman having been exposed in thin clothing for some hours to a heavy fall of rain on a cold winter's day, reached home thoroughly drenched, with his lips blue, his extremities almost insensible, and his frame violently attacked with shivering. Four successive wet sheet frictions, each followed by friction in a dry sheet, were immediately applied; the circulation became rapidly equalised, the shivering ceased, an agreeable warmth spread over the surface; a glass of spring water was then administered, and after a couple of hours' rest in bed the gentleman was able to dress for dinner; and it is most probable that to these simple means he owed an escape from a severe attack of illness.

No hydropathist can be unacquainted with the fact that often, when desirable, as it sometimes is, an incipient tumour can be dissipated by a judicious employment of the sweating process, whether in the dry blanket or hot air or vapour bath, aided, if necessary, by local tepid bathing and the heating compress. A patient who had been long ailing, had run the gauntlet through all the usual remedies, and had been rapidly progressing from bad to worse, arrived at Gräfenberg; and a couple of days after his arrival, before he had been submitted to any treatment—in fact, while he was still balancing his hopes and fears, hesitating, and inquiring respecting a mode of cure of which he had had no experience, and against which he had been warned by his former advisers—he perceived that a tumour was rapidly forming in the



#### THE ABREIBUNG IN FEVER.

scrotum; and becoming alarmed, he instantly sent for Priessnitz. It was one of those cases in which, from the debilitated and *impure* state of the patient, Priessnitz was unwilling to encourage suppuration; and although under other circumstances the patient would have been considered an unfit subject for sweating, yet, to achieve a particular purpose, Priessnitz ordered him to be packed immediately in the dry blanket. The patient had lain in the packing for nearly five hours without exhibiting the slightest appearance of moisture on the skin, when Priessnitz had him unpacked, and caused him to receive twelve or fourteen abreibungs, or wet-sheet frictions, each followed by a dry-sheet friction; the patient was then re-packed, and in about half-an-hour he sweated profusely, and the desired end was attained.

Let me here digress for a moment, while I mention a recent occurrence, which goes to prove two things: firstly, the superiority of Priessnitz's system to the ordinary system of drug-medication; and secondly, how ill-qualified to practise any part of the water cure is that practitioner who, relying solely on pre-conceived theoretical notions of the action of water, repels the teachings of experience.

A short time since a drug-practitioner, having vainly tried by all the usual means to dissipate a tumour, had at length recourse to the pharmacopœia of the hydropathist for a prescription; and, as any one at all practically conversant with the water cure could have told him, he selected from the hydropathic processes that one which of all others was the very one to baffle his purpose, namely, a local cold bath to the part affected. The tumour continued to grow; leeching and other remedies were next vainly tried, and the patient now suffers from a very severe fistula.

But to return to the abreibung. A friend of mine having unthinkingly lain on a bed on which a victim to the late famine fever had died, was attacked with shivering and other feverish symptoms. A few wet sheet frictions subdued the symptoms, which, however, soon manifested themselves again, to be again subdued and again to reappear—and thus on for four days. The cause of those symptoms was then discovered; the bed was changed, and after persisting for a couple of days in the free use of the wet sheet friction, the feverish symptoms were finally subdued, and a large number of boils appeared on the patient's body, legs, and arms. Thus by these frictions, together with the internal use of water, fever was continually combated at its first



## *The Abatement in Fever.*

approaches, and finally cut short when the cause of it was discovered and removed.

The temperature of a bath should be modified according to the temperature of the patient. If in a northern climate a person is found insensible from exposure to cold, friction with snow is the best remedy to recall sensibility; if a patient is burning in high fever, a tepid bath is more efficacious than a cold one.\* The wet sheet friction acts on the system in the rigour of fever just as friction with snow acts on a frost-bitten limb. The wet sheet friction is also the mildest of the general baths, and, owing to its combining strong friction with the smallest possible quantity of water which can be applied at once to the whole surface, it is the most speedily attended with reaction; it can therefore be safely and beneficially administered in most of those cases in which a cold plunge, douche, or even tepid bath, would be injurious, or perhaps even fatal.

With many thanks for past favours, I am, my dear sir, yours  
very faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

Cork, December 17, 1847.

\* Hot iron cools more rapidly in warm ~~water~~ than in cold water.

\* Hot water is employed to allay the pain consequent upon, and to cure the effects of, sun-burn.



19

*Deaths at Gräfenberg in 1846-7.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

DEAR SIR,—

May I avail myself of this opportunity to state that I have just received a letter from Mr. Priessnitz, in which he informs me that during the course of the last year, 1847, there were at Gräfenberg 1143 patients, five of whom died of organic diseases; and that the number of patients at Gräfenberg at the date of his letter (January 19, 1848) was four hundred. From former letters I learned that the number of patients in 1846 was 1022, of whom only two died.

I am, dear sir, yours very faithfully,

*Camberwell, Feb. 15, 1848.*

JOHN GIBBS.



THE (PROPOSED) MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL

THE (PROPOSED) MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—Although the Medical Registration Bill, which was laid before the late Parliament, was subsequently withdrawn, and although no similar measure has as yet been introduced into the present Parliament, yet, as such a measure is in contemplation, and as its scope and bearing have been made the subject of parliamentary investigation, and are continually being discussed in the medical journals, I beg to offer a few observations on some of the provisions which it is contended ought to form part of any such measure.

The contemplated provisions of the proposed Bill have hitherto been discussed as if they only concerned the medical profession, and in nowise interested the public, which appears to be looked upon as if only created for the especial benefit of that learned body. But in reality those provisions challenge the most jealous scrutiny on the part of the public, as will become apparent by a glance at a few of them. It is proposed that there shall be a registration of medical practitioners, excluding from the registry every practitioner not licensed by one of the British medical corporations; and further, that the name of any practitioner guilty of the vague crime of "any unprofessional conduct," shall be struck off the Registry; and still further—and this is the most important feature of the contemplated measure—that any unregistered person who shall practise medicine or surgery, no matter what may be the result of his practice, shall be liable, for every time he shall so offend, to summary conviction before a magistrate, to be followed by fine or imprisonment.

It is clear that a measure so harassing in its details must speedily suppress all nonconformity in medical doctrines and practice. The first thing that calls for condemnation is the illiberality which, while the various barriers between the different races of man are being daily swept away, would interpose a new barrier to exclude from practice, in this boasted land of freedom, the foreign physician or surgeon, no matter what may be his attainments, or with what discovery he may have enriched science.

The proposal to confer a power to expunge from the registry the name of a practitioner, for so vague a crime as "any unprofessional conduct," likewise demands unqualified reprobation, inasmuch as it is a proposal to create a machinery which might be vexatiously employed to repel any innovation on the established practice of



THE (PROPOSED) MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL. 287

medicine, and to crush the future Jenners, Harveys, or other obnoxious reformers.

But those portions of the proposed Bill which call for the utmost censure, and provoke the most unyielding opposition, are the clauses which justly entitle it to the designation of a bill of pains and penalties. I apprehend that there are but few persons who will seriously contest the manifest right of every citizen of a free state to pursue any honourable calling he pleases, whether it require the labour of the hands or of the head; and surely, if there be any such things as natural rights, every man has an unmistakeable right to be the conservator of his own health, or, if it shall be lost, to seek its recovery at whatever hands, and through whatever means, his judgment shall approve. So firmly do I hold the indestructibility of these rights, that strong as is my faith in the superior efficacy of the water-cure—and although as strongly believing that the old practice has slain its thousands by pill and lancet—and although earnestly desirous that this my creed should obtain universal acceptance—yet, if it were possible to win a majority to adopt it, and it were proposed to take advantage of this circumstance to crush the allopathic practice and practitioner by the penalties of the law, I would resist, as now, to the best of my ability, any such measure as an impertinent interference with the natural rights of others, and the establishment of an odious tyranny. No man is justified in attempting to force upon another his peculiar scientific notions, any more than his religious opinions. If the layman who may be in search of health is incapable of exercising a sound judgment on his own behalf in matters which so closely concern him, upon whom can he rely to decide for him between the claims of rival systems and rival practitioners? Does the fact of a man's being elected to serve in Parliament endue him with such wisdom that in his legislative capacity he can clearly see how to decide for others in matters in which by such interference he confesses that as a private individual he is incompetent to decide for himself? Or can the solution of the question be prudently left to the decision of the ministers of one of the rival sects, who have such a manifest interest in deciding in their own favour?

The Medical Registration Bill is advocated under the specious pretence of being a measure devised for the protection of the public; but does any portion of the public demand or need this protection? Clearly not. It will not be argued that the partisans of the still prevailing sect, for the benefit of whose ministers this



## THE (PROPOSED) MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL.

measure is designed, need the protection of the law; and it is not pretended that medical dissenters petition for legislative interference to force them back to the adoption of the faith from which they have seceded. Is it true that Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen, are such idiots that they cannot be trusted to determine for themselves in these matters—matters in which each man has as much right to the exercise of a free choice as he has to choose between white and brown bread? Does science indeed need to be fenced round with pains and penalties which even religious fanaticism would now blush to enforce? In science, as in religion, men will claim to think for themselves; but they have no more right in the one case than in the other to attempt to force their opinions upon others. How poor must be the pretensions of modern science, if indeed it requires to be robed in the cast-off garments of religious bigotry! Persecution never benefited the cause which it was employed to uphold. In America there are no prohibitory laws, and surely science does not languish there. The true way to put down quacks and quackery, whether within or without the profession, is to enlighten the people—to make the study of the human frame, and of the laws which govern it in health and disease, a part of every schoolboy's education.

How often has a common itinerant quack saved the life of a patient, when the titled ministers of science had consulted and prescribed in vain! I knew a patient who had been given over by several eminent medical men, and who, through the skill and science of an Irish peasant, had been rescued from impending death, to live thereafter during a period of over thirty years. Now, if this Medical Registration Bill had been in force in those days, that peasant, instead of having been liberally rewarded as he deservedly was, would have been liable to prosecution, and fine or imprisonment, for having saved a life.

I might rest here, in my opposition to this bill of pains and penalties, but that when such extravagant powers are demanded for any body of men, it provokes inquiry into the merits of that body as a public institution, and into the demerits of those the sacrifice of whom is required.

"The practice of physic," says Dr. Heberden, "has been more improved by the casual experiments of illiterate nations, and by the rash ones of vagabond quacks, than by the reasonings of all the once celebrated professors of it, and theoretic teachers of the several schools of Europe, very few of whom have furnished us

*Free  
competence  
ever pro-  
duces a  
better  
article,  
and the  
public  
are keen  
to disco-  
ver who  
to get  
best food  
for their  
money.*



with one new medicine, or have taught us better how to use our old ones, or have in any one instance at all improved the art of curing disease." If this be so, does it not prompt a suspicion that the "vagabonds" have been the real men of science, and the recognised practitioners the quacks? For, what is quackery? It is defined by one author to be "boasting pretences, or base practices, especially in medicine." Another author writes: "That system is quackery wherein the direful consequences of remedies are overlooked in the attempt at immediate and transient relief! That system is quackery which proceeds on the principle of producing a drug-disease in lieu of the accidental one! That system is quackery, wherein, as is well known, many physicians and apothecaries play into each other's hands, to the detriment of the patient's person and pocket, the one prescribing to suit the other's bill, which again regulates the calling in of the prescriber! Begotten of mystery and ignorance, quackery owns impudence, insincerity, and extortion for its sponsors, and the whole family of quacks fatten in the garden of drug medication!"

And what return have the members of this profession made to those, whether regular or irregular, practitioners, who have brought the most valuable additions to our stock of medical knowledge? Invoke the memories of the dead, and mark the replies. Harvey was styled the "circulator," and persecuted throughout life. Paré, who first tied up the arteries after amputation, was "hooted and howled down by the faculty of physic, who ridiculed the idea of hanging human life upon a thread, when boiling pitch had stood the test of centuries." The quack, Paracelsus, first employed antimony—the French Parliament passed a law making it penal to prescribe it. A poor Indian discovered the use of bark; the Jesuits introduced it into England, and it was denounced as the invention of the devil. Dr. Grænwelt first employed cantharides internally, and "no sooner did his cures begin to make a noise, than he was at once committed to Newgate by warrant of the President of the College of Physicians." Lady Montague's "rank, sex, beauty, and genius," did not preserve her from persecution; and Jenner was refused a license to practise his profession in London. And in our own days we have seen a Priessnitz condemned to imprisonment. Such are the rewards ever adjudged to reformers; while those who revile, proscribe, and persecute them, quietly seize on their several discoveries, and appropriate them to their own uses.



24  
THE (PROPOSED) MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL.

Let us now inquire in what degree of estimation that profession, which it is proposed to endow with such extraordinary power and privileges, was held by some of the most distinguished of its own members. Dr. Paris says, "The file of every apothecary would furnish a volume of instances where the ingredients of the prescription were fighting together in the dark." Dr. J. Johnson says, "I declare it to be my most conscientious opinion, that if there were not a single physician, or surgeon, or apothecary, or man-midwife, or chemist, or druggist, or drug in the world, there would be less mortality amongst mankind than there is now." Dr. Billing says, "I visited the different schools of medicine, and the students of each hinted, if they did not assert, that the other sects killed their patients." Franks says, "Thousands are slaughtered in the quiet sick room." Reid says, "More infantile subjects are perhaps diurnally destroyed by the mortar and pestle, than in the ancient Bethlehem fell victims in one day to the Herodian massacre." Speaking of the plague, Dr. Madden says, "In all our cases we did as other practitioners did—we continued to bleed, and the patients continued to die." And who does not remember Sir A. Cooper's famous declaration, that "the science of medicine was founded on conjecture, and improved by murder?"

Dr. Brown said that he "*wasted* more than twenty years in learning, teaching, and diligently scrutinizing every part of medicine." Knighton said, "Medicine seems one of those ill-fated arts whose improvement bears no proportion to its antiquity." Gregory pronounced that "Medical doctrines are little better than stark staring absurdities." Abernethy said, "There has been a great increase of medical men of late years, but, upon my life, diseases have increased in proportion." Baillie declared that he "had no faith whatever in medicine." And, not to multiply quotations too far, Dr. Dickson says, "Locke, Smollet, Goldsmith, (all three physicians) held their art in contempt;" and, elsewhere, "Sir J. Mackintosh was not the only man who left it (the profession of physic) in disgust; Crabbe, Davy, Lord Langdale, and hundreds of others have done the same;" and again, "The ancients endeavoured to elevate physic to the dignity of a science, but failed. The moderns, with more success, have endeavoured to reduce it to the level of a trade." The same writer gives, on the authority of Dr. Fosbroke, a case in point: "I saw a farmer last summer come into a druggist's shop. Some one had told him



*The Medical Registration Bill.*

that he 'must be bled;' so he drove a bargain, and stepped into a back room. 'That fool,' said I, 'does not require cupping.' 'He does not look as if he did,' said the druggist, 'but we can't afford to let him go without.'"

And now, after reading and pondering over such testimonies, who will contentedly surrender his liberty, in medical matters, into the hands of the medical profession? Every man who is prudent will insist upon the preservation, in all their integrity, of his natural rights to choose for himself and his family that mode of medical treatment which he shall deem most effectual, and that practitioner in whom he shall most confide—whether that treatment be hydropathic, homœopathic, or allopathic, or vegetable pillism—or that practitioner a fellow of thirty colleges, or a simple peasant.

I am, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

Camberwell, February 17, 1848.

---



26.

*Asiatic Cholera.*

---

ASIATIC CHOLERA.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

DEAR SIR,—Paragraphs containing rumours of the approach of the Cholera are continually appearing in the newspapers. Drug-practitioners are busy generously propounding remedies, and, with most commendable public spirit, condemning each other's prescriptions in the columns of the daily press; and the Prime Minister has promised that timely measures shall be taken to mitigate the horrors of the pest if it shall reach our shores. Under these circumstances it is possible that a short paper on the subject may not be deemed unseasonable by your readers.

You cannot have forgotten the consternation of the profession when this fearful disease invaded us in 1832; neither can you be ignorant that the faculty generally are as ill-prepared to contend with it now as they were in former years; but, for the information of those who may not be as well acquainted with such matters as you must be, I beg to make an extract from the minutes of the



proceedings at a meeting of the Western Medical and Surgical Association, as reported in the *Lancet* of September 19, 1846. In the course of a discussion on the treatment of cholera, Dr. Cahill said that he "positively felt a creeping of the skin at the relation of the enormities which had been perpetrated by practitioners upon their patients. When he listened to the recitals of practitioners who described the extravagant doses of mercury and of opium which they administered, he could not refrain from fancying that he was witnessing the orgies of so many Indian savages, whilst counting the scalps of their victims. He thought it a pity that the inventor of such a system of torture should not experience the fate of the inventor of the brazen bull, and illustrate upon his own person the efficacy of his infernal ingenuity. He believed that in the majority of persons who died of Asiatic cholera, death was the consequence of the treatment rather than of the disease. He had seen above a thousand cases of Asiatic cholera, and in no instance had he seen any benefit from any mode of treatment. On the contrary, he had seen persons die of narcotism, who would have survived if left to the *vis medicatrix naturæ*. He had seen others die of absorption of air through the veins when the saline fluid was injected; and he knew many who had had the extraordinary luck to escape both the doctor and the disease, yet rendered miserable for the remainder of life by the effects of the immense doses of mercury which had been given to them during the cholera paroxysm. In fact, it was afflicting to contemplate the sufferings which the rash and empirical practice of the profession, in the management of this epidemic, had created." The learned gentleman likewise said, "With respect to cholera, since nothing was known of its nature, and no treatment had any influence over it, the best plan was to do as little as possible,—give carrara, soda, or pump-water, with a little laudanum, perhaps, in the diarrhœal stage, and the patient would not be deprived of the chance which nature had given him."

It is to be presumed that the doctor had not seen this disease treated by the water cure, under the operation of which, if I am correctly informed, and as I can readily believe, results very different from those which he witnessed were obtained. It is stated that over twenty cases were successfully treated by Priessnitz, and between thirty and forty at Breslau by a clergyman whose name I regret that I have forgotten; and it is added, that neither practitioner lost a patient by death. The treatment adopted by each



## ASIATIC CHOLERA.

of them was nearly the same; the principal difference between them being, that the one employed the sitz-bath and the other the shallow tepid bath.

If, on the appearance of the premonitory symptoms, judicious treatment be promptly adopted, it seems not improbable that the disease may be cut short. Those symptoms may be any combination of the following: shivering, dizziness, a ringing noise in the ears, a small quick pulse, accelerated respiration, languor, præcordial anxiety, a cold white tongue, nausea, vomiting, severe gripings, and watery diarrhœa. If it be not checked, the disease quickly passes into the second or algide stage; the circulation becomes feeble, the blood is drained of its fluid, the muscles are contracted and cramped, the tongue is colder and whiter, the thirst becomes burning, the lips livid, the features contracted, the extremities shrivelled, and the skin cold, clammy, and discoloured.

Medical writers differ with regard to the meaning of the word cholera: some derive it from *χολη*, bile, and *ρην*, to flow; others, who hold that it signifies intestinal flux, derive it from *χολα*; and *ρην*.

But little is known respecting the nature of this disease; but the most rational opinion seems to be that it owes its origin to a poison pervading the blood, deranging the balance between the arterial and venous circulation, impairing the nervous energy and impeding all the functions of the various organs, excepting the secretions from the stomach and bowels—the preternatural excitement of which would seem to indicate an effort of nature to expel the disturbing cause from the system. This opinion obtains additional probability from the fact, which often has been observed, that the more profuse is the diarrhœa the less fatal is the disease.

Cholera may suddenly appear without manifesting any, or at least with very slight, premonitory symptoms; especially where the patient is labouring under any serious affection of the brain, lungs, or air-passages, when it will sometimes graft itself on the primary disease, and aggravate all its most serious symptoms.

On the first manifestation of premonitory symptoms, immediate recourse should be had to repeated friction in a wrung-out sheet, as in the earlier stages of fever. This will tend to stimulate the nervous energy, and to maintain or re-establish the balance of circulation between the arterial and venous systems; will counteract the disposition to internal congestion by promoting cuticular circulation; will aid the lungs by freeing the exhalants of the



skin, and will forward the elimination of the virus through the same channels.

But it will not be sufficient merely to attempt to resist the encroachments of the disease; the efforts of nature to expel the cause of it also claim assistance. To this end, cold or tepid water should be freely drunk to facilitate the vomiting, to dilute and weaken the action of the poison, to stimulate the kidneys, and to supply the waste of fluid in the blood. Dr. Ratty, in his Synopsis, says, "It (the drinking of water) has also frequently been found efficacious in stopping violent vomitings and purgings, partly as a diluent, and partly as a bracer to the fibres; and in violent, deplorable choleras, cold water is recommended by the ancients, and at this time ordered by Spanish physicians with good success, though Celsus orders it warm."

Enemata of pure water, tepid or cold, should likewise be freely administered; the quantity administered to an infant at one time should not exceed two ounces; four ounces will be sufficient for a child of six years old, eight ounces for a youth of fifteen, and fifteen or sixteen ounces for an adult.

But the principal process is *long and active friction*, either in the shallow tepid bath or in the sitz-bath. The latter seems to deserve the preference, inasmuch as it will more directly and powerfully aid nature in her efforts—its primary action being that of a purgative; while a less body of water will suffice than could be made to fulfil the same intention in a vessel of the shape and size of the half-bath; but if the sitz-bath be employed, then friction with wet hands should be applied to the extremities. Cold water may be used in the sitz-bath, provided that there is nothing in the previous state of the patient to contra-indicate its use; in which case tepid water must be employed. Tepid water, about 70 deg. Fahr., may likewise be employed in the shallow bath, as the body of water therein must be greater than in the sitz-bath; but warm applications are never indicated. Vapour-baths have been tried to recall the circulation to the surface, but without effect. On this point Dr. Daun, in his *Medical Reports on Cholera*, says, "O'Brien lay on the steam couch for three hours before he expired, in a heat that I am convinced would have raised a lifeless body to a temperature nearly, if not equal, to that of a person in health, but his body preserved an icy coldness to the last." In this case friction in wrung-out sheets, or in the shallow-bath, or, perhaps, the stimulus of the cold dash, would seem to be indicated.\*

\* In Dr. Barter's pamphlet on Cholera he says; "I have seen a letter from Dr. Carter in the *London Examiner* of the 6th inst, in which he quotes as follows, from Braithwaite's *Retrospect of Medicine*; 'I am acquainted with three persons, who, after they had been laid out for dead,



## ASIATIC CHOLERA.

Cramps in the extremities should be combated with brisk friction with wet hands to the parts affected. It is often necessary to draw off the urine with a catheter. Before the algide stage sets in, the heating bandage round the body may be very beneficial, but during the algide stage it should be omitted.

The third stage, or that of re-action, is marked by the following, among other symptoms; the pulse becomes fuller and harder, the skin becomes warm and its livid discolouration disappears, the tongue becomes red and warm, the cramps cease, diarrhoea decreases and stops, and the kidneys begin to act. In this case it is well to encourage moderate diaphoresis in the dry blanket.

The predisposing causes to cholera are, any excess in eating or drinking, the habitual use of alcoholic liquors, unwholesome food, sitting with wet feet, a neglected cold, uncleanness, impure air, deficient light or ventilation, <sup>heat</sup> and violent indulgence of the passions.

The most convenient vessel for a sitz-bath is one resembling a washing-tub, but a little smaller at the bottom than at the mouth, and with the front diameter at the mouth cut out to the depth of four inches: its dimensions then will be as follows—its depth at the back will be fifteen inches, and at the front eleven inches; and its diameter at the top will be twenty-five inches and at the bottom nineteen inches. When the symptoms are not too urgent, and that there is time to employ the wet sheet friction, it is always well to apply it to the patient *immediately* preceding the sitz-bath, and as part of the one operation; the former modifies the action of the latter, and many a patient who would shiver in a cold sitz-bath in fifteen minutes, could bear it for twenty-five minutes without being much chilled if he were prepared for it by previous friction in the wrung-out sheet.

The bathing vessel for the shallow bath resembles a slipper-bath in form, but it is open from end to end to allow of friction in it, and for the same reason it should be much shallower than the slipper-bath—about 20 inches in depth will be found sufficient; and a convenient length, for general purposes, will be about four feet six inches. The patient does not lie down in this bath, but sits in it with his legs extended; and the depth of water varies from about three to five inches. Wooden vessels seem preferable for these baths, as they are not so cold to the touch as vessels of tin or zinc.

The heating compress in general use at Græfenberg for adults is made of coarse thick diaper, is three yards long, and from sixteen

*on being washed (previous to interment) in the open court yard, with water, to obtain which the ice had been broken, recovered in consequence and lived many years. I received from Eryerom, in Turkey, a letter from our excellent*



31

# ASIATIC CHOLERA.

to eighteen inches wide. One-third of it is wetted and then well wrung out, and two-thirds of it are left dry. The end which is wetted and first applied to the body is cut straight off from the piece, and the other end is brought to a point, like the apex of a triangle, and to it are affixed two tapes, each long enough to go three or four times round the body. This bandage should be put on so as to exclude the air, but not so tight as to impede the respiration; it can be tightened to the shape by giving the angular end a half-twist previous to tying it. If this does not keep it properly in its place, suspensory tapes can be passed over the shoulders.

The dry blanket for the sweating process is applied to the body in the same manner as the wet-sheet packing, and is covered with a feather bed, and other blankets if necessary. After the sweating process the cold plunge bath should be taken if there be nothing to contra-indicate its use; but if there be, then a short shallow bath may be used. If neither the cold plunge nor the shallow bath can be had, friction, in a succession of two or more *dripping* sheets, may be substituted.

If the Premier would indeed take effectual measures to mitigate the horrors of cholera, if unfortunately it shall invade us again, he could not more certainly attain his object than by encouraging the formation of hydropathic hospitals for the treatment of this and other epidemics; but I apprehend that such a proposal, if it were submitted to the government, would be received pretty much as a certain general received Chief Justice Bushe's recipe for the cure of rheumatism. The general, who was by no means distinguished for attention to personal cleanliness, once complained to the Judge of the sufferings he endured from rheumatism, whereupon his lordship prescribed for him as follows: "You must desire your servant to place every morning by your bed-side a tub three parts filled with warm water. You will then get into the tub, and having previously provided yourself with a pound of yellow soap, you must rub your whole body with it, immersing yourself occasionally in the water, and, at the end of a quarter of an hour, the process concludes by wiping yourself dry with towels, and scrubbing your person with a flesh brush." "Why," replied the general, after a few minutes' reflection, "this seems to be neither more nor less than washing yourself!" To this the judge rejoined, "Well, it is open to that objection."

I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

Camberwell, February 15, 1848.

*Consul, Mr. Brant, who states, that Dr. Dixon, of that place was then curing more patients by frictions with ice or snow than by any other treatment. The same practice is reported to have been the most effective in Russia." And Captain Claridge has informed me that he saw in the Times a letter signed by two*



physicians, in which they state that they had successfully employed the wet sheet packing in fourteen cases of collapse and that they had not lost a single patient.

J.C.  
In Galignani's Messenger of Feb<sup>y</sup> 2. 1850, it is stated, on the authority of the Bombay Telegraph and Courier, that, on the subject of Cholera, "Dr. Larkworthy has sent in a report to the Medical Board in which the success attendant on the treatment of patients according to the cold water plan is satisfactorily proved."



*Facts v. Fiction.*

FACTS *versus* FICTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—Will you do me the favour to give a place in your Journal to the accompanying letter, which has been refused insertion by the parties to whom it is addressed?

They consider it “quite uncalled for;” they “know many coolheaded hydropathists who” (enamoured, I presume, of castigation, like Eloisa) “would relish very well the playful notice (!) taken of the high fashion into which the new system ran so suddenly.” They are not sure that the oft-repeated assertion, that the abuse of cold water leads to dropsy, is “without foundation,” as they “knew several children in one family who died of dropsy, and it was attributed to their having habitually filled their stomachs with water for the purpose of allaying the sensation of hunger!” They inform me that “the proper battle-field for the hydropathists is a scientific, not a popular journal.” If I successfully combat, “in a proper arena,” the opinions of which I complain, they will “trumpet forth” my victory to the world. But, in conclusion, they kindly warn me, that in the writer of “Heal-alls”—I “should find a very formidable antagonist.”

Their refusal to insert my letter is couched in polite terms, of which I am not insensible, neither am I forgetful of their past services to the cause we advocate; but I must say that I cannot but regard the course they have adopted on this occasion as ill-judged, and the reasons they assign as ill-considered. When they allowed *misrepresentation* to find its way into their Journal, surely they might permit truth to follow and confound it!

I am, my dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

Camberwell, May 3, 1848.

JOHN GIBBS.



FACTS *versus* FICTION.

TO THE EDITORS OF *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal*.

GENTLEMEN,—In a flippant article headed "Heal-alls," which appeared in the last monthly part of your Journal, there occurs the following sneering passage:—"Thus we are conducted to the freshest of all—hydropathy; the system which washes out disorders from the human frame; which has enriched a Swiss peasant of rugged outside and more rugged interior; which has turned the pharmacopœia into water; which has clothed fancy and fashion, not in silk attire, but in wet sheets; has turned wine into water, and the drawing-room into a cold bath; which we regret to add—though doing some good as respects temperance, exercise, and cleanliness—has turned slight diseases into dropsies."

It would be exceedingly difficult to compress a greater number of misrepresentations into the same number of lines—misrepresentations which, whether made through ignorance or in wanton malice, are equally discreditable and dishonest. The writer who pretends to enlighten the public mind, should first be at some pains to endeavour to enlighten his own.

The advocates of the water cure have repeatedly disavowed a belief in a panacea, and as frequently proclaimed that the use of "cold water," either externally or internally, forms only a part of their system. A persistence, then, in imputing to them such a belief, and a continuance in ringing the changes on "cold water," only betray the weakness and dishonesty of their opponents, and afford another illustration of the tenacity with which calumny clings to existence.

It is not alone on the subject of the water cure that the writer of the foregoing extract displays the profundity and accuracy of his erudition. With each stroke of his pen he performs some wonderful piece of legerdemain, and not the least remarkable metamorphosis which he effects is the one by which he "turns" a *Silesian* into a "*Swiss* peasant;" thus rivalling in geographical lore poor Lolah, when she says—

"Spain's an island near  
Morocco, betwixt Egypt and Tangier."

It is remarkable that wherever we meet with denunciations of the water cure, we may generally expect to find them mingled with aspersions of Priessnitz and of Captain Claridge. In the present instance the latter escapes, but we are elegantly reminded of the "rugged outside and more rugged interior" of the former.



This is a sneer which might well have been spared. It is evident that the writer of it could never have had the honour of an interview with Priessnitz—the latter having never visited Switzerland, and the former having never been in Silesia—not even in his dreams. Hundreds of those who have met Priessnitz, and who know him best, have publicly and spontaneously testified to the amenity of his manner and the kindness of his heart; in fact, the only evidences of ruggedness about him are the marks with which the combined powers of small-pox and allopathy have scarred his features. For the rest, what Lawrence says of John Hunter may with truth be applied to Priessnitz: “He began by discarding all the doctrines of the schools, and resorted at once to nature. Instead of creeping timidly along the coast of truth, within sight of precedent and authority, he boldly launched into the great ocean of discovery, steering by the polar star of observation, and trusting to the guidance of his own genius.”

But the gist of the extract from the article on “Heal-alls” is to be found in the concluding sentence—“has turned slight diseases into dropsies.” In these words is couched the terrible assertion which is to give hydropathy its death blow. It might be sufficient to meet this assertion with a counter-assertion, and to dare its writer to produce his proofs; but as that might be very inconvenient to him, I will act generously, and take his statement for what it is worth. I shall, therefore, briefly consider how far such an assertion is sanctioned by theory, and how far it is countenanced by facts, which are the tests of theories, and the only weapons which can be efficiently wielded to establish truth, or to overthrow error.

The writer of “Heal-alls,” like other writers of his loose class, leaves us in the dark as to whether he traces the evil consequences which he deplures to the internal or external use of water; therefore, in considering the subject it is necessary to go over more ground than it would be if he had been explicit.

Whether dropsy be the result of local inflammation, or of obstructed circulation caused by some “disease of the heart, the lungs, the liver, the spleen, or some of the large veins,” or by a “particular organic disease of the kidneys”—in no instance is it attributed, by medical authorities, to the drinking of water. On the contrary, the causes assigned are widely different; amongst them are alcoholic liquors, stimulant diuretics, drastic purgatives, and mercury. There is no fact better established in physiology than this—that

9



water is necessary to the due performance of all the vital functions. Whether it be taken pure, or in soup or any other beverage, it plays exactly the same part in the animal economy. Nature ever requires its presence. In dropsy thirst most imperatively indicates her wants, and he is no true physician who would disregard the claim. This brings us to the inquiry whether or not dropsy be caused by the improper *external* application of cold water; and that, under certain conditions, such a result may possibly ensue, I am not prepared to deny. But no physician acquainted with the pathology of this disease, and with the powers of the water cure appliances, could so mistreat a patient. Therefore, if the writer of "Heal-alls" be acquainted with cases where dropsies have been caused by improper treatment, he may be sure that those results have occurred in ignorant hands (perhaps his own), and that the system he assails is in no way responsible. But judging him by what he has written, I am inclined to include him in the *cum hoc, ergo propter hoc* school of logicians, and must take leave to doubt his ability to trace, in any medical matter, the connexion between cause and effect. As to my own experience, I am disposed to think that it cannot have afforded me fewer opportunities of observation than those which he has enjoyed, and therefore, albeit with some diffidence, I venture to refer to it.

During my residence at Græfenberg there passed through the hands of Priessnitz, in addition to the patients supplied by the surrounding district, over three thousand strangers, amongst whom I had a very extensive acquaintance. Since my return to this country I have visited several other hydropathic establishments, and conversed with many of the patients therein. I have also read about one hundred works on this system of medicine and hygiene, so inadequately named the water cure, and I have never met with a case, or the record of a case, in which a "slight disease," or any disease or condition of body, had been "turned" into a dropsy; on the contrary, I have witnessed beneficial results in the treatment of this disease—not by the "cold bath," to which the writer of "Heal-alls" would limit the hydropathic pharmacopœia—but by other remedies of which he seems to have no idea, yet which are perfectly familiar to the practical hydropathist.

But what are facts or theories to the opponents of the water cure? They disdain to investigate the former, and seem incapable of comprehending the latter. Instead of arguments they substitute hard words and reckless assertions.



37

FACTS *versus* FICTION.

They revile Priessnitz as an "ignorant peasant," and assert that he kills the great majority of his patients; and then, when it is shown on the authority of the published police reports, that the deaths at Græfenberg do not average one in every two hundred and seventy cases, they cry out that he owes the knowledge of his remedies, and his skill in wielding them, to the study of the earlier writers; and further, they unwittingly pay a high compliment to his knowledge of diagnosis and prognosis, by asserting that he cunningly refuses all cases of a dangerous complexion.

At one time they warn us that the water cure is a system fraught with danger and death to those who suffer themselves to be deluded by its pretensions; and at another time they claim it as a valuable adjunct to drug medication.

This moment they contend that the water cure is "nothing new"—that the remedial virtues of bathing, and water-drinking, and sweating, and air, and exercise, and diet, and the other component parts of this comprehensive system, have long been known and appreciated. In the next breath they clamorously demand that a coroner's inquest shall be held in every instance in which a death takes place under the operation of these *new* and dangerous remedies.

It is discreditable both to the heads and the hearts of those who thus assail a *methodus medendi*, which, as attested by thousands, while still in its infancy, has already effected a vast amount of good, and whose practitioners and advocates, discarding all occult remedies, together with the mysteries and mystification which so long enveloped the healing art, are endeavouring in plain and intelligible language to educate the public mind in the knowledge of disease and its causes, and of the *modi operandi* of ~~the~~ remedies. If the doctrines thus broached be unsound, let them be refuted; if the practice thus advocated can be shown to be erroneous, let it be condemned—but let neither the one nor the other be any longer misrepresented and maligned.

Trusting that you will not deem this letter uncalled for, and that it contains nothing to disentitle it to a place in your columns,

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Camberwell,

April 24th, 1848.



---

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—I believe that in many instances much harm has been done to individuals, and much mischief to the cause of hydropathy, by persons who, without sufficient practical knowledge, have inconsiderately ventured to treat either themselves or others: on the other hand, there are numerous cases in which, owing to the paucity of hydropathic practitioners, a patient must either be his own doctor, or call in an allopathic physician, or else do nothing; and in which a man of nerve and intellect, and some practical experience, may do much good. The following extract from a letter which I have received from a friend, furnishes an illustration.

“ My case was this. Last winter I took a cold, which ended in a cough, which became very severe, and which was accompanied with a good deal of derangement of the digestive organs. I foolishly abandoned my morning abreibung (wet sheet friction) from the fear of irritating my chest. Things went on very unsatisfactorily for weeks and my stomach became more deranged; and having been obliged to leave home and go to a distant part of the country on business of importance, I felt myself, from two or three days’



attendance, evidently unwell; and at last, one evening, I got a violent shivering, accompanied with loss of appetite, and all the symptoms of the same kind of feverish attack which I had on some previous occasions, beginning with great shivering, then a burning dry heat, and then the doctors and drugs for two or three weeks. I was alone at a country hotel, and was not even accompanied by my servant. I felt very much distressed to know what to do; I had no one to advise me, and my business was of that nature and importance that I should either attend to it or get a deputy appointed. I knew that once getting back into the hands of doctors and to a recurrence of drugs, I should have, most probably, the old system renewed again, and all the good effects of my visit to Græfenberg done away. I had resolutely abstained from all drugs since my visit to Græfenberg in 1845, and found the great happiness and advantage arising therefrom. Still, I dreaded tampering with myself, and had before my eyes the fear of bringing on fever or some serious attack by injudicious management; and I feared that at that moment I was in the commencement of some illness which required energetic measures and decision. Still I dreaded the drugs, and for that night did not send for the doctor. After I went to bed the shivering soon changed to the dry burning of fever, and I knew that something must be forthwith done. Recollecting that when in a similar state I was always benefited by perspiration, and having read in some of the watercure books of the efficacy of the wet sheet packing to produce perspiration, though I had never experienced it, I resolved at last to stand to my colours and, whatever might be the result, to try the leintuch (wet-sheet packing). So at the first light in the morning I made the waiter bring in a wet sheet properly wrung out, and two or three pair of blankets; and, to his horror and astonishment, I was soon wrapped up in the wet sheet and surrounded with the blankets. I was immediately before that in a very feverish state, my pulse very high, and all the indications of fever set in. To my delight I found the perspiration begin in less than half an hour, and in about an hour afterwards it was fully broken out. My skin got immediately soft, my pulse lowered, and I felt certainly better. I then took confidence, and remembering something of what I had heard of the way to act when in perspiration, I boldly ordered the waiter to throw up the sash, and give me a glass of cold water. Had I desired him to put a pistol to my head I do not think I could have horrified him more.



## OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

"The perspiration went on for four hours very freely, but then I did not know how to get out of it. I felt myself very weak, and although I had vague recollections of having heard that people get into a tub of cold water in that state, I was not quite sure, and I knew that a mistake then might not only damage myself, but throw a discredit on the system. I fortunately recollected that there was a young gentleman who lived near the village, who had gone, about twelve months before, to Doctor Barter's establishment a wretched, epileptic, worn-out, crawling skeleton, given over by the doctors, and advised by celebrated London physicians to try as a last resource the cold water system, and who, I had lately heard, was returned, to the astonishment of his family, in rude health and spirits; and, although I was not personally acquainted with this gentleman, I sent off for him to get his assistance in my dilemma. He most kindly came; and certainly when he entered my room, with firm step and joyous manner, just come in from his walk after facing a good stout breeze, wearing a sailor's jacket and with his shirt neck open, I did appreciate the value of the cold water system more than I had ever done before, for I recollected the wretched account which his father had given me of him about a year before, carrying to my mind the idea that his life was a burden to himself and his family.

"He immediately told me I had been long enough in the perspiration, got a sheet well soaked in cold water, made me jump up, and threw it over me; and, after I had been rubbed in this for a few minutes, he got a dry sheet, and had me well rubbed and dried. I was then very weak, but felt quite a different being, and having made me eat a little breakfast and rest for a little, he made me, in spite of my weakness, go out and take as smart a walk as I could for half an hour, and then return in and rest.

"The next day was Sunday, and therefore I could take care of myself, and on Monday morning I was able to begin my business again, and in one week was able, without suffering, to sit for ten hours at hard work in court; and although my cough has remained, till within the last few days, at times troublesome enough, yet I have been quite able to do business ever since, and have never touched a drug, or had a recurrence of the feverish attack or the shivering."

The foregoing statement was written some six or eight weeks after the illness of which it furnishes the details, and it supplies



much matter for reflection; but at present I shall confine myself to a very few observations.

If, in the first instance, the patient had had his cold properly treated, it is probable he might have escaped all the subsequent suffering. His fear of continuing the use of the *abreibung* lest it should "irritate the chest," was unfounded. Between the lungs and the skin there is what is termed "a consent of parts." As "the source of animal heat is in the lungs, so the external surface of the body appears to be the organ by which the temperature of the system is regulated." The due temperature is maintained by the healthy action of the functions of the skin, and the suppression of the insensible perspiration is the immediate cause of catarrhal affections; therefore, what is commonly termed "catching cold" has not inaptly been termed "catching heat." There is also much sympathy between the skin and the digestive organs. Therefore, in this case, the patient, instead of omitting his usual daily wet sheet friction at the commencement of his illness, should not only have continued its use, but should have repeated it oftener, with the intent to restore the skin to the proper exercise of its functions; and thus he might have successfully combatted the train of symptoms which followed, and, probably, he might have prevented the feverish attack which they preceded. In like manner, this attack might sooner have been cut short by a succession of wet sheet frictions, followed by drinking a glass or two of water. It is scarcely necessary to point out that the sweating process was pushed too far. The friction in the dripping sheet, which succeeded the sweating process, might have been repeated once or twice, and should have been followed by drinking a glass of water to assist reaction; for the same reason it would have been better to have taken some exercise immediately after the bath, than to have postponed it until after eating.

In the following case the treatment was rather more judicious; it is likewise extracted from a private letter.

"Thanks for your directions for the treatment of dysentery; if I should be attacked I shall be inclined to treat myself, in preference to calling in medical aid.

"I introduced hydropathy here, much to the consternation of the residents, in the following manner. On Friday week I got up with a great headach, sick stomach, foul tongue, diarrhœa, pulse



## OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

quick and weak, and with a chilly feeling. I partook of a slight breakfast, thinking that the attack might wear off; but about ten o'clock a severe shivering came on, and I decided on taking some treatment. Mr. H. G., on hearing me express my determination, told me that I should kill myself, and reminded me that a graveyard was in the immediate neighbourhood; and Mr. B. wished me to consult a doctor previous to doing anything. However, I procured a tub and a man, and took an abreibung (wet sheet friction) and a quarter of an hour's sitzbath. The man who gave me the bath said he would rather keep his bed three months than take such a dose. After the bath I went to bed for a few hours. When I got up I took some gruel; and about half-past six o'clock I took two more abreibungen, and went to bed for the night. In the morning, after an abreibung, I was well enough to attend to business. At noon I took another abreibung, and a third at night. On Sunday I was quite recovered. I wore the heating bandage round the body constantly from the first. Whether this treatment was judicious or not I am not able to decide, but the effect was all that could be desired."

It is not easy to say, from the foregoing statement, whether or not the use of the sitz-bath was judicious; in general, its use in the cold stage of fever is to be condemned.

In another instance, I was told by the party concerned, that he had been confined to bed for several days of a feverish attack, for which he treated himself with the watercure processes; that his convalescence was marked by the appearance of a very large abscess in the scrotum, which discharged a considerable quantity of matter, and exceedingly alarmed a medical man to whom he showed it; and that he also successfully treated it without any advice. I do not recollect what treatment this patient adopted. When I saw him, two or three weeks after his illness, he was in excellent health.

The foregoing cases tend to prove that, preach caution as we will, there are instances in which self-treatment will be adopted, and in which the results appear to justify the experiment; and, on the whole, they sufficiently illustrate the good that may sometimes be effected by even an imperfect administration of the hydropathic remedies. Therefore, and for the additional reasons that, owing to the variableness of our climate, catarrhal affections are very



prevalent amongst our population, and that, when neglected, they become the fruitful causes of many dangerous diseases, I have selected those affections as affording the subject matter for a few observations. In the first place I shall give a few cases which were successfully treated at Græfenberg during my residence there.

1. A SLIGHT COLD, WITH HEADACH.—*Treatment.*—Two wet sheet frictions in succession, each followed by a dry sheet friction, with a tepid sitz-bath for twenty minutes, and a head-bath for ten minutes; the whole combined forming one operation in the forenoon, and being repeated in the afternoon. By the wet sheet friction is always to be understood a *wrung out* sheet; when an *unwring* sheet is meant, it is always called a *dripping* sheet.

2. A COLD, WITH INFLAMMATORY SORE THROAT. (*Patient robust.*)—*Treatment.*—A sweating in the dry blanket twice a-day, followed each time by friction in the shallow tepid bath; when taking exercise, to hold water in the mouth until it warmed; the heating bandage round the head day and night, ditto to the chest and round the legs at night.

3. A COLD, WITH SORE THROAT AND ENLARGED TONSILS. (*Patient of a more delicate constitution than in previous case.*)—*Treatment.*—A packing in the wet sheet twice a-day, followed each time by the shallow tepid bath: a tepid sitz-bath for fifteen minutes, and the heating compress round the throat.

4. A HEAVY COLD.—*Treatment.*—A wet sheet friction in the morning, and a wet sheet packing for one hour, followed by the shallow tepid bath; if this treatment had not proved effectual, the patient should have sweated in the dry blanket for an hour and a half, and then have had the shallow tepid bath; this latter bath is always combined with friction to the whole body and limbs, and affusion on the head.

5. COLD AND COUGH.—*Treatment.*—Six wet sheet frictions daily, two at a time; two foot-baths for ten minutes each, the feet to be well rubbed in and after the bath; heating compress to chest day and night.

6. SORE THROAT, PAINS IN LIMBS, AND COMPLETE PROSTRATION OF STRENGTH. (*Patient, a young lady.*)—*Treatment.*—Light diet; exercise, to run up and down stairs until quite warm; then to be packed in the dry blanket, the blanket to be previously warmed to expedite the sweating, and the process to be followed by the shallow tepid bath; water to be held in the mouth; heating bandage round



44

OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

the throat; heating compress to the chest, put on like a shawl; had also wet sheet packings and wet sheet frictions; well on the second day.

7. COLD, COUGH, AND INFLAMMATION OF AIR PASSAGES.—(*A lady.*) *Treatment.*—Wet sheet packing for three quarters of an hour, with shallow tepid bath for one hour twice a-day; when fatigued by bath to come out, be dried, walk about the room for a time, and enter the bath again.

8. COUGH, SORE THROAT, AND PAIN IN THE CHEST.—*Treatment.*—Heating bandage round throat at night; expose the throat by day, (the weather was mild;) wet sheet packing twice a-day, with shallow tepid bath each time for fifteen minutes; tepid sitz-bath for twenty minutes.

9. ACUTE ATTACK OF RHEUMATISM IN NECK AND SHOULDERS, FROM EXPOSURE TO THE WEATHER. (*Patient, a young man, in other respects in rude health.*)—*Treatment.*—A profuse sweating in the dry blanket, followed by active friction in a succession of several dripping sheets, without any dry friction until the last dripping sheet was applied; no other treatment, except drinking water and taking exercise, was applied.

I have avoided lengthy details in transcribing the foregoing cases, as I have given them chiefly as texts with which to connect a few remarks, and from which to deduce a few rules of easy application, which probably will thereby be more firmly fixed on the reader's mind.

When there is a sense of chilliness the wet sheet friction should be applied to the patient. In all cases of catarrhal affection this process of the watercure will be safe and salutary; in many cases it will be efficacious, without being combined with any other bath, but in some cases, especially if the illness has been neglected in the commencement, it will be necessary to employ additional treatment.

The sitz-bath is useful when the head is affected, or when the bowels required to be regulated; it should be preceded generally by a wet sheet friction.

When febrile heat is present, then the patient should be packed in the wet sheet, and the packing should be followed by friction in the tepid bath; or if a bath cannot be had, then friction in one or more dripping sheets may be substituted. Sometimes one application of the wet sheet packing will not be sufficient; the patient will



45

OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

become more heated in it and will exhibit much uneasiness. In this case it will be necessary immediately to renew the application, and while the fresh sheet is being spread out, which ought not to occupy more than a minute, the patient can be enveloped in a dry blanket without any other covering.

The sweating process is effectual in reducing any glandular swelling and in relieving rheumatic pains; it is, however, an application requiring more caution than any of the preceding; it should be followed, like the wet sheet packing, either by friction in the shallow tepid bath or in a succession of dripping sheets.

Holding water in the mouth until it warms, and the application of friction with wet hands to the chest, will facilitate expectoration; and gargling the mouth and throat with tepid water is useful in all cases in which there is local inflammation of those organs.

When the head is much implicated, evaporating compresses, or prolonged head baths will be found serviceable. Cold affusion on the head may also in some cases be advisable, but it should be employed in connexion with the shallow tepid bath. Priessnitz is adverse, and it appears to me not without reason, to the energetic topical application of cold in any case, unless it be in combination with general treatment.

The use of the heating bandage is sufficiently apparent from a perusal of the foregoing cases. If the bandage for encircling the body be of one piece it can be more quickly and neatly applied by an experienced bath servant than it can when composed of two pieces; and it has this additional recommendation, that by making the strings of it fast with a slip knot to the bedpost, or any fixture of a convenient height, the patient can roll himself into it, and thus put it on without assistance if he should have occasion. It is said by a writer who advocates the use of a mixture of sponge and wool, rendered impermeable by a coating of india rubber, as a substitute for poultices, that the whole of their beneficial effects "are solely dependent on the *warmth and moisture* they contain;" but this is an error, unless it can be shown that vapour and warm water have a precisely similar action, which, I think, no one will venture to assert. It appears, therefore, that, although evaporation should be checked, it should not be entirely suppressed; for, if it be, then the moist application differs as much from what it was intended to be as a warm bath does from a vapour bath. The assertion that the retention of the moisture for a much longer time is effected by



46

OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

an impermeable covering, appears to be an argument against the use of any such covering; for, in fact, it causes the part to which it is applied to be enveloped in a bath of impure moisture, which ought to be partly exhaled and partly removed, to be followed by a fresh application. But, although the patient ought not to be enveloped in oiled silk, he will find a covering of that material of use to his watch, to preserve it from the vapour of the compress or bandage. Still, I would not be understood as unreservedly condemning the use of an impermeable compress; there may be occasions on which it may not be convenient to change the ordinary compress sufficiently often to keep it moist, and when any moist application would be preferable to none. I only mean to argue for a preference of the ordinary compress when it is possible to employ it; in cases where it does not warm sufficiently quickly it may be covered with a fold or two of flannel.

In every case the drinking of water is to be recommended. Wesley, in his *Philosophy*, advises that, for a cold in the head, the patient should drink about a pint of cold water fresh from the spring immediately after going to bed, and should then be closely covered up with the bed clothes; and he gives this advice with the intent to carry off the cold by perspiration.

On referring to case 7, it will be seen that there are cases which assume so serious an aspect as to require treatment too energetic to be employed by unskilful hands; and in concluding this part of my subject, it may be proper to remark, that the sweating process and bath require to be administered with more caution and skill than the wet sheet packing and bath; and, again, that this latter mode of treatment requires more skill and caution than the employment of the wet sheet friction and sitz-bath; and, finally, that in every case due regard should be had to the reactive powers of the patient.

The oldest of the modern writers on the medical use of water, Dr. Van der Heyden, advocates the employment of head baths in the treatment of catarrh. He says, "Bathing of the head in cold water cures also inveterate pains of that part, and the continual catarrhs and defluxions from thence. For it is certain, that if the head be put into cold water as far as the middle of the bone of the hinder part of the head, and to the end of the nose before, so that there be just left so much of the nose out of the water as that the party may have freedom of breathing only, and that this be done so long as while a man may be saying the Lord's prayer, the pain of the head, though it hath been of long continuance, will thereby be removed, and the defluxions stopped, as hath often been proved by experience. And I have been much confirmed in this opinion



of mine, by an experiment of it made upon a certain English knight, named Sir Toby Matthews, a man no less eminent for wisdom than fit for public trust. This gentleman, having been troubled twenty years together with an intolerable pain on one side of his head, and also with a continual and violent defluxion from the head, distilling through his palate and nose in so great quantity as that he could never go without a wet handkerchief in his pocket, he was so happily cured of both these maladies in the sixtieth year of his age, by thus bathing his head in cold water, as that till the seventieth year of the same, which he hath now passed, he had never had the least touch of either during the said space of time; and being now in better health than ever he was in his life before. To prevent his falling into the like infirmities again, he useth the said immersion of his head in cold water all the year long, and even in the depth of winter also: and he saith that he received this profitable advice from a certain English nobleman, who, having himself been a long time much tormented with the same disease, had by this means cured both himself and very many others who were alike affected, and restored them to perfect health, to the great admiration of all men."

This is a striking instance of the efficacy of the head bath, but still not sufficiently so to justify the indiscriminate exhibition of it, or to warrant a reliance upon it without the aid of additional treatment.

Dr. Buchan goes to the other extremity, and strongly recommends the use of foot baths. He says:—

"As a proof that the organs of perspiration are rendered more vigorous by occasional exposure to cold, I have known many examples of people who never failed to catch cold, as it is called, on their having their feet in the slightest degree wet; who, in consequence of adopting the habit of washing their feet regularly every morning with a cloth dipped in cold water, or what is preferable, in a solution of common salt in water, have entirely overcome this delicacy of constitution."

But although foot baths may be very beneficial in many cases, especially when employed as forming part of a system, they cannot be relied upon, any more than head baths, in every case.

Among the precautions recommended to prevent the catching of cold there are two, widely different in their nature, which deserve to be considered, namely, bathing and the use of flannel next the



48  
OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

skin. Each of these is alike advocated, with the intent to maintain or restore a healthy action of the functions of the skin. Dr. Buchan, (who very fully considers the rival claims of these two methods, and from whom I shall freely quote,) says,—

“The quantity of perishable matter discharged from the surface of the skin in this country, in the course of twenty-four hours, is calculated, on an average, to amount to fifty ounces. When we reflect that the matter daily discharged by perspiration exceeds, in more than a double proportion, the quantity of all the other secretions from the human body taken together, the importance of endeavouring to maintain in a healthy state the organ by which a function of such importance in the animal economy is performed, becomes obvious.”

Dr. Buchan advocates bathing and moderate clothing as a means to inure the frame to resist the injurious influences of atmospheric changes, and, in support of his views with respect to clothing, he quotes John Hunter, as follows:—

“A habit of uniformity in the application of heat and cold to an animal body, renders it more sensible of the smallest variations in either: while, by the habit of variety, it will become, in a proportionable degree, less susceptible of all such sensations. This is proved every day, in cold weather, by people who are accustomed to clothe themselves warm. In them the least exposure to cold air, although the effect produced in the skin is not perhaps the hundredth part of a degree, immediately gives the sensation of cold, even through the thickest covering: those, on the contrary, who have been used to go thinly clothed, can bear the variation of some degrees without being sensible of it. Of this the hands and feet afford an instance in point; exciting the sensation of cold when applied to another part of the body, without having before given to the mind an impression of cold existing in them.”

Dr. Buchan next proceeds to advocate the use of the cold bath.

“The modern refinement of constructing houses so as, by means of double doors and windows, almost wholly to exclude the external air; the thick covering which we spread on the floors of our chambers; and the heating of them by close stoves, with narrow chimneys; are in direct opposition to the doctrine I am now endeavouring to inculcate. But is disease less frequent? Is catarrh more rare, or consumption less fatal? In vain do the delicate accumulate defences against the vicissitudes of external temperature.



Those who never tread but on carpets, and take every precaution to prevent the breath of heaven from blowing on them, are more liable to be disordered by the impressions of cold than the laborious peasant, or the seaman daily exposed to the rage of storms and tempests. The occasional use of the cold bath, by inuring the body to a wider range of temperature, tends to diminish the danger of those sudden transitions from heat to cold, and the contrary; which in the common tenor of life it is impossible wholly to avoid. After having bathed in the sea during a few weeks in autumn, I have observed, with respect to myself, as well as in many other instances, that persons prone to catarrhal affections are much less susceptible of them during the ensuing winter. One general effect of the cold bath being unquestionably to induce a degree of what in common language is denominated hardiness, and which may be defined, that state of the living system which is least liable to be affected by disagreeable impressions."

\* \* \* "A frame so steel'd  
Dreads not the cough, nor those ungenial blasts  
That breathe the Teftian, or fell Rheumatism;  
The nerves so temper'd never quit their tone,  
No chronic languors haunt such hardy breasts."

But, beneficial as are the results of cold bathing, it should not be indiscriminately prescribed. I have somewhere seen it said that every one would be the better for a cold plunge or a cold ablution every morning. Such advice is very erroneous, and if generally adopted, would in many cases be attended with mischievous consequences. The shock attendant on the cold plunge might prove fatal in many cases, especially where there is an apoplectic tendency. The use of the cold bath is likewise improper in those cases in which there is deficient vital energy. In many cases friction in the shallow tepid bath is indicated, and in others wet sheet friction is decidedly preferable to either the cold or the tepid bath. The following judicious observations occur in Sir Arthur Clarke's *Essay on Bathing*:

"The warm glow or increase of animal heat, which so generally follows the sensation of cold, experienced on the sudden application of the cold bath, is to be ascribed to the reaction of the system, which enables it to resist an external impression by which it might be injured: this reaction is in proportion to the intensity of the cause by which it is excited, and to the vigour of the vital powers, of which it constitutes a peculiar effort. It is this reaction of the



## OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

system which enables the body to derive advantage from the application of the cold bath; and where the reaction does not take place, or takes place only in a small degree, the cold bath has been injudiciously employed: hence, where the system has been debilitated by long-continued exertion or disease, the cold bath should be avoided; and when after the use of the cold bath a person feels heavy, inactive, or chilly, or finds himself affected with headach, or tightness across the chest, it is evident it does not agree with him, or that he has continued it for too long a time."

Dr. Buchan would permit the wearing of flannel next the skin in some few cases, but in general he disapproves of its use; later experience shows that in every case it may be dispensed with. He draws a just distinction between sweating and perspiration:—

"A free perspiration is too often confounded with sweating. The former, however, is always to be considered as a proof of vigorous health, whereas the latter is generally a symptom of debility. It is commonly observed that weak people are most prone to sweat. The inordinate increase of this secretion, as of any other, tends to debilitate. If exercise be carried so far as to excite sweat, it will be followed by an adequate degree of fatigue."

In another place he remarks, "A healthy state of the skin, as of every other organ of the living body, consists in the power of carrying on its functions with regularity, independent of the influence of any extraordinary stimulant. If the body be constantly surrounded by a medium of high temperature, either from living in a warm climate or by wearing clothes which are very imperfect conductors of heat, the insensible perspiration will be checked by the smallest diminution of that temperature." And elsewhere he says,—"It is necessary to understand, that the perishable matter does not exude through the pores of the skin in proportion as they are relaxed by heat, as water might be supposed to transude the pores of leather. Perspiration is to be considered as an active function, in like manner as any other secretion of the living body." He further says,—“Besides the debility that flannel worn next the skin occasions, by increasing the secretion of sweat, it probably tends also to weaken by other means. The incessant irritation of the numerous points of which its rough surface is composed, and which always occasions uneasiness on the first adoption of flannel, only ceases to be perceived in consequence of the skin losing part of its sensibility; and this, like every other incessant irritation, must tend to



## OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

accelerate the approach of old age. Of this effect the pale and sickly appearance of a person accustomed to be too warmly clothed, which differs as far from the hue of health as the sickly delicacy of the hot-house plant is distant from the vigour of the forest oak, affords proof almost sufficient. Lord Bacon says, '*Vestes nimiae sive in lectis, sive portatae, corpus solvunt.*'

"The sensations of increased warmth and comfort experienced on first wearing flannel in immediate contact with the skin, constitutes one source of deception with regard to its ultimate effects. To the living body every new stimulus is for a time agreeable. A person not habituated to the use of fermented liquor thinks himself warmed and invigorated by swallowing a glass of distilled spirits: but how frequently do such fallacious sensations allure unhappy victims to the repetition of these Circean cups, till irremediable debility ensues, and men are indeed transformed into very beasts! People in the habit of taking purgative medicines soon find that the bowels will not perform their functions without them; but that would not be a good reason for saying that such people were more healthy than others, or for recommending the daily use of an aloetic pill to preserve health. The habitual use of flannel garments, by accustoming the exhaling vessels to perform their functions in a certain high temperature, in like manner diminishes their natural energy, and renders them liable to become torpid by the slightest abstraction of their usual warmth; and thus gives rise to colds, rheumatism, and other complaints arising from checked perspiration, which much clothing is commonly, but erroneously, supposed to prevent. Dr. Cheyne, who was certainly well acquainted with the maladies of the feeble and delicate, asserts 'that much clothing debilitates the habit, and weakens the strength; and that the custom of wearing flannel is almost as bad as a diabetes.'"

Dr. Buchan further fortifies his opinions by quoting from Dr. Trotter as follows:—

"After being much weakened by West India sickness, I had recourse to flannel next the skin; but in cold weather I now find more advantage from wearing it over the shirt, and think that I have fewer attacks of catarrh in variable weather, from this and the custom of general ablution.

"Although I was at one time a great advocate for flannel next the skin, I am now rather disposed to wear it over the linen, and to



## OBSERVATIONS ON CATARRHAL AFFECTIONS.

recommend daily ablution of the whole body, to inure it to the weather."

"Flannel worn next the skin has been cried up by many, in the treatment of stomach complaints, from the sympathy that is said to exist between that organ and the skin. I think better effects are to be derived from the daily ablution of the surface of the body. The one practice is to soften the skin, and render it too delicate; whereas the other tends to fortify it against the rigours and changes of season, and, by preserving it pure and pervious; promotes the extraneous discharge. Those who wish to try this practice of washing the whole body every morning with resolution and perseverance, will soon find reason to make them continue it for life."

The foregoing extracts contain a very forcible condemnation of the habit of coddling the body with intent to preserve it in health; but the folly of running into the other extreme, as some persons do, is equally to be condemned. I am no advocate for a man's shivering with cold all the day long; neither do I think that he should try to make his body "all face." Each one should wear that amount of clothing which, with proper exercise, would ensure a healthy circulation and a comfortable feeling of warmth. When the skin is corrugated with cold it can no more properly discharge its functions than it can when it is irritated and weakened by superfluous clothing.

Trusting to your kindness to excuse the length to which I have trespassed on your space,

I am, dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

Camberwell, March 15th, 1848.

JOHN GIBBS.







## A CASE OF WHITE SWELLING.

## A CASE OF WHITE SWELLING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have heard even friends of the water cure express doubts of its efficacy in the treatment of white swelling. For the benefit of such unbelievers I transcribe the case at foot from a letter which I received from the mother of the youthful patient. I had permission to dress it up for the press, but I have refrained from taking any liberties with it, thinking that when such cases are unadorned they are "adorned the most."

The enemies of the system frequently assert that it cures only imaginary diseases; how many would rejoice if it could be proved that white swelling properly came under this category!

From the details of this case it appears that, by the advice of Priessnitz, an operation was performed by the late very eminent surgeon, Dieffenbach; and this affords occasion to observe that Dieffenbach several times remarked, that patients sent to him from water cure establishments were in a healthier condition for the knife than others, and more speedily recovered from the effects of an operation.

I am, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

March 17, 1848.

"Until the age of four years my daughter was perfectly healthy, when, at the commencement of winter, she was attacked by cough and wheezing on her chest, which gave the idea that her lungs were affected. Leeches were applied and medicine given with little effect. She continued to look very ill, and became extremely peevish and inactive. In the spring



53

A CASE OF WHITE SWELLING.

she was suddenly seized by a pain in her left knee, which rendered her quite lame. The complaint was pronounced to be white swelling; one of our first surgeons assured me the attack was of a most acute nature, the joint of the knee being considerably enlarged, and the suffering very great. By steam baths and leeching the inflammation was in some degree subdued, and mercury was used in various ways, internally and externally. In a week or ten days the violent pain subsided, but she could not bear the limb to be moved in the slightest manner. In that state the child continued for eighteen months, during which she had three acute attacks similar to the first, which were got under in the same manner; each time the limb became more contracted, and the constitution evidently sinking, although wine, porter, and fresh meat, &c. &c., were allowed, in order to keep up her strength, but it did not succeed. She was at the sea-side for the benefit of the bathing, which appeared to strengthen her more than anything else, when I learned something of the water system from Captain Claridge's book, and subsequently from himself. At first, I must confess, I was rather startled at the idea of trying such an experiment on my child, but, as everything else had failed, I made up my mind to go to Græfenberg and put her into the hands of Mr. Priessnitz. In the beginning of September he commenced with her, giving her at first two packings up and tepid bath, and one knee bath during the day, and compresses on the knee and body. He desired that she should have crutches, and try to move about as much as she could without hurting herself. She continued the same treatment during the ensuing winter, during which she had a constant rash on her entire leg, and subsequently several gatherings on and round the knee, none on any other part of her body. In spring she commenced the cold bath after the packing up, and the douche bath. Her strength increased rapidly, her looks became quite healthy, and her appetite excellent. The appearance of the knee was very variable until the end of the summer, when it diminished considerably in size, and she could bear to have it moved without any annoyance; but about Christmas it became suddenly nearly as bad as ever it had been. All cure was then stopped,



56  
*Case of general debility.*

except one packing up and tepid bath, and the knee compresses were changed every quarter of an hour. The inflammation and pain were soon got under, but she continued the slight cure until the spring, when she commenced the packing up and cold bathing twice a day—douche bath twice and knee bath twice, with rubbing with the wet hand, and compresses changed every operation. During this summer she made a wonderful improvement, and the limb became so strong that she could bear to have it pulled so as to drag her about by it. Mr. Priessnitz said he thought the child was now quite free from *all disease*, and that I might have an operation performed to straighten the limb, in which opinion several English medical men quite agreed with him. I then took her to Berlin, having been two years at Gräfenberg; the leg was made quite straight by Dr. Dieffenbach, and since then the child enjoys perfect health,\* being quite strong on her limbs, though still somewhat lame. She continues the use of the cold bath and douche every day. It is generally thought that she will outgrow the lameness. I forgot to mention that from the time the knee was attacked the chest and cough quite recovered."

CASE OF GENERAL DEBILITY, WITH GOUTY  
DIATHESIS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—An opinion that cases of debility are not suited to the hydropathic treatment, has been carefully fostered by many medical practitioners; as an illustration, I may mention that a delicate lady, who was advised by a relative to proceed to Gräfenberg, was strongly recommended by her medical attendant to continue first for another year under allopathic treatment, in order that her strength might be sufficiently recruited to undergo the water



cure, from which she might then hope to derive some benefit. She took the advice of her relative, and derived the "benefit" without the year's preparation. However, the opinion alluded to derives no countenance from the subjoined statement, which I have just received from the gentleman whose case it details.

It will be seen that the patient had some water boils on his second visit to Græfenberg, and, as it has been objected that these boils arise either from the action of water on an irritable skin, or from the coarseness of the diet at Græfenberg, it may not be improper to observe that in this case the patient had not an irritable skin, and that he resided in private lodgings, and lived on plain English fare.

In conclusion, I would say that I do not think that five months can be held to be a very long time to surrender in exchange for the recovery of health, and that I cannot but regard a continuance for thirty months of the benefit derived as affording a very fair test of its permanency.

I am, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

Camberwell, April 27, 1848.

"Having resided in India upwards of thirty years, and during the latter part of my sojourn there, in consequence of repeated severe attacks of fever, my health having very much suffered, I was obliged to return to England for its recovery. A few months after my arrival in London, I determined to visit Græfenberg with a brother officer, who had recommended me to try the water cure under Vincent Priessnitz. Accordingly, I proceeded thither in August, 1844, and arrived there the latter end of that month, and immediately commenced operations. My ailment was characterised by general debility, with slight swellings in the joints of my fingers and gouty symptoms in my feet, the balls of which were a little enlarged and inflamed. The following treatment was prescribed by Priessnitz:—A leintuch (wet-sheet packing) for about an hour, about day break, followed by a tepid bath (about 65 deg. Fahr.) On entering the bath, twelve small pails of water (about three or four quarts each) were thrown over me; I was then hand-rubbed in the bath for five minutes, and then twelve more pails of water were thrown over me. I then got out, and



## GENERAL DEBILITY, WITH GOUTY DIATHESIS.

was immediately well rubbed in a dry sheet: afterwards I walked out for about two hours. At eleven a.m., I took an *abreibung* (wring-out sheet friction) for five minutes, followed by dry friction; and then a *sitz bath* (shallow hip bath) for a quarter of an hour, and again took exercise till about one p.m. In the afternoon, about five o'clock, I repeated the *abreibung* and *sitz-bath* as in the forenoon. Day and night I wore an *umschlag* (heating bandage) round the abdomen. I continued the foregoing treatment till the end of October, when I returned to England. I must add that, while under treatment I drank nine or ten glasses of water daily. I had no boils, but in about six weeks from the commencement of the treatment a rash appeared under the bandage on my abdomen. On the whole, I found myself very much better, and my strength greatly improved.

"In the year 1845, I returned to Græfenberg, and recommenced the cure on the 10th of July, continuing it till the end of October. In consequence of my improved state of health, my treatment varied from that on my first visit, and was as follows:—At half-past four a.m., I was packed for an hour, and took a cold bath, (for the first two days I took a tepid bath;) after the bath I walked for a couple of hours; at 10 a.m., I took the *douche*, commencing with it for two minutes, and after some time gradually increasing it to four minutes; after the *douche* I walked till half-past eleven a.m., when I took an *abreibung* for five minutes, and, after hard dry rubbing, a *sitz-bath* for fifteen minutes; I then took exercise till one o'clock p.m., after which I dined. At five p.m. I repeated the *abreibung* and *sitz-bath* as in the forenoon: the swellings of my finger joints still continuing, I wore heating bandages by night from my wrists to my elbows; I also wore them from my knees to my ankles; they had an excellent effect. I took twelve glasses of water daily, until a crisis of boils appeared on my wrists and legs, when, not being able to take so much, I diminished the quantity to ten glasses. Prior to the boils, a copious rash appeared on the abdomen, under the heating bandage, which I wore day and night while under treatment. My general health improved wonderfully,



THE WATER CURE IN ERYSIPELAS.

and my strength increased ; I also gained flesh hard and good, and the swellings at my fingers and joints entirely disappeared, and have not returned, although about two years and a half have elapsed since I last left Græfenberg. I consider the treatment to have been of the greatest benefit to me. My general health is excellent, and with pure drinking water I can now undergo more fatigue than I could were I to take wine, to the use of which I am now perfectly indifferent, although accustomed to take it moderately from my youth.

I should not omit to state that I was salivated during the severest illness which I had in India, and which was the immediate cause of my return to England, and I am of opinion that the water cure completely relieved me from the bad effects of the previous treatment, and also expelled from my system the large quantities of medicine which I had taken. Since my return from Græfenberg, I take a cold sponge bath every morning from head to foot, continuing it throughout the winter, however cold it may be; and for the last four years I have left off wearing a flannel jacket, to which I had been accustomed for nearly forty years, and as a consequence I feel increased comfort and decided benefit.

THE WATER CURE IN ERYSIPELAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

SIR,—It will no doubt be interesting to you, as well as to such of your readers as desire information as to the efficacy of the water cure in cases of erysipelas, to know that in a recent instance it has proved eminently successful. I must premise to you that I came to this establishment about two months since, not as a



The Water cure in Erysipelas.

patient, but with a member of my family suffering from rheumatic gout; and her case, as well as that of others in which I had witnessed the beneficial results of the system, gave me such confidence in its virtues that I had no hesitation in making choice for myself between the water treatment and *l'ancienne methode*.

I am in my sixtieth year, and usually enjoy ordinary good health, although occasionally subject to slight feverish attacks. I felt the approach of one of these on the morning of Saturday, the 22nd ult., and upon awaking, it was accompanied by a pain and slight inflammation in the nose, between the eyes; but not thinking it of much importance, I continued my usual avocations during the day. In the evening, however, I found my fever increasing, a disposition to shiver, and the inflammation spreading over the forehead, attended with much pulsation in the temples, and considerable painful irritation. I had recourse at eight p.m. to ~~Dr. Gibbs~~, the medical superintendent of the water treatment here, and under his directions I had three abreibungen, which immediately checked the shivering; a wet waist bandage, one round the forehead and face, and some draughts of cold water, ended the treatment for this night, which I passed comfortably and tranquilly, without experiencing any of that restlessness and excitement which I have usually hitherto had in fever.

On the following morning (Sunday, the 23rd) the pulse was about 96; the erysipelas (for such ~~Dr. Gibbs~~ had pronounced it on the previous evening) had spread, closing very nearly both eyes, and extending over both cheeks and the centre part of the forehead; it was red, swollen, and tense, and vesicles soon formed. I was packed twice consecutively for twenty minutes each time, and had a tepid half-bath, (18 Reaumer,) in which I was well rubbed by two persons for five minutes, dried, and replaced in my bed, where I remained all day, drinking occasionally moderately of cold water, and renewing the compresses on the waist, head, and face, as often as necessary to prevent their becoming dry. The same treatment was repeated at noon, and in the evening of this day (Sunday.) I had no appetite or desire to eat, but no thirst; the pulse during the day and up to ten p.m. averaged 90; it had been at times as high as 106. I passed, nevertheless, a comfortable night, tranquil but not heavy sleep, and upon awaking on Monday morning, the 24th, my fever had disappeared, pulse was soft, and down to 70; the erysipelas had, however, still increased, and had come out as thoroughly as could be desired. ~~Dr. Gibbs~~

(wet-  
sheet-  
frictions)

been

in the  
wet sheet

It was



*now/ these/* announced that an abreibung and a sitz-bath, (18 Reaumer,) to be repeated at noon and in the evening, unless present symptoms should change for the worse, ~~was~~ all that I should ~~now~~ require, and ~~his~~ directions were followed. In the evening I had a slight headache, which was instantly removed by taking an enema of water (18 Reaumer) after my last sitz-bath. I had this day a fair appetite, and felt in every respect so well that I could have got up and walked about, &c., but that it would have been inconvenient, as I was obliged to wear and renew so frequently the compresses on the face and eyes. The same treatment (viz., abreibung and sitz-bath three times a day, with compresses on the face and waist,) was continued on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the 25th, 26th, and 27th. I felt on the last-mentioned day in every respect, (save as to the inconvenience arising from the erysipelas, which was gradually disappearing under the continued application of the compresses,) quite well, appetite good, no diminution of strength, excellent nights, and good digestion. On Friday evening, the 28th, I took a carriage drive of ten miles, face still bandaged. On Saturday and Sunday evenings I walked a couple of miles; and on Monday the 31st, the erysipelas had so far disappeared that I was able to remove the compresses from the face, and to dine at the public table, doing ample justice to the first animal food I had taken since the 22nd.

*were/ further/*

Having now detailed the plain facts of my case, I shall intrude no farther on your time and space than to make one or two observations as to my own feelings under this water treatment, as compared with what they have been under and after the ordinary allopathic remedies for fever. In the former I have felt neither restlessness, irritable anxiety, diminution of strength or spirits; whilst the very contrary in an aggravated form have uniformly followed the latter treatment. I should have said that one spot upon the left cheek, which had not been covered sufficiently by the compress, remained hard and rather inflamed after the other parts of the face were freed from erysipelas; but it soon yielded to bathing with tepid water three or four times a day, and by wearing a small compress on the spot at night, and occasionally in the day. I am thankful to say that the whole face and skin are now restored to their usual appearance and tone, save a very slight remaining discolouration.

I cannot conclude without expressing the high sense I entertain of Dr. Gibbs's prompt and discriminating talent in the application



## CASE OF VARICOSE VEINS.

of the single but powerful element which ~~in his hands~~ I have seen during my stay here produce such signal benefit to others, and to which in my own case I owe, under Providence, the rapid cure of that which under other circumstances would probably have produced a long and painful confinement.

I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

R. H. S.

*Chartreuse de* ~~Chartreuse de~~ Pesio, ~~Chartreuse de~~  
August 2nd, 1848.

## CASE OF VARICOSE VEINS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—If you concur with me in thinking that the following case, which I have recently received from the patient, is not without practical value, you will oblige me by giving it a place in the *Water Cure Journal*. The patient is now in her twentieth year, tall, fair, and robust; and it is about two years and four months since she left Græfenberg.

Ever yours very faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

*de* ~~Chartreuse de~~ Pesio, ~~Chartreuse de~~  
September 11th, 1848.

Deep distress of mind was attended simultaneously with a too frequent recurrence of menstruation, and a swelling of the vein in the right foot, accompanied with pains in the back, cramps in the chest, and fits of weakness and giddiness, when I sometimes fell down. I tried the hydropathic treatment at two different establishments, but apparently without benefit, probably owing to the state of my mind. Pressure was tried on the vein, but it sent the blood to my head, making the feet as cold as ice. A bad attack was followed by greater weakness, and also by dilatation of the veins in the arms, and from the abdomen to the thigh. Priessnitz having been written to, replied by encouraging me to go to Græfenberg, and he prescribed preparatory treatment to be followed in the interim.

I arrived at Græfenberg on the 15th of May, 1845, and next day commenced the following treatment:—At 5 in the morning the packing-sheet for nearly an hour, followed by the shallow tepid bath for five minutes, the cold plunge for one



CASE OF VARICOSE VEINS.

minute, the shallow-bath repeated for three minutes, and the cold plunge again for one minute. At 11 a.m. the wrung-out-sheet-friction and sitz-bath for a quarter of an hour, during which time the right leg was continually rubbed with a wet cloth. At 4 p.m. the morning treatment was repeated; I only continued the use of the shallow-tepid bath for a few days. I took ten glasses of water daily, and wore compresses day and night round the waist, and from the toe to the ankle, and additional compresses at night to above the knee, and from the shoulder to the wrist. Up to the 9th of June, there was a general increase of strength, but no particular change. On this date I commenced the general douche at 10 a.m. for 5 minutes, and two foot-douches, one before dinner, the other before supper; and a few days later I commenced a second general douche in the afternoon also for five minutes.

On the 7th of July a crisis commenced on the right leg; the only change of treatment was the application by day to the knees of large compresses, which were frequently changed. This crisis commenced with a painful swelling about the right foot and ankle, which rapidly extended up to the knee, and was soon attended with an eruption; the pain was very great, and it was dreadful to move. July 29th, the right leg better, though far from well, and but little reduced in size. Swelling and eruption commenced in the left leg. August 23rd, able to walk a little; afternoon douche dispensed with, and also the compresses to the arm, as the veins therein had contracted. About this time an eminent allopathic physician, who had seen the case, wrote to my father as follows:—

“ The disease with which Miss — is afflicted, we call vari-  
It consists in a dilatation of the veins, which become elongated and form tortuous swellings. It seldom appears in the extremities before maturity, but may occur in other situations at a much more early age. The most judicious treatment is to remedy its bad consequences, and adopt means to prevent their recurrence. A radical cure may be effected, if it be confined to one vein, the saphora for instance, by an operation; but in your daughter's case it would be madness to think of such a thing. The disease being general, the best medical treatment for her is iron in com-

sc/



CASE OF VARICOSE VEINS.

bination with aloes, and sulphate of iron baths; but this would not effect a radical cure, nor do I know of anything that would, except these waters, (Caphern.) I fear the long continued application of cold has produced the disease we call phlegmasia doloris, but I should hope it is only temporary, and when the practice is discontinued it may pass away—it consists in a painful œdema of the lower extremity. You say the femoral veins enlarged during the treatment—in what state were the iliac? and the internal pelvic and abdominal, were they not enlarged also, think you? and who could apply pressure to remove their calibre? The effect of the long continued use of cold water seems to be to induce inflammation, which terminates in one of its accustomed five ways, depending on the length of time it is applied, and perhaps also on the manner and degree of vitality of the patient. If Miss — be really and radically cured by cold water, then will I become a convert. I hope your next will give me a much better account; but pray do not look for a cure from cold water—it would indeed be a miracle, but one tediously and painfully wrought. My kindest regards to the long and patient sufferer."

September the 14th. The afternoon douche was resumed; the packing-sheet both in the morning and in the afternoon was changed to two consecutive ones each time—the first for a quarter of an hour, the second for twenty minutes.

October the 29th. The treatment was reduced to two packing sheets, and cold baths morning and evening; douche at 11 a.m., and footbath for a quarter of an hour in the morning. Improvement was gradual.

January the 30th. The afternoon treatment was changed to a wrung-out sheet friction and sitz-bath, and wrung-out sheet friction and foot-bath on alternate days. Shortly after I left off the the morning foot-bath. Improvement still gradual.

February the 11th. One sheet packing and cold bath in the morning, and foot-bath in the afternoon. I left off the waist compress, which had never produced any eruption. For some time the veins continued to dilate, and then began gradually to contract. When I commenced the treatment the vein in the right foot was not bigger than a large pea, it dilated upwards to the extent of an inch and a half. The irregularity in the menstruation discontinued long before the







*Chronic*

# CURSORY REMARKS ON CONSTIPATION.

"The drugging system has reached such a pitch as to merit the reprobation of every man who wishes well to humanity."—Dr. JAMES WILSON.

"It would seem as if people lived to have stools, and not had stools to live."—Dr. GULLY.

"It is one of the most formidable difficulties with which the ordinary physician has to contend, that nearly all his remedies reach the point to which they are directed through one channel. If the brain requires to be placed under the influence of a sedative or a stimulant, if the muscular system demands invigorating by tonics, if the functions of organic life need correction by alteratives, the physician has no means of attaining his object, except by inundating the stomach and bowels with foreign, and frequently to them pernicious substances."—Dr. FORBES.

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

MY DEAR SIR,—For several months it has been my intention to resume my pen (such as it is) for the *Water Cure Journal*, but circumstances did not leave me time; now, however, I am able to snatch a few occasional moments to execute my intention. It may be affirmed, that amongst the numerous errors which generally obtain with the mass of mankind in medical matters, there are few which have produced more mischief than the prevalent opinions, that in the case of everybody alike it is essential to health that the bowels should be relieved daily and at any cost, and that the evacuations should be of a certain consistence and colour. The origin of these errors has been traced, and their falsity and evil results have been well exposed, in a little pamphlet published some ten years ago in Dublin, and entitled, *A Dialogue between a Bilious Patient and a Physician*, by James Henry, M.D. It would occupy too much of your space to follow Dr. Henry throughout the entire line of his argument; it may be sufficient to say that he ably demolishes the errors alluded to, and that, having substituted in their place some plain truths evidently in accordance with the principles of an enlightened physiology, the teachings of experience, and the dictates of common sense, he next proceeds to lay down some rules, which, *as far as they go*, are eminently in accordance with the principles and the practice of hydropathy.

Dr. Henry maintains, that "all medicines, and particularly all opening medicines, lose their power by use," and also that purgatives



Chronic

CURSORY REMARKS ON CONSTIPATION.

debilitate; he says, "They are much employed by the physician for the express purpose of inducing debility in diseases in which a reduction of strength is desirable, and are next to blood-letting, the most powerful means which he possesses for the attainment of that object;" and they "disturb the nervous system and lower the vital energy." After enumerating various other ill results, he thus addresses a patient: "To all these evil consequences of the use of purgatives, there is yet to be added that inconvenience which you have just now so sensitively deplored, and in order to find a remedy, for which you have this day sought my advice; I mean the increased confinement of the bowels which always follows the operation of an opening medicine." Dr. Henry has no faith whatever in the use of drugs in the treatment of constipation, and maintains that a restoration to health is only to be found in a system embracing attention to air, exercise, and moderation in eating. It is to be observed, that these are the opinions of a practitioner of the old school, and were published long before hydropathy was even named amongst us, and it should be added, that although Dr. Henry has evinced that he had caught many glimpses of the truth, yet he nowhere in his pamphlet betrays any knowledge of the vast power which the various applications of water, when judiciously exhibited, have in the cure of that disease of which he treats. Yet medical literature affords some few examples of the efficacy of water in overcoming constipation; one of the most remarkable is recorded in *Kite's Medical Essays*, published in 1795; the following is an abstract:

"D. D., of a strong, robust constitution, 48 years old, enjoyed a good state of health until he was seized with an irregular intermittent while an inmate of a workhouse, from which period he dated the origin of his disease. He was in the habit of taking strong purgatives, from Oct. 1785 to March 1786, when they ceased to act.

"Every remedy except quicksilver had now been employed, from which I could suggest the most distant probability of success, and the writings of the most eminent of the ancient as well as modern practitioners were in vain ransacked for new remedies. To those which I had used an unprejudiced trial had been given. In particular, a liberal and almost unrestrained use had been made of the strongest purgatives, opium, ether, injections of every kind, (amounting in number altogether to fifty,) electricity, the warm bath, applications of cold water, remedies so justly extolled, and so much

chronic



*Remarks on Febrile Affection.*

relied on in the advanced stage of these complaints, but without the least success.

"When I saw him on the fifteenth day of the disease, I found him in the following state:—The bowels continued obstinately constipated; the belly was hard, and immediately below the navel it was swelled irregularly; the pain was violent, but tensive, at times remitting and increasing much on pressure; the vomiting frequent, sometimes of a slimy matter, at others stercoraceous, having both the appearance and smell of liquid stools. The pulse was soft, weak, and irregular; the tongue was brown, but moist; the eyes sunk in the sockets, dull, and heavy; the breathing short, frequent, and attended with constant motion of the nostrils; the hiccup was frequent and harassing; his appetite and sleep had almost forsaken him; he had often a subsultus, sometimes a tendency to delirium; and his urine was scantily secreted, and frequently voided with some pain, depositing a copious brown sediment on standing.

"The patient had hitherto sustained his complaint with great fortitude and resolution, and had suffered every plan to be put in execution with singular patience; but having now become sensible of his extreme danger, he was anxious and dejected; despair was settled on his countenance, and he requested that he might be permitted to die peaceably. This was his situation, and so dreadful did it appear, that an alteration for the better scarce entered my mind.

"I join those in opinion who think it better, in desperate cases, to have recourse to doubtful or even dangerous remedies, than suffer the patient to be lost without making use of any means to save him. Were we to observe this as an invariable rule, were we never to relinquish our attempts till they can no longer be employed, it would, I am confident, be productive of many extraordinary recoveries. Every practitioner who is guided by these sentiments, can doubtless bring to mind several instances, wherein his apparently vain and fruitless perseverance has been crowned with most unexpected success. The termination, however, of the present case is so decidedly in point, that it is unnecessary to adduce any further proof in support of it."

In the course of his remarks, our author states, that while cold applications gave relief, the patient suffered greater pain "than usual" in the warm bath: and then he proceeds,



69

## Remarks on Constipation.

"As he was now too weak to be removed into the washhouse, he was supported, sitting on the side of the bed, with his feet in a tub. In this situation two or three pails full of the coldest water were poured over his legs and thighs, so that his feet and ankles were of course constantly immersed in the liquid. This operation was perpetually repeated for the space of ten minutes, when he was so much affected by the intense cold, that I judged it prudent to desist. He was wiped dry and put to bed. Within the half hour, being then pretty well recovered, a pint and a half of cold water was injected by clyster, and almost immediately after wet napkins were applied cold to the whole abdomen, and renewed as soon as they became in the least warm. The effect of this treatment was so strongly marked that it was really astonishing, for in a few minutes he had a profuse evacuation of uncommonly hard and large fæces, and this was followed by several thinner ones. He was now comparatively easy; the swelling and hardness of the belly was considerably abated; he had no further return of the vomiting or hiccup, and there was every appearance of speedy recovery."

Strange to say, the author had again recourse to drugs; was obliged to repeat the bathings; still persisted in the use of drugs, a third time was obliged to return to water, but persisted in making drugs have a share in the cure. He overcame the constipation, but in three weeks after his patient got ascites, (probably in consequence of the immense quantities of purgatives which he had taken,) and he died of the disease in nine months, during which time he had no return of the constipation.

So it has been with all the elder advocates for the medical use of water—they generally have had recourse to it only in extreme cases, and as soon as improvement became manifest they have almost invariably returned again to active drug treatment: thus marring with one hand the work of the other, and not one of them ever thought of framing a rational system from the *dissecta membra* supplied by occasional individual experience. It was reserved for our own day, and for Priessnitz, to arrange the straggling materials into the basis of a new science—to reject the absurdities of his predecessors and to supply their deficiencies.

Numerous cases could be quoted from various medical writers, and I could add many others from my own experience, in proof that the water cure, with its accessories, has been effectual in the treat-



70

## Remarks on Constipation.

ment of many cases of constipation, in which all other remedies had proved ineffectual. There is no system which so bountifully provides the means of stimulating deficient or controlling inordinate functional action. Cavillers, who dispute facts, because they do not square with their preconceived notions, only deserve to be answered with the following anecdote from Baynard: "Here a demibrained doctor, of more note than *nous*, asked in the amazed agony of his half understanding, how 'twas possible that an external application should affect the bowels, and cure pain within? 'Why, doctor,' quoth an old woman standing by, 'by the same reason that, being wetshod, or catching cold from without, should give you the gripes or pain within.'"

There is generally too much refinement in classifying diseases, which might be pushed to an extreme length—there being no two cases exactly alike; nevertheless, some discrimination is necessary. In this paper I can only lay down some general rules, premising that, in their application to individual cases, there are two things to be particularly borne in mind—namely, the reactive power of the patient and the cause of the disease, whether originating in an over-worked brain, an inactive skin, or a deranged mucous membrane. From this it follows, that the treatment should be constitutional and particular—that is, such as may be applicable to the particular disease to be treated, and such as may be applicable to the entire state of health and to the vitality of the patient: attention being given to avoid those applications which may be contra-indicated—a subject too wide to enter upon at present. Further, practically speaking, the treatment should be both general and local; that is, such as should be applied to the entire system, and such as should be applied to some particular organ or organs: and, in determining the amount of treatment, reference should be had to *local* as well as to *general* reaction: for experience shows that there are inequalities of reaction in the same body, in like manner as there are inequalities of circulation or of nervous power.

At the commencement, except in urgent acute cases, the treatment should be gentle;—it is possible to be cautious, yet confident, without being hesitating and violent. The wet sheet friction immediately preceding and combined with the sitzbath, forms a process applicable to every case of constipation: and it may be held as a general rule, that whenever, from other causes, this treatment is inadmissible, the



41

## *Remarks on Constipation.*

case is beyond the reach of the water cure. Active friction should be employed in the sitzbath, which should be tepid or cold, as indicated by the general state of the patient: it should, at all events, be tepid when there are bleeding piles, especially if the system be loaded with impurities.

The wet sheet friction tends to restore tone to the minute nerves and blood vessels, as well as to the excretory glands of the skin, and should always be followed by the dry sheet friction. When the skin is hot and dry, with no sense of chilliness, with adequate reaction and capability of taking exercise, the wet sheet packing is advisable, and it should be followed by the shallow tepid bath, or the cold plunge, or friction in one or more dripping sheets; or by tepid or cold affusion in a dry bath. But the sweating process, whether in the dry blanket, hot air, or vapour bath, is generally too severe, too disturbing, and too weakening in intestinal diseases, and should by all means be avoided where there is nervous debility or excitability, or where the brain is implicated. In the latter case head baths are mostly advisable, as are also foot baths for their derivative effect; especially when the feet suffer from cold. The heating compress round the abdomen should be worn day and night if possible, and a smaller compress should be worn round the head whenever there is abnormal heat of that part, especially in the sitzbath, or wet sheet packing; and in cases of piles a local compress



## Remarks on Constipation.

should likewise be worn. To all these the daily use of the douche may be added for its stimulating effect, if the patient's strength and reactive power, and the absence of any disease contraindicating its use will admit of it. When the douche or cold plunge are inadmissible, the substitution of the splash bath (or the affusion of one or more buckets full of cold or tepid water, the patient sitting in a dry bath) will often prove beneficial. *Hot* baths are generally highly injurious.

A drink of water should be taken immediately after each bath, or each combination of baths, to assist reaction, and at other times, especially in the morning, it should be drunk freely, care being taken, however, never to commit excess, which is indicated by a sense of weight and coldness in the stomach; and when there is irritation of this organ, it is often advisable to drink water that has stood for some time in the sun, or in a warm room. In chronic cases enemata should be sparingly and cautiously used; but when there is much tension, weight, or pain in the abdomen, or when there is headache or feverishness, then the use of enemata is admissible; on the other hand, they should often be promptly and freely used in acute cases. In such cases an enema of tepid water may be given at once, then the wet sheet friction, next the sitzbath, and immediately after the bath another enema. In many cases this operation will prove sufficient; but if it should be necessary to repeat the lavements, their temperature may be gradually lowered to cold.

The diet should be plain, excluding all spices and spirituous liquors. Bulk is necessary to *most* stomachs. By this I do not mean that an inordinate appetite should be indulged; on the contrary, it should be restrained; and where food is rejected by the stomach it is best to eat but little at a time and often. But I mean that the food should not wholly consist of such articles as are capable of assimilation. Too nutritious a diet is a frequent cause of indigestion in cases of delicate persons whose stomachs cannot provide a sufficiency of gastric juice, while bulk is necessary to stimulate the gastric secretion. From hence it follows, that the food should contain



73

*Remarks on Constipation.*

a certain portion of *debris*, for the removal of which nature provides, thus clearly showing that its presence is expected; and this debris is not without its use, for in its passage it unites with the secretions which are about being expelled from the body, and by their united bulk they form that stimulus to action which nature requires. It is a general advice to water cure patients, (and indeed to others,) not to drink much liquid, take any bath, use much exercise, or work the brain, for at least one hour after any meal, lest digestion should be interfered with; and this advice is good, as is likewise the reason assigned. Nevertheless, patients sometimes think that they discover an inconsistency, and they object that digestion lasts much longer than an hour, and they inquire why the prohibition should not extend to the whole time, or be entirely withdrawn? The answer is obvious, because it generally takes an hour, and seldom more than an hour, to secrete a sufficient quantity of gastric juice for the purposes of digestion.

Exercise, like bathing, is an alterative, and should never be neglected; it should be taken before every bath, (except the morning one,) and also after every bath. The patient should be as much as possible in the open air, (and air baths are often useful;) but as I have already said, he should not take much exercise for at least one hour after any meal, neither should he ever exercise to the point of fatigue, as the expenditure of nervous power does not leave sufficient for the purposes of digestion, and the slowness with which the blood obeys the stimulus of food to visit the stomach causes a deficiency of gastric juice—facts fully proved in the celebrated case of St. Martin, with which I presume most of my readers to be acquainted. Repose should also be taken for some time before a meal, and both immediately before and after a meal every kind of mental labour should be avoided. When the expulsive power (which is different from the excretory power) is weak, it is advisable to strengthen the abdominal muscles, by sawing or chopping wood, or rowing a boat, or any similar exercise. The clothing, especially of



74

## *Remarks on Constipation.*

the legs should be as light as convenient. When there is much accumulation of fœces, with want of expulsory power, it sometimes, but very rarely, becomes necessary to have recourse to mechanical means of removal.

Constipation is but rarely (except where there is inflammation) an idiopathic affection; and often there is but little accumulation of fœces. This occurs when there is a deficiency of blood making power in the system, when the skin is hard and dry, and in persons advanced in life. In such cases, and indeed, in every variety of the disease, some patients may go for two or three weeks without an evacuation, and without any ill results. Dr. Henry declares that he never knew inflammation result from constipation, and that wherever they were present together, inflammation was the cause and not the consequence; and Dr. Gully says, "I have known a full-blooded person go fifteen days without a fœcal evacuation, and without the smallest drawback of any kind from it; and after all he passed but little, the skin having been eminently active all the time." Sometimes, however, diarrhœa supervenes, and often proves highly beneficial. While it lasts all strong treatment should be given up, and but little exercise taken; long sitzbaths, or short ones more frequently repeated, preceded by the wet sheet friction should be used; if febrile heat, it may be advisable to pack in the wet sheet, and to follow the packing by the shallow tepid bath, or friction with a wet dripping sheet. The compress should be often changed, and the patient should drink freely; if the diarrhœa should prove obstinate or be attended with much pain, then enemata may be added.

Amongst the evils resulting from the use of purgatives may be particularised the sweeping away from the stomach of the mucus, provided as a protection against the action of the gastric juice and the reduction of the power of making blood. Dr. Henry sums up his objections as follows: "I have now shown you that your opinion, that it is necessary to good health that the stools should be brought by the aid of purgatives, to agree with a certain assumed standard, either



75

## Remarks on Constipation.

with respect to frequency, or colour, or consistence—is opposed, *first*, by your own experience of the utter futility of all attempts to render your bowels more regular by the aid of purgative medicines; *secondly*, by my medical experience of the same fact with respect to other persons; *thirdly*, by my medical experience that such attempts are not only futile, but ruinous to the health; *fourthly*, by my medical experience of the great variety that obtains in the stools of healthy persons, both with respect to their number, colour, and consistence, or if I may say so, by my medical experience of the non-existence of a fixed standard for the stools; *fifthly*, by the principles of physiology, which show that the stools of healthy persons must of necessity vary, and cannot by possibility be reduced to a fixed standard."

Before taking my leave of the subject, I cannot forbear quoting one or two passages from Andrew Combe's instructive work, "The Physiology of Digestion."

"It ought never to be forgotten, that the stomach is not an isolated organ, which can thrive or suffer without affecting or being affected by the state of the other vital organs. On the contrary, it is most closely connected by sympathy with the whole bodily frame, and disease can scarcely show itself in any part without the digestive organs speedily participating in the derangement; nor can the stomach itself become diseased without more or less disturbance of the general system. For these reasons, in seeking to secure the blessings of healthy digestion, we must not only give a preference to easily digestible over indigestible food, but also have constant regard to those circumstances which influence the stomach through its sympathy with the rest of the organization. We must ~~not~~ vary our regimen (using that word in its true and comprehensive sense, and not as embracing diet alone) according to age, constitution, and mode of life; and we must ~~also~~ so regulate our meals with respect to time, quantity, and other conditions, as at once to facilitate digestion and promote the health of the system at large. To enjoy a perfectly sound state of the digestive functions, the health of the muscular



## Remarks on Lungs & Pharynx.

system, for example, must be secured by adequate, but not excessive or ill-timed exercise ; because if this be neglected, little waste of tissues will occur, little appetite for food be felt, little gastric juice be secreted, and consequently little power of digestion be enjoyed. If, on the other hand, *too much* exercise be taken, muscular and nervous exhaustion will ensue, and extend equally to the stomach itself; and hence the frequency of indigestion after a full meal taken in a state of exhaustion. For a similar reason the health of the lungs must be promoted by full and free respiration in a pure and temperate atmosphere; because, without the fulfilment of this condition, healthy and well-constituted blood cannot be formed, and the functions of the stomach, in common with those of other organs, become impaired when it is deprived of a sufficiency of nourishing blood. The due action of the skin must also be secured by proper attention to bathing, cleanliness, and clothing; because otherwise the excretion of waste materials could not go on efficiently, and their retention in the system would affect both the blood and the general constitution, and thereby also impair the digestive powers. In like manner the health of the brain and nervous system must be secured by active and cheerful occupation of intellect and feeling, otherwise the tone of the stomach will become impaired, and its powers be proportionally reduced. All of these requisites are essential to the preservation of vigorous and healthy digestion, because the Creator has so linked together all the important organs, that no one can fail in its duty without injuring the rest and being injuriously acted upon by them in its turn."

In order to strengthen the abdominal and respiratory muscles when necessary, Dr. Combe recommends not only suitable exercise, but also the removal of "all impediments to free respiration, such as stays, waistbands, and belts." He insists much upon the observance of a proper diet, and he says, "If he (the physician) and the patient are satisfied with simply procuring relief, he has ready means at hand in any of the ordinary purgatives. But if a *cure* is their



## Remarks on Constipation.

object, they must go back to the root of the evil, and begin by restoring the digestive organs to health."

In the foregoing remarks, I have not pretended to indicate the *amount* of treatment in individual cases; this must be determined by practical experience, weighing the exigencies of the case and the reactive power of the patient. I have only endeavoured to indicate the *kind* of treatment, to serve as a basis of practice. The knowledge requisite for practice is not to be learned from books, but from experience, which can best be acquired by visiting a hydropathic establishment. The follies attributed to persons who, *without any practical experience*, presume to treat themselves, are scarcely credible. It is true that in a former paper I gave three cases of successful self-treatment, but it is to be remembered that in each case the patients had, at least, some share of practical experience, two of them having been previously treated at Gräfenberg, and the third at his own residence.

In conclusion, I shall only briefly notice a frequent objection; it is often said, "But if one once begins the water cure he must continue it for the rest of his life." This only receives a colour of truth from the fact that there are many patients incurable by the water cure, as well as by every other mode of treatment, who, induced by the alleviation which they receive from it, continue to practise it for years. But whatever force there may be in such an objection applies in a far greater degree to allopathic practice, as witness the thousands who go on from year to year swallowing, by eminent advice, every imaginable compound of nauseous drugs, and notwithstanding daily becoming worse. It is likewise true that many who *have* been cured, continue to observe some of the hygienic rules of the water cure and to practise one or more daily ablutions, either from choice, or for the sake of cleanliness, or as a preservative from disease, or from all three; for it is not pretended that because a person has been once cured by the water cure, he therefore derives from thence for ever after an immunity from disease. Allopathy often aims at patching up; the water cure aims at renovation; the latter ought to be a



# *Remarks on Constipation.*

more difficult task, and surely a longer time might be fairly claimed for its performance than should be conceded to the former. But very different is the case as it actually stands; add to this, (to determine the scale, if there be any hesitation between the two systems,) that it may be boldly asserted that if all acute cases were treated by the water cure, there would scarcely be left a chronic case for allopathy to glean. In confirmation of the opinions which I have advanced, I might quote from various excellent works by hydropathic physicians, but I have preferred confining myself chiefly to the admissions of the disciples of an adverse school.

I am, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

~~Chartreuse~~ Chartreuse de Pesio, June 28th, 1849.









Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a signature or a list of names, located at the bottom of the page.



# A few Facts.

## A FEW FACTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATER CURE JOURNAL.

DEAR SIR,—I inclose a portion of the breast of a shirt, curiously stained by sweat, thinking that if it be possible to give a coloured plate of it in the *Water Cure Journal*, it would possess some interest for your readers. I have seen many discolorations on sheets, bandages, &c., but none resembling the one I send you, nor containing a similar mixture of bright pink and dark coloured hues. The gentleman to whom the shirt belonged had been treated, more than two years ago, for an eruption on the skin, the origin of which was obscure, and the nature of which was matter of controversy among his medical advisers. He drank mineral waters; had administered to him pills, variously compounded, with preparations of mercury, opium, soda, potash, and gentian; took powders of sulphur and carbonate of magnesia, and had lotions prepared from belladonna. He had for years been accustomed to bathe himself every morning with warm water, but was recently persuaded by some friends of his and of the water cure, to substitute cold water instead. In other respects, too, he adopted the hydropathic rules, gave up wine, kept early hours, and took much exercise in a mountainous country. On two occasions, while on mountain excursions, he sweated freely; and when his shirt dried it presented, both times, similar appearances. The piece of shirt which I send you was stained on the second occasion. It may not be *mal-à-propos* to add, that recently a *scrofulous* water cure patient, after profuse sweating, also from active exercise, felt a peculiar roughness of the face; and, on arriving at home, scraped off nearly the quantity of a teaspoonful of crystallized salts.

Allow me to avail myself of this opportunity to record a few facts, which appear to me of more than ordinary interest. A lady, who had been for some weeks under active hydropathic treatment for gout, and who had had an attack of gravel many years before, was seized, shortly after her evening treatment, with violent pains,



## *A few Facts.*

denoting the presence of gravel: a tepid sitzbath, with active friction, gave instant relief. She passed a quantity of gravel in the bath, and continued for some days to pass more, with very little suffering, and that always mitigated by a repetition of the sitzbath, although many bits of the gravel had sharp uneven points, and were about the size of grape stones.

In a case of retention of urine, where the tepid sitzbath and the cold footbath each by itself had alike failed to afford relief; where it was not considered advisable to have recourse to the sweating process, and where there was a strong disinclination to the passing of a catheter—the tepid sitzbath and the cold footbath in combination—that is, the feet in cold water while the patient sat in tepid water, gave speedy relief.

It sometimes happens, I believe, that a patient is pronounced unfit for the water cure because he cannot at once undergo active treatment; when, if he were gently initiated, he might be led on to it by degrees. An instance in point is afforded in the case of a neuralgic patient, who had twice before tried the water cure, and each time had been obliged to abandon it. After the lapse of some months he wished to try it again. A wet sheet friction was applied, when he instantly lost all consciousness, the result of the shock. A perseverance in active friction in the sheet by two men restored him; but it became a question whether he had not better finally abandon all idea of taking the water cure. His own desire, and the wishes of several of his friends, were that he should endeavour to persevere; and, as he said that he felt the shock most when touched any where between the armpits and the hips, it was determined to gird him round with a *dry* towel, and to give him his wet sheet friction over it. This time he stood the shock without any unpleasant result. About an inch in breadth of the body compress was wrung out of tepid water, and then applied; and thus, from day to day, he was led on, until now he is able to wear the compress in the usual manner, and to take, without the protection of the dry towel, any requisite number of wet sheet frictions. He is nearly restored to health; and whereas formerly he was obliged to guard himself with the utmost care from atmospheric influences and changes, he can now enjoy life, and take his outdoor exercise in any weather.

As the subject of the hydropathic treatment of cattle is now exciting some interest, I seize this opportunity to give the particulars of a case of successful treatment which I witnessed when last in



81

# A few Facts.

Ireland, in the spring of 1848. Hundreds of head of cattle died of a disease, of which the leading symptoms were total loss of appetite, constipation, and violent pains in and swelling of the abdomen, until the skin became drum-tight. On a small farm one valuable cow died of this distemper, under the usual veterinary treatment, and in two or three days after another was seized with all the most dangerous symptoms. In a few hours she was swollen to an enormous size—the ordinary remedies were apparently useless—she was then well rubbed by four persons with wet wisps of straw, and then with dry wisps—a thick blanket was then wrung out of cold water, and bound round her body, with a dry one over it. As the swelling went down the outside blanket was tightened round the other, and in about two hours the swelling had quite disappeared, the animal ceased to moan, and appeared quite well, eating her food as usual. Afterwards, when the attendants attempted to remove the blankets, she began to moan; and, as she was a favourite cow, she was indulged by being permitted to wear it for some weeks. The steward on a neighbouring farm, on being told of this case, said that his master had pursued a similar mode of treatment; and that, although he had had several head of cattle ill, he had not lost one. In a case of rheumatic fever in a dog the water cure was equally successful. He was dipped quickly in cold water, and then enveloped in a dry blanket. A few repetitions of this treatment effected a cure.

As news from Gräfenberg is always interesting, I beg to state that I have learned that, notwithstanding the troubled state of the Continent in 1848, there were at Gräfenberg 857 patients, of whom four died.

Trusting that this *melange* of facts may not be uninteresting or uninteresting to your readers,

I am, dear Sir,

Yours very truly,

JOHN GIBBS.

Chartreuse de Pesio, October 4, 1849.

---



62

## AIDS TO THE TAXIS IN HERNIA.

(To the Editor of the *Water Cure Journal*.)

Dear Sir,—It is now almost universally admitted that water has many therapeutic properties, its possession of which was once denied; and its powers, varied modes of application, and the indications for its use, in many diseases, are now well ascertained. In the treatment of fever, for instance, its efficacy is indisputable, when it is properly applied, and the mode of exhibiting it is so clearly indicated that it is almost impossible to err. But there are other diseased conditions in which the propriety of employing it is more than doubtful, and others still in which its efficacy and mode of application are as yet alike undetermined, facts not being sufficiently numerous and forcible to enable experience to pronounce with the voice of authority. The object of this paper is to endeavour to draw attention to one of those diseased conditions, and to propose for inquiry whether or not there be amongst Hydropathic appliances any which may be usefully employed to aid the taxis in the reduction of hernia in those cases which do not require the use of the knife, and where it is possible to return the intestine by manipulation. It is to be hoped that this and similar inquiries will meet with favour, and employ some of the attention of the able men now practising Hydropathy, and that they will have the goodness to enrich your columns with the records of their experiences, as a rational, comprehensive, and universal, practice can only be built up by the united efforts of many, and by each practitioner correcting his views and experience by those of others. In Kite's "*Essay*," a work from which I have before quoted in the pages of the *Journal*, there is an interesting case which I purpose to give in full—it is entitled:—

"An account of the beneficial effects of a very liberal and long-continued application of cold water in strictured hernia."

The author says—

"I have in repeated instances of the most dangerously strictured hernia, and in some where the operation was determined on, and prepared for, seen the *long-continued application of very cold water* relieve the patient like magic, and



AIDS TO THE TAXIS IN HERNIA.

allow the hernia to be returned with the greatest facility, when all the usual powerful remedies have not produced the most trivial advantage. I am well aware that cold applications have been a long time in general use in these cases; as they are usually applied, I know them to be inefficacious, or that they will only succeed in comparatively slight cases; but in order to produce the full effect, it will be necessary to apply it to a much greater extent than usually done, or than by many may be thought prudent; but if it be not so done, it will not answer, and the miserable sufferer must perish inevitably, or run the risk of a most painful, dangerous, and horrible operation. I might bring forward several instances in support of what I have said, but I think it necessary to state only one, which indeed was the very worst I ever saw.

"Everest, about 35 years old, had had a scotal hernia several years, but as it usually returned into the abdomen on laying in bed, and as it was seldom materially inconvenient to him, he had never applied a truss, or paid any particular attention to it. One day, however, after dinner, he was attacked with a very severe pain in the part—inflammation and tension came on, and a medical gentleman was immediately sent for—the symptoms had increased so rapidly, and the man was already in so alarming a state that he called in another; not long after I was sent for, and I saw him about six hours after the first attack.

"There was greater tension and inflammation than I had ever seen in any case before—the parts were so enlarged and so exquisitely painful that he could scarcely bear them to be touched. Before I saw him he had been bled, and had taken several strong purgations—warm fomentations had been applied, and the tobacco glyster had been injected. I immediately gave him an opiate, and placing him almost upon his head, I made a gentle attempt at reduction, but without the least prospect of success.

"I was thoroughly satisfied that no remedies whatever short of the operation, would be productive of the least advantage except it was a very liberal application of cold water; and from the many instances I had seen of its good effects in hernia, and in constipated bowels, I determined to give it a fair chance for the space of three hours, although, from the very unusual severity of the symptoms, relief was scarcely to be expected from anything but the operation, and this we agreed to perform as soon as it should appear that the cold applications did not produce the desired effect.

"With this view, sheets were thoroughly wetted with water, artificially cooled by the neutral salts, and dashed over the abdomen, thighs, &c.; and they were repeated every two minutes for three parts of an hour, without any other effect than that of abating the intensity of the pain.

"As this was what might be called a very fair trial, I began to despair; it



## AIDS TO THE TACTS IN HERNIA.

occurred to me, however, that in the most obstinate case of obstructed bowels I had ever witnessed, the patient did not experience relief until he was weakened and lowered to such degree by the cold applications that prudence prevented its further continuance. I resolved, therefore, in the present instance to pursue the plan to the same extent as in that case.

"Five or six pails full of water, fresh drawn, were ordered into the apartment; the patient was laid on his back over a tub large enough to receive the water; one or two gardening water-pots were filled with the water, and the contents of one of them poured over the ~~parts~~; as soon as it was emptied another was used in the same manner, and this process was repeated until the patient *was so much chilled, and the powers of life so much reduced*, that it was thought proper to desist. At this time the tension ~~was removed~~, the parts became corrugated, and with the most trifling assistance the hernia was reduced."

Priessnitz employs a different application, which is said in several cases to have much facilitated the reduction of the hernia—namely, sweating the patient freely in the dry blanket and performing the necessary manipulations under the blanket while perspiration was still going on. I have not witnessed any case of the kind, neither do I remember if any such has been recorded by Hydropathic writers, and at present I have no opportunity to consult their works; yet I see no reason to doubt the correctness of the very meager information which I have received, and which only amounts to this—that in some two or three cases Priessnitz employed the sweating blanket and succeeded in returning the intestine.

The questions which now naturally present themselves are these: were the cases so differently treated by Kite and Priessnitz, or were any of them, only *recoveries* and not *cures*? or, more strictly speaking, was the return of the intestine really aided in some cases by the tonic application of cold—in others by the relaxing effects of warmth?—if so, do extremes meet, and is it immaterial which of these applications be employed?—are they equally effective? or, are there any diagnostic symptoms which indicate the employment of the one in some cases and the employment of the other in other cases? or must actual experiment determine the question in each individual case? These are the questions to which I solicit the replies of your correspondents, and to which I confess that neither



my experience nor my memory supplies any satisfactory answers.

If we would perfect our system we must make occasional excursions from the regions of the known to the realms of the unknown. We know that there are many diseases which in general are perfectly controllable by Hydropathic means—the exceptions being either when the disease has reached that point at which nothing will arrest its progress, or, when it is so complicated with some other disease as to forbid the full exhibition of the Hydropathic remedies; we know that hundreds of cases have been cured, *not* by a do-nothing system, (for that has never been objected to Hydropathy—on the contrary, the strength of its remedies has been seized upon as the ground of accusation)—*not* by a single practitioner riding his hobby and deluding himself and others, but by a host of able practitioners—often when the cases had been given up by eminent medical men and after all the ordinary means had failed; we know, then, that these were cures, not simply recoveries, for, if they were not cures, then we must surrender all confidence in medical science and regard all systems as alike delusions; but we, also, know that there are cases which forbid the use of the Hydropathic remedies, and others <sup>in</sup> which they can be only partially tried; we know, too, that cures have been made and lives preserved before Prossnitz arose to perform his wonders and compel our admiration and esteem: is it not, then, worthy of inquiry whether or not there be on the shelves of the Allopath—or in the vials of the Homœopath—or among the luxuriant herbs of the field—or in the countless gushing mineral springs—or elsewhere—a fewer or greater number of remedies which may be honestly, wisely, and beneficially, combined with the means furnished by the Hydropathic system in cases where those means are confessedly inadequate of themselves. And, in pursuing such inquiries, I am sure that the advocates and practitioners of Hydropathy will not be withheld by bigotry, nor deterred by a fear of being accused of inconsistency, if they should see reason to modify or in any respect change those opinions which have been called forth by the joy and enthusiasm with which they hailed and embraced a new truth—a great discovery; but they will shew, as



86

AIDS TO THE TAXIS IN HERNIA.

*hitherto*, that they are not influenced by a blind attachment to a theory, a system, or a name, but by an ardent desire to do good in their generation,—to minister to health and to the preservation of life. This readiness to listen to reason—to weigh facts and embrace truth wherever it may be found, will do much to recommend to the universal acceptance of medical gentlemen those Hydropathic remedies whose efficacy has been so fully proved and so justly extolled.

I am, dear Sir, your obdt. Servt.,

JOHN GIBBS.

Nice-Maritime, April 6, 1850.



87

Providential Incident.

=

To the Editor of the Journal of Health.

=

PROVIDENTIAL INCIDENT IN A  
CASE OF SCARLET FEVER.

Sir,

I HAVE very recently received some details of a case, which, although not an isolated one, is nevertheless so far uncommon and remarkable as to deserve being put upon record. The patient is a young lady, the daughter of a beneficed clergyman of the Established Church, and I had the particulars both from herself and her father, and have their kind permission to use them without mentioning names.

In the year 1846 she was treated by her brother, a medical gentleman, for scarlet fever. On the 14th of January she was very ill—on the 21st she was delirious, and only slight hopes of her recovery were entertained. On that morning, about three o'clock, her nurse tender fell asleep, and the patient, labouring under the delusion that the family had been all murdered by soldiers, whom she supposed to be then in the house and about to take her away, left her bed, got out of the scullery window unperceived, and went some distance through the garden with the intention to throw herself into the rivulet, as she wished not to survive the imaginary destruction of her family; but, thinking that it would be better first to give information of their supposed fate, and hoping that she should catch cold by exposure on the way, and thus attain her object of shortening her life, she changed her route with the intention to go to a neighbour's house. With this object she retraced her steps, crossed the road, went through the church-yard, climbed a wall, passed through a field, in which she was knee-deep in water, and



crossed a hedge and a second field, but fancying that she saw soldiers, she again changed her course, and, having proceeded a few yards, she stepped into the brook, thinking that she could walk across it, as she had often done in childhood; but the stream was much swollen with recent rains, being, at this part, about nine feet deep and twelve or fourteen feet wide, yet fortunately less rapid than at the two places which she had previously approached. Finding herself at once out of her depth, she happily remembered some directions for swimming which she had read some days before falling ill, and by following them she managed to reach the opposite bank, up which, it being steep, she had great difficulty in clambering. Before arriving at the brook, being oppressed with heat, she threw away her night-cap and a blanket, in which she had enveloped herself on leaving her bed, and proceeded the rest of the way in her night-dress and stockings. After crossing the brook she passed through three fields, and over a road and a closed gate into a farm-yard, and succeeded, without molestation from the watch-dog, in awakening the mistress of the house, who knowing that the young lady had been confined to bed with fever, at first refused credence to her statement that she was the person she represented herself to be, and denied her admittance; but, by breaking some panes of glass and putting in her hand, telling the good dame, who was much alarmed, that surely she would recognise that, and also bidding her hold a candle to the window that she might see her face, she succeeded in making herself known and was admitted. I have traced her route in company with her father, and visited the person in whose house she got shelter, and think that altogether she travelled more than half a mile, and am told that she must have been more than half an hour in the open air. It is remarkable that she did not receive a single scratch, although she crossed several hedges and was without shoes.

On being admitted, she complained of being much exhausted, and was assisted up stairs to bed, where she immediately fell into a sound sleep—her first sleep for some nights. In about an hour and a half information was conveyed to her father of her situation.



I shall not attempt to give any idea of the state of mind of her father, brother, and the other members of her family, on her being missed, and while they, with their immediate neighbours, were employed in searching for her, up to the time of receiving intelligence of her. Suffice it to add that she was conveyed home and put to bed—that a sudorific was given to her—that copious perspiration came on almost instantly—that she was allowed to drink freely of water, which had been previously denied to her—that delirium entirely ceased on the following morning about the same hour in which she had effected her escape—that she was down stairs on the third day, and that she enjoys better health since her illness than she had done before.

Of this case it cannot be said, as our opponents sometimes assert, that it had been carefully selected for experiment as one in which bathing could do no harm, and that, for the rest, the practitioner trusted to time and chance and the influence of other causes—no—the remedy was provided and its action controlled by the Good Physician who careth for all His creatures. Yet I am not about to recommend such a process in similar cases, while we can gradually produce the desired result by the employment of that mild and tried remedy, the shallow tepid bath. I shall only further remark on this case that, if it be not taken as evidence of the value of bathing in similar cases, it must at least be allowed to have weight against the common opinion that the contact of fresh air and cold water with the skin must necessarily repel the disease and endanger the life of the patient. That the medical gentleman who attended the lady was persuaded that her immersion was beneficial to her, we may infer from the fact that, being in attendance, on a subsequent occasion, on two sisters suffering from scarlet fever, and whose lives were despaired of, he had his patients laid on a table and sponged all over with cold water, and they both recovered. One thing more we may learn from these facts, and that is—a little tolerance for those medical gentlemen who still pertinaciously cling to the old practice. We have here an example of a gentleman who, in the case of his own sister, adheres strictly to the old way, even when life is trembling in the balance, thus giving proof of



his sincerity in his medical creed ; but who afterwards, in similar cases, when accident had revealed to him the power of a remedy in which before he had no faith—having no practical experience of its efficacy, its value not being recognised in the schools—had sufficient liberality and intelligence to employ it when opportunity served, and thus saved two lives. It is only natural that, when human life is at stake, men of the finest intellect, tenderest feelings, liveliest conscience, and the stoutest nerve, should shrink from the employment of remedies they had never tried; but we may gather confidence from every day's experience that facts, not presented in an offensive manner, must influence educated and enlightened men, to the banishment of error from their practice.

Middle-wood Hall, Dec. 4, 1850.

Yr. Obedt Servt.  
John Gibbs.



91

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CAPTAIN CLARIDGE, AS A  
HYDROPATHIC ADVOCATE.

CAPTAIN CLARIDGE is the first English author who has written on the Water-cure, and may, therefore, be regarded as the introducer of it to the British people. He was previously known as the author of an excellent *Guide down the Danube*, and had been, we believe, a frequent contributor to our newspaper literature. His work, entitled *Hydropathy, or the Cold-water Cure*, was published in 1842, and quickly ran through six or eight editions,—besides several editions of an *Abstract*. It was favourably noticed by the press, and especially in a lengthy and able article in the *Times*. In his preface he says:—"Some years ago, a friend of mine at Gratz, in Styria, who had received in his own person a most miraculous proof of the efficacy of the treatment at Gräfenberg, strenuously recommended me to go there; but as almost every one is prodigal of advice, and as one every day hears of some vaunted panacea, it made no more than a momentary impression upon me, and was, therefore, disregarded." He adds:—"My attention was first seriously drawn to the subject by a distinguished officer of marines at Venice, who was, some years ago, so reduced by fever in the East, as to be unable to continue the service in which he was engaged," and who had been benefitted by the advice of Priessnitz. But Captain Claridge's resolution to visit Gräfenberg was not finally formed until he had the opinion of a "leading medical man, who attended the Imperial Court at Vienna, and the British Embassy in that city," who said that he thought that "the treatment would be advantageous" to the Captain, and that "he frequently sent his own patients to Gräfenberg." Captain Claridge had long suffered from rheumatism and headache, and the benefit which he, as well as a member of his family, derived from a short treatment, during a three month's residence at Gräfenberg, under the care of Priessnitz, together with the results which he had witnessed in other cases, impelled him to publish; and, after perusing the works of several German authors, he "felt that he should be guilty of a dereliction of duty to his country, if he did not exert his humble efforts to promulgate the benefits of the system which they so warmly advocate."

Since he commenced the advocacy of the Water-cure, Captain Claridge has been indefatigable in his exertions to promote its extension—he has freely devoted his time, his money, and his talents, to furthering it: it was he who introduced Dr. Weiss to Dr. Thomas J. Graham, which introduction led to the subsequent professional connection between them, and to the establishment of the former in this country;—it was at his instigation that one of the most talented advocates of the system, Dr. Ed. Johnson, proceeded to Gräfenberg, on a medical visit;—it was he who, at much expense and risk, first opened the magnificent Establishment at Sudbrooke Park, and confided the medical management to Dr. Weiss;—he has gratuitously distributed large numbers of his own works, and of the works of other English hydropathic writers;—in 1843, he travelled, at his own expense, through many parts of England, Ireland, and Scotland, delivering lectures, and founding Hydropathic Societies, and he published the results of his mission in a pamphlet, entitled *Facts and Evidences*;—he has contributed articles to both the English and American Water-cure journals;—he visited Gräfenberg a second time in 1845, and passed twelve months there, the fruits of which are his pamphlet on *Cholera*, and his latest work, *Every Man his own Doctor*;—he has personally pressed the subject of the Water-cure upon the attention of several Continental Sovereigns;—he founded the first Water-cure Establishment that was opened in Italy;—he has always advocated the opening of a Hydropathic hospital in London; and, at a time when there appeared some prospect of so desirable an object being attained, he directed that his name should be put down as a contributor of £50; and he has not hesitated, on many occasions, without fee or reward, when no hydropathic practitioner was at hand, to step in to the relief of sickness and suffering—nobly braving, in his compassion for afflicted humanity, the responsibilities, the contingent consequences, the risk of disease, the possible odium, and, it might be, the legal persecution to which a failure would have rendered him liable. For these things his rewards have been the approbation of his own conscience, the thanks of those whom he has rescued, the cheering words of his friends and of some of his fellow-labourers, and a share of that misrepresentation and abuse which generally assails the reformer. In the preface to his last work, he says, and we yield implicit credence to the statement—"That it was my intention to make money by hydropathy is an allegation without a foundation; my object being completely philanthropic. Having gained my own health, and saved the life of my daughter, at Gräfenberg, and having witnessed most astounding cures there, I wished to make generally known so valuable a remedy,—to do this by writing, lecturing, attending the sick, opening establishments, or any other means in my power, my exertions have been



## Biographical Sketch.

unceasing. I may therefore be permitted to repeat, my motives have been disinterested, as, thanks to Providence, I am perfectly independent in circumstances. The promotion of hydropathy has always been attended with expense to me—a sacrifice which I am still willing to make for its advancement." When the disinterested labourer for the benefit of his fellow-men has to defend himself from unmerited and ungenerous charges, it is humiliating to human nature, and must be galling and disheartening to the assailed; but, on the other hand, Captain Claridge must have been often cheered and gratified by the frequent testimonies publicly borne to the value of his labours by those who have followed in his steps, and a public testimonial is now being prepared for him—affording a fresh proof of the estimation in which he is held. Dr. Smethurst dedicates his work to him. Dr. James Wilson says of him:—"Such men as Mr. Claridge ought not to be abused, for he could have no pocket motive; all that can be said is that he is a little enthusiastic in these matters—a little enthusiasm does a great deal of good sometimes, when the motives are such as Mr. Claridge's." Dr. Thomas J. Graham says:—"So extremely valuable is this treatment, that the public are, in my opinion, much indebted to Captain Claridge, for the trouble he has taken in introducing it to our notice." Dr. Rt. Hay Graham says:—"The public are much indebted to Mr. Claridge for introducing this remedy to their notice, having before his eyes the uncertainty of the medical art, his object has been to benefit mankind, by what appeared to him a more certain, as well as a more simple, mode of curing disease." Mr. Preshaw, in his *Wet Sheet* says:—"The British public are under deep obligations to Captain Claridge for his excellent treatise on the Water Cure." Dr. Weiss says:—"To Captain Claridge the merit is undoubtedly due, of having first directed the attention of the public in the latter country (England), to this invaluable system—an undertaking in which he has shewn the greatest perseverance and industry, advocating the good cause by word and deed, and never losing an opportunity of extending its popularity." And Dr. Ed. Johnson writes:—"Every person in England who is cured of his disease by the hydropathic treatment, owes a large debt of gratitude to Captain Claridge, whose indefatigable exertions and indomitable courage, in spite of all opposition, have succeeded in planting hydropathy in this country—a soil in which, protected by humanity, and watered and pruned by science, it cannot fail to thrive, and grow, and flourish—a blessing to the people." Other writers, too, have borne grateful and graceful testimonies to his services; but it is to be regretted that there are others still who have either passed over in silence, or spoken slightly of the labours of their pioneer and fellow-labourer. His writings, it is true, may not be free from error, but whose writings are? It should be remembered that his first work on the Water-cure is avowedly a compilation, and it might have disarmed censure that, in the preface, he confesses himself "unacquainted with the abstruse terms used in medicine," and it might have won respect and confidence that he was a volunteer, whose services were freely accorded from pure love to the cause which he had espoused, and to which, it is not too much to say, that he has not rendered less important services than any other advocate of it. His enthusiasm may sometimes mislead him—but, without enthusiasm, no man can be a good pioneer, or can ever effect anything really worthy of admiration—and his good faith and sincerity are undeniable.

Brixton. 1857.

J.G.



# PLAIN RULES FOR WATER-CURE PATIENTS.

*Extracted from "Letters from Graefenberg," and revised by the Author.*

1. Avoid, as much as possible, the causes of disease, whether they be the vigils of the student, the anxieties of business, the dissipations of fashionable life, or the undue indulgences of appetite.
2. Commence the treatment with a determination to give it a fair trial, to repose due confidence in your medical adviser, and to do neither more nor less than he shall prescribe.
3. Do not eat to excess, under the erroneous impression that, under the water-cure, it matters not how severely the digestive organs be taxed.
4. Abandon the use of all alcoholic stimulants, spices, and hot drinks.
5. Do not drink more water than the stomach can readily absorb—(when water lies cold and heavy on the stomach, it is a symptom of excess.)
6. Do not exercise to the point of fatigue; or, if over-fatigued, do not eat until you shall have rested.
7. Observe a proper mean in clothing; beware of too sudden transitions from cold to heat; avoid the fire, especially after a bath, and, if cold and unable to exercise, put on warmer clothing.
8. Avoid late hours.
9. If not sufficiently warm for your bath, omit it.
10. Drink a little water soon after each bath, or combination of baths.
11. Take proper exercise after each bath, unless when specially directed not, as in bad cases of diarrhoea; and take exercise before each bath, except on rising from bed; but do not bathe after violent exercise, until the increased action of the heart and lungs shall have subsided: yet be careful to maintain the exalted temperature of the body—this is best done by buttoning your coat and walking gently up and down, or by lying on the bed covered with a blanket. Although it be perfectly safe to bathe while perspiring—even from exercise—provided the increased play of the heart and lungs be permitted to subside,—yet it is dangerous to bathe when the body has cooled down after perspiring.
12. If attacked with shivering, or if over-fatigued, do not take any bath, except the wrung-out sheet-friction.
13. Do not douche on the head, chest, or abdomen; nor longer than ordered.
14. Wet the head and chest lightly and quickly, preparatory to the plunge or half bath; and also, with a corner of the sheet, preparatory to the sheet-friction.
15. Keep in motion while in the cold bath, and do not stay in for the second chill; assist the bath-servant in the frictions in the half-bath and in the rubbing wet-sheet; and employ friction in the sitz-bath.
16. Do not lie too long in the wrung-out sheet-packing.
17. Do not allow a slovenly bath-servant to rub *with* the rubbing wet-sheet, but *over* it.
18. Change the bandages or compresses before they become dry—it will generally be necessary to do so six or seven times daily—and put on each one so as to exclude the air, but not so as to impede the respiration or the circulation.
19. Do not take enemata without special directions.
20. Do not engage in mental labour, or take active exercise, or take a bath, for at least one hour after a meal; and do not eat after a bath until reaction be fully established.
21. Do not lance any boil or swelling.
22. If head-ache, with heat, should attend the sitz-bath, or the sweating-blanket, or the sheet-packing, wear a cooling compress on the head during the operation.
23. Do not drink immediately before a bath, or while in a bath, or soon after a meal, unless compelled by thirst.
24. Report instantly any new or unusual symptom to your medical adviser.

Brixton 1851.

*W. G.*



## GRÆFENBERG STATISTICS.

THE following tables are compiled from Claridge's *Hydropathy*, Wilson's *Water Cure*, Smethurst's *Hydrotherapia*, Gibbs's *Letters from Græfenberg*, the *Water Cure Journal*, and the Austrian Police Reports.

Claridge states that the number of patients at Græfenberg in 1829 were 45, and that in 1830, they were 54.

Wilson's tables extend from 1831 to 1841, inclusive, and are as follow:—

| Year.            | Patients. | Deaths. | Age.           | Disease.                                              |
|------------------|-----------|---------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 1831 ...         | 62        | 1       | Officer        | Hectic Fever, Consumption.                            |
| 1832 ...         | 118       | 0       |                |                                                       |
| 1833 ...         | 236       | 2       | A child ... 6  | Scrofula, Convulsions.                                |
|                  |           |         | A man ... 53   | Disease of the chest.                                 |
|                  |           |         | A man ... 53   | Cramp.                                                |
| 1834 ...         | 236       | 3       | " ... 59       | Liver complaint.                                      |
|                  |           |         | " ... 20       | Hectic fever.                                         |
| 1835 ...         | 342       | 2       | A man ... 65   | Apoplexy.                                             |
|                  |           |         | " ... 35       | Internal gout.                                        |
|                  |           |         | A man ... 36   | Pulmonary consumption.                                |
| 1836 ...         | 469       | 3       | " ... 53       | Cramp in the chest.                                   |
|                  |           |         | A woman ... 26 | Hectic fever, inflammation of [the bowels.            |
| 1837 ...         | 590       | 1       | A man ... 56   | Pulmonary consumption.                                |
|                  |           |         | A man ... 85   | Internal abscess.                                     |
|                  |           |         | " ... 26       | Pulmonary consumption.                                |
| 1838 ...         | 800       | 6       | " ... 44       | Ditto ditto.                                          |
|                  |           |         | " ... 50       | Abscess in the liver.                                 |
|                  |           |         | A woman ... 38 | Cramp.                                                |
|                  |           |         | " ... 50       | Apoplexy.                                             |
|                  |           |         | A man ... 60   | Diarrhoea.                                            |
|                  |           |         | " ... 31       | Hectic fever, cancer.                                 |
| 1839 ...         | 1,400     | 6       | " ... 42       | Consumption.                                          |
|                  |           |         | " ... 48       | Hectic fever and abscesses.                           |
|                  |           |         | " ... 45       | Consumption.                                          |
|                  |           |         | " ... 56       | Apoplexy.                                             |
|                  |           |         | A man ... 23   | Consumption.                                          |
|                  |           |         | " ... 25       | Ditto.                                                |
|                  |           |         | " ... 50       | Supposed disease of the heart.                        |
| 1840 ...         | 1,576     | 7       | " ... 57       | Cancer and hectic fever.                              |
|                  |           |         | " ... 29       | Diseased kidneys.                                     |
|                  |           |         | " ... 53       | Supposed apoplexy.                                    |
|                  |           |         | A woman ... 37 | Had not commenced the cure.                           |
|                  |           |         | A man ... 25   | Hectic fever.                                         |
|                  |           |         | " ... 53       | Cancer of stomach, vomiting.                          |
|                  |           |         | " ... 40       | Consumption.                                          |
|                  |           |         | " ... 50       | Disease of heart, lungs, and stomach.                 |
| 1841 above 1,400 | ...       | 8       | " ... 24       | Mercury and syphilis.                                 |
|                  |           |         | A child ... 4  | Scrofula, enlarged mesenteric glands and suppuration. |
|                  |           |         | A woman ... 39 | Cancer, hectic fever. (fever.                         |
|                  |           |         | " ... 45       | Cancer of the stomach, hectic                         |
| Total 7,329      | ...       | 39      |                |                                                       |

There are a few discrepancies between the numbers of patients in some years as given by Captain Claridge and by Dr. Wilson, but they are trifling, and are, probably, errors of the press; thus Claridge states the number of patients in 1833 to be 206, in 1834 to be 256, and in 1837 to be 570; in other respects both authors agree. We have given the preference to Dr. Wilson's tables for the sake of the analysis of the diseases of which the patients died; but it is right to add Dr. Wilson's observations thereon—he says: "The surgeon of the little town, who states the nature of the fatal diseases, is not the first pathologist extant, so that I cannot answer for his accuracy. Some are put down as consumption, or wasting: I have, however, ascertained that they were nearly all hopeless cases on their arrival—persons who insisted on remaining, when Priessnitz unwillingly acceded to their entreaties to try and relieve some of the symptoms."

There is, however, one error in Dr. Wilson's tables which, we think, we should

notice, and the correction of which is to be found in the following extract from p. 188 of "Letters from Græfenberg:"—"Perhaps I might avail myself of this opportunity to correct an error into which Dr. Wilson, in compiling his table, has fallen. He states that there were eight deaths at Græfenberg, in 1841—whereas there were only six. There were two deaths at another establishment of a different kind (the Hunger-cure establishment), in the neighbourhood, and it is evident that, in running his eye over the registry, he unwittingly transferred, by a very natural mistake, those two deaths to his table."



GRÆFENBERG STATISTICS.

Captain Claridge gives a different sort of analysis of the patients in the year 1840—he classes them according to their nations as follows:—"Austria, 367; Galicia, 93; Poland, 128; Hungary, 137; Prussia, 527; Saxony, 21; Bavaria, 13; Wurtemberg, 15; Duchy of Baden, 3; England 2; Mecklenburg, 13; Sweden, 7; Russia, 94; France, 15; Belgium, 7; Italy, 3; Hamburg, 39; Moldavia and Wallachia, 27; Hanover, 4; Switzerland 6; Cracovie, 25; Denmark, 12; Brunswick, 5; America, 2; other countries, 12; in all, 1576." The two alluded to above, were, we believe, the first English patients at Græfenberg.

We are indebted to Dr. Smethurst for our next extract, he says:—"In the year 1842, the number of patients amounted to about 1200,—out of these five deaths occurred; but it is stated that two out of the number had not been accepted by Priessnitz, they therefore remained upon their own responsibility." The exact number of patients in 1842, was 1182.

We make our next extract from "Letters from Græfenberg:"—"The following is a table of the deaths which occurred at Græfenberg, from the 1st of January, 1843, to this date. April the 12th, 1846, inclusive:—

|                                                                                                       |      |            |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------------|----|
| "Number of patients at Græfenberg in 1843, including 246 from previous year ...                       | 1050 | ... deaths | 4  |
| "Number of patients at Græfenberg in 1844, including 259 from previous year ...                       | 1080 | ... "      | 5  |
| "Number of patients at Græfenberg in 1845, including 240 from previous year ...                       | 1004 | ... "      | 4  |
| "Number of patients at Græfenberg in 1846 (up to April the 12th), including 281 from previous year... | 382  | ... "      | 0  |
| Total ...                                                                                             | 3516 | ... "      | 13 |

Respecting these thirteen deaths, the same work furnishes the following information:—

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Rejected by Priessnitz ...                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1  |
| Epileptic fits, hepatization of lungs, and ossification of valves of the heart, a man ...                                                                                                                        | 1  |
| Epilepsy, a man, aged 56 ...                                                                                                                                                                                     | 1  |
| Gout and dropsey, a man, aged 54 ...                                                                                                                                                                             | 1  |
| Rheumatism, scrofula, diarrhoea, a man, aged 20 ...                                                                                                                                                              | 1  |
| Softening of the brain, a man, about 50 ...                                                                                                                                                                      | 1  |
| Effects of a fall on the head, not reported for some days, and causing congestion of the dura-mater, and exudation in the right sinus, &c.—the patient previously under treatment for scrofula—a man, aged 23... | 1  |
| Supposed inflammation of lungs, in a gouty subject, brought on by douching on the chest, and followed by patient's refusing to take timely treatment, a man, perhaps 60 ...                                      | 1  |
| No post mortem ...                                                                                                                                                                                               | 1  |
| Causes of death unascertained by the author, except that, on arrival, one patient was in a very precarious state...                                                                                              | 4  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 13 |

The author of "Letters from Græfenberg" thus analyses the list of patients for 1843:—"The number of patients was 1,050, amongst whom were 100 noblemen, including 7 princes, 112 military and naval officers, many clergymen, and fellows and professors of colleges, about 30 lawyers, and 40 physicians and surgeons, and 4 apothecaries, and many others, by far the greater portion of whom are from amongst the educated and influential members of society;" and further that, of the foregoing, "ten physicians and two surgeons were British."

From a letter published by the same author in the "Watercure Journal," it appears that the number of patients at Græfenberg in 1846, was 1022, and the number of deaths 2; and that the number of patients in 1847, was 1143, of whom five died of organic diseases.

From private accounts received from Græfenberg by the same author, it further appears that the number of patients in 1848, was 857, among whom were four deaths from natural causes and one suicide; and the number of patients in 1849, was 838, among whom were nine deaths. These were the years in which the continent was so much disturbed, which will account for the falling off in the numbers of patients, and also, perhaps, in some degree, for the increase in the relative number of deaths; the depressing influences of anxiety and fear on the vital powers being well known.

We are not able to bring down our statistics to a later date than October the 15th, 1850—to which date we have received the police-lists for that year, they being the last which have reached us, and we have had no further information from other sources. In 1850, from the 1st of January to the 15th of October inclusive, there were four deaths, and the number of patients was 1231—a goodly number for nine months and a half, clearly evidencing that Græfenberg has escaped the storm of revolution which overthrew so many time-honoured institutions, and shook thrones and kingdoms to their foundations.

Brixton. 1857.

*W. J.*



96

## DEATH OF VINZENZ PRIESSNITZ.

Vinzenz Priessnitz is dead!—a void is left which never can be filled—a great man; a great benefactor of his race is gone “to render an account of the deeds done in the body”—gone, we trust, to exchange his earthly honours for a “crown of immortality.”

“We shall never look upon his like again.”

There is not one left who can take up his mantle as it falls. Thousands will mourn for him as their friend, their benefactor, their chiefest earthly hope. We mourn for him—we mourn for ourself, for his bereaved family, for his friends, for the poor around him, for the many who looked to him for aid, for suffering humanity throughout the world. We have lost a friend, a guide, whom we esteemed, loved, revered. We can only announce our loss—we can add no more—we are too deeply stricken down with grief—we feel as if part of our own life had departed from us.

The following is from the *Times* of Monday, December 8, 1851:—

“Priessnitz the celebrated Founder of Hydropathy, died at Gräfenberg, on the 26th of November, at the age of 52. In the morning of that day Priessnitz was up at an early hour, but complained of the cold, and had wood brought in to make a large fire. His friends had for some time believed him to be suffering from dropsy of the chest, and at their earnest entreaty, he consented to take a little medicine, exclaiming all the while, “It is of no use.” He would see no physician, but remained to the last true to his profession. About 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the 26th he asked to be carried to bed, and upon being laid down, he expired.”

an error  
J. H.

Brixton. 1857.

J. H.



*Proposed  
Hydrotherapeutic Hospital.*

SIR,—In reply to yours of the 25th ult., which followed me here from Camberwell, I request that you will put me down as a donor of £1 to the fund now being raised for the object you mention. I have long wished to see such an institution as the one now proposed to be established, and, wishing it every success, I must regret that I cannot proffer more effectual assistance.

I should have enclosed you a Post-office order for £1 by this post, but that I was refused it at the office here because I could not tell your christian name, as you only signed your note to me with your initial. When you favour me by rectifying the omission, I shall have the pleasure to remit you the above-named sum; and

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

JOHN GIBBS.

112, Patrick's-street, Cork, Oct. 10, 1847.

REVIEW. ✕

*Hydrotherapia; or, the Water Cure; being a Practical View of the Cure in all its Bearings, &c., &c.* By THOMAS SMETHURST, M.D. London: John Snow. pp. 288.

It is only about six years since the water cure was first prominently brought before the notice of the British public by Captain Claridge in his excellent work on the subject; and in the short space of time which has since elapsed, the cause has made such progress, that about sixty books and pamphlets have been written and published in English by its friends and advocates, many of whom are authors of the highest talent and reputation; and it is no mean praise of the work before us to say, that it deserves no less consideration than any one of the class to which it belongs.

✕ From the *Water Cure Journal*  
for April. 1848.



## REVIEW.

Many reasons have been assigned for the hostility which the advocacy of the water cure excited, and indeed which, in too many instances, it still continues to excite in professional circles; but the real ground of objection appears to be, that it owes its origin to a man who had gone through no curriculum, and who had graduated at no college. If Priessnitz had proposed some one particular process of the water cure as applicable to some one particular disease, it is not improbable that he would at once have found a more gracious reception at the hands of a very large number of medical men; but, because he dared to build up a system embracing many remedies, and applicable to a large number of the diseases to which flesh is heir, he and his system were received with derision, and condemned, unheard and untried. Still, there have not been wanting many members of the medical profession to whom that which to others was a stumbling-block proved a strong point of attraction. And it is because Priessnitz has not proposed a specific for some one disease, but because he has framed a system consistent in its details, wonderfully efficacious in its working, and not unscientific in its theory—that such men as Dr. Smethurst have first become its disciples, and then its apostles.

From extensive reading and much reflection thereon, and from a personal experience of the inefficacy of the ordinary remedies, Dr. Smethurst was disposed to examine without prejudice the claims of this new system, and his conversion was effected by the telling facts which came under his observation during a short course of practical study at the "Water University" of Gräfenberg, and by the results in his own case, under the treatment of Priessnitz, for an old and obstinate affection of the knee-joint, for which he had vainly "sought the advice of the heads of the faculty, and pursued their prescriptions with rigid exactness, to little or no purpose."

When men of active minds and generous impulses embrace a cause which, though fraught with blessings, has nevertheless to encounter a torrent of opposition, they cannot long maintain the inglorious position of passive spectators of the contest, but must fulfil their destiny by joining in the struggle for the



right, or else belie their nature and suffer what to such spirits is the most terrible of inflictions—the pangs of a self-accusing conscience. It is to this imperative necessity for action, and urging of the inner life, that we owe Dr. Smethurst's eloquent advocacy of a great truth—the water cure; and well and nobly does he perform the task which he has assigned himself.

The author devotes several chapters to an "Historical Sketch of the Water Cure," from the earliest down to our own times. In this sketch he betrays the evidences of extensive reading and much research. He divides his history into three periods, the first of which he brings down to the year 900, A.D., and he thus concludes this part of his subject: "Such was the water cure in past ages, when water was used as a dietetic and therapeutic remedy, but without any scientific knowledge." In his sketch of the second period he attributes the disuse of water to the mass of new drugs introduced into the practice of medicine in consequence of the endeavours of the Arabs to "enrich chemistry and pharmacy," to "introduce new remedies, and to restrain the use of water." And this disinclination to the pure gift of nature continued to grow until, "as times progressed, as the sciences and liberty of thought advanced, prejudices gradually disappeared, and among them, the prejudice against cold water. Our countryman, Floyer, victoriously won the field which had been struggled for step by step." From this time water began to be more esteemed, and accordingly, during the third period, it was much employed by many eminent physicians, among whom Dr. Currie especially deserves to be remembered. "But by far the greatest impulse to the general use of cold water was given by Professor Oertel, of Ausbach; and although in his enthusiasm he has been led into a great many exaggerations as to the effect, and in his desire to appear a great reformer seemed to have wished to upset all existing theories and systems, he has unquestionably the great merit of having spread the knowledge of the use of water by his own extensive observations of its good effects, in a dietetic and also therapeutic view, and by his numerous popular writings on the subject." The doctrines of Oertel rapidly



spread over the Continent, but it is the opinion of Dr. Sme-thurst that they would have been as rapidly consigned to oblivion if Priessnitz had not arisen:—

“The precept of Oertel spread rapidly over the Continent, partly by the truth it contained, partly by the seeming facility of application, and partly by the peculiar manner of giving it publicity. The water method assumed the appearance of a proper system, and an extent it had never reached before. The motto was, ‘Drink water in abundance; the more the better, for it prevents and cures all evils.’ Contradictions, slanders, eulogies, and real true experience, were mixed helter-skelter. Societies were formed in Germany, who employed water dietetically and medicinally; water cures were spoken of on all sides, applied at random without distinction and without reason, and the mania would have exhausted itself had not the unassuming Vincent Priessnitz become known. Through Priessnitz—a plain man, who had tried the curative effects of cold water on himself, and on many thousands since—the water cure will be handed down to posterity. Without medical, anatomical, or physiological knowledge, he has applied cold water most rationally. He has formed a pathology of his own, (humoral pathology;) his ideas as to the structure of the human body are his own also; and he saw his theory justified in the result of the appearances, during the course of his cures. The subject is so important that I must devote another article to it, to which I refer the reader. Accordingly, under the head of ‘Vincent Priessnitz’ he will find more remarks regarding this, I fain must say, wonderful man; and may I be permitted to direct the attention of my medical readers to it likewise? May I entreat and urgently implore them not to blind themselves to facts, but grant the subject that attention to which it is so justly entitled, for the sake of science and suffering humanity? It should be their duty to observe and search into the various effects of water, with the view of improving and perfecting the system; and the many difficulties should but form a fresh stimulus. It is no discredit that Priessnitz, the humble peasant, be their prototype here, for bravely and fearlessly did he combat and overcome all obstacles.”

The sentiments contained in the foregoing extract have in general our hearty approbation; but there is one passage to which we must demur. We cannot believe that any man “without medical, anatomical, or physiological knowledge,” no matter how vast his intellect or how lofty his genius, could originate and successfully administer a system of such extraordinary efficacy, combining so many powerful remedies, applicable to so many diseased conditions, governed by such fixed



101

laws, and requiring so perfect an acquaintance with the animal economy, so intimate a knowledge of diagnosis, and so nice a discrimination of the *vis vitæ*. Priessnitz is a self-taught, but it does not therefore follow that he is an ignorant man. The question is not, From whence did he derive his knowledge?—though we think that, too, might be satisfactorily answered by recalling to mind his keen powers of perception and discrimination, and accurate inductive reasoning, and by remembering the opportunities which he has enjoyed in the study of some fifteen or twenty thousand cases which have passed through his hands. He did not frame his system at once at the outset of his career, but he built it up bit by bit, ever adding to it as his mind expanded and his materials increased. If this be not so, on how unsound a foundation does the water cure rest, or else how unnecessary to the successful treatment of disease is an acquaintance with the physical sciences! We have dwelt so long on this point because we are sensible that a misconception would lead to most injurious inferences.

Having disposed of the historical part of his subject, the author proceeds to the consideration of that which, though perhaps not so interesting to the general reader, is by far the most important, namely, the practical part. Before proceeding to lay down the rules for the treatment of particular diseases, Dr. Smethurst makes some general observations, from which we present the following extract:—

“Two important questions must be decided in proceeding to the cure of disease by water: First, *The idiosyncrasy of diseased persons*; and, secondly, *What diseases are suitable for the treatment?*”

“As success can only be expected when the vital power is still able to combat the encroachment of disease, or capable of being recovered sufficiently to commence the struggle, it follows that the solution to the first question lies simply in the state of the patient's strength. *If the existing vital power be sufficiently strong to bring about a proper reaction by the stimulants applied, without succumbing to these stimulants, there is a possibility of success.* Progressing disorganisation, or continued obstruction of such organs, upon which the process of life essentially depends, must cause life—the vital power—to be depressed to such a degree as to render a recovery impossible, if the functions of such organs cannot, in part at least, devolve upon others. The vital power can under such circum-



stances never attain its full energy. Now, as the chance of success depends upon this alone, we arrive at the answer of the second question: *What diseases* are suitable for the water cure? All advanced disorganisations of inner organs are unfit for the treatment. The utmost that can generally be expected is a degree of alleviation of suffering, and a moderate extension of the span of life by a judicious dietetic use of water. Under this category would come consumption in its last stages, organic diseases of the heart, far advanced chronic dropsy, cancer, &c.; neither can internal organic malformation be removed by the water treatment.

"The practical solution of these important questions is very difficult; experience, judgment, and talent are necessary. A due guiding of the vital power, or support of it in its struggles to recover health, is the most essential point; and according to the disease, age, sex, and constitution, the practitioner will have to employ the *anti-inflammatory, exciting or stimulating, strengthening, derivative, soothing or revulsionary process*; all derived from the various combinations of the many applications of water as Priessnitz practises it, and by which he has saved hundreds from seeming inevitable death.

"I shall now proceed to lay before my readers the diseases which are advantageously treated by the water cure; but among the many disorders which the system is highly calculated to remove, I cannot help, in concluding these remarks, to point out the so-called drug diseases. These are maladies generated by the use or abuse of medicines, particularly mercury, which entail a train of sufferings rendering life miserable and a burden to the individual. Priessnitz found an eradicated remedy for them in pure cold water. The fact is incontrovertibly proved by the hundreds and thousands cured of such diseases at Griefenberg and similar institutions; who, given up as lost, were there restored to life, health, and enjoyment. Were the water treatment effectual in nothing else, it and its founder would find honourable place in the history of medicine: but the inference should not be lost: remove the cause, the inundation of patients with deleterious drugs, and the effect will be, the immediate expunging of, at all events, one class of diseases from our records. In proportion as our wants and mode of living get simplified, we shall require less of stimulants; and in proportion will disease and suffering, till now advancing with the progressive state of civilisation, be diminished."

The above rather lengthy extract, in which there is much that is excellent, has so encroached on our space, that we regret that we cannot follow our author much farther in this branch of his subject; but we cannot take leave of it without noticing a few errors, which we think we have succeeded in discovering. We happen to know that Priessnitz does not employ the half-bath in the cold stage of fever; nor sitz-baths,



but foot-baths, in certain cases mentioned at page 185—that he orders such of his patients as require eye-baths, to keep the eyes closed during the first half of the time appropriated to the operation—and that he never orders his patients to be packed all night in wet sheets, which is a practice not followed at Græfenberg, but at an establishment of a different kind, about two English miles distant from it. To this we wish to add, that whatever may have been his practice formerly, Priessnitz does not now employ the sweating process as freely as stated by our author. But, with a few exceptions, the treatment of disease as laid down by Dr. Smethurst is highly rational, and deserving of frequent and patient study.

It is now time to bring our observations to a close; but first we desire once more to express our approbation of the manner in which Dr. Smethurst has fulfilled the task he has undertaken—a task for which he has proved himself highly qualified. The result of his labours displays the evidences of extensive reading, habits of close observation, practical acquaintance with his subject, personal experience, and above all, a candid and unprejudiced mind. In conclusion, we beg to say, that we cordially wish that this work may have the widest possible circulation.

*J. G. Wilson.*

*Given to the Library of the University of Cambridge  
1831*



## Review.

## Literature. ✕

## THE WATER CURE.

*Life at the Water Cure: Facts and Fancies noted down during a month at Malvern.* By R. J. LANE, A.E.R.A.; and *Confessions of a Water Patient.* By Sir E. BULWER LYTTON, Bart. London: W. Horsell.

WHEN we would offer a word in favour of the so called water-cure, we are often told that the "medical virtues of water have been always known." If we were told that *some* of the medical properties and uses of this remedial agent were known in former times, we should be told only the truth, though not the whole truth—as it is, the objection to which we refer conceals a gross fallacy—but in either case it remains to claim attention to the discoveries of our own day. Water, both hot and cold, internally, and externally, has been employed by medical men, in their practice, from the earliest times; and, also for a very long period, in the forms of vapour and of ice. Some of its uses have been known even to barbarous tribes; and many medical writers—some of them incidentally, and others of them in works especially devoted to the subject, have celebrated its virtues and advocated its employment in some particular modes of exhibition in the treatment of some particular disease or diseases, or even of only some one stage of a disease; but nothing deserving the name of a system or science was ever advocated or formed until the present one. We have ever regarded any attempt to prove the *antiquity* of bathing as superlatively absurd and ridiculous—as well attempt to prove the antiquity of the human race, or the flowing stream—the *savage* is generally a first-rate swimmer—the birds of the air brighten their plumage in the liquid crystal, the wounded stag flies to the healing spring, and tradition affirms that the son of a half-civilised king, and many succeeding generations of Britons are indebted for the discovery of the efficacy of the waters at the ancient city of Bath, to a *mangy pig*! Nature is the earliest physician and water the oldest remedy.

The first English work on water, of any pretension, which has come under our notice is, "A History of Cold Bathing, both Ancient and Modern." It was first published, if we rightly remember, in 1702, and ran through six editions—all of which, except the 4th, we have had the good fortune to meet with. The 5th edition, published in 1722, (which now lies before us) extends to 300 pages and is divided into two parts; the first part contains 183 pages on "cold bathing," from the pen of Sir John Floyer. The second part, with an appendix, treats of the "genuine use of hot and cold bathing," by Dr. Ed. Baynard. It is a curious and remarkable book, written in a quaint and forcible style, giving evidence of keen penetration on the part of its authors, and containing much that is instructive and useful, blended with many stinging and amusing sarcasms, several striking cases of cure, some old, exploded theories, and some very bad advice. Sir John generally recommends a *preparatory* course of as much bleeding and purging as the patients' strength can endure!

✕ From the Pioneer for May, 31,  
and June, 7, 1857.



The "History of Cold bathing" was soon followed by other similar works, the principal of which are;—"An Account of the Wonderful Cures performed by the Cold Bath, by Dr. J. Brown," pages, 144--it appeared in 1706, and soon reached a second edition. "The curiosities of common water, by John Smith, C.M.," pages, 80, which reached a seventh edition in 1724." "A Rational Discourse on the Inward Uses of Water, by Thomas Short, M.D.," pages, 70, published in 1725. And "Febrifugum Magnum, by John Hancock, D.D.," a seventh edition of which appeared in 1726, containing 131 pages, and which was speedily followed by "Morbi-fugum Magnum," containing 288 pages, by the same author. Of these works Dr. Hancock's are by no means the least deserving of preservation. In 1737 there appeared "An Essay on Hot and Cold Bathing, by John King, Apothecary"—this work, which extends to 176 pages, contains a record of a water-cure establishment (if it may be so called) of those days. It was situated on the river Waveny, at Burgay in Suffolk, and contained hot, and cold baths, and the "hummums, or hot room" for sweating. This establishment was opened and conducted by Mr. King, who merely carried out the prescriptions of various physicians; each patient having any medical adviser he thought fit—an arrangement which may now, perhaps, furnish a useful hint to enterprising persons in or near large towns. Mr. King, like Floyer, advocates much that is good, but also recommends a preparatory course of bleeding and purging, and helps to perpetuate other injurious fallacies.

Since the days of Floyer and his co-operators, water has been more employed than previously in medical practice, but still its employment has not been general, notwithstanding the advocacy of a host of clever writers. The principal works that appeared in the interim between the time of Floyer and King and that of the opening of the Graefenberg establishment by Priessnitz, are a treatise on Asthma by Dr. Ryan, in which he advocates the use of the cold bath, in the treatment of that disease; two volumes on Gout, by Dr. Kinglake, advocating a water-treatment; Rigby's Treatise on Animal Heat; Stock's work on Cold; two volumes by

Dr. Currie, and one volume by Dr. Jackson advocating cold affusion, in fever; Fuller's "Medicina Gymnastica;" Buchan's work on Sea-bathing; Saunders on warm and cold Bathing; Lambe on Spring-water; Gibney on the Vapour Bath; and Oliver's Use and Abuse of Warm-bathing: the celebrated Dr. Smollett also wrote a pamphlet on bathing.

The first work in English, (by Captain Claridge,) on the Priessnitzian system appeared in 1843, and it has been followed by over eighty books and pamphlets on the same subject. Many of these are excellent works, with which we presume our readers to be acquainted, or, if not, they ought to be. Some of them are purely scientific—others, like the two now re-published in the cheap little volume before us, are popularly written, but yet are instructive as well as amusing. Objections have been made, but, we think, inconsiderately, to such "light works" on so important a subject. We deem them as necessary, and, in a sense, as useful as graver and more pretending works. Fortunately, neither Mr. Lane nor Sir E. B. Lytton profess to present us with hand-books of practice—they know the water-cure is not to be learned in "a month," but requires long and careful study to master its principles and practice. Priessnitz himself took years of patient and thoughtful experiment to bring it to its present state of perfection. What



## *Review.*

Hydropathist can carefully read this volume, and, for a moment doubt its utility? Written by highly gifted men, who are above all suspicion of any interested motive, who have themselves gone through, and derived benefit from the treatment which they advocate, who represent it as it is, stripped of all imaginary terrors, and who record their experiences in grateful, eloquent, and joyous language—why should it not meet a right hearty welcome from, at least, every brother in the same faith?

When on the point of leaving Malvern, Mr. Lane thus reviews "the occurrences and sensations of the past month:"—

"I look back with astonishment at the temper of mind which has prevailed over the great anxieties, that, heavier than my illness, had been bearing their full weight upon me. Weakness of body had been chiefly oppressive, because by it I was deprived of the power to alleviate those anxieties; and now, with all that accumulation of mental pressure—with my burden in full cry, and even gaining upon me during the space thus occupied, I have to reflect upon time passed in merriment and attended by never failing joyous spirits.

"To the distress of mind occasioned by my gathering ailments, was added the pain of banishment from home, and I have been translated to a life of careless ease, with 'jest and youthful jollity' playing about me. Any one, whose knowledge of the solid weight of anxiety that I carried to this place would qualify him to estimate the state of mind in which I left my home, might well be at a loss to appreciate the influences which had suddenly soothed and and exhilarated my whole nature, until alacrity of mind, and healthful gaiety became expansive and ungovernable, and the buoyant spirit on the surface was stretched to exuberant mirth and lightness of heart."

In the "Sequel" written five months after leaving Malvern, he says:—

"Before I went to Malvern, I suffered from giddiness, even on hastily rising from my chair; and the effort to mount the stairs always distressed me by palpitation and pain. Now, even after the exercise of running up or down a hill, I have never experienced the slightest inconvenience; my knees, which always failed me in any attempt at quick walking, are as strong and serviceable as I could wish, and the routine of gymnastic exercises that I indulge in at the foot of the 'accustomed hill,' have served to develop and to sustain a balance of power in the whole system."

Two months later he writes to Dr. Wilson:—

"I now drop a few words in praise of my right leg, and will then resume the ascending scale in my detail of bodily perfections. The halting gait which I took to Malvern having been conquered by a week's training, and the stiff knee made practicable, I soon attained that degree of strength which was not exhausted by walks of twelve, fourteen, sixteen miles in a day; and this power has been more than maintained up to the present time (witness our forty miles' walk of June 11, 1849).

"Of the heart, liver and lungs, I will only remark how well they keep their places; how quietly and unobtrusively they perform their several duties, not reminding me of their presence by any irregular or fluttering pulsation, by any inactivity requiring a stimulant, or by the least discomfort of any kind. The right hand and arm are as sensitive and efficient as ever; the free circulation extends to the finger's ends, and 'my hands are of your colour.' Thus has been established that good fellowship between 'the belly and the members,' which constitutes the chief animal enjoyment of life.

"I now arrive at the head; and here I am utterly at a loss to convey to you my estimate of the manifold good resulting from your treatment, and which involves renewed memory, mental energy, and entire emancipation from that leaden weight of sluggishness, which no effort of discipline could in any degree control.



"What more need I add? In place of a wasting and enfeebled frame, of constantly returning low fever, which never left me more than a few days' interval of comparative ease, of a prostration of mental power, which made my life burdensome, and of the habitual endurance of those neuralgic symptoms, from which there was but one step to the loss of muscular power on the right side, I am now stronger than I have been for ten years past, and equal to any exertion of body or of mind. I have gained 14lbs. in weight, since I left the balmy air, the holy water, and the lovely hills of Malvern: I have established an appetite at most insatiable; nor have I occasion, after a meal, to think what I have eaten; and the last symptoms of neuralgic pain, which had lingered in the head and neck only (and left no numbness on subsiding), have long since vanished.

"My mouth and tongue had been for many years a misery to me. The least irregularity of diet was followed by severe punishment; and any indulgence in fruit or other acids, was the cause of ulcers in the mouth and soreness of tongue, to which I had become so inured, that I never thought to be relieved from the habitual pain: and as an excuse for imperfect articulation, I was often obliged to plead, 'I am not drunk, but have a sore mouth.' Of this distressing symptom I have never had the slightest return.

"When by the advice of Dr. —, I left town, he said all that he could to cheer me. He hoped that I might wear out the predisposition to disease, by total cessation from all labour of body or mind, and by the gentle medicines that he prescribed; but he frankly added, that I must not expect to make *old bones*.

"How stands the case now? I feel that I have a sense of capacity of mind to meet and battle against any difficulty that may create a demand, and a strength of body that, I think, I never knew before. It is no presumptuous confidence that encourages me to look forward in thankfulness and trust to the enjoyment of that period, when 'old bones,' the frame-work of healthy fabric, shall help to constitute the latter portion of life—'my real, my younger youth;' when, reverting to the blessings, which I may date from the adoption of my present habits, I may say—

'Therefore, my age is as a lusty winter,  
Frosty, but kindly.'

"I leave to others the question *how*, and through what channels, the internal and outward application of cold water arrives at its results; I have only to state that result in my own case, and to attribute it duly to the agent administered by you.

"I have done my best to show how, with implicit faith in a system of which I knew nothing, and in you, of whom I had learned all that should inspire the fulness of confidence, I have pursued the habits in which I was initiated

at Malvern; and have thus arrived, through God's blessing, at a state of perfect bodily health, which leaves nothing to be desired but its continuance."

After a lapse of four years from the date of his first visit to Malvern, Mr. Lane again describes himself as "firm of step and full of health and energy."

Now for an extract or two from Sir E. B. Lytton:—

"Without fatiguing you and your readers further with the *tonga cohorts* of my complaints, I pass on to record my struggle to resist them. I have always had a great belief in the power of the will. What a man determines to do—that in ninety-nine cases out of the hundred I hold that he succeeds in doing. I determined to have some insight into a knowledge I had never obtained since manhood—the knowledge of health.

"I resolutely put away books and study, sought the airs which the physicians deemed most healthful, and adopted the strict regimen on which all the children of Esculapius so wisely insist. In short, I maintained the same general habits as to hours, diet (with the exception of wine, which in moderate quantities seemed to me indispensable), and so far as my strength would allow, of exercise, as I afterwards found instituted at hydropathic establishments.



## Review.

"I dwell on this to forestall in some degree the common remark of persons not well acquainted with the medical agencies of water—that it is to the regular life which water-patients lead, and not to the element itself that they owe their recovery. Nevertheless I found that these changes, however salutary in theory, produced little, if any, practical amelioration in my health.

"All invalids know, perhaps, how difficult, under ordinary circumstances is the alteration of habits from bad to good. The early rising, the walk before breakfast, so delicious in the feelings of freshness and vigour which they bestow upon the strong, often become punishments to the valetudinarian. Headache, languor, a sense of weariness over the eyes, a sinking of the whole system towards noon, which seemed imperiously to demand the dangerous aid of stimulants, were all that I obtained by the morning breeze and the languid stroll by the sea-shore.

"The suspension of study only afflicted me with intolerable ennui, and added to the profound dejection of the spirits. The brain, so long accustomed to morbid activity, was but withdrawn from its usual occupations to invent horrors and chimeras. Over the pillow, vainly sought two hours before midnight, hovered no golden sleep. The absence of excitement, however unhealthy, only aggravated the symptoms of ill-health."

Sir Edward reads Captain Claridge's and Dr. Wilson's books, and goes to Malvern. There he makes sundry reflections, but we have only room for a few extracts:—

"The first point which impressed and struck me was the extreme and utter innocence of the water cure in skilful hands—in any hands, indeed, not thoroughly new to the system. Certainly, when I went, I believed it to be a kill or cure system. I fancied it must be a very violent remedy—that it doubtless might effect great and magical cures,—but that, if it failed, it might be fatal." . . . "The next thing that struck me was the extraordinary ease with which, under this system, good habits are acquired and bad habits relinquished. The difficulty with which, under orthodox medical treatment, stimulants are abandoned, is here not witnessed." . . . "Nor this alone. Men, to whom mental labour has been a necessary—who have existed on the excitement of the passions, and the stir of the intellect—who have felt, these withdrawn, the prostration of the whole system—the lock to the wheel of all the entire machine—return at once to the careless spirits of the boy in his first holiday." . . . "The safety of the system, then, struck me first; its power of replacing, by healthful stimulants, the morbid ones it withdrew, whether physical or moral, surprised me next; that which thirdly impressed me was no less contrary to all preconceived notions. I had fancied that, whether good or bad, the treatment must be one of great hardship, extremely repugnant and disagreeable. I wondered at myself to find how soon it became so associated with pleasurable and grateful feelings, as to dwell upon the mind amongst the happiest passages of existence. For my own part, despite of all my ailments, or whatever may have been my cares, I have ever found exquisite pleasure in that sense of *being*, which is, as it were, the conscience, the mirror of the soul. I have known hours of as much and as vivid happiness as perhaps can fall to the lot of man; but, amongst all my most brilliant recollections, I can recall no periods of enjoyment at once more hilarious and serene than the hours spent on the lonely hills of Malvern—none in which nature was so thoroughly possessed and appreciated." . . . "And, now, to sum up, and to dismiss my egotistical revelations; I desire in no way to overcolour my own case; I do not say that when I first went to the water cure I was afflicted with any disease immediately menacing to life—I say only that I was in that prolonged and chronic state of ill health which made life at the most extremely precarious—I do not say that I had any malady which the faculty could pronounce incurable—I say only that the most eminent men of the faculty had failed to cure



me. I do not, even now, affect to boast of a perfect and complete deliverance from all my ailments—I cannot declare that a constitution naturally delicate has been rendered Herculean, or that the wear and tear of a whole manhood have been thoroughly repaired.

“What might have been the case had I not taken the cure at intervals—had I remained at it steadily for six or eight months without interruption, I cannot do more than conjecture; but, so strong is my belief that the result would have been completely successful, that I promise myself, whenever I can spare the leisure, a long renewal of the system.

“These admissions made, what have I gained meanwhile to justify my eulogies and my gratitude?—an immense accumulation of the *capital of health*. Formerly, it was my favourite and querulous question to those who saw much of me, ‘Did you ever know me twelve hours without pain or illness?’ Now, instead of these being my constant companions, they are but my occasional visitors. I compare my old state and my present to the poverty of a man who has a shilling in his pocket, and whose poverty is therefore a struggle for life, with the occasional distresses of a man with £5,000 a year, who sees but an appendage endangered, or a luxury adridged.

“All the good that I have gained, is wholly unlike what I have ever derived either from medicine or the German mineral baths; in the first place, it does not relieve a single malady alone, it pervades the whole frame; in the second place, unless the habits are intemperate, it does not wear off as we return to our ordinary pursuits, so that those who make fair experiment of the system towards, or even after, the season of middle age, may, without exaggeration, find in the latter period of life (so far as freedom from suffering, and the calm enjoyment of physical being are concerned) a second—a younger youth! And it is this profound conviction which has induced me to volunteer these details, in the hope (I trust, a pure and kindly one) to induce those, who more or less have suffered as I have done, to fly to the same rich and bountiful resources.

“We ransack the ends of the earth for drugs and minerals—we extract our potions from the deadliest poisons—but around us, Nature, the great mother, proffers the Hygeian fount, unsealed and accessible to all. Wherever the stream glides pure, wherever the spring sparkles fresh, there, for the vast proportion of the maladies which art produces, Nature yields the benignant healing.”

We had marked several other passages, to quote them for the edification of our readers, and for our own gratification; but want of space forbids—indeed we fear that we have already far exceeded our allotted limits—we now, therefore, take a reluctant leave of this very interesting, instructive, eloquent, joyous, and withal, very cheap little book, cordially wishing it every success, and fully believing that it “has done a great deal of good, and is going to do a great deal more.”

In conclusion, we cannot refrain from suggesting that a worthy companion volume might be compiled by combining in a similar cheap form Col. Dundas’s “Hints to the Halt, the Lame, and the Lazy,” Mr. Wilmot’s “Tribute to Hydropathy,” Mr. Greave’s “Testimony to the Water Cure,” and the hydropathic portions of Mr. Wright’s “Six Months at Gräfenberg.”

JOHN GIBBS,



*From*

THE HYDROPATHIC ALMANAC, for 1851.

*English* Hydropathic Literature,

*from 1841 to 1851.*

*2*

| TITLE.                        | AUTHOR.        | TITLE.                            | AUTHOR.       |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Hydropathy .....              | Captain        | Theory and Practice of the        | Dr. Baükie.   |
| Facts and Evidences ..        | Claridge.      | Water-cure .....                  |               |
| Cholera .....                 |                | Hydropathy .....                  |               |
| Every Man his own Doctor ..   |                | Water-cure Manual ..              |               |
| The Water Cure .....          | Dr. J.         | Consumption .....                 | Dr. Shew, a.  |
| Drug Diseases .....           | Wilson.        | Cholera .....                     |               |
| Practice of the Water-cure .. |                | Water-cure in Pregnancy ..        |               |
| Dangers of the Water-cure ..  | Des. Gully     | Facts in Hydropathy ..            |               |
|                               | and Wilson.    | Hydriatics .....                  | F. Graeter.   |
| Water-cure in Chronic Disease | Dr. Gully.     | Introduction to the Water-cure    | Dr. Nicholls, |
| The Water-cure .....          | Abdy.          | Experience in the Water-cure      | a.            |
| Hydrotherapia .....           | Dr. Sme-       | Water-cure in all Diseases        | Dr. C. H.     |
|                               | thurst.        | Errors of Physicians, &c.         | Meeker, a.    |
| Handbook of Hydropathy ..     | Weiss.         | Atmopathy and Hydropathy ..       | Ross.         |
| Hydropathy .....              |                | Water-cure for Ladies ..          | Shew, a.      |
| Results of Hydropathy ..      |                | Water and Vegetable Diet ..       | Lambe.        |
| Letter on Hydropathy .....    | Doctor E.      | Medical Visit to Gräfenberg ..    | Scudamore.    |
| Lecture on Hydropathy .....   | Johnson.       | Observations on Hydropathy ..     | Dr. King.     |
| Domestic Practice of do ..    |                | Principles of Hydropathy ..       | Dr. Mastin.   |
| Diseases of Women .....       |                | The Wet Sheet .....               | Dr. Weeding.  |
| Philosophy of the Water-cure  |                | Hydropathy .....                  | Dr. Heath-    |
| Words of a Water-doctor ..    | Doctor         | A Lecture on ditto .....          | cote.         |
| Cholera .....                 | Balbirnie.     | Theory and Practice of Hydro-     | Dr. Feld-     |
| Curability of Consumption ..  |                | pathy .....                       | mann.         |
| Hydropathy .....              | Dr. J. Forbes. | Principles of Hydropathy ..       | Dr. Freeman   |
| Treatment of Small-pox ..     | Dr. M'Leod.    | Medical Reflections ..            | Weatherhead.  |
| Fever .....                   |                | Gout and Rheumatism ..            | C. V. Schlem- |
| Cold Water system .....       | Dr. T. Gra-    | Hydropathy .....                  | mer.          |
|                               | ham.           | Cold Water Cure .....             | Dr. Mayo.     |
| Gräfenberg .....              | Dr. R. H.      | Confessions of a Water-patient .. | Sir E. Bulwer |
|                               | Graham.        |                                   | Lytton.       |
| Life at the Water-cure ..     | R. J. Lane.    | Observations on Water Cure ..     | Sir A. Clarke |
| Six Months at Gräfenberg ..   | H. C. Wright.  | A Testimony .....                 | J. Greaves.   |
| Inquiries into the Effects of |                | Hydropathy .....                  | Dr. Culver-   |
| Water .....                   | H. E. John-    |                                   | well.         |
|                               | son, M.D.      | A Tribute .....                   | J. E. E. Wil- |
| The Cold Water-cure .....     | R. Beamish.    |                                   | mot.          |
| Observations on Hydropathy    | Dr. Bushman.   | Morbid Emotions of Women ..       | W. Johnson,   |
| Letters from Gräfenberg ..    | J. Gibbs.      |                                   | M.D.          |
| Hydropathy for the People ..  |                | Water Cure in Scotland ..         | Professor     |
| Cholera .....                 | W. Horsell.    |                                   | Blackie.      |
| Hydropathy and Homœopathy     | E. Lee.        | Aspects and Prospects ..          |               |
| Hints to the Halt, Lame and   |                | Report of the London Hydro-       |               |
| Lazy .....                    | Colonel        | pathic Society .....              |               |
|                               | Dundas.        | Water Cure Journal ..             |               |
| Results of the Water-cure     |                | American Water Cure Journal, a.   |               |
| Fever .....                   | R. East.       |                                   |               |

Those works marked "a" are American Publications.

*2*

*John Gibbs.*



# HYDROPATHIC DIRECTORY FOR 1851.

## BRITISH PRACTITIONERS.

| NAME.                    | RESIDENCE.            |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Baikle R., M.D.          | Unknown               |
| Balbirnie J., M.A., M.D. | Malvern               |
| Bayter R., M.D. (C.S.L.) | Blarney, near Cork    |
| Bear, A.M., M.D., F.R.   | Dublin                |
| Bushnan J. S., M.D.      | Wiesbaden             |
| Burgess, M.D.            | Mühlbad               |
| Clarke Sir A., M.D.      | Dublin                |
| Courtney A., Surgeon.    | Ramsgate              |
| Curtin T., M.D.          | Cork                  |
| East R., Surgeon.        | Dunoon, near Green-   |
| Ellis J., M.D.           | S'dbr'ke Prk, Surrey  |
| Feldmann, M.D.           | Unknown               |
| Freeman, M.D. (C.S.L.)   | Birmingham (tenhm)    |
| Garrett G., M.D., M.R.   | Sherb'ne Villa, Chel- |
| Goodman J., M.D.         | Disley, nr M'chester  |
| Gulley J. M., M.D.       | Malvern               |
| Graham T. J., M.D.       | Epsom                 |
| Graham R. H., M.D.       | London                |
| Grindrod R. B., LL.D.    | Malvern               |
| Hills, Surgeon           | Arundel, Surrey       |
| Heathcote, M.D.          | Ipswich               |
| Johnson Ed., M.D.        | U'brslade Hl, Wrwk-   |
| Johnson H. E., M.D.      | The Frus, Aldry Edg   |
| Johnson W., M.B.         | Unknown (Cheshire)    |
| King, M.D.               | Chesterham (shire)    |
| Laurie W. F., M.D.       | Dunstable, Bedford-   |
| Lovell H., O., M.D.      | London                |
| Malcolm J., M.R.C.S.     | Unknown               |
| Marsden J. L., M.D.      | Unknown               |
| Martin, M.D.             | Boppard               |
| Mayo H., Surgeon         | Wharfedale, Y'kshire  |
| Macleod M.D., FRCP Ed.   | Angusfield, Ab'deen   |
| Munro A., Surgeon        | Alexandria (land)     |
| O'Connor P., M.D.        | Bowness, Westmore-    |
| Paisley, M.D.            | Rothsay, I. of Bute   |
| Paterson, M.D.           | Honeydown House,      |
| Preshaw, Surgeon         | Darby Dale (Jersey)   |
| Rischanech, M.D.         | Moorpark, Surrey      |
| Smethurst T., M.D.       | Malvern               |
| Stummes L., M.D.         | Cork                  |
| Wherland J., M.D.        | Malvern               |
| Wilson J., M.D.          | Isle of Wight         |
| Weeding S., M.D.         | Unknown               |
| Wetherhead H., S'geon.   | Unknown               |

## AMERICAN PRACTITIONERS.

| NAME.                  | RESIDENCE.           |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Alcott W. A., M.D.     | Newton, Mass.        |
| Barney L., M.D.        | Jefferson Co., N.Y.  |
| Bedortha N., M.D.      | New Lebanon, N.Y.    |
| Coyle T. C., M.D.      | Georgia              |
| Curtis, M.D.           | Cincinnati           |
| Denniston E. E., M.D.  | Northampton, Mass.   |
| Dexter, M.D.           | Philadelphia         |
| Eby S. M., M.D.        | Ephrata, L'n'et' Co. |
| Foster H., M.D.        | Lowell               |
| Farrar, M.D.           | Waterford, Me.       |
| Gleason S. O., M.D.    | Glen Haven, N.Y.     |
| Gray M. D., M.D.       | Springfield, Mass.   |
| Hamilton, M.D.         | Saratoga             |
| Hayes P. H., M.D.      | Cuba, N.Y.           |
| Haynes T., M.D.        | Concord, N.H.        |
| Houghton R. S., M.D.   | New York             |
| Jackson, M.D.          | Glen Haven, N.Y.     |
| Kitteridge E. A., M.D. | Boston, Mass.        |
| Lorenz C., M.D.        | Waterford, Me.       |
| Mann, M.D.             | Philadelphia         |
| Meeker C. H., M.D.     | South Orange, N.J.   |
| Munde C., M.D.         | Northampton, Mass.   |
| Nichols T. L., M.D.    | New York             |
| Pomeroy J. A., M.D.    | Newtown, Indiana     |
| Potter E. A., M.D.     | Oswego               |
| Reuben L., M.D.        | Canandaigua          |
| Rodgers S., M.D.       | Worcester, Mass.     |
| Roof, M.D.             | Cooperstown, N.Y.    |
| Seelye T. T., M.D.     | Cleveland            |
| Shew J., M.D.          | New York             |
| Shieferdecker C., M.D. | Philadelphia         |
| Schetterly W. R., M.D. | Unknown              |
| Stedman J. H., M.D.    | Richford, N.Y.       |
| Stuart F., M.D.        | Philadelphia         |
| Thayer O. V., M.D.     | Picher Springs, N.Y. |
| Thomas C. B., M.D.     | Maysville, Ky.       |
| Trall R. T., M.D.      | New York             |
| Weder, M.D.            | Philadelphia         |
| Wesslehoff, M.D.       | Brattleboro, Vt.     |
| Wilworth B., M.D.      | Unknown              |

## CONTINENTAL PRACTITIONERS.

| NAME.             | RESIDENCE.         |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Adler, M.D.       | Leipzig            |
| Baldou, M.D.      | Paris              |
| Bigel, M.D.       | Strasburg          |
| Bazan T. D., M.D. | Spain              |
| Brandis, M.D.     | Pesio,* Piedmont   |
| Beck              | Berlin             |
| Barschewitz, M.D. | Gorishowo, Posen   |
| Bentzel, M.D.     | Ulm, Warttemberg   |
| Bender, M.D.      | Weinheim, Baden    |
| Blau, M.D.        | Langenberg, Reuss- |

|                     |                      |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Bürkner, M.D.       | Breslau              |
| Brünner, M.D.       | Albisbrun, Switz'nd  |
| Cohn, M.D.          | Reimansfelde, Prus-  |
| Cybulka, M.D.       | Prag                 |
| De Bonnard A., M.D. | Pt-a-moussin, France |
| De Waremm H., M.D.  | France               |
| Emmel, Surgeon.     | Kaltenleutgebr, Aus- |
| Frolich, M.D.       | Wiedenau, Silesia    |
| Fritz, Surgeon      | Budischau, Moravia   |
| Flikentscher, M.D.  | Alexnd'rsbad, Bay-   |
| Fleischmann, Prof.  | Schallersdorf, aria  |
| Fitzler, M.D.       | Ilmenau, Saxe-Wmr    |

|                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Gillebrt-Dhrcourt, M.D. | Lyons } France       |
| Geoffroy, M.D.          | Nancy }              |
| Gränichstaedten, M.D.   | Laale, Austria       |
| Hamplin Dr.             | emberg               |
| Halmann, M.D.           | Marienbergl on-the   |
| Heusner, M.D.           | Mühlbad Rhine-       |
| Hörner, M.D.            | Schlafsa, Bavaria    |
| Hempfel, M.D.           | Leimnau              |
| Herzog, M.D.            | Schweitzermühle,     |
| James C., M.D.          | Paris (Saxony        |
| Kanzler, M.D.           | Kuchelbad, Bohemia   |
| Klee Dr.                | Posen                |
| Kupuseinski, M.D.       | Poland               |
| Koren, Surgeon.         | Budischau, Moravia   |
| Küster, M.D.            | Cronthal, Nassau     |
| Latour R., M.D.         | France               |
| Legrand M.A., M.D.      | Paris                |
| Lubanski, M.D.          | Pont-a-moussin, Fr.  |
| Landa, Surgeon          | Leitmeritz (sia      |
| Lehman Dr.              | Alt-Scheitnig, Prus- |
| Lincke, M.D.            | Jonsdorf, Saxony     |
| Malik, M.D.             | Karlsbrunn           |
| Mosen, M.D.             | Marienbad, Prussia   |
| Müller, M.D.            | Saxon Switzerland    |
| Mazegger, M.D.          | Obermais, Tyrol      |
| Marker, M.D.            | Denmark (mia         |
| Mayer, M.D.             | Geltschberg, Bohe-   |
| Martiny, M.D.           | Lebnsten, Sxe-Mugn   |
| Niederführ, Surgeon     | Kunzendorf, Silesia  |
| Niemann A.              | Unknown              |
| Noggerath, M.D.         | Rolandseck-on-the-   |
| Oertel Prof.            | Auspach (Rhine       |
| Ottenthal Von, M.D.     | Mühlau, Tyrol        |
| Otto-Schram, M.D.       | Unknown              |
| Priessnitz Vinzenz      | Gräfenberg           |
| Pigeare, M.D.           | Neuilly, France      |
| Plutti, M.D.            | Elgrsbrg, Sxe-Gotha  |
| Petri, M.D.             | Laubach, nr Coblenz  |
| Plitt, M.D.             | Tharant, Saxony      |
| Parow, M.D.             | Greifswalde, Pome-   |
| Seoutteton H., M.D.     | Paris (rania         |
| Schedel, M.D.           | Paris                |
| Schrötteringk A., M.D.  | Hamburg              |
| Swygenhorn, M.D.        | Belgium              |
| Schitzlein, M.D.        | Bavaria              |
| Stecher, M.D.           | Kreischau, Saxony    |
| Sitzler, M.D.           | Ilmenau, Saxe-Wmr    |
| Schnackenberg, M.D.     | Wilzogr, Hesse-Cast  |
| Schneider, M.D.         | Gleisweiler, Bavaria |
| Vick, M.D.              | Rostock, Mecklenbg   |
| Voght, M.D.             | Alexnd'rsbad, Brdnbg |
| Vogel, M.D.             | Hinhenstein, Saxony  |
| Wachendorf, M.D.        | Eskrath, Rhenish-    |
| Waltz, M.D.             | Holland (Prussia     |
| Wertheim, M.D.          | Germany              |
| Weidenhoffer, M.D.      | Elisenbad, Bohemia   |
| Würzner P. C., M.D.     | Austria †            |

\* This is the first Water-Cure Establishment opened in Italy; it was founded by Captain Claridge, and has just completed its third season, two of which it was under the medical superintendence of *the author.*  
There is, perhaps, no part of the world in which the Water-Cure was more favourably received on its introduction than in Italy—some of the most eminent men in the profession, both native, British, and French, having furnished patients to the Pesio establishment. Other establishments are now in contemplation in Italy.

† There are many other practitioners and establishments, both at home and abroad, especially in Russia, whose names we regret we are unable to furnish.

*John Gibbs.*



COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING HERALD.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to draw public attention to a bill now before parliament, which proposes to render compulsory the vaccination of infants, and to express a hope that it never shall become law?

Passing by the facts that the advocates of vaccination have never proved that small-pox is necessarily a fatal disease; or that vaccination is an assured and the sole preservative against disease; or that it is a safe operation, unattended with permanent injury to health, or loss of life; and also setting aside the facts that no statistics have been presented to us showing the relative average mortality from small-pox, and the relative average mortality from other diseases, and the relative average duration of life amongst the vaccinated and amongst the unvaccinated,—setting aside all these facts, surely it is manifest that it would be a gross injustice, a grievous domestic tyranny, and a dangerous precedent, to force upon those who dissent from it, not ignorantly, but upon thoughtful and anxious inquiry, the adoption of any peculiar medical practice, although its advocates should be sustained and incited by a profession once as violently clamorous against it as they now are in demanding its enforcement.

True science, like true religion, disclaims to invoke the terrors of the law. —I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
St. Leonard's-on-Sea, August 15. JOHN GIBBS.

1853.

*small-pox*

*shy*

*vaccination*

*respectively*



BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CAPTAIN CLARIDGE. \*

THERE is ever a natural curiosity to learn something of the individual who has acquired celebrity, or rendered himself useful in any public capacity: as such there are two men who, for the services which they have rendered to science and humanity, have especial claims upon our notice—Vincent Priessnitz, the founder of the Water Cure, with a sketch of whose life we hope to present our readers in a future number, and Captain Claridge, the introducer of this most valuable system to the British public, of whom we now offer a brief memoir.

We are not of those who lay stress upon ancestry—we regard the man and his merits: nevertheless, the origin of a distinguished man is not devoid of interest. We therefore begin by saying that, if genealogy be worth anything, the subject of this article may lay claim, we believe, to one of the oldest pedigrees in England.

We have before us a book, entitled *Life and Posthumous Works of Richard Claridge*, edited by Joseph Besse, and published by J. Sowle, at the Bible, in George Yard, Lombard Street, 1726. This Richard Claridge was the direct ancestor of Captain Claridge, and from this book we extract the following information:

‘Richard Claridge, the eldest son of William Claridge, of Farnborough, in the county of Warwick, yeoman, and of Isabel his wife, both sober and religious persons, of good reputation, and well to pass as to outward circumstances, was born at Farnborough aforesaid, in the month of December, 1649.’

‘He was brought up to learning from his childhood, and having a natural desire after, as well as aptitude for it, early acquired a competent knowledge both of the Latin and Greek tongues.’ ‘He was entered at Baliol, Oxford, in the seventeenth year of his age; removed to St. Mary’s Hall in 1668, where he gained the reputation of being a good orator, philosopher, and Grecian; took his degree of B.A. in 1670; was ordained priest in 1672; and instituted

to the rectory of Peopleton, in Warwickshire, in the following year.

He afterwards, from strong conscientious motives, sacrificed his preferment and his prospects, left the church, ultimately became a member of the Society of Friends, and opened a ‘considerable’ school at Tottenham.

Here he suffered the ordinary persecutions of his sect, and, moreover, a prosecution for teaching school was commenced against him at Doctor’s Commons, by Lord Colrane and Mr. Smithson, Justices of the Peace, ‘excited thereto’ by the vicar of the parish and his lecturer, and the master of the Free School. This prosecution was carried into the Queen’s Bench in 1708, which court, under the direction of Lord Chief Justice Holt, twice decided in his favor.

Besides this collection by Besse, he was the author of the following works: *Lux Evangelica*, in answer to Keith; *Melius Inquirendum*; *Tractatus Hierographicus*, or a Treatise of the Holy Scriptures; a Preface and Appendix to John Norcott’s *Baptism*, 1694; a Preface and Appendix to Hercules Collins’ *Sandy Foundation*, 1695; an Answer to William Allen’s *Vindication*, 1696; and a *Defence of William and Mary*.

He was thrice married: first to Anne, daughter of Arnold Green, of Colesdon, Upton Snodbury, a gentleman of ‘good estate and reputation’; secondly to Mary, daughter of John Draper, of Brewern Grange, Oxfordshire, a man of ‘considerable estate, and good estimation amongst men’; and thirdly, to Mary, daughter of Edward Tomkins, gentleman, of Abingdon, Berkshire. He died in 1723, in the seventy-fourth year of his age.

With respect to his pedigree, Besse states: ‘About this time (1719), the genealogy of the Claridges had been taken out of the Herald’s Office by some of that family; and a kinsman had sent the same to him.’ This genealogy deduced the descent from Robert the Great, Duke of Germany; but Claridge,



## *Biographical Sketch of Capt. Claridge.*

true to his Quaker principles, while thanking his kinsman for his kindness, deemed such a descent of comparatively little value, and reminded him, 'There is a pedigree, namely, the Christian, which is noble indeed, and is worthy of our most diligent search and earnest inquiry.'

We are informed that the arms of Claridge—Vaire, Gules and Argent—are pronounced by Burke to be amongst the oldest in England.

From this Richard Claridge was descended John Claridge, the author of the *Country Calendar*, or the *Shepherd of Benbury's Observations*: and also the late Rev. James Claridge, father to the subject of our present sketch.

Richard T. Claridge, the subject of this memoir, a captain in the Middlesex Militia, a deputy lieutenant of the county of Middlesex, and a member of the Arcadian Academy at Rome, the elder, and now only surviving son of the late Rev. James Claridge (a curate in the Established Church), was born near Farnborough, Warwickshire, in 1799, and, by the accidental death of his father, was left an orphan at the early age of eight years.

There are some curious coincidences in the lives of Captain Claridge and of his ancestor, Richard Claridge, above-named. Each was born at Farnborough, and each married a Miss Green. The former married, firstly, Elizabeth Anne, only child and sole heiress of the late William Green, Esq., of Bolton Street, Piccadilly, and of Kew, Surrey. Of this marriage, the only issue is one daughter, Emma, wife of the Marquis de St. Aignan, of Château Sommary, Bourbon Lancy, France.

Captain Claridge married, secondly, his present wife, Eliza Ann, relict of the late George Morgan, Esq., of Brickendonbury, Herts, formerly of the Coldstream Guards, and M.P. for Brecon.

Captain Claridge, who seems to have inherited the literary tastes and moral determination of his ancestors, is the first English author who has written on the Water Cure, and may therefore be regarded as the introducer of that science to the British and American peoples. He was previously known as the author of an excellent *Guide down the Danube to*

*Turkey and Greece*, a work which soon reached a second edition, received much praise from the reviewers, and of which the *Morning Herald* says: 'This is a new edition of a very useful and well-written volume, and comes before the public with additional claims to notice, as it contains a great increase of valuable matter. It possesses, also, another advantage, which many Guide Books want, being written in a clear, unaffected style; and abounding with interesting particulars concerning art, science, and literature. It is evidently the production of an accomplished man, who has seen and read much, and travelled to some purpose.'

He was also a frequent contributor to our newspaper literature, especially as an advocate against capital punishment.

He was likewise one of the earliest advocates of the establishment of public baths and wash-houses. In a lecture, which he delivered at Edinburgh in 1843, he drew attention to the difficulties under which the poor labored as regards the observance of cleanliness. The immediate result, we are informed, was a public meeting, at which resolutions were passed, which ultimately led to the establishment of baths and wash-houses.\*

His first work on the Water Cure, entitled *Hydropathy*, appeared in 1842. The appearance of this work placed him for a time in a most singular position—as the sole English advocate of a science opposed so strongly to popular prejudice, the teaching of the schools, and the material interests of many. His boldness, as might be expected, provoked much commentary and discussion, and speedily involved him in a large correspondence with friends and foes. One of the earliest letters he received was from E. S. Abdy, A.M., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and author of a *Journal in the United States*, and subsequently, of *Cases of Disease cured by Cold Water*, in which he truly remarks: 'This day you have put your head into a hornet's nest, and made a hundred thousand enemies. I can attest the truth of your work—having myself been cured, in Germany, by hydropathy. It was my intention to have published

\* He was also the original patentee of Claridge's Asphalt and it was through his exertions that the experiment of the wood-pavement



on the subject, but I had not the courage; now, however, in support of you, I shall bring out a work as speedily as possible.' Notwithstanding the opposition which it provoked, the Captain's work carried such conviction with it as speedily to run through ten editions, besides nine editions of an Abstract. It was favorably and widely noticed by the press, both at home and abroad, especially in a very able article in the *Times*, occupying upwards of two columns. It likewise drew forth the commendation of Father Mathew. In a letter to the author he says: 'The work is calculated to do much good, and you have proved yourself a benefactor to the human race.' In his preface, Captain Claridge says: 'Some years ago, a friend of mine at Gratz, in Styria, who had received in his own person a most miraculous proof of the efficacy of the treatment at Græfenberg, strenuously recommended me to go there; but as almost every one is prodigal of advice, and as one every day hears of some vaunted panacea, it made no more than a momentary impression upon me, and was, therefore, disregarded.' He adds: 'My attention was first seriously drawn to the subject by a distinguished officer of Marines at Venice, who was, some years ago, so reduced by fever in the East, as to be unable to continue the service in which he was engaged,' and who had been benefited by the advice of Priessnitz. But Captain Claridge's resolution to visit Græfenberg was not finally formed until he had the opinion of a 'leading medical man, who attended the Imperial Court at Vienna and the British Embassy in that city,' who said that he thought that 'the treatment would be advantageous' to the Captain, and that 'he frequently sent his own patients to Græfenberg.' Captain Claridge had long suffered from rheumatism and head-ache, and the benefit which he, as well as a member of his family, derived from a short treatment, during a three months' residence at Græfenberg, under the care of Priessnitz, together with the results which he had witnessed in other cases, impelled him to publish; and, after perusing the works of several German authors, he 'felt that

he should be guilty of a dereliction of duty to his country, if he did not exert his humble efforts to promulgate the benefits of the system which they so warmly advocate.'

Since he commenced the advocacy of the Water Cure, Captain Claridge has been indefatigable in his exertions to promote its extension; he has freely devoted his time, his money, and his talents, to furthering it, both at home and abroad; it was he who brought, at his own expense, Dr. Weiss, to this country, to conduct the establishment of Stanstead Bury; it was he who, at much expense and risk, first opened the magnificent establishment of Sudbrook Park; he was the first to introduce the Water Cure into Italy, and accordingly converted into the first hydropathic establishment opened in that country, that splendid pile, the Grande Chartreuse of Pesio, situated amidst the most magnificent and romantic scenery in the Maritime Alps, to which, besides other distinguished personages, the younger members of the royal family of Piedmont have resorted.

He was mainly instrumental in inducing many eminent and talented advocates of the system to abandon the old practice of physic, and proceed to Græfenberg. He established, throughout the kingdom, many societies for inquiring into and propagating the new science; the first and principal of which was founded at the Rooms of the Society of Arts in London. He has gratuitously distributed large numbers of his own works, and of the works of other English hydropathic writers. In 1843 he travelled, at his own expense, through many parts of England, Ireland, and Scotland, delivering lectures; and he published the results of his mission in a pamphlet, entitled *Facts and Evidences*. He has contributed articles to both the English and American Water Cure journals. He visited Græfenberg a second time in 1845, and passed twelve months there, the fruits of which are his pamphlet on *Cholera*, and his latest work, *Every Man his own Doctor*. He has personally pressed the subject of the Water Cure upon the attention of several con-



## Biographical Sketch of Capt. Claridge.

tinental sovereigns; and, amongst them, upon Pius IX., who, on hearing that part of the process was wrapping people in wet sheets, exclaimed, 'che penitenza!' When further informed that it was continued in winter, said, 'mortificazione grande!' The Pope ended by relating an anecdote, that St. Ignatius being ill in bed of fever, and sought for by his enemies, rushed out of the house into a river, wherein he stood up to his chin, until his pursuers had passed by, and he was thereby cured of his fever.

He has always advocated the opening of a hydropathic hospital in London; and, at a time when there appeared some prospect of so desirable an object being attained, he directed that his name should be put down for a liberal contribution; and he has not hesitated, on many occasions, without fee or reward, when no hydropathic practitioner was at hand, to step in to the relief of sickness and suffering—nobly braving, in his compassion for afflicted humanity, the responsibilities, the contingent consequences, the risk of disease, the possible odium, and, it might be, the legal persecution to which a failure would have rendered him liable. For these things his rewards have been the approbation of his own conscience, the thanks of those whom he has rescued, the cheering words of his friends and of some of his fellow-laborers, and a share of that misrepresentation and abuse which generally assails the reformer. In the preface to his last work, he says, and we yield implicit credence to the statement: 'That it was my intention to make money by hydropathy is an allegation without a foundation; my object being completely philanthropic. Having gained my own health, and saved the life of my daughter, at Græfenberg, and having witnessed most astounding cures there, I wished to make generally known so valuable a remedy—to do this by writing, lecturing, attending the sick, opening establishments, or any other means in my power, my exertions have been unceasing. I may, therefore, be permitted to repeat, my motives have been disinterested, as, thanks to Providence!

I am perfectly independent in circumstances. The promotion of hydropathy has always been attended with expense to me—a sacrifice which I am still willing to make for its advancement.'

When the disinterested laborer for the benefit of his fellow-men has to defend himself from unmerited and ungenerous charges, it is humiliating to human nature, and must be galling and disheartening to the assailed; but, on the other hand, Captain Claridge must have been often cheered and gratified by the frequent testimonies publicly borne to the value of his labors by those who have followed in his steps; and a public testimonial has just been presented to him, affording a fresh proof of the estimation in which he is held.

Dr. Smethurst dedicates his work to him. Dr. James Wilson, of Malvern, says of him: 'Such men as Mr. Claridge ought not to be abused, for he could have no *pocket* motive: all that can be said is, that he is a little enthusiastic in these matters—a little enthusiasm does a great deal of good sometimes, when the motives are such as Mr. Claridge's.' Dr. Thomas J. Graham says: 'So extremely valuable is this treatment that the public are, in my opinion, much indebted to Captain Claridge, for the trouble he has taken in introducing it to our notice.' Dr. Rt. Hay Graham says: 'The public are much indebted to Mr. Claridge for introducing this remedy to their notice: having before his eyes the uncertainty of the medical art, his object has been to benefit mankind, by what appeared to him a more certain, as well as a more simple, mode of curing disease.' Mr. Preshaw, in his *Wet Sheet*, says: 'The British public are under deep obligations to Captain Claridge for his excellent treatise on the *Water Cure*.' Dr. Weiss says: 'To Captain Claridge the merit is undoubtedly due, of having first directed the attention of the public in the latter country (England) to this invaluable system—an undertaking in which he has shown the greatest perseverance and industry, advocating the good cause by word and deed, and never losing an opportunity of extending



117  
Biographical Sketch of Capt. Claridge.

its popularity.' And Dr. Edward Johnson, the celebrated author of *Life, Health, and Disease*, and many other valuable works, writes: 'Every person in England who is cured of his disease by the hydropathic treatment, owes a large debt of gratitude to Captain Claridge, whose indefatigable exertions and indomitable courage, in spite of all opposition, have succeeded in planting hydropathy in this country—a soil in which, protected by humanity, and watered and pruned by science, it cannot fail to thrive, and grow, and flourish—a blessing to the people.' Other writers, too, have borne grateful and graceful testimonies to his services; but it is to be regretted that there are others still who have either passed over in silence, or spoken slightly of the labors of their pioneer and fellow-

laborer. His writings, it is true, may not be free from error; but whose writings are? It should be remembered, and it might have disarmed censure, that, in his first work on the Water Cure, he confesses himself 'unacquainted with the abstruse terms used in medicine;' and it might have won respect and confidence that he was a volunteer, whose services were freely accorded from pure love to the cause which he had espoused, and to which, it is not too much to say, that he has not rendered less important services than any other advocate of it. His enthusiasm, as it ever does, may sometimes mislead him; but, without enthusiasm, no man can be a good pioneer, or can ever effect anything really worthy of admiration, and his good faith and sincerity are undeniable.

John Gibbs.



*Medical Liberty*  
*Compulsory*

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex,

May 20th, 1854.

GENTLEMEN,—I beg to thank you for your courtesy, and to express the gratification I received from the compliment you so kindly pay my pamphlet.

I am happy to perceive that you take the true view of *Compulsory Vaccination*—it is the getting in of the thin edge of the wedge, and involves the whole question of medical liberty. If ~~our rulers~~ have any right to prescribe, in any one point, compulsory medical treatment for any portion of its subjects—it has an equal right to interfere and coerce its subjects in every other point of medical practice.

Aggressions upon the medical liberty of the subject can only be repelled on the broad ground of principle.

If the State chooses to demand any particular qualifications on the part of its public servants, medical or otherwise, it has a right to do so; but it has no right to interfere between man and man, and to prevent A. B. hiring himself to C. D. for any lawful purpose, and to prohibit C. D. from employing and paying, with his own money, A. B. for work done. If A. B. and C. D. be mutually satisfied, the State has nothing to say to the matter.

This seems to me the ground which Medical Dissenters should occupy; they should demand of the State to be put on an equal footing, as between man and man, as their diploma'd competitors, and should insist on the laws affording them proper protection, i.e., the same protection which it affords to others, namely, the right of free labour and the right of remuneration.

If Medical Dissenters, and the friends of medical liberty, would preserve even the rights and privileges they now enjoy, they must become the assailants of monopoly, and no longer content themselves with acting upon the defensive. The first object that invites their assault is the Compulsory Vaccination Act. Let them try their strength against that: they would have right on their side; and, should they succeed, they would obtain a prestige which would assuredly carry them on to victory in all that they could reasonably desire.

My pamphlet is entitled to, at least, this much weight—that it is from the pen of a man who has no personal or pecuniary interest whatever in the subject it discusses.

I write these few hasty words amid the pressure of many engagements, and begging you to accept my thanks for your kind attention,

I am, Gentlemen, yours obediently,

JOHN GIBBS.

The Gentlemen of the British College of Health.

P.S. Would you kindly oblige me with another copy of the Circular in which you invite public attention to our Medical Liberties.—J. G.

*From the Practitioner Hygienist and  
Medical Reformer. May, 1854.*



THE HASTINGS BOARD OF GUARDIANS AND  
THE COMPULSORY VACCINATION ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

"It can scarcely be disputed that no one has a right to put in jeopardy the lives of his fellow subjects."—Return of the Small Pox and Vaccination Committee of the Epidemiological Society to the Lords. P. 3.

"As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise."—Luke 6, 31.

"And not rather, let us do evil that good may come? whose damnation is just."—Rom. 3, 8.

SIR,—I observe in your impression of yesterday, under the head of "Board of Guardians," the following short, but important paragraph:—"The Chairman and the Clerk were requested to consider the provisions of the Vaccination Act Amendment Bill, and report thereon at the next meeting."

I have not the pleasure of having any personal knowledge of those gentlemen, and therefore do not know how to reach them, except through your columns, neither do I know what qualifications they may bring to the discharge of the duties imposed upon them; but I think that, without doing any great violence to probability, I may assume that their qualifications will not become less if they will have the goodness to peruse a few facts, which I trust that you will have the kindness to lay before them and before your other readers, for one and all of whom such facts ought to possess the highest interest.

There is no subject, upon which so many otherwise well-informed people betray such gross ignorance and unreasoning credulity, as vaccination; and therefore it is that the partizans of this practice—inflamed with cruel zeal, or frenzied with fear—recklessly cast away every gentlemanly feeling, disregard every principle of justice, violate the spirit of freedom, outrage the precepts of Christianity, trample upon common sense, betray their own best rights and dearest interests, and perpetrate atrocities, from which it is to be hoped that they would recoil with horror, if they could only regard them with cool intelligence.

There is a very prevalent, though far from universal belief, that vaccination is infallible as a protection against small pox. No person who will take the trouble to peruse and digest the Returns of the Registrar-General, can continue to embrace so gross a delusion. Numberless are the cases of deaths, from small pox, of persons who had vainly put their trust in vaccination. Let one example suffice for the present—in the first quarterly return for 1853, No. 17, it is stated, under the head of Taunton:—"There has been one death from small pox, that of a male, twenty years of age, vaccinated in childhood."

In the three subsequent quarterly returns for the same year, Nos. 18, 19, and 20, no death from small pox is recorded as occurring at Taunton. Moreover, we find this further information respecting Taunton, in the *Lancet*, of July 2, 1854:—"At Taunton, Mr. White reports that vaccination has become almost extinct, and that in a population of between 4,000 and 5,000, not one case has offered for vaccination in the last two and a half years."

That is the population in which one death from small pox occurs in the year 1853, and that death befalls a person who had been "protected" (?) by vaccination!

In connection with this part of the subject let me state, on the authority of the *Lancet*, of February 12, 1853, that out of 800 patients admitted into the Small Pox Hospital in 1852, only 230 were unvaccinated, or in other words, that 570, or considerably more than two thirds of the whole had been vaccinated; and this in a population, of which we may form some idea of the relative numbers of the vaccinated and the unvaccinated from a perusal of the following statement of the numbers born and vaccinated, in the previous year, 1851, in the City of London Union:—"In the City of London Union, in which, in the year 1851, the births are returned 1,311, only 61—i.e., about a twentieth of the whole number—were protected during the first year by the lancet of the Union Surgeon."

[+ *Lancet* July 2. 1853.]

[+ *Ann. Medical & Chirurgical*  
p. 13.]



Not to insist further, at present, upon the countless notorious failures of vaccination as a prophylactic—not to insist upon the striking facts which have been adduced to prove that, upon the whole, vaccination is not a blessing, but a curse, to the human race, and that it cannot be, that it is not, a condition essential to *health and longevity*, that the *pure stream of life* should be contaminated by the introduction of a disgusting virus derived, or directly taken, from the blood of a brute—it should be sufficient to quote a few facts from the Returns of the Registrar-General, which prove that *vaccination is frequently an immediate cause of death*.

*discovered*

"In Bethnal Green, at 19, Warner place south, on 15th July, the son of a cabinet-maker, aged seven months, died of *vaccination, erysipelas*."—Registrar-General's Weekly Return for week ending July 23, 1853.

"In Mile-end-town lower, the daughter of a gentleman, aged three months, died of '*erysipelas*.' The medical man states that *it supervened on vaccination*."—Weekly Return for the week ending Saturday, April 1, 1854.

"At the German Hospital, Dalston (both on 30th March), the son of a mariner, aged ten weeks, and the son of a sugar baker, aged thirteen weeks, died of '*general erysipelas after vaccination, effusion on the brain*.' In Ratcliff, at 2, Devonport street, on 6th April, the son of a coal merchant, aged three months, *died of erysipelas all over the body (one day), succeeding vaccination, which was considered to be fine*."—Weekly return (No. 14, vol. 15) for week ending Saturday, April 8, 1854.

"In the south sub-district of St. Giles, at 8, Parker street, on 13th April, the daughter of a mason, aged one month, '*irregular vaccination when a fortnight old*.'"—Weekly Return for week ending April 15, 1854.

"At the Cock and Castle, Kingsland, on 1st May, the son of a licensed victualler, aged four months, died of '*vaccination, inflammation of the cellular tissue of arm and thorax*.' In Haggerston east, at 54, Union street, on 1st May, the son of a hot-presser, aged four months, *died of 'gangrene after vaccination' (fourteen days)*."—Weekly Return for week ending May 6, 1854.

Is it possible that a Christian people can only find safety, from an evil which they dread, by the practice of legal infanticide? Can they really hope that the blessing of God will sanctify such iniquity? Can they seriously reprove the heathen for similar atrocities?

Is it to be wondered at, that, with such facts as I have quoted before them, thinking men should conscientiously decline to jeopardize the health and lives of their offspring by the adoption of a *deceitful, disgusting, and unnatural practice*—a practice alike debasing to man and dishonouring to God? Is it not rather to be wondered at that any man professing Christianity should not only yield himself captive, mentally and bodily, to as mischievous a delusion as ever enthralled the human intellect, but that, failing in argument to disseminate his opinions, he should seek by brute force to propagate his obnoxious practice?

Thousands object to vaccination on religious grounds; are they to be dragooned out of their objections in a nation boasting to be foremost in its attachment to the cause of civil and religious freedom, and professing to regard aggressions on either, in foreign lands, with a holy indignation?

Let the Hastings Board of Guardians act, on this occasion, as gentlemen, freemen, Britons, Christians should act; and let them indignantly denounce and repel this insidious, brutal, un-English, and un-Christian aggression upon our civil and religious liberties and personal rights. Should they not do so—should they betray their duties to their neighbours, their country, their religion, and themselves—let them be assured that the day will come when the legitimate consequences shall recoil upon themselves, and they shall bitterly bewail their short-sighted folly and selfishness. *Those who disregard the rights and liberties of others, deserve and shall receive no sympathy when their own rights and liberties are confiscated.*

*their own heads*

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
July 8, 1854.

*They  
shall be*



# The Medical Circular.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 1854.

To the Editor of the Medical Circular.

SIR,—My attention has been directed to a notice of my pamphlet, 'Our Medical Liberties,' in the impression of your Journal of May 24, 1854. With the opinions you express concerning the merits of that pamphlet, I am not at all concerned, but, as you question a statement contained therein, I conceive myself entitled to claim a place in your columns for this brief reply. You say:—

"For instance, it is asserted that at the meeting of the South London Association, Mr Brady 'exclaimed with incautious and indecent exultation, in the last year, by passing the Compulsory Vaccination Bill, they had taken away the liberty of the subject.' Now it is very likely Mr Brady said this; and we have said something like it many times ourselves, but we deny that Mr Brady *indecently exulted* over the thought; he rather grieved at the mistaken spirit of legislation which pervaded that Act."

If in this passage you mean to imply that *you condemn the principle of compulsion* which pervades the Vaccination Act of last session, I beg to express my gratification; but, as far as regards Mr Brady, I would ask leave to let him speak for himself in the following quotation:—

"He wished to show to the House of Commons that his was a measure of social, not of political reform—that the object it had in view was, not for a class but for the community at large. By these means he was almost certain that he would ultimately succeed in introducing the first wedge of medical reform. The legislature had already given precedents to which he might refer. *In the last year, by passing the Compulsory Vaccination Bill, they had taken away the liberty of the subject, and he could not be told now that he was interfering unlawfully with that liberty.*"—Report of a Meeting of the South London Medical Association, 'Medical Times,' Feb. 11, 1854, p. 147.

I am, &c.,

THE AUTHOR OF 'OUR MEDICAL LIBERTIES.'

Maze-hill Cottage, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex,

July 12, 1854.

[We cannot perceive any "indecent exultation" in the foregoing remarks. Mr Brady opposed the Vaccination Act at the time of its passing through the House, and in the observations cited he rather upbraids the members than exults over their successful attack on the liberty of the subject.]

L. W. C. A.



# COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

*To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."*

"One man in his individual capacity having no right to interfere with another, two men cannot have that right, nor can any number of men, because no number of *no rights* can ever make a right."—*Dove's Elements of Political Science*, p. 164.

"This doctrine, that it is the duty of the State to protect the health of its subjects, cannot be established, for the same reason that its kindred doctrines cannot, namely—the impossibility of saying how far the alleged duty shall be carried out..... The arguments employed by the dissenter to show that the moral sanity of the people is not a matter of State superintendence, are applicable, with a slight change of terms, to their physical sanity also."—*Herbert Spencer's Social Statics*, pp. 373-5.

"He was opposed to it (compulsory vaccination) on constitutional grounds, as no parents ought to be compelled to have their children vaccinated. *He denied that vaccination was any preventative of small-pox, and [affirmed that it] was often the cause of blindness and scrofula.*" Speech of Mr. W. Michell (M.D., M.R.C.S.L.) in the debate in the Commons, July 18, 1854, on the Compulsory Vaccination Act Amendment Bill.—*Medical Circular*, July 26, 1854.

SIR,—In addressing you on the subject of the Compulsory Vaccination Act Amendment Bill (since thrown out in the Commons—an omen, let me hope, of the fate ultimately to await the Compulsory Vaccination Act itself), my purpose obviously was to call attention to a few facts not generally known, and to arouse, if possible, whatever of manly, gentlemanly, English, and Christian feeling there might be in the Hastings Board of Guardians against an atrocious violation of the right of private judgment and freedom of the person, in a matter of the most vital import. How far I have succeeded I know not. It is apparent, however, that there are not wanting benevolent gentlemen, whose amiable ambition it is to undertake the regulation of our nurseries, and to relieve parents of the burden of thought and responsibility. It seems to require no small degree of modest assurance to endeavour to persuade us that we have neither the right nor the capability to judge and act for ourselves and our families in important domestic and personal concerns, and that even on public grounds, we should resign some of our most sacred duties and privileges into the hands of eager volunteers. Such unlooked-for hardihood is much the same as if some eccentric burglar were to endeavour to persuade us that he had a moral right to invade our dwellings, and to dispose of our worldly goods, under the plea that the disposition he contemplated was essential to the "welfare of others." Apart from the arrogance of such pretensions, the melange of medical common-places in your last impression (July 21), is perhaps as scientific and as much to the purpose, as if the whole Faculty of Physic had assisted in concocting it.

If the tendency of free discussion and the plain statement of facts be to bring vaccination into disrepute, the Compulsory Vaccinators will only have to blame themselves, and may trace their discomfiture and the disgrace of their vaunted nostrum to their own rude and insolent invasion of the rights of others.

That small-pox committed "dreadful ravages in this country in the last century," seems only too true; but (as, indeed, it is admitted), so also did the plague; yet, we are not told why that once dread foe has ceased to destroy, neither are we informed that "dreadful ravages" are now committed in this country by another dire scourge of the human race—*consumption*; of which it has been observed as a "singular coincidence, that from the time of the first use of cow-pox," it has fearfully increased, until it is said, that few families in the kingdom can boast to have escaped its blighting power,—until the mortality from it, in the metropolis alone, in the last ten years, numbers no less than 68,204 victims. And that this may be something more than a mere "singular coincidence," we are led to

*much*



123  
31  
suspect from the experiences of Drs. Barthey and Rilliett, that, out of 208 vaccinated children who died, 183 died of tubercular consumption, while out of 90 unvaccinated children who died, only 30 died from that disease; the obvious inference from which is, that the mortality from consumption was increased fourfold by vaccination.

The "propositions" I maintain are, that vaccination has not been shown to be an *efficient, harmless, and necessary* prophylactic, and that, be it a blessing or a curse, its partizans have no right to lay violent hands upon others, and to inflict upon them an obnoxious surgical operation.

"That there are many deaths, or attacks, from small-pox," is the argument of the compulsory vaccinators themselves, and surely a legitimate and logical reply to it is to point to the numbers of the many sick and dead, who had vainly relied upon vaccination as a protection,—facts which seem to require no little sophistry to explain away, and which derive additional force from the reflection that of the unvaccinated, it is fair to assume that several must have caught small-pox from a practice no less disgusting, unnatural, and injurious, namely, inoculation.

*A priori* there is nothing in vaccination to recommend it as a prophylactic. Surely, then, the *onus* rests with the proselytising, intolerant, compulsory vaccinators themselves to prove both the *efficiency* and *harmlessness* of their mysterious nostrum,—to prove that their disgusting practice is something more than a game of chance, a throwing of the dice for life or death. This is only what *prudent people* would demand of the vendors of any specific. Vaccinators have no right, in addition to their other eccentricities, further to defy the laws of logic and common sense, by requiring that those whom they fail to convince shall prove a negative.

Has any compulsory vaccinator ascertained what is the relative percentage of deaths from small-pox amongst the two classes, the vaccinated and the unvaccinated? Can he tell what protects from the assaults of small-pox the thousands who are unvaccinated? Can he instruct us why it that other thousands, that even whole communities (as the other day at Loanga), display an insusceptibility to the action of the *vaccinae virus*? Did it ever occur to him that that same innate power which affords an efficient protection from the invasion of cow-pox, may likewise yield an efficient protection against small-pox?—the one being held to be identical and, indeed, convertible into the other. Does he ignore that conservative power in the living organism which is supposed to combat and overcome the aggressions of disease? Dare he seriously maintain that that power is best sustained in all its integrity and activity by *corrupting the stream of life*?—the pabulum and "sum of all the organs."

The real question for statesmen, physicians, philanthropists, logicians, parents, should be, *not* does vaccination afford protection from this or that peculiar form of disease, but is it conducive, or adverse, to *health and longevity*—a question continually overlooked by zealous, headlong vaccinators, by even the Epidemiological Society themselves when they innocently put forward several pages of figures, which Parliament courteously accepted, as justifying the "conclusion" at which the society unanimously arrived in favour of making vaccination compulsory. The following tables, compiled from those figures, and contrasting the mortality from all causes in different parts of Great Britain and Ireland, vaccination being voluntary, with the mortality from all causes in different parts of the Austrian empire, vaccination being compulsory, assuredly lend no countenance to either compulsion or vaccination.

Mortality from all causes in various parts of Great Britain and Ireland.

| Town or district. | Year. | Population. | Dths. from all causes. | Dths. per thousand. |
|-------------------|-------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| London            | 1851  | 2,373,799   | 55,354                 | 23.3                |
| England and Wales | 1851  | 17,922,768  | 395,933                | 22                  |
| Liverpool         | 1850  | 258,236     | 7,500                  | 29                  |
| Manchester        | 1850  | 228,433     | 6,680                  | 29                  |
| Birmingham        | 1851  | 173,951     | 4,056                  | 23.3                |
| Leeds             | 1851  | 101,343     | 2,502                  | 24.6                |
| Dublin            | 1851  | 258,361     | 6,931                  | 26.8                |
| Cork              | 1851  | 85,745      | 2,002                  | 23.3                |
| Galway            | 1851  | 34,057      | 789                    | 23                  |
| Limerick          | 1851  | 53,448      | 1,418                  | 26.5                |

It is worthy of notice, that the rate of mortality in these towns is highest in two English towns and lowest in an Irish town.



| Mortality from all causes in various parts of the Austrian Empire. |       |             | Dths. from  | Dths. per |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Town or district.                                                  | Year. | Population. | all causes. | thousand. |
| Lower Austria....                                                  | 1850  | 1,538,047   | 54,970      | 35.7      |
| Upper Austria....                                                  |       | 852,323     | 23,646      | 27.7      |
| Styria.....                                                        |       | 1,006,971   | 30,534      | 30.3      |
| Illyria.....                                                       |       | 783,180     | 31,630      | 44.2      |
| Trieste.....                                                       |       | 82,597      | 3,283       | 39.7      |
| Tyrol.....                                                         |       | 859,706     | 25,276      | 28.2      |
| Bohemia.....                                                       |       | 4,409,900   | 170,432     | 38.6      |
| Moravia.....                                                       |       | 1,799,838   | 55,637      | 30.9      |
| Silesia.....                                                       |       | 438,586     | 12,123      | 27.4      |
| Gallicia.....                                                      |       | 4,555,477   | 140,329     | 30.8      |
| Bukowina.....                                                      |       | 380,826     | 11,070      | 29.0      |
| Dalmatia.....                                                      |       | 393,715     | 9,442       | 23.9      |
| Lombardy.....                                                      |       | 2,725,740   | 92,550      | 33.9      |
| Venice.....                                                        |       | 2,281,732   | 76,150      | 33.3      |
| Military Frontier,<br>without the 7 burghs.                        |       | 1,009,109   | 44,610      | 44.2      |

Laying aside for the moment all other and higher considerations, and viewing the question of compulsory vaccination as merely one of arithmetic, it would seem to need something more than an appeal to the oldest inhabitant, or a sentimental allusion to a "fair countenance," to disarm objections founded on such facts as, that out of 800 patients admitted into the Small-pox Hospital, more than two-thirds had been protected by vaccination; that the *one* death in a twelvemonth, at Taunton, in a population of thousands, amongst whom vaccination had been disused for years, should be that of a young man who had been vaccinated, and that the disease did not extend its ravages, suggesting that there may be some other protection against it than the practice of vaccination; and that in lands compulsorily protected, the mortality *from all causes* is mostly considerably higher than—in some instances *double*—the mortality from all causes in lands where vaccination is optional, or was so at the time to which the figures refer.

To pretend that the frequent deaths from vaccination should have no force in determining the question of compulsory vaccination, is only to maintain that the State has a right to commit infanticide at the bidding and for the assumed benefit of a faction.

With reference to a notorious recent fatal case of lithotomy, it is gravely remarked, with a simplicity that would become a Fellow of the College of Surgeons, that "he will be a bold man who comes forward to write down the practice altogether on that account." But it is not ~~said~~ that, as a more fitting comment upon that little event, (for a knowledge of which the public are indebted to one of those happy accidents by which, it is said, that honest men sometimes come by their own), a coroner's jury brought in a verdict that "the deceased died of inflammation caused by an operation *unskilfully performed*;" neither are we reminded that the victims to vaccination died, *not* because the operation was "unskilfully performed," but simply *because it was performed*. We should be told, too, that lithotomy is usually reserved as a *desperate* remedy in a *desperate* case, while vaccination is usually performed on a *healthy* person, as a sort of charm, which, it is hoped, may ward off a "remote and fortuitous

evil." Were any man mad enough to propose to make the incision—now reserved for the removal of a foreign body—compulsory upon all infants, as holding out a promise of some mysterious protection throughout life, I hope that somebody would be found "bold" enough to appeal to the case of Alfred Richardson.

*Ethically*, it may be very true that "the best known remedies must be used, until better ones can be discovered," but, considering the increasing number of conflicting medical schools and authorities, the constant fluctuation of medical doctrines, and the various antagonistic remedies zealously proposed for any one given disease—small-pox itself for example—it can scarcely be hoped that a Parliamentary pharmacopœia could give much satisfaction, or that Parliament could be prevailed upon to undertake one. And then what would be thought of a Parliamentary dietary?

Unlearned as I am in zoögraphy, I cannot get rid of the impression that somewhere or other, I have read that "*kine*, as well as swine, are subject to *scrofula*;" neither can I avoid feeling some difficulty in believing that the "physical condition" of a *diseased brute* "is even purer

not from  
Pike.

added,







# Compulsory Vaccination

Deficient in modesty, logic, and common sense, is it strange that compulsory vaccinators should find their arrogant pretensions repulsed, their claims to medical infallibility derided, their treacherous nostrum contemptuously rejected, and their presumptuous attempt to arbitrate, uninvited, on questions "social, political, and theological," or even in matters of mere taste, laughed to scorn? Yet, considering what human nature is, one would charitably seek some excuse for such rash audacity in the reflection that rejected advice is too often gall and wormwood to him who has vainly proffered it, and that, even amongst philanthropists, wounded vanity too frequently seeks to avenge itself by coercion.

Elsewhere, in the *News*, there is an allusion to "financial burdens," in connection with this subject, and this gives occasion to observe that the Compulsory Vaccination Act levies a tax upon every English babe for the benefit of the medical profession.

If this legislation be persisted in, we may expect that the memory of Jenner will some day become more odious than ever it has been honoured, and that he will be ~~decided~~ as having, by his fatal discovery, not only taught men to rely upon a delusion and to propagate disease, but as having given occasion to the foes of freedom, when beaten upon other battle-fields, to rally again to the assault, and so to frighten the people from their propriety as to surprise them into a heedless and unavailing surrender of a precious birthright, for worse than "a mess of pottage."

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
July 26, 1854.

P.S.—Another case of legal infanticide is reported in the current number of the Registrar General's Weekly Returns:—"In Mile-end New Town, at 1, George street, on the 17th July, the daughter of a carman, aged three months, erysipelas after vaccination (three weeks), convulsions (twenty-four hours)."—Weekly Return, week ending Saturday, July 22, 1854.

## The Freeman's Journal

DUBLIN, TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1854.

### MATHEW RELIEF FUND.

The following letter was received by Doctor Hayden from Mr. Gibbs:—

"Maze-hill Cottage, St. Leonard's-on-Sea,  
4th August, 1854.

"DEAR SIR—I believe that I have to thank you for a copy of the *General Advertiser* of the 22d ult., calling my attention to the Mathew Relief Fund. It caused me the deepest pain to learn that the very reverend gentleman is the victim of multiplied afflictions; and even had I not the greatest esteem and respect for him personally I should still feel it to be a duty to contribute my mite to the necessities of a man who is the unselfish patriot and the friend of his race, and whose own hand has ever been 'open as the day to melting charity.'

"I beg to enclose towards the Mathew Relief Fund a post office order for 2*l*., being the contribution of 1*l*. from myself, and 1*l*. from my wife.—I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

JOHN GIBBS.

"Dr. G. T. Hayden, 82, Harcourt-street,  
Dublin."



English Liberty 127

ENGLISH LIBERTY!

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

"The first and primary end of human laws is to maintain and regulate these absolute rights of individuals."

"Besides those limbs and members that may be necessary to a man, in order to defend himself, or annoy his enemy, the rest of his person, or body, is also entitled, by the same natural right, to security from the corporal insults — menaces, assaults, beating, and wounding; though such insults amount not to destruction of life or member."—Blackstone's Commentaries, b. 1, ch. 1.

"To make a complete crime cognizable by human laws, there must be both a will and an act. .... In all temporal jurisdictions an overt act, or some open evidence of an intended crime, is necessary, in order to demonstrate the depravity of the will, before the man is liable to punishment. And, as a vitious will without a vitious act is no civil crime, so, on the other hand, an unwarrantable act without a vitious will is no crime at all. So that to constitute a crime against human laws, there must be, first, a vitious will, and secondly, an unlawful act consequent upon such vitious will."—Ibid, b. 4, ch. 2.

"Let me exhort and conjure you never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by without a determined, persevering resistance. One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact, to-day is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and where they do not suit exactly, the defect is supplied by analogy."—Junius.

SIR,—Has England become an Austrian Province? or have our rulers imported an Austrian Police?

Our streets are daringly placarded with insulting, revolutionary notices, headed

"COMPULSORY VACCINATION!"

Will Englishmen tamely allow themselves to be thus bullied by the tools of a medical faction? Or can it be that an Englishman's appreciation and love of Freedom are limited to the exercise of a noisy, but empty privilege—the roaring out of drunken and lying songs, ending with

"Britons never shall be slaves!"

The enemies of freedom are cunning, active, and watchful. Bit by bit, they eagerly strive to steal away those liberties, which, as yet, they dare not attempt to ravish openly and at once.

Englishmen were wont to boast that their constitution assured the inviolability of the person. That security no longer exists. The constitution is daily violated in the persons of the most innocent.

English justice used to demand proof of an overt act as essential to the commission of a crime. The dangerous—the fatal principle has been imported into English legislation, that the penalties of the law may fall where no overt act has been committed.

Strange that the first sacrifice of British Freedom is offered up at the shrine of quackery!

I am, sir, your obliged and obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,

August 5, 1854.

7  
The new  
doctrine of  
the  
is  
and constantly  
employment  
of active  
provision  
of  
liberties

+ Collected Stems, See page 133



"OUR MEDICAL LIBERTIES" AND THE "CRITIC."

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—The Editor of the *Critic* not having vouchsafed any notice to a communication I addressed to him in reply to an article in his paper, I beg to enclose you a copy of that communication, with a request that, as a lover of fair-play and freedom of speech, and an opponent of unnecessary State-meddling, you will oblige me by giving

it a place in your columns, and thus show that misrepresentation and injustice may not pass wholly unrebuked, and that the free discussion of an important public question may not be bucked even by the *Critic*.

That the *Critic* should be extremely sensitive to any opposition to the establishment of a State physis is only natural in a writer who sighs for the establishment of a State literature—of what has been called a "Priesthood of Science"—but furnishes no excuse for falsehood and misrepresentation. In the current number of the *Critic*, under the heading "The Literary World," there occurs the following passage:—

"The incorporation of literature into a profession, if practicable, would undoubtedly afford it advantages not to be despised, not only by consolidating its strength, and giving it as it were a local habitation as well as a name, but, what is even far more important, by raising up for it a protection against the assumption of its functions by ignorant and ~~unqualified~~ practitioners."

Under such a system, what would become of the *Critic*?

We live in strange times when even a portion of that press, which we have been taught to regard as the guardian of our liberties, should basely join, for its own ends, in the conspiracy against them!

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

THE AUTHOR OF "OUR MEDICAL LIBERTIES."

Maze-hill Cottage, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex.

August 16, 1854.

[COPY.]

To the Editor of the *Critic*.

SIR,—A copy of the *Critic* of June 15, 1854, has been placed in my hands. I observe therein a notice of my recent pamphlet, "Our Medical Liberties," in which your reviewer, while accusing me of "ignorantly and unjustly" aspersing the medical profession, of using "indecent" language, and of a "violation" of common sense and truth, so far oversteps the boundaries of legitimate criticism, abuses your confidence, disgraces your journal, and endeavours to deceive your readers by the grossest falsehoods, as to entitle me to a place in your columns in reply.

Your reviewer asserts:—

"So far from the spread of vaccination subserving the interests of the profession and gratifying the avarice of its members, it is notorious that the medical body is the only one (except the undertakers) who suffer in their pockets from the diffusion of the blessings of vaccination. If, therefore, this obnoxious Act had been the work of the profession, or if it had received the general sanction and encouragement of medical men, their object must have been other than that of power and gain."

Your reviewer did well to remind his readers that the interests of the medical profession and the undertakers are identical—it is a fact to be carefully remembered.

Passing over the suppression, by your reviewer, of the facts that vaccination is accused of not being a preventative of small-pox, that it is charged with being the means of propagating various diseases, and that it is proved to be frequently an immediate cause of death, "it is notorious" that the Compulsory Vaccination Act levies a tax upon every English babe for the benefit of the medical profession. True, the profession protest against some of the details of this measure, affect indignation at the smallness of the remuneration accorded to their suspicious services, and loudly clamour for an increase of pay, but, nevertheless, they pocket the proceeds of the tax. That the Compulsory Vaccination Act is held to subserve the interests and forward the ambitious views of the profession is evident from the speech of their mouth-piece, Dr. Brady, M.P., in recommendation of his Medical Registration Bill (at a meeting of the South London Medical Association, as reported in the *Medical Times* of Feb. 11 1854, p. 147), in which he says:—

unqualified,



"The legislature had already given precedent to which he might refer. In the last year, by passing the Compulsory Vaccination Bill, they had taken away the liberty of the subject, and he could not now be told that he was interfering unlawfully with that liberty."

That the principle of compulsory vaccination is not only generally acceptable to, but actually advocated by the profession, we have the assurance of no less an authority than that Report of the Epidemiological Society, to which your reviewer appeals, as confidently as if he had read and mastered it, as "the only authentic document which contains a particle of information on the subject," and of which he dares to assure his readers that I "never heard," although he might have found mention of it in a quotation at page 31 of the pamphlet he pretends to criticise, if he had taken the trouble first to read it. At page 5 of the Report of the Small-pox and Vaccination Committee of the Epidemiological Society it is stated,—“We have been put in possession of the opinions of nearly 2,000 of our medical brethren,” and at page 35 we find,—“A very large majority of those medical practitioners who, in replies to the queries issued by the society, have proposed any remedies for the prevention of Small-pox, have urged the necessity of compulsory vaccination.” I think now that it will require some effrontery to re-assert that the Compulsory Vaccination Act does not subserve the interests of the medical profession, and that it did not receive “the general sanction and encouragement of medical men.”

Your reviewer also asserts :—

“A still more serious allegation is brought against the profession when Mr. Gibbs says, not only that ‘scarcely one, if one [medical man] has ever considered, or even thought of considering, the subject in all its bearings.’”

I never said so. On the contrary, I quoted, as adverse to vaccination, the opinions of various medical men, who obviously did think “of considering the subject in all its bearings.” What I say (at page 10) is, that of the “advocates of vaccination,” “scarcely one, if one of them, had ever considered, or even thought of considering, the subject in all its bearings.” This accusation I now deliberately re-affirm, and I specially include in it both your reviewer and the Epidemiological Society, notwithstanding that that society flippantly express a “strong and unequivocal opinion that there is not the smallest foundation for” believing that vaccination “is the means of introducing other diseases into the system.” The following tables, compiled from figures pompously paraded, by the Epidemiological Society, to Parliament and the nation, as justifying and requiring a measure of compulsory vaccination, show how incompetent that society is to deal with statistics.

MORTALITY FROM ALL CAUSES IN VARIOUS PARTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, VACCINATION BEING VOLUNTARY.

| Town or Country.   | Year.   | Population.   | Deaths from all causes. | Deaths per thousand. |
|--------------------|---------|---------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| London .....       | 1851 .. | 2,373,799 ..  | 55,454 ..               | 23.3                 |
| England & Wales .. | ..      | 17,922,768 .. | 395,933 ..              | 22.                  |
| Liverpool .....    | 1850 .. | 258,236 ..    | 7,500 ..                | 29.                  |
| Manchester .....   | ..      | 228,433 ..    | 6,680 ..                | 29.                  |
| Birmingham .....   | ..      | 173,951 ..    | 4,056 ..                | 23.3                 |
| Leeds .....        | ..      | 101,343 ..    | 2,502 ..                | 24.6                 |
| Dublin .....       | 1851 .. | 258,361 ..    | 6,931 ..                | 26.8                 |
| Cork .....         | ..      | 85,745 ..     | 2,002 ..                | 23.3                 |
| Limerick .....     | ..      | 58,448 ..     | 1,418 ..                | 26.5                 |
| Galway .....       | ..      | 34,057 ..     | 789 ..                  | 23.                  |

MORTALITY FROM ALL CAUSES IN VARIOUS PARTS OF THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE, VACCINATION BEING COMPULSORY.

| Town or Country.                                | Year.   | Population.  | Deaths from all causes. | Deaths per thousand. |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Lower Austria ..                                | 1850 .. | 1,538,047 .. | 54,970 ..               | 35.7                 |
| Upper Austria ..                                | ..      | 852,323 ..   | 23,646 ..               | 27.7                 |
| Styria .....                                    | ..      | 1,006,971 .. | 30,534 ..               | 30.3                 |
| Illyria .....                                   | ..      | 738,180 ..   | 34,630 ..               | 44.2                 |
| Trieste .....                                   | ..      | 82,597 ..    | 3,283 ..                | 39.7                 |
| Tyrol .....                                     | ..      | 859,706 ..   | 25,276 ..               | 28.2                 |
| Bohemia .....                                   | ..      | 4,409,900 .. | 170,432 ..              | 38.6                 |
| Moravia .....                                   | ..      | 1,799,838 .. | 55,637 ..               | 30.9                 |
| Silesia .....                                   | ..      | 438,586 ..   | 12,123 ..               | 27.4                 |
| Gallicia .....                                  | ..      | 4,555,477 .. | 140,329 ..              | 30.8                 |
| Bukowina .....                                  | ..      | 380,826 ..   | 11,070 ..               | 29.0                 |
| Dalmatia .....                                  | ..      | 393,715 ..   | 9,442 ..                | 23.9                 |
| Lombardy .....                                  | ..      | 2,725,740 .. | 92,550 ..               | 33.9                 |
| Venice .....                                    | ..      | 2,281,732 .. | 76,150 ..               | 33.3                 |
| Military Frontiers without the 7 Boroughs ..... | ..      | 1,009,109 .. | 44,610 ..               | 44.2                 |

3/



From these tables it is clear that, in lands compulsorily protected (?) by vaccination, the mortality from all causes is mostly much higher than, in two instances more than double, the mortality from all causes in lands where vaccination is optional, or was so at the period to which the figures refer.

The propositions advanced by the Epidemiological Society at page 5 in support of compulsory vaccination are capable, for the most part, of a direct negative. It is not true that "small-pox is a disease to which every person is liable who is not protected by a previous attack or by vaccination;" many persons are manifestly insusceptible of small-pox. It is not true that every case of it is a centre of contagion, and every unvaccinated or imperfectly vaccinated population is a nidus for the disease to settle in and propagate itself;" single cases of small-pox occur in "unvaccinated, or imperfectly vaccinated" populations, and the disease does not spread. It is not true "that vaccination is a perfectly safe and efficient prophylactic against this disease;" cases of small-pox and of death from small-pox are constantly occurring amongst the vaccinated, and cases of death from vaccination itself are frequent.

One proposition, however, may be accepted, and we shrink not to join issue with the Epidemiological Society when they assert, that "it can scarcely be disputed that no one has a right to put in jeopardy the lives of his fellow subjects," which is precisely what compulsory vaccinators themselves daily do, as is proved by the records of death from vaccination reported in the Returns of the Registrar-General.

On one point I freely plead guilty to the charge of ignorance hurled at me by your reviewer, to whom I now beg to express my obligation for this extraordinary piece of information, that the Epidemiological Society "for two years laboured night and day" (!) "on the statistical history, progress, and results of vaccination." This information, while awakening our admiration of such ~~power~~ of endurance, and our sympathy for the inevitably consequent exhaustion of both the mental and physical powers, fully explains the baldness of a document, so jejune and inconclusive, that, otherwise, it would not be easy to account for its production, except by calling to mind the confession of the *Lancet* (Feb. 19th, 1853), "that in no assemblages for discussion do we meet with such proof of utter want of logical discipline of the mind as at our Medical Societies;" or by supposing that the Epidemiological Society entered upon their fatiguing labours, not in search of truth, but with a determination to find matter to support a foregone conclusion.

The report of the Epidemiological Society affords an example of out of what slender materials ingenious men can build systems, and of the tenacity with which the human mind can cling to a hope however fallacious.

One thing, at least, compulsory vaccinators have proved, namely, that actuated by whatever other motives they may be, they are so smitten with a dread of small-pox, as not only blindly to fly for protection to a practice as deceitful as it is disgusting, but so to forget, together with their hollow pretensions to a large philanthropy, the rules of good breeding, good sense, religion, and logic, as, while unveiling their selfish hypocrisy, to exhibit their distrust of their boasted prophylactic by their very anxiety to coerce others.

That men, whose dream of delusive hope I dissipate, whose pride and impertinence I rebuke, and whose extravagant pretensions and incompetence I expose, should be angry and abusive, is only what I might have expected. However, it would be every way better for such gentlemen, whether members of the Epidemiological Society or not, to cease to usurp functions they are unqualified to discharge, to retire from dictating to a people they are incapable to instruct, and to withdraw into that privacy, where their virtues, abilities, acquirements, and good intentions, might hope to find a more adequate scope.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

THE AUTHOR OF "OUR MEDICAL LIBERTIES."

Maze-hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea, Sussex,  
August 3, 1854.

# quote a  
case from  
the lowest

+ ask for  
Layden

strength

long

mercantiles



131  
Jan 4. 1855.

THE HYGIEIST OR MEDICAL REFORMER.

Mr. GIBBS, of ST. LEONARD'S-ON-SEA, on the  
MEDICAL LIBERTIES of the SUBJECT,  
AND THE  
COMPULSORY VACCINATION ACT.

THE BRITISH COLLEGE OF HEALTH has much pleasure in publishing the following letter from the above-named gentleman, and trusts that all Hygeists will do all in their power to obtain a repeal of the infamous Compulsory Vaccination Act. Our Medical Liberties have one by one been taken away, and unless the people bestir themselves, they will not only lose their Medical Liberty, but also every other Liberty. Let them therefore look to it in time!!!

MAZE HILL COTTAGE,  
ST. LEONARD'S-ON-SEA, SUSSEX, Dec. 1854.

GENTLEMEN,—I write a hasty line to remind you that now is the time to recommence the war for the maintenance of our Medical Liberty. Parliament is sitting. Might I suggest that you and your able friends, MESSRS. FRASER, HIBBERT, &c., would do good service by writing and sending copies of their publications to Dr. W. MICHELL, M.P., House of Commons, who is both a determined Anti-Vaccinator and Anti-Compulsion man, and who will not assent to any measure of so-called "Medical Reform" that will not respect the rights of all medical schools, sects, and practitioners. I know that I need

not offer any apology to you for making this communication.

I hope before long to beg your acceptance of a few copies of another pamphlet, which I am preparing for the press, and in which I hope to quote a few passages from Mr. FRASER's able pen.

I wish much that the various sects of Medical Dissenters could see it to be their interest to form an association for protecting our Medical Rights and Liberties, and for such like common objects.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient Servant,  
JOHN GIBBS.

*The British College of Health.*



THE MAINE LAW AND THE UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

FIAT JUSTITIA, RUAT CÆLUM.

SIR,—Having carefully perused, in your journal of the 12th inst., the report of a meeting called by the friends of the United Kingdom Alliance, I would beg permission to offer thereupon some remarks, which, I regret, the pressure of other affairs has compelled me to postpone until now. As I attended the meeting in question, it may be asked why I did not then avail myself of the general invitation to reply. The hour at which that invitation was given seemed too late to enter upon an argument which would occupy much time, and could not fail to provoke still further discussion, and it did not appear unwise to weigh more deliberately and dispassionately, than the distraction and excitement of a public meeting would permit, facts and reasonings, which, deficient neither in force nor novelty, were advanced with considerable eloquence and ability. Let me hope that nothing has been lost by the delay; at least, having thereby been enabled to give the subject a twofold consideration, I cannot be charged with undue precipitancy in arriving at the conclusion that the appeal of the Alliance presents a very powerful persuasive to the practice of temperance, but fails to establish the claims of the Maine Law to popular sympathy and support.

Having no personal interest whatever in any form of the strong drink traffic,—having not even any cherished habit to defend, and being as anxious as anyone can be that this nation should be entirely purified from the stain of drunkenness, and relieved from the appalling train of evils which undoubtedly attends this vice, I am willing to pay all due respect to the benevolent motives of the advocates of the Maine Law, even while rejecting their conclusions.

The objects of the United Kingdom Alliance are stated to be the "entire abolition of the liquor traffic," by means of the adoption of the Maine Law. Before proceeding to consider the policy, wisdom, and efficiency of this law, it will be well to clear away some obscurity and mystification caused by the terms in which the objects of the Alliance are stated. The assertion that the phrase "entire abolition" does not imply "compulsory teetotalism," is an abuse of language. If, indeed, "entire abolition" have an indeterminate meaning in the minds of the advocates of the Maine Law, they should not employ this phrase as their war cry. The Maine Law, as administered in the State of Maine, does not compel the "entire abolition of the liquor traffic;" it only limits that traffic; it creates in each district a monopoly of the traffic for "medicinal and mechanical purposes," and thus throws the traffic into the hands of monopolists, doctors, and smugglers. It is undeniable that, in the State of Maine, any person, who is determined to obtain intoxicating liquors, can do so; the orderly and temperate, with the impediments thrown in their way, by the operation of the law; the disorderly, with the facilities thrown in their way, by the instrumentality of smuggling. No doubt there are very many sober, orderly citizens in the State of Maine, but there is no proof that they have become sober and orderly in consequence of the liquor law; it is more rational to assume that they were sober and orderly before the passing of a law which originated in their benevolent but mistaken haste to make all men like themselves, and in their forgetfulness that no law can destroy the knowledge of the arts of manufacturing strong drinks, or quell that powerful instinct in the human breast to resist or evade dictation and compulsion. I believe it will be found that even the comparative obstacles to obtaining strong drinks, caused by the operation of high duties and consequent high prices, have ever led to illicit manufacture and trade,—practices highly demoralising and prolific of every vice, not excluding drunkenness itself.

It is a mere abuse of language to endeavour to establish analogies between a law to abolish the liquor traffic and enactments bearing upon the sale of poisons, and of adulterated, or deteriorated articles of food, and of obscene publications, sabbath trading, cruelty to animals, public gaming-houses, the abolition of negro-slavery, and of the corn-monopoly.



9

The vendors of strong drinks do not offer them for sale as other than they are, and purchasers buy them with their eyes open, fully aware of what they are doing. Compelling a dishonest trader to abstain from selling chicory as coffee is only compelling him to fulfil his contract; should the buyer ask for chicory, the trader is not forbidden to supply it.

In a very wide sense, strong drinks may be said to be poisons, so may various other articles of diet; but those drinks cannot, with any regard to common sense, or to the proprieties of language, be said to be poisons in the same sense as arsenic, for example; they cannot be secretly administered in minute doses by the assassin, so as to effect his guilty purpose.

Government, it is true, attempts to put down the trade in obscene publications, but it does not yet venture to propose to put down the printing press altogether, because it is sometimes misused as an instrument to propagate immorality.

Government likewise endeavours, with limited success, to suppress gaming-houses, but it does not dare to touch the practice of private gambling.

It is not correct to assert that an exception is made in favour of strong drinks in allowing their sale on the Sabbath, and that the sale of beefsteaks, and similar articles of diet is forbidden. Every hotel and eating-house will supply a good beefsteak on the Sabbath, as well as a bottle of stout. But this is a question of Sabbath-observance, quite beside the question of a Maine Law. There is a wide distinction, and with a difference too, although the advocates of the Maine Law do not always seem to perceive it, between limitation and total abolition. Many trades are compelled to abstain from Sunday trading, but this, I opine, would furnish but a feeble argument for the total abolition of ~~the~~ *their* traffic.

on that day

There is no analogy between the abolition of compulsory slavery and the suppression of a traffic in which no one is forced to engage, either as purchaser or vendor. The seller of strong drink holds no one in forcible bondage; if the buyer be a slave, he is a willing one to his own depraved appetite. The abolition of slavery was not so much a positive enactment, as the repeal of laws which gave legal power and authority to the wrong-doer to perpetrate the foulest outrages upon the persons of unwilling victims. In this case, abolition was but the extension to all men of equal laws and protection from the perpetrators of the most atrocious wrongs.

9

Neither is there any analogy between the abolition of the liquor traffic and the repeal of the corn-monopoly. Under the phrase "abolition of the liquor traffic," lies hid, as one of the enactments of the Maine Law, the establishment of a new and, no doubt, lucrative monopoly, and, not only so, but such abolition would grievously trench upon the liberty of the subject, and throw vast power and much emolument into the hands of that most aggressive body, the Medical Profession. Whatever be a man's opinion of the value of alcoholic stimulants as medicines, it can scarcely be contended that it would not be an act of gross tyranny to compel a medical dissenter (and medical dissenters are now to be numbered by thousands) to apply, fee in hand, to a "legally qualified practitioner" for a certificate empowering him to purchase strong drink to replenish his empty medicine chest, or on an emergency. To do so would be to violate that excellent principle of our Constitution, which declares that it is better that any number of guilty persons should escape than that one innocent person should suffer, and would be tantamount in cruelty and folly to the act of that Government which, in disturbed times, should not only deprive the disaffected, but the well-affected, of ~~the~~ *their* weapons of defence. How far a system of medical certificates would operate, in reality, as a check upon drunkenness, may be inferred from the ~~change~~ *change* of Mr. Wakley, Ex. M.P., editor of the *Lancet*, the great champion of the Medical Profession, and the well-known Coroner, in his charge to a Jury:—

sig

"He could assure the Jury that, if he pleased, he could procure, in a very short space of time, certificates of all their deaths, and have them registered as easily."—[*Weekly Times*, April 30, 1854.]

statement

The interference of the legislature, for the protection of dumb and defenceless animals from the cruelties of ruffianly owners, lends no countenance to the broad assertion that it is the duty of the State to take forcible care of such of its subjects, as, it may be its pleasure to assume, are incapable of taking care of themselves. The right of the State to interfere with the private actions of individuals, is happily very limited, and no enlightened friend of his race would be



134  
very anxious to enlarge it. The State asserts the right to restrain dangerous lunatics who may be left at large, and performs the duty of relieving the wants of the destitute who may apply for aid; but it would be preposterous to class in either category the moderate drinkers of alcoholic liquors. If, indeed, there be any class so morally and intellectually feeble as to be incapable to take care of itself, the sooner it dies out the better; this much is certain, that the nursing of the State can never strengthen it; it must ever grow feebler and feebler until destruction shall overtake it. No system of fetters and straitwaistcoats can teach moral and intellectual cripples to walk independently. That must be an unwise doctrine which leads to the conclusion that no man is competent to take care of himself, but that every man is competent to take care of everybody else. Equally unwise would it be to confer upon the State the functions of a teacher of morals; it is but ill qualified to discharge such a duty, and has no more right to punish an offender for immorality than for irreligion. To attempt to do so would be to recur to the old days of persecution; morals are the fruit of religion; religion is the only sound corrector of immorality. Poor, miserable, proud worm that man is; how persistently he errs in seeking occasion to raise his hand in punishment, or restraint, against, perhaps, his less corrupt, but less discreet brother, instead of assiduously and affectionately trying to win him to better things by the voice of kindness and sympathy. Human laws are not the weapons of Him whose kingdom is not of this world; they can never touch the conscience. It is impossible to make men moral by compulsion. If, in America, (as we are informed in the American Hydropathic Quarterly Review—a periodical favourable to temperance—No. 2, p. 362,) "the use of opium, as a stimulant, has greatly increased," as a sequence to voluntary teetotalism, what may not be looked for as the consequence of compulsory teetotalism? Man may be compelled to abstain from the practice of some one evil habit, but the restraint will only sharpen his appetite for vice, and his ingenuity in devising means of indulgence; for the one devil, that an inadequate authority has ordered to evacuate his breast, a host of devils will take possession. Enforced morality, like enforced religion, must have its re-action; after the Puritans came the profligate Court of the Restoration. Men can be really virtuous only when perfectly free agents. The exposure to temptation is an imperative condition of ~~our~~ existence—it is at once the test and the stimulus of ~~our~~ strength; the forbidden fruit was planted beside the Tree of Life, in the Garden of Eden itself.

a,  
1  
were  
The conversion of grain into strong drink in a time of famine may well be deplored; but a time of famine is an exceptional time, and even then it is the want of buyers of bread that causes the grain to be converted to other purposes. There is no reason to suppose that if the conversion of grain into strong drink ~~was~~ entirely, not merely prohibited, but prevented, there would be one ounce more of food available for the lips of poverty. It is not the conversion of grain into strong drink that causes famine; the cause lies deeper. It avails little to the man out of employment, funds, and credit, that a thousand granaries may be bursting with grain in his vicinity. The prohibition of distillation and brewing would not increase the quantity of grain, but, paradoxical as it may sound, would probably lessen the supply by lessening the competition, and by throwing large tracts of land out of cultivation, as well as numbers of persons out of employment. When there shall be sufficient demand for the loaf, then, and only then, can distillation and brewing profitably cease. It is absurd to suppose that, scantily populated as the world at present is, it could not be made to minister to all the luxuries as well as the mere wants of men; and it is vain to expect that men will be content with the bare necessities of existence; to require this would be to require them to go naked, to sleep under leaf-huts on the bare ground, and to dine on living grubs, like Australian savages.

cogent  
It may be lamented that such vast sums should be annually squandered upon strong drinks, but that offers no reason for the suppression of the traffic, unless, indeed, it be an argument equally valid against the traffic in other articles of wasteful luxury. Further, it is altogether gratuitous to assume that, in the event of the suppression of the traffic in strong drinks, the sums now wasted thereupon, would be diverted to any better purpose. Intoxica-

a,  
his being,  
his,



135-  
ting liquors are not the only seductives to sensual enjoyments, and drunkenness is not the only vice that draws, "as with a cart-rope," erring man. Moreover, the hoard of the miser benefits no one.

It is far from certain that the traffic in strong drinks is the greatest source of crime; if it be, how then does it happen that crime does not most abound amongst those classes who can best afford to indulge in those drinks? Crime has its real source in the untutored depravity of the human heart, and, as *in vino veritas*, the depraved man, when thrown off his guard by indulgence, then reveals the depths of his iniquity.

After all, we are not a nation of drunkards. We do not drink as our ancestors did. Men who look neither forward nor backward, whose vision can take in only the present, and scarcely that, may not know that there is a natural progression in human affairs, which advances with the greater acceleration the less it is clogged by legislative devices. Nevertheless, there has been amongst us, a natural, because a gradual progress in national prosperity; let us beware of disturbing and thwarting this progress by too much intermeddling with private rights. The real, as the only legitimate, foundation of enduring national prosperity is to be found in the characters of individuals, and individuals held in leading strings and treated on the bib and papspoon system, can never achieve anything great or good; in so far as they are not hypocrites they are automatons.

Education, purer tastes and habits of self-reliance, controlled by religious convictions, are the true and only correctives of vice.

A schoolboy impatience to attain an end is always detrimental to a good cause; the wise man knows that the lofty, widely-spreading, robust tree is the growth of ages, and, thus informed, he is content, in holy hope and faith, to plant and foster the tiny seed.

To look to legislative enactments to that which can be done only by the constant warfare, from generation to generation, of zealous and energetic men, is to despair of the Gospel, or to ignore it; and to minister, on the one hand, to the pride of the modern Pharisee, who, not content with publicly glorifying himself, and thanking God that he is not like yonder sinner, invokes the vengeance of human authority on his erring brother; and, on the other hand, to foster a race of Christian Sybarites, who, weary of well-doing, and of the constant warfare with the inevitable evils of humanity, vainly seek to achieve, by human devices, the luxury of living in a world where the plaint of woe shall never assail their ears, and where no rumpled rose-leaf shall disturb their dream of spiritual idleness and voluptuous anticipation of heavenly repose.

Let Englishmen beware of the daily increasing tribe of political tinkers, who, under the pretext of repairing the old "kettle of the State," are, on every side, busily employed in picking fresh holes in it. Since the passing of the infamous Compulsory Vaccination Act, all the would-be statesmen have been busy vaunting their political nostrums; we have his Eminence, Cardinal Wiseman, advocating a censorship; we have an association of literary gentlemen, backed by the *Critic*, wanting to put down "unqualified practitioners in literature;" we have a noble lord wanting to get in the thin edge of the passport system; we have the *Illustrated London News* proposing that the State shall regulate the style of our domestic architecture; we have Mr. Ebsworth, in the *Times*, modestly proposing that there shall be medical overseers, with powers to make house to house visitations, and hinting that it would be desirable to have the regulation of our tables and of our daily exercise; we have another writer proposing that "medical ~~men~~ shall be empowered to take possession of, and ~~any~~ ~~from this time forth~~ ~~all~~ sickly-looking children; and we have certain doctors invoking the State to prevent us from consulting and seeing whom we please to minister to our bodily ailments, as if they had a certain ownership in our bodies and our purses.

Let us have no more class-legislation under any pretext whatever; it has been the worst bane of our country. Neither let us import foreign laws; in both cases our best protection is to be found in articles of home-growth, "redolent of the soil."

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage,

St. Leonards-on-Sea, Jan. 27, 1855.

complete,

our journal,  
re into the  
element of

\* of Saturday,  
August 26. 1854.

inspectors,  
they may wear a  
cross, and of enforcing  
a proper mode of  
treatment for them,

we no more want  
them than we  
want foreign  
legions;



136

The Maine Law

---

THE MAINE LAW AND THE UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

SIR,—It is not easy to surprise me,—it does not surprise me that the chairman of the late meeting should attempt to defend the Alliance, or that a lawyer should believe in Acts of Parliament and desire more of them. But I confess that it does surprise me a little, that any gentleman capable of reasoning could carp at *prolixity* in reply to arguments which occupied a couple of hours in their delivery, by a succession of speakers, from the very platform on which he presided; and that a member of an association, whose wise object it is to free *religion* from the trammels of the State, should labour to enslave *morals* by placing them under that same suspicious rule. Were his doctrines to find general acceptance, what an interesting, as well as a curious, essay might be written upon *geographical* morality! There might be some pretext for such doctrines if rulers were infallible. As it is—not to speak of State morality in Prussia, where the "unfortunate class" to which he refers are a State institution—not to speak of some still more eccentric State moralities in the dominions of our good ally, the Sultan—not to speak of some of the State moralities of even that model republic whence the Maine Law emanates—not to speak of the State moralities of any foreign nation, or even of some of our own subject States—surely the recent notorious display of State morals in our very midst, offers nothing very alluring to a thinking being. When rulers shall efficiently discharge their present obligations, will it not be time enough to think of confiding other duties to their hands?

It could only occur to a mind, in which "morals" and "well-digested laws" are regarded as synonymous, to infer, from anything which I have written, that men should not bridle their passions, that the law should not suppress public nuisances, and that the State should not fulfil its obligations to protect life and property.

The simple question before us at present is this—is the Maine Law a wise, legitimate, and efficient remedy for particular evils? In support of the affirmative, the speakers at a public meeting emphatically advanced certain arguments, which I have endeavoured to controvert. Now, it would appear that, on second thoughts, the chairman of that meeting does not deem those arguments worth consideration; had this avowal been sooner made it would have spared me much trouble, and left much of your valuable space available for more genuine and profitable discussion, at a time that demands the most serious thought.

The chairman of the late meeting loves facts—so do I, chiefly for the principles deducible from them. I have given him two facts, which no amount of legal ingenuity could induce me to reject as irrelevant to the question under discussion. I beg to repeat them—drunkenness has not been suppressed in the State of Maine, and smuggling prevails there. It may not be impertinent to add, that the press informs us that, since the passing of Mr. Wilson Patten's Act, smuggling has much increased in Scotland; and that in Glasgow, on last New Year's Day, 193 cases of drunkenness were booked at the Central Police Office; while, on the preceding New Year's Day, the number of cases was only 76. If these numbers be correctly given, they do not afford much encouragement to the endeavour to "put down" drunkenness by legislative restrictions.

The chairman of the late meeting lays great stress on the evils connected with the "flaring gin palace;" but to assert that the Maine Law is the only legitimate, wise, and adequate remedy for those evils, is to beg the question. "Put down" all evils that with brazen front outrage *public* decency, or that disturb the *public* peace; but do not recklessly and wantonly confiscate the liberties of millions of inoffensive people.



The chairman of the late meeting is evidently weary of employing "moral suasion;" wherefore, then, does he sanction the waste of so much valuable time in trying to persuade, through the press and from the platform, this wicked generation to adopt his conclusions? Is he, and those who act with him, really in earnest in thus using "moral suasion," or do they actually believe that they alone are capable of recognizing its voice and obeying its dictates? What will their good allies of the temperance societies say to such wholesale denunciation of "moral suasion," and to the implied utter condemnation of their zealous labours through so many long years? If indeed "moral suasion" has completely failed in the cause of temperance, can it be believed that compulsion will succeed? If, as Mr. J. B. Gough informs us, "out of 600,000 persons who had signed the temperance pledge in the United States, 450,000 had broken it:"—if voluntary teetotalism thus tends to make *pledge-breakers* in such startling numbers, it may be enquired, in what proportion, in any given number of persons, compulsory teetotalism would operate to produce *discontented law breakers*? It seems to me, that, if men cannot be kept sober with their will, it is impossible to make them sober against their will; unless, indeed, they be subjected to a rigorous and perpetual imprisonment.

It may not be out of place to observe here, respecting the petitions now being presented to Parliament, praying for the suppression of distillation and brewing, that such a prayer, in days of free trade, when our ports are open to the grain and the commerce of the world, could only emanate from the most ill-informed and unreflecting fanaticism. Is it not evident to every sober mind that, if this prayer were granted, much of the foreign grain which now finds its way into our ports would be carried into rival states, there to be converted into alcoholic liquors, and brought from thence to our shores, in the course of legitimate trade or contraband traffic, to the enrichment of the foreign, and the detriment of the British manufacturer, workman, merchant, and carrier; while the evils sought to be diminished amongst ourselves, namely, scarcity and dearness, would be aggravated by the practical contraction of competition in the supply of the raw article?

After all, this question of seeking aid from legislative crutches, is one that each man will decide for himself. For my own part, I would vastly prefer taking care of myself, as I have been accustomed to do, and would much rather run the risk of an occasional tumble than be led about in the easiest of go-carts, although it should be constructed by the enlightened members of the United Kingdom Alliance, and be guided by the blandest of government officials.

Until arguments more weighty and pertinent be advanced in support of the Maine Law, I must be excused for continuing to regard it as "a snare and a delusion"—as the offspring of a perverted logic and a philanthropy run mad. This may be denounced as the language of prejudice, but it is well known that, if I have a bias to either side, it is to the side of strict temperance.

As this, I should hope, is the last occasion I shall have to trouble you with my sentiments on this subject, I would beg leave to offer a few additional remarks.

The advocates of "compulsory teetotalism" tell us that "the public weal is the supreme law;" it may have been amongst Heathens, but I was wont to believe that Christians recognized a higher rule of action, namely, to do as they would be done by. If I might suppose that our immaculate philanthropists could have a single vice, evil habit, or anti-social failing to get rid of, I might be allowed to ask how they would like to be drilled out of it by Act of Parliament? I am inclined to think that their organs of combativeness would be as violently aroused to resist as they are now excited to assail, and who would not applaud the display of a manly independence?

In these days it imperatively behoves all lovers of liberty to be watchful even to jealousy. On all sides we are assailed and disgusted with evidences of the activity of the spirit of reaction. Thousands are weary of liberty—they hate and dread it. All who cherish traditions of the rights divine of rank, not of humanity—all the wickedly ambitious—all



138

# The Maimed Law.

impertinent busybodies—all the ruffianly foes of freedom of thought and action—all the faint-hearted who dare not think for themselves—all the mentally purblind who cannot see the way to heaven, even at noon-day, without the light of half-a-dozen of Price's patent caudles—all these, and others, are clamorous in calling on their idol—repression. Even recent national disasters are seized upon as furnishing occasion to belaud tyranny and to asperse constitutional principles, as if those disasters could be traced to those principles, and not to the systematic and treacherous violation of them by their pretended guardians. Our constitution has become all but a sham: if we do not take care—if we do not infuse new blood—new life and vigour into it, we may soon have to mourn over a dry skeleton. There is no use in shutting our eyes—a struggle, a war of principles is impending. If England would not fall from her high estate, every son of hers who is actuated by the spirit of honest patriotism, must actively uphold the vital principles to which she owes her greatness. The glories which cast a halo over the gloomy horrors of the campaign in the Crimea have been won by the *soldiery*; the conservation of our rights and liberties at home must be achieved by the *people*. When that campaign shall have been fought and *won*—for who dares despair of England's fortunes?—then may the poet with some truth exclaim:—

“Stern o'er each bosom Reason holds her state,  
With daring aims irregularly great;  
Pride in their port, defiance in their eye,  
I see the lords of human kind pass by;  
Intent on high designs, a thoughtful band,  
By forms unfashion'd, fresh from nature's hand,  
Fierce in their native hardness of soul,  
True to imagined right, above control,—  
While e'en the peasant boasts these rights to scan,  
And learns to venerate himself as man.”

I am, sir, your obliged and obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonard-on-Sea,  
February 10, 1855.



139

THE MAINE LAW AND THE UNITED KINGDOM  
ALLIANCE.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

SIR,—I should abstain from troubling you with any further remarks upon this subject, but that my opponent accuses me of "unfairly representing him as opposed to moral suasion," and that I have a similar charge to bring against him.

I beg that Mr. Dawson will believe that I would not intentionally misrepresent him, and that I much regret having done so; but I hope that he will allow me to plead in extenuation that I had the cry of "total and immediate abolition" ringing in my ears.

Mr. Dawson says:—"According to your correspondent, the abolition of the slave-trade was an interference with that liberty [of the subject]; but *this*, he must remember, was effected by an Act of Parliament."

Now, I desire to correct this misrepresentation, and not the less so that I am sure that it is not a wilful one on the part of my opponent; I, therefore, most emphatically deny that I ever wrote, spoke, or even thought one word to warrant such an accusation: on the contrary, I now, as always, regard the abolition of the slave-trade as but the abolition of iniquitous laws, which empowered scoundrels, with impunity, to rob and murder innocent victims. The abolition of the slave-trade was no infringement of any man's rights—it was no invasion of, but a memorable concession to, the spirit of liberty; and to this effect I expressed myself in the first letter which I addressed to you on this subject.

I cannot refrain from adding, that, in my opinion, Mr. Dawson's arguments point to *free-trade* in alcohol, as well as in religion, and not to prohibition, as a remedy for the evils he deplures.

I regret that I cannot oblige my opponent by "venturing to affirm" anything as to how far "stout and rum" may or may not be to blame for our disasters in the East, but it would seem that there is no evidence to shew that the brandy and wine, so liberally dispensed, have destroyed the army of our allies.

In conclusion, I cannot take leave of a courteous and manly opponent, whose good intentions, talents, and energy, I admire and respect, and with many of whose sentiments I heartily sympathize, without saying how much pleasure it would afford me to shake him by the hand and quietly to discuss our differences, *viva voce*, by a cosy fireside, over a comfortable cup of tea.

I am, sir, your obliged and obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
February 24, 1855.



Handwritten:  
Hospitals  
1855

Feb. 13. 1853.

THE COMPULSORY VACCINATION ACT.—The last annual report of the Royal Jennerian and London Vaccine Institution deprecates the attempts made to diffuse vaccination by legislative efforts, and shows that all legislative aids had injured rather than promoted the cause of vaccination.

John Gibbs

### COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

The following abstracts on the above subject have been forwarded to us with a request for publication. We have every reason to depend on the integrity of our contributor, but wish to hold ourselves independent of any conclusions which may be drawn from the statements made :—

THE COMPULSORY VACCINATION ACT AND THE MEDICAL JOURNALS.—The *Medical Times* "regrets to find that this Act has already entirely failed in producing the effects which were expected from it," and laments that "the fundamental principle of the measure, namely, its compulsory character, has already been practically abandoned."—The *Medical Circular* candidly states that this Act is a failure, owing to its "embracing two bad principles," namely, "vaccination enforceable by fine, and the imposition upon medical men of labour for which no adequate requital is allowed." It condemns the "first principle as tyrannical, and the second as unjust;" and adds—"how it could be expected that any Act of Parliament so obviously repugnant to the feelings and habits of Englishmen could meet with success, surpasses our powers of imagination to conceive."—The *Lancet*, referring to the Registrar-General's Returns, remarks :—"The Registrar for Ipswich says,—'The Act is very unpopular amongst the labouring classes, owing to the mistaken notion that other diseases are produced by vaccination.' If this opinion be a prejudice, we can vouch for the fact that it is not confined to the labouring classes. Parents in the wealthier classes are quite as anxious in respect to the health of the child from which vaccine lymph is taken; and so widely extended is the dread, that along with the prophylactic remedy something else may be inoculated, lest the germ of future diseases may be planted, that few medical practitioners would care to vaccinate their own children from a source of the purity of which they were not well assured. It is in consequence of the universal prevalence of this feeling that the compulsory clauses of the Act are doubly and justly obnoxious." The *Lancet* adds,— "Thus the Act, invested with every attribute of unpopularity, by studied disregard of the judgment and interests of the medical practitioners,—that is, of those through whose agency alone it is possible to give it effect; by unnatural association with the Boards of Guardians, which can have no pretence to take charge of a sanitary measure affecting the entire population; and by an arbitrary and harsh contempt for the feelings of the poor, sure to be still further alienated by the appearance of compulsion,—could have no other fate than utter failure."

VACCINATION AND SMALLPOX.—The statistics of the Smallpox and Vaccination Hospital, London, show that in a period of sixteen years, during which smallpox has been epidemic four times—namely, in 1838, 1844, 1848, and 1851—"rather more than half the patients admitted into the hospital had been previously vaccinated."

John Gibbs

The above appeared in the *Hastings*  
News of Feb. 23 and March 2. 1855.



41  
*Priessnitz and his opinions.*

Let me insert here\* a short letter from John Gibbs, Esq., author of "Letters from Græfenberg, &c.," and I do so just to show the immense advantages likely to accrue to medical practitioners and to the public by generously seeking to aid each other in the great work of the future. Mr. Gibbs writes as follows:—

"Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea, Sussex,

"February 5, 1855.

"Dear Sir,—I have just read your leader, in this month's *Record*, on 'The Work of the Future,' and cannot refrain from expressing the gratification I have derived from it. I cannot but think that a reprint of it, in a cheap form, widely circulated, would do much good. I have also read your 'Plea for the Botanic Practice of Medicine' with much pleasure. I go with you in much that it contains; but you will pardon me for saying that I think Thomson's theory stands on one leg. *Heat* is often as destructive as *cold*. The theory of Priessnitz that health is the maintenance and the equalization of the temperature seems to me to be the more comprehensive. By the way, will you excuse me if I venture to correct two or three inaccuracies in your otherwise very clear and candid account of Priessnitz and his system. In the first place it is an error (for which, however, you are not responsible) to call it the 'cold water cure.' Priessnitz cured patients with tepid water; he prescribed it both internally and externally, and also laid great stress upon *air, exercise, diet and friction*; he also employed sweating in many cases, though not in the vapour bath, but in the dry blanket ~~in the fire~~ at the fire to expedite its action.

"With regard to Priessnitz himself, he is inaccurately said by many writers to have been a 'peasant,' and to have been without education. He was of the class that in this country, we should rank with Yeomen, as his ancestors, for many generations, had been small landed proprietors, so was he, not a tenant farmer. He could read and write. I have seen him write. For he inserted his cases in books, but these were stolen from him. 'Tis true he never did publish, nor did he ever, after his books were stolen, write anything excepting directions to patients and to correspondents on the subject of his system. A collection of his letters, if they could be had, would furnish much valuable information. I have about half-a-dozen which I received from him at different times. His theory was that every disease was a disturbing force in the system requiring to be removed, and that it could only be done by acting upon the vital powers in order that the morbid matter might be thrown off through the natural evacuations either by the lungs, bowels, kidneys, or skin, or in some form of critical eruption. He also held the unity of disease, and taught that the balance of the system might be disturbed on either side, and that it was as necessary to control action when too violent as to stimulate where deficient. It may possibly gratify you to learn that Priessnitz did not arrogate everything to his own system, and condemn *en masse* all other modes of treatment. He frequently refused patients as unsuited to his treatment. He advised some of them to try Homœopathy, and has ordered even some of his patients to leave him for a few weeks, and then to return to him. He has acknowledged that diseases have been cured under Allopathic treatment, and also by Morrison's pills, ~~and held Morrison in esteem~~ in esteem, and, moreover, he has expressed his regret that the laws of Austria would not permit him to blend with his treatment the Botanic practice. Thus you see that Priessnitz was not a man of one idea.

which he sometimes heated

some time

the result of

for the proper cure

the treatment by herby

\* Botanic Record. March. 1855.



142

## Priessnitz & his opinions.

*pleasant* "I enclose you a little Botanic specimen. It is called, in Ireland, the Fairy flax." It was first pointed out to me by an Irish ~~labourer~~ as an excellent remedy for secondary syphilis. I have tried it with success in many cases. Please hand to Mr Rhodes five shillings, in post stamps, as a trifle towards the debt incurred in opposing the Registration Bill.

*fund for liquidating* Excuse this trespass upon your time, and believe me, yours truly,

*age* "JOHN GIBBS."

"P.S.—The more I think over your plan of Colleges and licensing Medical Dissenters, whilst respecting, at the same time, Medical Independents, the more I like your views. You have hit the right nail on the head."

We shall conclude by remarking that Mr. Gibbs' excellent letter is one of the greatest proofs that can be given of the immense advantages that would grow out of a free medical press. We should see truth gradually develop itself by placing it in opposition to error. Priessnitz was a man of great natural powers; so was Thomson, Mesmer, and Hahnemann, and many others who have been chained even to old routine; nor is the time far distant when the merits of every system will have to be fairly discussed. Irresponsibility is weakness, imbecility, and dissolution. Responsibility—vigorous mental and *intellectual developement, principle and life.*

*Note.*—The Fairy Flax which Mr. Gibbs sent us, is the small Dwarf Flax. It has been altogether overlooked by botanic writers. Amongst some fifteen or twenty, we have found it only in one writer, and that is James Newton. It contains, so far as I can judge by taste and comparison, the same cathartic properties as the Mountain Flax, but in a less degree.



143

A SCIENTIFIC FACT AND A PHILANTHROPIC  
THREAT.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to solicit the attention of your readers to a fact and a threat which concern every Briton—every payer of rates and taxes—everybody who cares for the welfare of our army and the honour of our country—every philanthropist and every lover of truth?

The fact is to be found in the *Times* of yesterday, in the article of its able correspondent at Constantinople:—

"The terrible mortality which has fallen upon the British army in camp has hardly created a greater sensation than the disproportionate number of deaths which have occurred in the various hospitals on the Bosphorus. The sick who have come down with dysentery and fever have almost all died—according to the army doctors, from unavoidable causes; but according to the medical men—French, English, and Perote—who practice in the capital, on account of the faulty treatment which they have received. The matter has formed the subject of conversation for many weeks, and the observation is continually made that *the English doctors are killing their patients at Scutari* through a wrong-headed adherence to a mode of practice which, if successful anywhere, is certainly not adapted to the climate of Constantinople."

That "English doctors" should kill their patients "through a wrong-headed adherence" to a murderous ~~mode~~ of practice, is only too common an occurrence to excite surprise, and it is not to be expected that they will soon cease to do so amongst the unthinking routinists of private society; but is it not time to take some measures to "abate the nuisance," when it threatens the existence of our army and imperils the safety of the nation? So think, it would appear, a more rational and safer school of practitioners who offer their services, in this emergency, to the Government; whereupon the organ of the "wrong-heads" has the impudence to hold out the following threat:—

mode,

"Our attention has been called to the fact, that strenuous efforts are being made to induce Government to appoint some Homœopaths for service in the East; Lord Panmure may be assured, that, should he yield to the wishes of Lord Wilton and others in this matter, the resignation of the whole Civil Staff would certainly follow."—*Medical Times*, February 24, 1855.

Could the Government confer a greater boon upon our army than to forestal the fulfilment of this insolent threat, ~~and~~ instantly ~~to~~ dismiss the "whole civil staff" of the Medical Department, and appoint men of heart, head, and science, in their stead?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Wage Hill Cottage,

St. Leonards-on-Sea, March 10, 1855.

J. G. W. L.



## THE MAINE-LAW.

To the Editor of the Alliance.

Sir,—Having closed one controversy—not unsatisfactorily, I trust, to my estimable opponent [Mr. Dawson, in the *Hastings and St. Leonard's News*—I find myself at liberty to turn to another adversary. I have not much of which to complain, in the article [page 268] in which you do me the honour to comment upon my first anti-Maine-law letter in the *Hastings News*—on the contrary, I find in it much for which to thank you; and I do not propose to go over the same ground a second time; neither do I claim to occupy much of your space; but I would beg leave to offer a few words on two or three points upon which you have touched.

You object to the assertion that the Maine-law creates a lucrative monopoly. I do not know how the agents for the sale of intoxicating liquors are paid in the State of Maine—the document in my hands, purporting to be an abstract of that law, being silent upon that point<sup>(1)</sup>—but, on the very same page with your strictures, under the head of “Foreign News,” I find that in New York it has been decided to pay the agents by a per centage on the sales fixed at a maximum of “twenty-five per cent. on the purchase price”—a very nice profit, and, as it seems to me, a no small encouragement to the agent to sell as much as possible.<sup>(2)</sup>

You also object that I have shown a want of analogy only in a few immaterial points between the Maine-law and other enactments quoted as justifying that measure; but you seem to overlook the fact that the points, in which I show the want of agreement, are the very points adduced as analogous by the advocates of the Maine-law.<sup>(3)</sup>

Permit me to observe that the example, to which you allude, of the use of medical certificates in lunacy cases, adds no strength to your argument. It is notorious that those certificates are continually fearfully abused to the worst of purposes, and that ~~no~~ person, who has active, vindictive, and unscrupulous enemies, or interested and unprincipled relatives, can be considered safe from incarceration in one of those bastilles—the private lunatic asylums. It is fervently to be hoped, that before long, public indignation will be so aroused upon the subject of the iniquities practised under the lunacy laws, as to cause a thorough reformation, and to ensure that the citizen shall not be deprived of liberty upon the authority of a venal medical certificate, or without the adverse verdict of a jury.<sup>(4)</sup>

May I add that it would much narrow the grounds of discussion, if the Alliance would propose, in explicit language, some definite measure.<sup>(5)</sup> The cry of “total and immediate abolition,” where such is not meant, causes much misapprehension and needless controversy.<sup>(6)</sup> If the Alliance would propose a measure that, while respecting the rights of the orderly, and throwing no obstacle in the way of the medical dissenter, would only treat confirmed drunkards as lunatics,<sup>(7)</sup> punish the vender of intoxicating liquors to drunken persons and youths,<sup>(8)</sup> and break up all disorderly public seminaries of drunkenness<sup>(9)</sup>—such a measure would disarm many objectors, and provoke, except from interested persons, far less opposition than is aroused by the present vague cry.<sup>(10)</sup>

In conclusion, I would only observe, that it pains me to find myself opposed to gentlemen with whom I should be pleased to act in concert, and who have in view an object very dear likewise to my own heart; but I cannot persuade myself that permanent good can result from the introduction into legislation of a principle which appears to me to be unsound:<sup>(11)</sup> nevertheless, if hereafter my apprehensions should be shown to be without foundation, and if the measure you so ably, and, I believe, sincerely and bene-

not  
any  
\* (add footnote here)



145  
*The Maine Law.*

volently advocate, should prove to be adequate to the overthrow of one of the greatest curses of the human race, no one shall rejoice more cordially over its success than, sir, your obedient servant<sup>(12)</sup>

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonard's-on-Sea,  
March 14th, 1855.

EDITOR'S NOTES.

(1) The municipal authorities of each town or city in Maine are directed by the Maine-law to appoint an agent annually, and to prescribe such compensation for his services as they may think fit.

(2) Remuneration by profit on the sale is objectionable. The agents should have a fixed salary, by all means.

(3) Not by ourselves. We cannot endorse every argument adduced by some Maine-law advocates.

(4) We have never proposed medical certification, nor is it imposed by the law of Maine.

(5) All in good time. The principle of prohibition is unmistakably definite. Does our correspondent agree with us that the buying and selling of intoxicating liquors, except for medical and mechanical purposes, should be put an end to? If so, we shall probably not differ as to the details of the measure.

(6) We do mean the *total* prohibition of the liquor-traffic, with the slight exception named in the preceding note; there is no room for misapprehension upon that point. And with respect to time, the prohibition we seek must be as *immediate*, as the growth of public enlightenment will enable us to make it. No half-measure will ever be accepted in full by the United Kingdom Alliance.

(7) Where should we lodge some five or six hundred thousand drunkards? And why not adopt the easier method of prevention?

(8) More difficult than to prohibit the entire sale, and much less effectual.

(9) Allowing lunatic-manufactories, if conducted *orderly!*

(10) Who but Mr. G. has ever called our cry a vague one? The publicans find it more than definite enough.

(11) If our *principle* is unsound, why dispute mere hypothetical matters of detail pertaining to the mode of bringing it into operation? If the sheep is not to be killed, why debate about the precise manner of cutting up its mutton?

(12) We thank our correspondent for his very courteous and gentlemanly opposition; it is the next best thing to his adhesion to our cause.

*See Alliance  
of Feb 10. 1855  
p. 255 col. 2  
p. 3.*



146

## COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

"Bray a fool in a mortar, and he will return to his folly."

SIR,—Those active aggressors, the self-elected members of the Epidemiological Society, are at their baneful work again. They have had the audacity to lay before constituted authority, and constituted authority has had the complaisance to lay before the Legislature a proposition which deeply affects the rights and liberties, not only of every British subject, but of every stranger now within or who may hereafter cross the borders of England; and which, possibly, may become law, unless public attention be timely awakened to the danger. This odious proposition is embodied in the following pregnant sentence:—

"The Compulsory (Vaccination) Act applies only to children born in England and Wales after a certain date; it does not extend to the whole existing population of England and Wales, nor to those who, whether adults or children, may at any time immigrate into this portion of the kingdom. This is a grave defect."

The Epidemiological Society insist upon the value of compulsion, and boast, in opposition to other statements, that it has operated to extend the practice of vaccination, and, therefore, they desire a still more stringent and comprehensive measure; but they forget to state that, if vaccination has been spread, the ravages of smallpox have extended, likewise, at the same time, and in a much greater ratio.

Notwithstanding the apathy of a great part of the public—which seems to view, with the same philosophic indifference, the destruction of an army abroad, the mal-administration of governmental departments, the violation of fundamental principles, and the invasion of our personal liberties at home, and national disasters and impending ruin everywhere—this last impudent attempt at outrage is not likely to be carried into effect without, at least, some little semblance of resistance. The *Medical Circular* actually condemns such wholesale "coercion;" it does not quite approve of fine and imprisonment, as it considers them rather uncongenial to English minds, and, therefore, it would be content to enforce vaccination only upon the persons of helpless infants by the very original and gentle method of refusing, to unvaccinated babes, the rite of baptism! Start not, ye pious persons, who devoutly believe in the saving grace of this sacrament, ye little know the fatuity of purely medically educated minds. Why should unvaccinated infants be admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven, or what more appropriate punishment than their exclusion therefrom could be visited upon the heads of those heretical parents who will not believe in the vilest and most pernicious of quackeries?

Let us examine the claims of this nostrum, which Law, Physic, and Divinity are invoked to thrust upon us, and the rejection of which it is proposed to visit with pains and penalties to the damage of purse, body and soul—here and hereafter—in time and eternity.

Is vaccination productive of any good? Is it attended with any evil? The vaccinators themselves shall answer these questions.

A short time ago, my attention was arrested by a notice of the death of Dr. George Gregory, in the *Lancet* of January 29, 1853, in which it was stated:—"Dr. Gregory held the office of physician to the Smallpox Hospital for many years, and had paid much attention to that disease. His views, however, in respect to vaccination, were by no means settled, and of late years had given rise to much controversy."

This statement did not much surprise me when I called to mind that, during a period of sixteen years, "rather more than half the patients admitted into the (Smallpox) Hospital had been previously vaccinated;" but I felt a desire to become acquainted with Dr. Gregory's opinions, and with that intent I consulted his work on "Eruptive Fevers."

When he wrote that work, he had, he says in his Preface, "the experience which twenty years of official connection with the Smallpox and Vaccination Hospital had given" to him.

amongst a population  
whom vaccination  
much neglected,

must be  
of force



In the first paragraph of his work, Dr. Gregory asserts, "The great principle that *there are no diseases strictly isolated from others*; they are links in a chain—

"All are but parts of one stupendous whole!"

"They must be viewed in conjunction if we would hope to form just, enlarged, and legitimate views of the character and pathological affinities ~~to~~ each."

Dr. Gregory invites especial attention to "exanthematic or epidemic mortality," and inquires—"What is its amount? What proportion do deaths by the exanthematic bear to the deaths by all other diseases? Is this proportion constant or fluctuating? Is it alike in town and country?"

To these queries he replies as follows, at pp. 5, 6, 7, and 8:—

"Upon an average of years, 350,000 persons die throughout England and Wales, and 46,000 in the metropolis. The mortality by the four great epidemic maladies (smallpox, measles, scarlatina, and hooping cough) is very nearly 40,000 in England and Wales, and about 5,000 in the metropolis, averaging one in nine of the total mortality, or eleven per cent. This is a very large proportion. That four diseases only should absorb one-ninth of the total mortality of this and probably of all other countries may well excite our surprise.

"If the exanthematic are considered independent of the hooping cough, considerable fluctuations will be perceived, the mortality by them falling sometimes as low as six per cent., at times rising to near thirteen; but a very important principle comes into play here, which serves to equalize the amount of epidemic mortality. This curious doctrine had long been surmised, but was never proved until the statistical inquiries of recent times shewed its correctness. We may, for want of a better name, call it the law of vicarious mortality, by which is understood, that whenever one epidemic diminishes, another increases, so that the sum total of epidemic mortality remains, on an average of years, nearly the same."

"Table exhibiting the amount of epidemic mortality in England and Wales during the years 1838, 1839, and 1840.

|                                                                | Year 1838. | Year 1839. | Year 1840. |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Smallpox .....                                                 | 16,268     | 9,131      | 10,434     |
| Measles .....                                                  | 6,514      | 10,937     | 9,326      |
| Scarlet fever .....                                            | 5,802      | 10,325     | 19,816     |
| Total mortality by the }<br>exanthematic .....                 | 28,584     | 30,393     | 39,576     |
| Hooping cough .....                                            | 9,107      | 8,165      | 6,132      |
| Total of epidemic mortality                                    | 37,691     | 38,558     | 45,708     |
| Total mortality through- }<br>out England and }<br>Wales ..... | 342,529    | 338,979    | 359,561    |

"We learn from this table that every year is distinguished by some master epidemic. In 1838, smallpox was the ruling epidemic throughout England. In 1839, measles and scarlet fever struggled for the mastery. In 1840, scarlet fever was so general and so fatal that the mortality by it exceeded by one-fifth the ravages of smallpox during an epidemic season (1838), and more than doubled the mortality by that disease in 1839.

"The following table, exhibiting the amount of epidemic mortality in the metropolis during a period of five years, shews that the same general principle applies to town and country, but is less manifest in the smaller population.

"Table shewing the epidemic mortality in London during five years—1838 to 1842.

|                                                         | 1838.  | 1839.  | 1840.  | 1841.  | 1842.  |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Smallpox .....                                          | 3,817  | 634    | 1,235  | 1,053  | 360    |
| Measles .....                                           | 588    | 2,036  | 1,132  | 973    | 1,292  |
| Scarlet fever ....                                      | 1,524  | 2,499  | 1,954  | 663    | 1,224  |
| Total mortality }<br>by the exan- }<br>themathic .... } | 5,929  | 5,169  | 4,321  | 2,689  | 2,876  |
| Hooping cough ..                                        | 2,083  | 1,161  | 1,069  | 2,278  | 1,603  |
| Total of epidemic }<br>mortality .... }                 | 8,012  | 6,330  | 5,390  | 4,967  | 4,479  |
| Total mortality }<br>throughout }<br>London .... }      | 52,698 | 45,441 | 46,281 | 45,284 | 45,272 |



148

"From this table we learn that, in 1838, smallpox was the great epidemic in London as in the country. In 1839, measles and scarlet fever were both on the increase; while smallpox had sunk from 3,817 to 634. In 1840, scarlet fever predominated. In 1841, whooping cough doubled its numbers, and shot above all the rest; while scarlet fever sunk to the low point which small pox had reached in 1839. The year 1842 has been remarkable, first, for the extreme infrequency of smallpox, one death only throughout this great metropolis being attributed to it for each day of the year; and, secondly, for the uniform rate of mortality occasioned by its three great rivals. Everything teaches us that when one avenue to death is closed, another opens—

"Noctes atque dies patet atri janua Diptis."

"You will perceive from all this, that vaccination, great as its merits are [What are they?—J. G.] (and no one more fully appreciates them than I do), does not, and cannot do all that its too sanguine admirers promised. The blessings of vaccination are met and balanced by the law of vicarious mortality. How and why is this? The explanation is easy. The weak plants of a nursery must be weeded out. If weakly children do not fall victims to small pox, they live to fall into the jaws of tyrants scarcely less inexorable. Scarlet fever and measles are both advancing in respect of mortality, and the increase of deaths by whooping cough since this century set in [that is since the introduction of vaccination.—J. G.] is quite extraordinary."

It may be in place to notice the increase of another scourge—insanity—of which the *Illustrated London News*, of February 17, 1855, says:—"In the City of London, without any increase of population, the number of lunatic poor has doubled within the memory of some of the Guardians, and the cause has baffled their inquiries. Some are inclined to attribute this dreadful visitation to excess of eagerness and strife in commercial pursuits or in mental exertions; others to diet, and some partially to the effects of railway travelling." Why not to vaccination?

I offer no apology for the length of this extract—it contains matter too important. What inference would be drawn therefrom by a mind uninoculated and unimbued with the puerilities of medical logic—would it not be that vaccination is a monstrous humbug?

Not so, however, thinks Dr. Gregory—he continues:—"These statistical considerations are both curious and instructive; but they are not to diminish our zeal in behalf of vaccination, or our efforts to lessen the sum of human misery."

At p. 28, Dr. Gregory further says:—"It is seldom that two diseases are epidemic at the same time in the same district. When the yellow fever raged with such violence at Gibraltar in 1804, it was remarked that all other diseases declined; and well they might, for in that fatal epidemic, out of a civil population of 14,000 persons, twenty-eight only escaped an attack. We may hence learn why, during the presence of an epidemic which proves fatal at a high percentage, the sum total of annual mortality is often not sensibly augmented. The reason is obvious. Other diseases fall off; and if men die of cholera, or children of smallpox, they are not left to be the prey of pneumonia or of hydrocephalus, of asthma or of croup."

That, after such considerations as passed through the mind of Dr. Gregory, he should continue to feel any "zeal in behalf of vaccination" might well excite some surprise, if he did not elsewhere (at p. 25) intimate his own conviction that the worse the general state of an individual's health the greater his security from the invasion of "zymotic miasms;" a doctrine, indeed, which is the only consistent one for a vaccinator to hold.

The arguments advanced in favour of vaccination may be thus briefly summed up:—

- 1.—There are not so many scarred visages as there used to be fifty years ago.
- 2.—Some persons, who have been vaccinated, live and die without ever catching smallpox.
- 3.—Sometimes, when smallpox appears in a house, or a locality, vaccination checks its further spread amongst the inhabitants. And,
- 4.—The majority of the people believe in vaccination.



Now, I cannot see that these arguments prove anything. With respect to the relative number of scarred visages at the present time and at the distance of some fifty years ago, as my memory does not extend so far back, I can make no comparison; but, oddly enough, I can call to mind some instances of scarred visages, whose owners had been duly protected by vaccination. Moreover, some facts offer themselves to my judgment as accounting very satisfactorily for the decrease (if there be a decrease) in the number of "scarred visages," without compelling my recognition of the claims put forward in behalf of a disgusting nostrum. One cause to which I am disposed to attribute, in part, the lesser number of scarred visages now to be noticed, is the abandonment of the highly absurd, barbarous, and pernicious treatment formerly pursued, and so well described by Dr. Gregory, for a mode of treatment which, though not perfect, is far more safe, rational, and scientific. Another partial cause of the lesser number of scarred visages may be found in the fact, noticed by Dr. Gregory, "that epidemics are unusually severe when they first appear in any country, or are renewed after any long interval of time:" of the operation of which law he gives the following examples—

"When cholera first invaded India, in 1817, it raged with an intensity which may have been equalled, but has never been surpassed. When the cynanche maligna first invaded Naples in 1618—when smallpox first appeared in America, 1518—when the putrid sore throat first invaded America in 1735, and London in 1747—the ravages of each disorder were terrific. It seems, then, to be a law of the animal economy that the susceptibility to any morbid poison is great in proportion as it has been little accustomed to the impression."

As regards the fact that many persons who have been vaccinated pass through life without being seized with smallpox, it reminds one of Bacon's whimsical defence of the use of amulets, that the happy possessor only died once and seemed to escape often; and it may be met and balanced by another fact—that a far greater number of persons who have not been vaccinated enjoy a like immunity.

That the spread of smallpox, when it makes its appearance in a house or a locality, is frequently checked by the vaccination of the healthy seems too hasty an inference from the facts adduced in proof. The truth appears to be that the contagion is encountered and successfully resisted by the innate conservative power in the human system, before recourse is had to the presumed prophylactic. The period of incubation of smallpox is fourteen days; and (at p. 66) Dr. Gregory informs his readers that "*Contagious emanations* are given off from the human body at every stage of smallpox, from the first invasion of fever to the throwing off of the latest scabs."

There are various facts, too, which lend a colour to the belief that the merit frequently attributed to vaccination is in reality due to the innate power of the system to resist the invasion of disease. Take a few examples.

At Taunton, early in the year 1853, one death from smallpox occurs in a large population, amongst whom vaccination had almost entirely fallen into disuse, and the disease did not spread.

Ida Pfeiffer was a passenger in a steamer in the East. The women and children of a harem came on board and took possession of the cabin; they brought smallpox with them; five of them died. The pestilential vapour from the cabin was horrible; but the disease did not extend beyond the harem.

Captain Canot and his slave cargo were many weeks at sea when a case of smallpox occurred amongst the slaves. The wretch, with all the *sang froid* and good intentions of a compulsory vaccinator, perpetrates what he calls "a necessary murder," and the disease did not extend.

Now if, in these cases—at Taunton, aboard the steamer, and aboard the slave ship—vaccination had been had recourse to, we should never hear an end of its praises as the blessed means of checking the spread of smallpox. Truly, that must be a valuable prophylactic, which offers a mock protection after the danger has been encountered and overcome!

There remains for consideration the assertion that the majority believe in vaccination—an assumption that, in my opinion, remains to be proved; but even if should be so, it would scarcely afford safe and sufficient *data* upon which to decide a debatable medical question. It would scarcely do to bow down to the will of a majority as a test of truth, or to accept an opinion merely because it should chance to be

149  
It is rational to suppose  
that the more cleanly  
the people become  
the more the influence  
of the disease is  
diminished  
any

daintily



the persecuted,

the popular one. Had such been the received criterion of truth in the days of Jenner, we should not now be engaged in repelling the aggressions of his intolerant disciples. Who is so blind as to contend that truth shifts and changes with majorities, or that minorities have no rights and must ever be in the wrong? After all, of what weight is the testimony of the credulous believers in a nostrum? There is no mysterious specific that crowds of unthinking fanatics do not trumpet forth its miraculous powers. If it should be said that by a majority is only meant a majority of the educated classes, I must ask, of what utility is the education that fosters unreasoning credulity and presumptuous ignorance?

It is confessed that vaccination does not diminish the sum total of human mortality. What is it, then, but a great sham?

Filth is the hotbed in which smallpox thrives, and from whence it oftentimes springs spontaneously; and cleanliness, of both place and person, is the best prophylactic against this, as against other forms of epidemic disease.

If Jenner's discovery be not a worthless and pernicious nostrum, it is strange that in his own land of thoughtful Englishmen, it can be propagated only by the pains and penalties of law.

Can anything be more absurd than that any man should attempt to visit with punishment the want of belief in a scientific (or rather unscientific) dogma, *when and because* he cannot prove it to be true, except that he should boastingly pretend to the possession of a prophylactic of such potency, that he is impelled to proffer it to the acceptance of all; and yet, if it be not immediately accepted, should threaten force under the plea of self-preservation, when, if he speak the truth, it is so easy for him to protect himself, and at the same time, to give evidence of his honesty, by directly applying the nostrum to his own person.

What would be thought of the tinker who should knock a hole into the bottom of his saucepan lest one should be burned therein in the ordinary way? And yet this is just what the vaccinator does; and when he finds, as he might have foreseen if he had been governed by common sense, that his saucepan does not wear a bit the better, but rather the worse, he gravely endeavours to excuse the failure by asserting that, unfortunately, he made the hole too big or too little, too much on this side or on that, or by offering some other equally wise excuse.

If men would but cast away their nursery superstitions and candidly and intelligently examine this question, they could scarcely fail to perceive that a belief in vaccination is at variance with the theories of all the "pathies" and "isms;" that it conflicts alike with the *contraria contrariis* of the allopath and the *similia similibus* of the homœopath—it being neither *contrary* nor *similar*, but "*the same*." The consistent disciple of Priessnitz (who taught the *purification* and *strengthening* of the system by water and hygienic means), the followers of Thomson (who rejected all but simple remedies, *capable of assimilation*), and the pupil of Graham (who would not permit the introduction of even *healthy animal matter* into the human system), must alike reject the medical use of this diseased and poisonous animal product. Even the isopath cannot justify its employment, inasmuch as it is introduced into the healthy, not into the diseased body, and is exhibited *not as a remedy, but as a charm*. Every thinking mind should reject the irrational doctrine, that the dissemination of disease throughout the community is the way to render it healthy, and must condemn the equally irrational practice of giving *everybody* a malady, because *somebody* may possibly catch it. When men shall venture to think for themselves, vaccination cannot fail to be rapidly numbered with other obsolete medical superstitions and quackeries—the last, but not the least—the vilest and most mischievous of all. Doubtless, in the progress of truth, the day will come when they, who now loudly boast of their faith

in this nostrum, will blush at their former credulity if it be but named in their hearing.

Having trespassed at such length upon your time and space, I shall, with your permission, postpone, to another letter, the consideration of the second part of my subject,

And am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
April 10, 1855.

effects to be,

by phisical &amp; moral means,

pathetic,

nt as a disease—  
ot as a cure,The vaccine is the  
antiseptic doctrine  
must be used re-  
indicate it.



To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

"Ejus nocumentum est sæpius juvamento majus."

"There has been a great increase of medical men of late years, but, upon my life, diseases have increased in proportion.—Abernethy.

"Quam parva sapientia regitur mundus."—Oxenstierna.

SIR,—In this letter I propose to inquire—is vaccination attended with evil results? A question that, like the one discussed in the previous letter, shall be answered by the vaccinators themselves.

Passing over, for the present, the fact that vaccination is frequently an immediate cause of death, of which I gave some examples in your columns on a former occasion, we shall limit our inquiries, at present, to this point—does vaccination introduce other diseases, besides cowpox, into the system?

First, let us see what the *Lancet* (a zealous advocate of vaccination) has to say on the subject. Two or three short quotations, of a recent date, will suffice:—

"There is a belief—it may be denounced as a prejudice, but it is not the less a deeply-rooted conviction, and one not confined to the poor or the ignorant—that if the vaccine disease may be transmitted by inoculation, other diseases less beneficial may be propagated in the same manner, and by the same operation. Many a parent of high and low degree dates constitutional disease in her offspring to vaccination with 'bad matter.' Who shall say that this etiological conclusion is always false?"—*Lancet*, July 15, 1854.

"The poor are told that they must carry their children to be vaccinated by medical men who may be strangers to them. They apprehend—and the apprehension is not altogether unfounded, or unshared by the educated classes—that the vaccine matter employed may carry with it the seeds of other diseases not less loathsome than the one it is intended to prevent."—*Lancet*, October 23, 1854.

"So widely extended is the dread that, along with the prophylactic remedy, something else may be inoculated, lest the germ of future diseases may be planted, that few medical practitioners would care to vaccinate their own children from a source of the purity of which they were not well assured."—*Lancet*, November 11, 1854.

If such be the opinions of medical practitioners in general, let us hear the sentiments of one or two of them in particular, and, to avoid the imputation of partiality, let us select both a homœopath and an allopath.

Let us first listen to the homœopath. Dr. Hering is a firm believer in vaccination, and triumphantly appeals to the practice thereof as "offering one of the most conclusive proofs of the truth of the homœopathic law." Alas, for homœopathy, if it cannot furnish more conclusive proofs of its efficiency! Dr. Hering confesses—"It is a matter of great importance to obtain the virus from a healthy child—one that is free from scrofulous taint, and all other hereditary, and especially cutaneous diseases."

Now, for the allopath. Mr. Borham, who is not only a zealous, but likewise a compulsory, vaccinator, published, in the *Lancet*, of July 29, 1854, the subjoined correspondence between himself and another compulsory vaccinator—the distinguished author of the "Compulsory Vaccination Act"—*arcades ambo*.

"Cambridge terrace, Hyde Park, July 17, 1854.

"My Lord,—The amendment of your Vaccination Act has been so unostentatiously and speedily hurried through the upper House, that the profession had not an opportunity of knowing the amendments you have made, or expressing an opinion thereon.

"There is no portion of Her Majesty's subjects more anxious to carry out measures affecting the public health than the medical profession, and especially that of vaccination, which owes its origin to a professional brother.

"I think, my lord, that every medical man ought to vaccinate those children that he has brought into the world, for many obvious reasons—it would make the object more complete. He can do so by your recent amendment; but the slight remuneration of one shilling will deter many from accepting it, and thus it will rather tend to the dissemination of other diseases equally or more frightful than the smallpox. To make this clear to you, I will illustrate it by cases that have fallen under my own observation, and these are legion—viz., many children are born apparently healthy, and seemingly remain so for two or three months, when an eruption



Lodwick

breaks out upon the region of the —, precluded from observation by the apparel, but the face and arms appear quite healthy. The district vaccinator is deceived by the appearances of these children; they are vaccinated, fine pustules are produced, and *this vitiated virus is transmitted to scores of others, who shortly after suffer from fulsome eruptions, or the foundation is laid for scrofula or tuberculous consumption.* These children have been born of parents who were either suffering from primary or secondary s—s [It is a curious fact that 'half the deaths registered from this disease were in children under one year' (*Lancet*, March 17, 1855); and it is worthy of note that in many cases the disease was derived solely from the father, the mother never having been afflicted with it.—J. G.] during utero-gestation; and this frightful disease, after the birth of the child, either lies dormant, or slightly shows itself about the third month, the time for vaccination. Such diseases are likely to be known by the medical attendant of the family, and I humbly submit it as a strong reason for the remunerating fee to be sufficiently large to induce him to vaccinate those he attends, so that such diseases may have less chance of being propagated.

"Thanking you, my lord, for the fulfilment of your promise in extending the operation to all qualified surgeons, and hoping I may not be too late for you to give an increased fee your favourable consideration,

"I am, my lord, your obedient humble servant,  
"To Lord Lyttelton." "W. H. BORHAM.

"10, Great George street, July 19, 1854.

"Sir,—The House of Commons have rejected the proposed fee of 1s., and I must now let the matter alone, having done what I could; but you have misunderstood the object of it. Union surgeons are paid 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. for operation, certificate and all. Private practitioners complained that they had to furnish *certificates* for nothing; I therefore proposed that they should be paid 1s. for the *certificate alone*, which, compared with the other, seems about in proportion for the *operation*. Of course they are paid by *their employers*, unless they choose to do it gratis.

"The object was not to throw contracts open to all, which, though I should be glad if it could be done, I did not venture to do, *because I found doubts expressed in high authority whether it might not interfere with the due supply of lymph.*"\*

"Your obedient servant,

"To W. H. Borham, Esq." "LYTTELTON.

The foregoing correspondence speaks so clearly and forcibly for itself as to need but few words of comment.

Why the "district vaccinator" should be liable to be deceived any more than "the medical attendant of the family" is not very apparent. The fact is that no surgeon or physician can be sure that any given lymph is unmixed with the seeds of some other disease besides those of cowpox. There is no known medical test by which any one human being can be pronounced free from the taint of some transmitted malady. It is impossible for a medical man to pronounce with certainty what child is perfectly healthy. It is asserted that, from children apparently the most healthy, diseases the most horrible have been propagated in and by the vaccine virus. A gentleman, well known in the philanthropic world, informs me that, with lymph taken from a child supposed to be perfectly healthy, his grandchild, a healthy child, of healthy parents, was vaccinated; from this child the virus was transferred to his cousin, another healthy child, the offspring also of healthy parents. Subsequently both children became afflicted with a loathsome disease, prior to the outward manifestation of which, some twenty other children were vaccinated from them.

Dr. Laurie, of Dunstable, who kindly allows me to mention his name, thus writes to me:—"I vaccinated a child with pure lymph (reputed to be) from the Royal Vaccine Institution. The child, though previously apparently healthy, has ever since been nearly blind; opacities of the cornea developing themselves immediately after the operation. This case, and several others from other vaccinators, at Edlesborough, where it was performed, have militated very much against the practice of vaccination amongst the poor."

It would lengthen this paper too much to give other similar testimonies; but the phrases "most likely" and "less chance," in Mr. Borham's letter, sufficiently confess the existence of the danger and the absence of immunity.

\* "How, if the contract were open to all, it could interfere with the due supply of lymph, I should like the 'high authority' to explain. This high authority must have hoodwinked his lordship."  
—W. H. B."



153  
Compulsory Vaccination

Occasionally, some unreflecting person may hastily assert, without assigning any reason, that it is impossible that two poisons can be deposited together in the vaccine vesicle. Why impossible? If two distinct poisons can circulate together in the blood, why is it impossible that they should be deposited together in the same exudation therefrom? If they preserve their distinctive properties in the blood, why not in the lymph? Shall it be said that the one overcomes the other—that, for example, cowpox masters scrofula—the cause of vaccination gains nothing by the argument, for the result must be the formation of a third something, which is neither cowpox, nor scrofula, and which cannot be innocuous, when transmitted to the circulation of another human being.

In the last Session in the House of Commons, Mr. Apsley Pellatt gave notice of motion for a "Return respecting Infanticide;" to be complete. This return should include the number of legal infanticides scientifically performed by the medical officers of the State.

If the cautionary hint connected with Mr. Borham's objections to the "slight remuneration" and demand of an "increased fee" have any meaning, it implies a threat that, if the modest demands of certain medical gentlemen be not complied with, it will not be their fault if the most horrible diseases do not overrun the community.

The note appended by Mr. Borham to Lord Lyttelton's letter is natural enough, but it might have occurred to one, less bent upon private ends, to have asked his Lordship—how, if it be impossible to obtain a "due supply of lymph," he could think of visiting people with the pains and penalties of the law, for the non-observance of vaccination?

Is it strange that the Compulsory Vaccination Act should be very generally pronounced to be a failure? The *Lancet*, the *Medical Times*, and the *Medical Circular*, all tell us that it is so. The Royal Jennerian Vaccine Institution condemns all legislative interference with the cause of vaccination as injurious to it. Indeed, such interference can have but one of two results: if it be submitted to, it must lower the standard of independence and self-reliance and degrade the national character; if it be repelled, it must foster a spirit of bitter hostility against the State and its institutions. Accordingly, while in some districts the people have slavishly bowed their souls and bodies to the yoke; in other districts (as the registrars report), they very naturally threaten violence—and who can affect surprise or blame? Resistance is the natural reply of the free and brave to aggression, and how could the upholders of physical-force-science hope that it should prove an exception to the rule? Even if vaccination were a good, the loss of liberty would be too heavy a price to pay for it. Without liberty all other blessings are of no value. The man who can think otherwise deserves to be a slave. As it is, the chief consequence of compulsory legislation has been to provoke inquiry and resistance, and to bring into greater abhorrence a nostrum of which its advocates not only confess that it does not diminish the sum total of human mortality, but that it adds to the sum of human misery.

On the first introduction of vaccination, the wags jocularly asserted that it would change the vaccinated into horned cattle. A truth is often concealed beneath a jest. This much, at least, is very apparent—the minds of the believers in this bestiality must have been much brutalized before they could think of forcibly thrusting it upon their neighbours. No man with the slightest pretension to refinement or gentlemanly feeling—not to mention that divine courtesy which distinguishes the true Christian and influences him to do as he would be done by—could think of forcing his way, in person or by proxy, into his neighbour's dwelling, to commit violence upon, and to communicate disease to, the persons of its inmates. Such ruffianism may be paralleled, but not exceeded—no, not even by that of a Birmingham jailor, jail-surgeon, a mad-doctor, a public school monitor, or master, an Indian tax gatherer, an American slave holder, a drunken Russian serf, or any of the other ruffians, with the record of whose atrocities we have been almost daily disgusted of late.

It is not too much to say that he, who with a full knowledge of the inefficiency and evil consequences of vaccination can honestly profess implicit trust therein, must be an impenetrable dolt; he, who would not resist to the utmost the attempt to violate the sanctity of his person by the compulsory baring of his shoulder, the wounding of his skin, and

capient,

bulky



154  
*Comptonbury Vaccination*

the infusion into his system of a disgusting virus, or of any matter whatever, is but a base slave; and the parent who would tamely suffer that wrong and violence to be inflicted upon the person of his helpless infant, which he would repel to the utmost if offered to himself, is a brute beneath contempt.

No wonder that even a "District Vaccinator"—all honour to him—should feel his manhood, and thus address me:—

"Sir,—I am certain that this odious, this detestable, this law, which is everything that is most cruel and wicked, cannot long remain in force; it is worthy only of the Emperor of all the Russias, or the King, Dahomey."

How much it were to be wished that, on a question like this, some of our religious professors and spiritual pastors, instead of bullying their neighbours into compliance with their crude belief in an obscure point in medical practice, would imitate the Christian humility of the excellent Rev. John Newton, as evidenced in his letter on inoculation to the Rev. Mr. R——, in his "Cardiphonia;" he says:—

"I am not a professed advocate for inoculation; but if a person who fears the Lord should tell me, 'I think I can do it in faith, looking upon it as a salutary expedient which he in his providence has discovered, and which therefore appears my duty to have recourse to, so that my mind does not hesitate with respect to the lawfulness, nor am I anxious about the event, being satisfied that, whether I live or die, I am in that path in which I can cheerfully expect his blessing,' I do not know that I could offer a word by way of dissuasion.

"If another person should say, 'My times are in the Lord's hands; I am now in health, and am not willing to bring upon myself a disorder, the consequences of which I cannot possibly foresee: if I am to have the smallpox, I believe he is the best judge of the season and manner in which I shall be visited, so as may be most for his glory and my own good; and therefore I choose to wait his appointment, and not to rush upon even the possibility of danger without a call. If the very hairs of my head are numbered, I have no reason to fear that, supposing I receive the smallpox in a natural way, I shall have a single pimple more than he sees expedient; and why should I wish to have one less? Nay, admitting, which however is not always the case, that inoculation might exempt me from some pain and inconvenience, and lessen the apparent danger, might it not likewise, upon that very account, prevent my receiving some of those sweet consolations, which I humbly hope my gracious Lord would afford me, if it were his pleasure to call me to a sharp trial. Perhaps the chief design of this trying hour, if it comes, may be to show me more of his wisdom, power, and love, than I have ever yet experienced. If I could devise a mean to avoid the trouble, I know not how great a loser I may be in point of grace and comfort. Nor am I afraid of my face; it is now as the Lord has made it, and it will be so after the smallpox. If it pleases him, I hope it will please me. In short, though I do not censure others, yet, as to myself, inoculation is what I dare not venture upon. If I did venture, and the issue should not be favourable, I should blame myself for having attempted to take the management out of the Lord's hand into my own, which I never yet did in other matters, without finding I am no more able than I am worthy to choose for myself. Besides, at the best, inoculation would only secure me from one of the innumerable natural evils the flesh is heir to; I should still be as liable as I am at present to a putrid fever, a bilious cholic, an inflammation in the bowels or in the brain, and a thousand formidable diseases which are hovering round me, and only wait his permission to cut me off in a few days or hours; and therefore I am determined, by his grace, to resign myself to his disposal. Let me fall into the hands of the Lord (for his mercies are great), and not into the hands of men.'

"If a person should talk to me in this strain, most certainly I could not say, 'Notwithstanding all this, your safest way is to be inoculated.'

"We preach and hear, and I hope we know something of faith, as enabling us to intrust the Lord with our souls. I wish we had all more faith to intrust him with our bodies, our health, our provision, and our temporal comforts likewise. The former should seem to require the strongest faith of the two. How strange is it, that when we think we can do the greater, we should be so awkward and unskilful when we aim at the less! Give my love to your friend. I dare not advise: but if she can quietly return at



the usual time, and neither run intentionally into the way of the smallpox, nor run out of the way, but leave it simply with the Lord, I shall not blame her. And if you will mind your praying and preaching, and believe that the Lord can take care of her without any of your contrivances, I shall not blame you: nay, I shall praise him for you both."

That eminent Christian, the Rev. John Newton, dared not even to advise, where our meek and humble pastors of the present day do not hesitate to coerce: thus

"Fools rush in, where angels fear to tread."

Surely, if ever it be wise and expedient to observe the divine injunction, "take no thought for the morrow," it is with reference to this question. For my part, I freely confess to some reliance upon nature—nature's laws and nature's God. I believe that temperance, cleanliness, exercise, cheerfulness, and courage, are the best prophylactics; and I see, in the facts we have been considering, sufficient reason to exclaim with Newton—"Let me fall into the hands of the Lord, and not of men!"

When infanticide is enforced by the State, the Christianity of the nation is but badly vindicated by the exclusion of honest unbelievers from an assembly of practical infidels. It affords matter for the gravest reflection and gloomiest apprehensions that the appointed guardians of our liberties should carelessly vote them away to gratify the rapacity of a combination of traders, the vanity of a faction composed of filthy, wicked quacks, and the self-sufficiency of a rash and inexperienced lord, who vainly aspires to be a statesman; and that religious bodies and their leaders should applaud, or, at least, should not remonstrate, whilst ignorant, headlong legislators thus betray their trust.

Is it too much for a British freeman to claim to be the owner of his own body and the conservator of his own health—to have his house held sacred from the forcible intrusion of insolent quacks, and his family protected from the violent infliction of disgusting diseases? If it be, patriotism is but an empty sound, principle an unmeaning word, "civil and religious liberty" a cuckoo cry, public religious observances a solemn mockery, and England no longer a land worth loving or living in.

Under ordinary circumstances, I should hesitate to obtrude my opinions on a medical question at such length upon the public; but, when it is sought to force upon the persons of me and mine, in common with others, a medical practice which reason condemns and conscience disapproves, I feel that I have a right to demand the attention of every individual possessed with common sense and common honesty, while I sternly and indignantly repel the usurpations of a traitorous legislature, and insist, not beseech, that my rights—as a parent, a man, a freeman—be respected.

I am, sir, your obliged and obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,

April 16, 1855.



## COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

"Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

SIR,—Human nature, of a certain stamp, is the same now that it was when the above words were guilefully shouted forth by the interested few, and thoughtlessly echoed by the slavish and credulous many.

"Medicus" appears to think that he may indulge in a little bit of safe impertinence from behind his mask, and so he should, as far as I am concerned, but that I suffer myself to be influenced by a feeling of compassion for the unthinking, doctor-ridden crowd, who love mystery, and hang upon the words of a physician as upon the declaration of a health-oracle, and who would probably allow themselves to be blindly duped, to the great injury of themselves and their families, if "Medicus" should remain unanswered.

It would be somewhat more to the purpose, if—instead of drawing an inconsequent comparison between the mortality from smallpox in these kingdoms and in some down-trodden foreign states, in which, with dire consistency, vaccination has long been compulsory—"Medicus" had stated the respective annual average mortality, both from smallpox and from all causes, in the same foreign states, during comparative cycles of years, embracing periods when smallpox was epidemic as well as when it was not so, both *before* and *after* the introduction of vaccination. Should "Medicus" present your readers with such statistics, it would be but considerate, on his part, to accompany them with a caution, that "paternal governments" have peculiar facilities for cooking statistics to justify anything whatsoever that may furnish an excuse to treat their subjects as children or as slaves. It would be also wise to add that, notwithstanding the paternal solicitude and care of such governments, there are seasons when smallpox will obstinately assail whole districts, and spread terror and devastation around. Furthermore, it would by no means tend to hinder your readers from drawing just conclusions, if, with something very like the *suppressio veri*, two important facts were not withheld—namely: That in Ireland (and in England, too, though in a lesser degree), smallpox is chiefly propagated by the pernicious practice of inoculation; and that, in many foreign states, in which vaccination is compulsory, the *deaths from all causes* are much in excess, in some instances double (as I formerly showed in your columns), what they are in these kingdoms.

It would, likewise, have been helpful, as well as ingenious, to have warned your readers, in drawing comparisons between the respective mortality, from any given disease, in these kingdoms and in any foreign state, to consider the influence of climate upon health in general, and upon the manifestations of epidemic disease in particular; and this important point might have been illustrated by the following apt quotation from Dr. Gregory:—"There are some countries as yet unvisited by the exanthemata. Smallpox, measles, and scarlet fever, are to this day unknown in Australia and Van Diemen's Land." And yet—can it be believed?—instead of trying to ascertain, like rational beings, the cause, or causes, of this happy exemption, the insane, overbearing, cruel fanatics, who practice vaccination, have not only introduced it into those hitherto highly-favoured lands, but have actually succeeded in making it compulsory there! Could folly soar higher? How self-conceit and arrogance can swell a worm until the poor creature fancies himself a demi-god, and, like Nebuchadnezzar of old, is ready to bid every one to fall prostrate at his feet and worship him.

"Medicus" must forgive me if I say that, allowing so little weight to his facts, I cannot attach much importance to his opinions. Neither can I attach much importance to the opinions of the Epidemiological Society—indeed, it would be highly illogical of me to do so. After all, that Society is only "Medicus" in the plural number,—only a cipher multiplied. *Ex nihilo nihil fit.*



*Compulsory Vaccination* 137

However, there is one argument—a very prominent one also, of that Society, as well as of "Medicus"—which deserves some notice. Strangely enough, too, it is ever a favourite argument of bullies, and is often succinctly expressed in the pithy phrase—"If you won't, I'll make you!" This argument may be very imposing on the lips of a public school-monitor to his sag, or of a slave-holder to his slave, but "Medicus" may be assured that, on the present question, there are tens of thousands of independent, inquiring minds, which will not be thus answered, and will not accept the knock-down argument of an Act of Parliament in lieu of facts and reasons. At what a time an imbecile government chose to tamper with the constitutional rights and holiest feelings of the people! Accustomed as the partizans of legalised quackery are to commit daily, if not hourly, blunders of various kinds, they never committed a greater than when they resolved, in Grand-Ducal fashion, to try and force their nostrum upon those who have seriously and sagely determined not to have it. Accordingly, caring but little for the deductions of such a rough-and-ready school of logicians, and being neither biassed by prejudice, nor blinded by self-interest, I choose to continue to trust to my own judgment, and to hold fast to my conviction that vaccination is not an "antidote" to anything, but health and good manners; that it spreads disease and death throughout the community; that it does not diminish the sum of human mortality; that it adds to the sum of human suffering; that it is, every way, a wicked delusion, which could have emanated only from the "father of lies;" and that to advocate it is, at best, but to preach, "Let us do evil that good may come!"

"Medicus" asserts that if vaccination "does not always [does it ever, except when it proves fatal?—J. G.] prevent smallpox, the attack is much milder." So mild, indeed, is it, that, in illustration, "Medicus" might have told you, on the authority of Dr. Gregory, that, out of 298 patients, having smallpox after vaccination, who were admitted in the course of a year into the smallpox hospital, 31 died. And "Medicus" might have added, on the authority of the Registrar General, that, out of 432 deaths from smallpox, in an epidemic season, in a period of ten weeks, in London, 135 deaths were returned as occurring after vaccination,—and this, be it remembered, in a population, of which it is complained by the unreasoning, intolerant advocates of this *antidote* (?), that it is much neglected. By a "curious coincidence," there is being waged at present, in a northern paper, a controversy between a gentleman and an "M.D." of the school of "Medicus." In this discussion, the "M.D." naively indulges in some extravagant assertions and fanciful statistics; and the gentleman, who chooses to think for himself, informs the public that he "was nearly killed when an infant by vaccination, and afterwards brought to death's door by smallpox;" and he adduces, in support of his views, not only an instance in which the vaccinated had smallpox more severely than the unvaccinated, but an instance in which the vaccinated died of smallpox, and the unvaccinated escaped altogether.

"If" (says "Medicus," somewhat positively), "vaccination did nothing more than this for us [i.e., cause the attack of smallpox to be milder], surely the State is bound to compel its application." Is it? Will "Medicus" state in what code of legal ethics he has discovered this dogma? I apprehend that his knowledge of the constitution of the State is about on a par with his knowledge of the constitution of the human body, and the laws of disease and health. Where has "Medicus" discovered that it is part of the duty of the State to discharge the functions of the family physician? Nay, more, to obtrude its unbidden and unwelcome services, not into the chamber of the sick, but into the dwelling and upon the person of the healthy? If such be amongst the duties of the State, would "Medicus" condescend to enlighten us further, and say, where does this duty begin and where does it end? Is it confined to one single point in ten thousand points? If so, why so? If a duty have no definite limits, how shall it be performed, or who shall be responsible for its performance? Is the State to take the person of the citizen, with or without his leave, entirely into its sanitary keeping, and prescribe to him how he shall be treated in any and every disease,—in typhus, or in cholera, and enforce the prescription? If not, why not?



158

Compulsory Vaccination

Nay, inasmuch as forcible vaccination is advocated, not as a means of cure, but under the pretext of prevention, is the State to enforce upon the person all precautionary measures assumed to be adapted to place the human system in the best condition to resist the invasion of disease? Is the State to enforce temperance in eating and drinking, regular hours, personal cleanliness, exercise,—in a word, every sanitary precaution? If not, why not? If the State is to do all this, how is it to do it? At what hour shall the curfew be rung for all the lieges to put out their lights and go to bed? What is temperance? How many dishes shall there be on the table to dinner? what shall they contain? and how many ounces of food shall be allowed per head? What amount of exercise shall each person take daily? Into how many baths, and at what temperature, shall he plunge? How shall he be clothed? Are these things to be regulated by fixed rules, without distinction of person, regard to the state of health, or consideration of constitutional idiosyncrasy? or shall the sanitary officers, to be appointed by the State, have plenary powers in each individual case? Are these things too absurd to be seriously thought of? So is compulsory vaccination, even if it were not—which it is—a pernicious, wicked practice. The one is no more absurd than the other. But in what code is it declared that such things are amongst the duties of the State, or that the citizen is bound to submit to such and a multitude more of similarly absurd usurpations? Once more—from what class would "Medicus" select his sanitary officers to carry out these assumed duties? Would he take them from his own profession? How many nice little berths, with nice little powers, and nice little salaries, loom pleasantly in the distance to the eager eyes of himself and his confreres! Of what wild schemes, fanatics, and worse than fanatics, are capable, may be exemplified by the proposal, once seriously made, to reduce the lower classes of the Scotch to slavery, to protect them from the evils of poverty! What ineffable kindness!

But, has "Medicus" reflected upon the probable results, in a political sense, of such parental affection and authority upon the part of the State? Has he thought of the effect

his communistic scheme would have upon the national character and welfare? Has he considered the innumerable frequent embarrassments it would cause any government, however wise and strong? I presume that he has not pondered these and a host of similar questions, or he could not write such transparent nonsense, unless, indeed, he be utterly incapable of grasping them ~~to his mind~~, and comprehending their aim and force. Into what a Balaklava such crude doctrines, if enforced in practice, would soon convert the nation!

But, assuming that vaccination is a blessing, and compulsion justifiable, let us inquire how far compulsory vaccination is practicable. One correspondent, a lady, inquires—"Has it struck you, the great power these doctors are striving for? Where is the test, and who is to apply it, that they will use even average good vaccine matter?" Another correspondent, himself a "district vaccinator," thus writes:—"A more absurd enactment never emanated from the legislature. Besides the enclosed certificates, there is another of 'TEMPORARY UNFITNESS' Now, temporary unfitness consists, in this part of Her Majesty's dominions, in the weather being too hot or too cold—the position of the wind—the child's bowels being too confined, or too relaxed—its having had its milk, or not. In short, I do not see how a conviction should occur; certainly not if I were engaged in the defence."

If, on the one hand, "Medicus" be rather audacious in demanding political power for his scientific sect, let us do him the justice to acknowledge that, on the other hand, he displays some atoning modesty in asserting the medical claims of his nostrum. It is somewhat to his credit that he does not venture to deny the evil results of vaccination in disseminating other diseases, and that he forbears to express, as he might have done, on the high authority of the Epidemiological Society, "a strong and unequivocal opinion that there is not the smallest foundation" for such a belief, by which flippant and impudent falsehood, and other similar untruths, that learned and honourable society beguiled a too confiding legislature to stultify itself, and to betray its trust.



# *Compulsory Vaccination.*

How the once extravagant pretensions of vaccination have dwindled down! And this is the thing, in favour of which we are required to surrender our liberties! Alas, for medical science!—how pitiful it looks, as, in its despairing pride, it meanly beseeches the secular power to sustain it!

It is worthy of remark that, in this town, not one medical man has yet had the good sense, or good taste, as elsewhere, publicly to repudiate any complicity in this physical-force-science, and that not one Christian minister has yet ventured to speak—even if he has ventured to think—one word on behalf of “civil and religious liberty,” of the respect due to religious scruples, or of doing as one would be done by. But, notwithstanding this apathy, or bluntness of moral perception, or whatever it be, on the part of those who might be supposed foremost to array themselves on the side of right, it is very satisfactory, and very much to the honour of your town, that, as appears from the figures quoted by “*Medicus*,” a considerable majority of the parents of children ~~born~~ therein, in 1854,—namely, 375 to 298—had the intelligence to think, and the independence to act, for themselves, despite the threatened pains and penalties of a foolish, tyrannical, unjust, unconstitutional, un-Christian law.

On a former occasion, I warned your local Board of Guardians, that, if they would not oppose, like men and Christians, this infamous law for enforcing the vaccination of infants, they might be assured that the hand of tyranny would soon be extended to grasp themselves. Accordingly, it is now proposed to subject them to a like coercion, with the ~~unpalatable~~ addition of a little bit of centralization. Dare they remonstrate? With what face could they do so? And yet, if they do not, they may believe me now, that this is but the beginning of the end. But, be it a Board of Guardians, or a Board of Admiralty, a Scientific Body, or the Horse Guards, the Committee of a petty Charity, or the Cabinet of the Empire, the same fatal stupidity seems ever to pervade the official mind. Let us hope that, ere long, the voice of an aroused and justly indignant people will teach our law-makers, both little and great, that they are not our masters, but our servants. If ever the vessel of the State is to be righted, and to sail once more, in stately beauty, on her conquering course, a clean sweep should be sternly made, from the highest to the lowest, of all the imbeciles who lumber her noble decks.

I am, sir, your obliged and obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,

April 31, 1855.

*To make it more palatable.*



160

# The Maine Law.

To the Editor of the *Miner*.

## THE MAINE-LAW.

Sir,—If the Alliance be really determined not to accept anything short of the immediate and total abolition of the liquor-traffic, it is indeed quite useless to propose to it any less sweeping measure. However, I cannot help thinking that, even if the *legal* traffic in strong drinks were entirely suppressed, other enactments would still be needed. After all that your proposed measure could accomplish, smuggling and private brewing and distilling would still remain as sources of supply of intoxicating liquors, and it can scarcely be expected that at least a portion of the evils of which you now complain would not therefore still linger amongst us, and require correction as they do in the state of Maine. (1)

Permit me to plead, in apology for the use of the expression "vague cry," the fact that, while total and immediate abolition and the Maine-law are employed as synonymous by the advocates of the policy of the Alliance, they are not, strictly speaking, convertible terms. The Maine-law in Maine, besides permitting the sale of intoxicating liquors for "medical and mechanical purposes," allows their *importation*, as well as private manufacture for domestic use. (2)

You ask if I agree with you that buying and selling of intoxicating liquors, except for medical and mechanical purposes, should be put an end to. I do not; I have distinctly asserted the opposite opinion more than once, and have repeated it even in the very letter which you did me the favour to insert. I hold that, *as between himself and his fellow man* each man has an undoubted right to eat, drink, and consequently to purchase, whatever he may please, no matter howsoever injurious it may be to his health—whether it be an Indian curry or a Welch rabbit, turtle soup or red herring, Burgundy or gin—or to macerate himself with ascetic mortifications, at his option. (3)

Thanking you very warmly for your courtesy, and regretting that I should have to trespass upon it a second time, I am, sir, your obedient servant, JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonard-on-Sea, April 9, 1855.

(1) We have always admitted that the Maine-law would resemble all other law in being occasionally evaded.

(2) The Liquor-law of Maine allows the importation solely because the state legislature of Maine is prohibited by the constitution of the United States from enacting a law forbidding it. Our "cry" for the Maine-law is well-known to be a demand for a law generally resembling the Liquor-law of Maine, but embodying as many improvements upon it as experience shall show to be attainable. It means, a law at least as stringent as that of Maine; and to call this a vague demand verges on hypercriticism.

(3) Unless the law of the land, for the general good, prohibits it. *Ed. Alliance.*



### THE MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL.

"There is an evident inclination on the part of the medical profession to get itself organized after the fashion of the clergy. Moved as are the projectors of a railway, who, whilst secretly hoping for salaries, persuade themselves and others that the proposed railway will be beneficial to the public—moved as all men are under such circumstances, by nine parts of self-interest gilt over with one part of philanthropy—surgeons and physicians are vigorously striving to erect a medical establishment *à la* mode to our religious one. Little do the public at large know how actively professional publications are agitating for state-appointed overseers of the public health."—*Spencer's "Social Statics,"* p. 375.

SIR,—Scarcely is one attempt upon the liberty of the subject exposed and baffled—at least for the moment—than another is made. This is the age of selfish pretension. When the ship is close to the breakers, and the best efforts of all hands are needed to carry her in safety through the storm, her decks are infested with gangs of impudent marauders, animated with sinister designs upon some portion of the stores or cargo. To drop the metaphor; in this—one of the most momentous periods in our country's history—designing lawyers are wanting to steal away a bit of the trial by jury, eagerly clamouring for paid magistrates and public prosecutors, and attempting "to subject the affairs of every household to a species of legal confessional" (*Times*, June 26, 1855); covetous and ambitious churchmen are demanding twelve new bishoprics, and grasping at control over the private devotions of families, and artful and avaricious doctors are confidently putting forward the most preposterous claims. It is with these last that we have now to do.

For some years, medical agitators have been struggling to obtain, amongst other similarly selfish objects, a "Medical Registration," or, as with unconscious irony, they sometimes call it, a "Medical Reform" Act. A new effort in this direction is now being made, and there is under the consideration of Parliament a measure entitled "A Bill to alter and amend the laws regulating the Medical Profession," which proposes the compulsory registration of all persons practising medicine and surgery, with the exception and exclusion from the registry of those practitioners not possessed of certain (so called) "qualifications"—namely those diplomas with which orthodox quacks delight to honour one another—and the summary punishment of unregistered practitioners by fine and imprisonment for every offence against the statute.

If this bill pass, it will give great power to a body of traders who have already more power and privileges than they deserve, or than is conducive to the advancement of science, or compatible with the principles of justice and the welfare of society; and it will rob the thoughtful citizen of some of his best rights.

It is fair that Government should require any qualification it may value on the part of public servants, medical or other, but it has no right whatever to step in between any two freemen, to prevent the one from selling and the other from buying needful advice and personal service, especially in the important matter of health. Who will seriously contest the manifest right of every citizen of a free country to pursue any honourable and useful calling, whether it require the labours of the hand or the head? Surely, if there be any such things as natural rights, every man has an unmistakable right to be the conservator of his own health, and to seek its preservation or recovery, at whatever hands, and through whatever means, his judgment shall approve. Has not every man the right to consult, for an attack of headache or dyspepsia, a well-informed, intelligent chemist, if such advice should seem

preferable to that of a doctor of medicine; or even (apart from the wisdom of the act) to call in the first cabman on the stand to feel his pulse, look at his tongue and order a remedy, bind up a cut finger, or extract a tooth or a corn; and, if satisfied with the service rendered, to remunerate it with *his own money*? Or shall he be compelled to submit to be experimented upon by, and to pay a man, in whose talent and skill he may have no confidence, or be debarred of any medical advice and assistance whatever?

What would be thought of the barbers—those fathers of surgery—if they were to combine to obtain a law, giving them a monopoly of cropping and shaving?

aking



Once, when old physic and its doting ministers failed to render me any benefit, but rather succeeded in aggravating my ailment, a few natural remedies administered by the advice of an unpretending German farmer—the sagacious and inventive Priessnitz—restored tone to my digestive organs, and gave me a renewed lease of health. Should I have permitted any absurd law—if such had been—to debar me from the blessing within my grasp, or to hinder me from the performance of an act of grateful justice in return? Is it not written, "The labourer is worthy of his hire?"

Would the confiscation of my natural rights, and the rights of the "irregular practitioner" whose services I may yet need, be of any benefit whatever to the community? I think not. To rob me of one of my natural rights, is to rob every other man as well, and posterity also. Viewed closely, "Medical Registration" is only a scheme to enable the partizans of one medical sect to compel all others to contribute to the maintenance of its ministers. In furtherance of this dishonest object there is a loud outcry against "quackery," from very suspicious lips. If "irregular practitioners" be unprincipled men-slayers, the proofs ought to be palpable to the most careless observer. The victims of old physic crawl in every street, or moulder in every churchyard. With one weapon alone—chloroform—in a short time, over fifty fanatics were *suddenly* slain by the "Priesthood of Science," exclusive of many others who perished slowly from the action of the *remedy*. Where are the fifty victims to "irregular practice?"

From the census of 1851, it seems that the "legally qualified" and the "irregular practitioners" are about equal in number. Where is the proof that the "irregular practitioners" attain to an equality of mischief with the "legally qualified?" Why should the law step in to sacrifice the interests of the one to the interests of the other?

For a very long time—further back, by far, than the "memory of the oldest inhabitant" extends—the State has petted the "legally qualified." They have been dignified by colleges. Knighthoods and baronetcies have been showered amongst them—often for very equivocal services. They have had the monopoly of all public medical offices—military, naval, and civil. They have had exclusive possession of dispensaries, hospitals, lunatic asylums, workhouses, prisons, friendly societies, &c., &c. They only have had the right to grant medical certificates, and give medical testimony. Surely, if with all these aids and props they cannot maintain their ground against medical dissent and dissenters, they deserve to fall, and we may be pardoned for thinking that their chief "qualification" is the "legal" one; and that the sooner protection is wholly withdrawn from them, and "a clear stage and no favour" left to them and their rivals, the better for the interests of humanity, as well as the more consonant to the dictates of justice and the principles of freedom. Neither would the interests of science suffer thereby. Free competition ever serves the buyer—why should physic be an exception to the rule? We have had enough of mystery and protection. The faculty stoutly denounce "patent medicines"—with what logic can they seek to force upon us "patent" physicians? If the Government stamp impart no efficacy to the drug, how shall it to the practitioner?

Before noble lords and honourable gentlemen prattle of enforcing uniformity in medical practice, they had better inquire if there be really, anywhere, any such thing.

If there be quacks, either within or without the profession, who prey upon the unthinking—as doubtless there ~~be~~—the true way to put them down is to enlighten the public mind. Let that system of medicine, which cannot endure examination, perish—but let it be by the voluntary rejection of an enlightened and thinking people. So shall science be honoured, instead of being dishonoured by being fenced around with pains and penalties which even religious intolerance would now blush to employ.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Maze Hill Cottage,  
St. Leonards-on-Sea, July 16, 1855. JOHN GIBBS.



# THE MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL.

SIR,—Once more the "*cacoethes scribendi*" impels me to trouble you. Will you therefore kindly allow me to offer some remarks in reply to your correspondents—the facetious "Vindex," and the staid "Aliquis?" Both do me the favour to use many arguments to persuade me not to entrust the care of my health to any intelligent Jehu, but to choose an orthodox practitioner, with the wisdom-conferring diploma. I am much obliged to them, but they quite mistake the issue between us, which is simply this—that *I have a right of choice*. If I have not this right, why do your correspondents waste so much advice to induce me to choose in a particular way? Do they only mock me with "less than the shadow of a shade?"

The gist of the letter of "Vindex" is—that, "In matters medical this protection is for the people, not for the doctors." What does the demand that the profession shall send representatives to Parliament evince?—an anxiety to protect the people or the profession? If "Vindex" would take the trouble to read the medical journals and reports of medical meetings, he would find that protection is insisted upon as especially needful to the doctors. The cry is the same from Dr. Ebsworth, who exclaims,—"*The public were made for us, not we for the public!*"—to the *Lancet*, which proclaims,—"*Advertising quacks, herbalists, mesmerisers, homœopaths, electro-botanic physicians, et id genus omne*, flourish as the result of ignorance on one hand, and the imperfection of our medical laws on the other. The remedy is a Registration Bill."

There is logic in this—medical dissenters have no right to complain if colleges which were not founded for them disclaim them. Their sole right to practise is in the natural right of the patient to choose his system and his doctor. They cannot be allowed to appeal to the right of *private judgment* one moment and to denounce it the next. The rationality and the ingratitude of such conduct are on a parity, and the logical sequence is, that the family medicine-chest should be placed under the control of the family physician.

As to the assertion that protection is needed by the public—the public should be duly grateful, but there is no proof whatever that the public either need or ask for such protection. The advocates of Medical Registration continually beg the question. Where, I repeat, is the proof that illegal practise does more, or even as much, mischief as the orthodox practise?

The partizans of old physic do not pretend that *they* need protection—they are proud of their wisdom in choosing as they do—so proud indeed, that they want to choose for their neighbours also; their neighbours, too, think that they are competent to choose for themselves, and pity the blindness, whilst they repel the impertinence, of their would-be benefactors.

What is all this fuss about "protection?" Are the British races really so childish, that they cannot take care of themselves? If so, how does it happen that some 500 gentlemen at St. Stephen's are endowed with sufficient wisdom to protect us, the majority, from ourselves? Can the wisdom at St. Stephen's be more than a sample of the whole? Why, those protectors, if they had their way, would soon protect us into idiocy, and themselves into a college of Lay-Popes.

Cannot "Vindex" perceive the difference between that *protection* which the State is bound to afford the free citizen on his demand, and the imposition of an insulting coercion? If not, to reason with "Vindex" is hopeless.

"Vindex" charges me with "Medical Socialism" and "Communism"—does he know the meanings of the words he plays with? Why, I want every man to choose *his own doctor*, and pay him with *his own money*. The medical sectaries who strive to quarter their doctors on the public are the communists.



164  
"Aliquis," to whom I am obliged for his attempt to enlighten me, and gratefully "take the will for the deed," is kind enough to offer to correct some of my errors. Will he forgive me for saying that the errors are his own? I can scarcely think that he has any knowledge of the existing laws for regulating the practice of physic, or that he has read the bill which has led to this discussion. It is very difficult to reason with a gentleman who quite mistakes the facts of the case. He says—

"All the lieges of the realm, who are of mature age, and not under the authority of husband or father, have full liberty by the laws of the land, which neither the bill in question, nor any other can interfere with. The adult British subject may consult any unlicensed practitioner whom he pleases. \* \* \* The law, then, is a good one that gives license of practising medicine and surgery only to those who have been regularly educated to those arts. \* \* \* No chemist has any legal right to prescribe medicine, unless he has the license of Apothecaries Hall."

Now can "Aliquis" reconcile these contradictions? What sort of logic is this? What sort of liberty is this full liberty which "Aliquis" assures us we possess? A. B. may call in C. D., but C. D. shall not go to him. Pretty liberty! The liberty of the subject is infringed. "Aliquis" himself tells us that it is, in the restraint placed upon chemists. It is only within a few hours that I saw a poster in your streets threatening with the terrors of the law those unhappy parents who, in a land of liberty, dare to think for themselves, and decline to poison, with animal corruption, the pure blood of their babes; and when I last addressed you, there was before Parliament a bill to extend this atrocious law to adults. Call you this liberty? I call it slavery! Well might an intelligent member of the working-class exclaim to me—"Why, sir, they might as well brand us!" Moreover, the liberty of the subject is restricted on the very point on which "Aliquis" asserts that he has full liberty. Who that has read, can have forgotten the plea of an unqualified practitioner in London, as reported in the *Times*, for his refusal to attend the victim of an assassin, when prompt aid might have saved life, that he would have thereby rendered himself liable to a penalty of £20, and might have been subjected to a prosecution for criminal negligence on some professional quibble, had death ensued?

Some of the assertions of "Aliquis" find their refutation in the extract from "*The Rock*," quoted in a parallel column in your journal.

Allow me to thank "Aliquis" for his allusion to the mercantile marine, which furnishes such an apt illustration of the right I am contending for—the right of the employer—to which, impertinent traders conspire to impose a limit. The erroneous assertions of "Aliquis" respecting Priessnitz and his system, though beside the question, require a passing notice. If Priessnitz "knew nothing of diet" the more potent must have been his remedies, and the more remarkable his skill in applying them; if he "knew nothing of diet," neither did Combe, who held nearly similar opinions. Priessnitz's only mode of arriving at the actual morbid condition of the human being was "not by the skin;" he also judged by the tongue, countenance, conformation, circulation, temperature, and questioning. The douche, although not necessarily hurtful, like many of the so-called remedies in orthodox practice, may be abused to the injury of the patient; therefore, the statement of the seven cases of paralysis (which "Aliquis" does not pretend occurred in Priessnitz's practice) is one of those assertions incapable of refutation. It would be but the same if he had said, yes. Perhaps the "seven" cases is but a rhetorical flourish, like the "hundreds and hundreds" of deaths, on which point I happen to have by me authentic information in some of the published police lists, from which it appears that the number of patients at Gräfenberg in 1843, was 1050, the deaths, 4; in 1844, 1080, deaths, 5; in 1845, 1004, deaths, 4; in 1846, 1022, deaths, 2; some of these fatal cases were from the first rejected by Priessnitz, and some were the victims of their own contumacy: this certainly does not look like "hundreds and hundreds" of deaths. But "Aliquis" does not even know how to spell the name of Gräfenberg.

seven hundred



165-

It is no uncommon thing for a medical man to die at, or even long before, the age of 50; but it is a very uncommon thing for a youth of 18 years of age, to have his chest and ribs crushed in by the wheel of a loaded waggon—to re-set his broken bones and cure himself—and for more than thirty years after to go through as much mental and bodily wear and tear as would have killed half-a-dozen ordinary men.

However, Priessnitz is not the only "unqualified practitioner" who has saved life and limb after the "legally qualified" had laboured in vain—many a peasant has done the one—many an unlearned bone-setter has done the other; and Sir Benjamin Brodie stated in his evidence before a committee of the House of Commons, that many eminent practitioners in the metropolis were without legal qualifications. Everywhere we see professional prejudice, linked with incapacity, opposed to improvement. Without a natural capacity, all the training in the world would no more make a doctor than a general. With a natural capacity, the one will force the gates of knowledge, as the other will the impediments opposed to his progress. In my opinion, the best qualification of a medical practitioner is that he cures his patients. There are heaven-born doctors, as well as heaven-born soldiers and statesmen. Cromwell was a brewer—Priessnitz a farmer.

14, *as* portrayed by Dr. Laurie. Is the faculty entitled to lay claim to exclusive privileges? I could add a few traits to the picture, but for the present abstain. Do "Vindex" and "Aliquis" desire the additions?

It is rather strange that a gentleman whose modest motto is "*Tempora mutantur*," &c., and who cannot "tell what his opinions will be next year, next month, to-morrow," should yet desire to impose with the authority of law his present opinions upon his neighbours.

Perhaps I should apologize for occupying so much of your space, with this exposure of the puerilities of "Vindex" and "Aliquis." When the feat is accomplished, one cannot but avow how unprofitable it is

"To break a butterfly upon the wheel."

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
Maze Hill Cottage, JOHN GIBBS.  
St. Leonards-on-Sea, August 1st, 1855.



166 *To the Editor of the Lancet's News*

## "VINDEX" AND "ALIQUIS."

"Destroy his fib or sophistry—in vain;  
The creature's at his dirty work again."

"We say it with deep regret, but we must say it, that in no assemblages for discussion do we meet with such proof of utter want of logical discipline of the mind as at our Medical Societies."  
—*Lancet*, February 19, 1853.

*Aliquis,*  
SIR,—*"Vindex,"* having gone out of his way to falsify facts, and thereby provoked an irrelevant discussion, complains that I have wandered from the record; and, losing his temper, he gives a second specimen of his skill in scolding. After the exhibition of his powers in that way in his first letter, in which he fell foul of his own clients, I could not hope to escape; but surely he might have spared Dr. Ebsworth and the *Lancet*. Counsel engaged in the same cause do not usually abuse each other, at least in open court.

*Vindex,*  
*Aliquis,*  
"Vindex" and "Aliquis," in their eagerness to detract from the merits of the mighty dead, boast of the antiquity of the Water-Cure. In their unreflecting haste, they overlook their obvious invitation to the retort: how, then, does it happen that it was reserved for a German farmer to step in advance of all other professors of the healing art, and proffer this potent system to the relief of suffering humanity? Was it the ignorance or culpable negligence of the "Priesthood of Science" which left him the opportunity? But "Vindex" and "Aliquis" both know that there is scarcely a point of resemblance between the comprehensive system of Priessnitz, and bathing as previously practised by learned physicians like Dr. Sir John Floyer, and Dr. Edward Baynard (not Barnard). The ordinary treatment recommended by Floyer, was a series of cold plunge-baths, preceded by a vigorous course of bleeding and purging. His plan, therefore, was first to knock his patient down, and then to try and set him on his feet again. Priessnitz, on the contrary, allowed the first part of the operation to be performed by one of the clients of "Vindex" and "Aliquis," and in the second part of the operation he displayed rather more skill than the learned knight. The idea which "Vindex" has formed of the Water-Cure may be gathered from that Latin quotation, in which he informs us that the Roman youth swam in the Tiber. It is strange that, in his zeal for antiquity, he overlooked the probability that Adam and Eve bathed themselves in the pellucid waters of Eden. Is a swim in the Tiber the system of which "Aliquis" tells us that it "requires great medical skill for the judicious application of it?" "Aliquis" asserts that in the system of Priessnitz "there is nothing new, except the process called packing." If "Aliquis" were right, this should be sufficient to immortalize Priessnitz. But "Aliquis" is wrong. There are two processes included under the term "packing," which are very different the one from the other:—the one is that excellent febrifuge, the wet pack—the other that admirable sudorific, the dry pack. That most useful application, the wet-sheet friction, is also due to the invention of Priessnitz. But it is not merely in these and similar inventions, as well as in devising salutary combinations of baths, but in the clear and sagacious rules for their application, that the genius of Priessnitz shines. The reckless assertions of "Aliquis" can only be excused on the supposition that he is the dupe "of one of the most able men that ever practised it [the Water-Cure] in modern times," who so naively confesses to shortening the lives of his patients. Who is that "great unknown?" Is he the Dr. Graham, to whose "early pamphlet" "Vindex" refers? But, which Dr. Graham? Two of that name—Dr. Thomas J. Graham and Dr. Robert Hay Graham—wrote early pamphlets on the subject. Is it to Dr. Robert Hay Graham, who maligned Priessnitz in a style which must have great charms for him, that "Aliquis" refers? But the calumnies of Dr. Robert Hay Graham were met with a prompt and stern denial in the columns of the *Times*, in which journal the late Lord Litchfield, the Hon. and Rev. E. H. Tracy, and fifteen other British and four American gentlemen, then at Gräfenberg, stated that Dr. Graham's work "abounds in gross exaggerations, mis-statements, and calumnies, respecting Priessnitz," and, from that day to this, Dr. Graham has observed a discreet silence. As well attempt to rob Watts of the steam-engine, or Harvey of the discovery of the circulation of the blood, as Priessnitz of the system connected with his name. To this great man may be applied with propriety, what Lawrence says of John Hunter:—



57  
"He began by discarding all the doctrines of the schools, and resorted at once to nature. Instead of creeping timidly along the coast of truth, within sight of precedent and authority, he boldly launched into the great ocean of discovery, steering by the polar star of observation, and trusting to the guidance of his own genius."

"*Man muss Gebirge haben*," said Priessnitz, and he was right. He spoke, breathing of the pure air and quaffing of the pure springs of his native hills, with the dusty, sultry plains, and the muddy, tepid waters of Prussian Silesia at his feet. But did he mean to cut off from the hope of cure, all those who could not fly to the mountains for health? By no means. He once wrote to your present correspondent—"Wherever there is a spring of water, cures can be made." If remedial or hygienic means be worthless at Brighton, the logical inference,—a dangerous one for the clients of "Aliquis"—is, that they are equally worthless in all situations which lie low.

It scarcely needs the trumpet of "Aliquis" to proclaim the worth that is to be found within the ranks of the medical profession, to which there are few who cannot bear testimony, and of which even this controversy has furnished illustrations. In Drs. Laurie and Johnson we have proof that medical men can love truth, brave prejudice, respect the rights of others, and obey the whisperings of conscience. They may be emphatically classed with the *gentlemen* of the profession. They know that, neither by their virtues nor their acquirements, they have a right to tyrannize over their fellow-men, and, therefore, they repudiate any such claim. The really learned, in their humility, compare themselves to mere gatherers of pebbles on the shores of the vast, unfathomed ocean of truth; and recognize in the peasant, who has a hereditary knowledge which enables him to cure jaundice or rheumatism, a fellow-labourer, as much educated to his work as any doctor of medicine in the land. But if there be men of virtue, learning, and liberality in the profession, it is proper to bear in mind, especially when great privileges are demanded, that its ranks are polluted by men of a different order, such as the paltry tyrant, who brutally snatched the piece of bread and butter from the hands of one of our dying soldiers in a hospital in the East. Neither should the confession of Heberden be forgotten—"The practice of physic has been more improved by the casual experiments of illiterate nations, and by the rash ones of vagabond quacks, than by the reasonings of all the once-celebrated professors of it, and theoretic teachers of the several schools of Europe, very few of whom have furnished us with one new medicine, or have taught us better how to use our old ones, or have in any one instance at all improved the art of curing disease."

In a former letter, I had to thank "Aliquis" for his kindness in furnishing me with an apt illustration. I have now to confess a similar obligation to "Vindex." Between "green pickles" and the poisonous compounds vended by the clients of "Aliquis," there is a striking affinity. Both are alike deleterious and both are proffered by the "legally qualified." If the venders of "green pickles" should assert that those who decline to purchase are ignorant people, incapable of taking care of themselves, and that the trade should be protected by Act of Parliament, the analogy would be complete.

Your readers will determine for themselves, if they require the strait-waistcoat discipline to which they are invited by "Vindex" and "Aliquis." Perhaps enough has been said for the present on "Medical Registration." Should occasion invite, I may, with your permission, return to the subject; but upon "Vindex" and "Aliquis" I shall not stoop to bestow another thought; conceding to them the monopoly of those weapons of slang with which no gentleman would sully his cause.

"Go," said my Uncle Toby to the fly which had been buzzing around him—"Go," said he as he suffered it to escape—"Go, poor devil, get thee gone, why should I hurt thee?—This world is surely wide enough to hold both thee and me."

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards, August 15, 1855.

Sir,

all similarly  
should be  
down;



168  
*To the Editor, Hastings News*

**THE MEDICAL REGISTRATION AND COMPULSORY VACCINATION BILLS.**

SIR,—It is proper to state that, although the Medical Registration and Compulsory Vaccination Bills bear the name of Brady, the one emanates from the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association, and the other from the Epidemiological Society.

Who can believe that measures originating in such sources are meant for the good of the public, and not the aggrandizement of the profession? Can the sheep confide in the guardianship of the wolves?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Maze Hill Cottage,  
August 28, 1855.

JOHN GIBBS.

**A DIALOGUE.**

*Clergyman.*—Has that child been baptized?

*Woman.*—No, sir, but it has been vaccinated!

*Clergyman.*—H-h-h-u-m!

*Observer.*—(aside)—No wonder, when the superstitious votaries of medical baptism with corruption place it as high, if not above, Christian baptism with pure water, they should propose, as they do, that a certificate of vaccination should be the passport of admission into the Christian Church.



169  
*To the Editor of the Standard*

#### VACCINATION.

SIR,—Your last impression contains some extracts from the current Quarterly Return of the Registrar-General, in which appears the following passage:—"Small-pox prevailed among the soldiers at Canterbury, who had not been vaccinated."

As this extract insinuates a most pernicious error, perhaps you will allow me to supply the antidote from the same source—the Returns of the Registrar-General.

"Greenwich; Woolwich Arsenal.—At Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 28th December, a private in Royal Sappers and Miners, aged 18 years, 'small-pox (24 days), exhaustion, marks of vaccination indistinct.'

"In the same sub-district, at Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 1st January, a gunner, Royal Artillery, aged 18 years, 'small-pox (110 days), after vaccination.'

"In the same sub-district, at Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 4th January, a serjeant, Royal Artillery, aged 28 years, 'small-pox (18 days), after vaccination.'"—[Return week ending January 12, 1856].

"Greenwich; Woolwich Arsenal.—At Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 14th January, a gunner, aged 19 years, 'small-pox (12 days), after vaccination.'

"In the same sub-district, at Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 15th January, a gunner, aged 26 years, 'small-pox (13 days).' Had marks of vaccination.

"In the same sub-district, at Royal Ordnance Hospital, a bombardier, aged 20 years, 'small-pox, confluent (20 days).' Vaccinated."—[Return week ending Jan. 19, 1856].

"Greenwich; Woolwich Arsenal.—At Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 28th January, a gunner, Royal Artillery, aged 20 years, 'small-pox (22 days), after vaccination.'

"In the same sub-district, at Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 28th January, a private in Queen's Own Light Infantry Militia, aged 16 years, 'small-pox (21 days), marks of vaccination distinct, phlegmon et abscessus (11 days).'

"In the same sub-district, at Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 3rd February, a gunner, Royal Artillery, aged 19 years, 'small-pox (1 month), after vaccination, abscesses in the thigh.'

"In the same sub-district, at Royal Ordnance Hospital, on 28th January, a driver, Royal Horse Artillery, aged 18 years, 'variola confluenta (13 days), marked with cow-pox.'"—[Week ending Saturday, February 16, 1856].

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
Maze Hill Cottage, Feb. 18, 1856. JOHN GIBBS.

ANOTHER DEATH FROM VACCINATION.—"Strand; St. Mary.—At 10, Hart Street, St. Paul, Covent Garden, on 25th March, the daughter of an ostler, aged three months, 'traumatic erysipelas, resulting from vaccination (nine days).'—*Weekly Return of Registrar-General for Week ending Saturday, March 29th, 1856.*



170  
To the Editor of *Hastings Weekly Express*

#### THE NEW COMPULSORY VACCINATION BILL.

SIR,—This infamous bill, the progeny of credulity and ruffianism, ostensibly provides for the *compulsory* vaccination of every child under thirteen years old, and insidiously hands over the *whole population* to the tender mercies of that monstrous incarnation of jobbery—the Board of Health—which the bill empowers (clause 26), “When smallpox is prevalent in any part of England, to issue special regulations and directions with respect to the steps to be taken for preventing the spread of the disease by *revaccination* or *OTHERWISE*!”

Modest powers to confer upon a Board which, pocketing some £11,000 per annum for doing nothing, desires to acquire a reputation for industry by doing mischief.

For neglect of the provisions of the Act (if the bill become law), it imposes the penalty of *twenty shillings*, with cumulative penalties of *five shillings per day*, and *five pounds* for the violation of “any regulation or direction of the General Board of Health issued under this Act” (clause 29)—i. e., for administering Homœopathic globules, if the Board should forbid their use, or speaking or writing against that humbug, vaccination, if the Board should impose silence.

Further, should any child die of smallpox, without having been vaccinated, the parents, or guardians, are to be subject to the terrors of a Coroner’s Inquest (clause 28).

Moreover, the bill provides specially for the compulsory vaccination of children attending *schools* receiving “aid from Government grants”—the inmates of *workhouses*, *lunatic asylums*, and *prisons* (clause 23), and *emigrants* (clause 24).

The Vaccination Act of 1853, is moderately estimated to cost the country £100,000 per annum; would the present proposed law, with its increased fees to vaccination quacks, of *two shillings and six-pence* and *three shillings and six-pence* (clause 17), cost the country less than a quarter of a million per annum, if not much more?

Will Englishmen in general—will the men and women of Hastings and St. Leonards in especial—suffer this ruffianly bill to become law?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
March, 18, 1856.

P.S.—The *second* reading of the bill is fixed for 31st inst.



To the Editor, *Harvard* *et al*

MEDICAL REGISTRATION.

SIR,—Pray allow me to invite attention to another bill now among the notices of motion of the House of Commons for the second reading: it is entitled, "A Bill to alter and amend the laws regulating the Medical Profession;" it proposes to establish a Medical Council of eight (clauses 7 and 8), to be paid for attendance and travelling expenses (clause 16), with paid staff (clause 18), and paid Registrar and staff (clause 20)—another nice job: and

That all persons holding British diplomas shall be entitled to be registered (clause 21)—thus infringing the rights of labour (man's primary right), by excluding persons holding foreign diplomas or practising without diploma: and

That only registered practitioners shall be entitled to charge for attendance, or to hold any public medical appointment, including the medical offices of *clubs* and *benefit societies* (clauses 35, 36, and 37)—thus ignoring the rights of individuals to choose their own practitioners and modes of treatment: and

That qualified persons now in practice shall pay a fee of one pound on registration (clause 21), and after 1st November, 1856, a fee of ten pounds (clause 22): that the names of persons registered shall be liable to be struck off for "misconduct" (clause 29)—a comprehensive word, which may be twisted to include the prescribing of Homœopathic globules, the advertising a Hydropathic establishment, the rejection of vaccination, the discovery of a new remedy, the wearing a moustache,\* the exhibition of too conspicuous a brass plate, the display of a blue instead of a pink night-lamp over one's door, or the commission of anything unfashionable, or that may be distasteful to, or the omission of anything that may be required by, the omnipotent Council of Eight.

What next? How many kicks is John Bull disposed to bear from the confraternity of quacks?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
March 24, 1856.

\* One of the staff at one of the metropolitan hospitals, not long since, was actually required, by his colleagues, on pain of being sent to Coventry, to shave off his moustache. Gentlemanly treatment this from *gentlemen* (?) towards a gentleman! No wonder, that, with such ideas of propriety and liberty in their own order, the members of the medical profession combine to trample upon the rights of laymen.



142

THE SPY-SYSTEM—  
SHALL WE HAVE IT IN ENGLAND?

"Are we to be forced to dread a *spy* in every house into which a medical practitioner shall enter? Is the fear of a charge of secret poisoning, more horrible than the fear of being secretly poisoned, to be infused into the tenderest relations of life? Is the spectre of a doctor in the witness-box to interpose in all the small charities of society and of the family—frightening the husband from the sick room of the wife, forbidding the mother to administer a spoonful of drink to her dying child, daunting the servant in the performance of the necessary offices for a helpless master? Assuredly we do not pretend to be able to answer in the name of the public; but we do know that, to the results to which we point, such triumphs as those of Drs. Christison and Taylor at Burdon directly and not slowly tend."—*Dublin University Magazine*, February, 1856.

"Any parent who disapproves of vaccination will avoid registering his child, and thus a most valuable agency will be interfered with. It may be urged, that if a parent does not have his child's birth registered, and thus escapes the reception of the notice from the Registrar of Births to have his child vaccinated, some neighbour will inform the registrar of this neglect, and thus the law will lay hold of him. What, then, will result? The establishment of a system of *espionage*, and the consequent creation of an immense amount of ill-will. Such a state of things is quite unsuited to the horizon of Great Britain. It may pass in despotic countries, where the size of coffins and the route the funeral *cortege* must travel, are laid down by bureaucratic interference; but this meddling of the executive—*this spy-system*—is not yet recognized in England. . . . . Are we to have another Wat Tyler insurrection, produced by the dissatisfaction created by *medical spies* forcing their way into family circles and baring the arms of children, determined to inspect these arms whether or not the parents be willing? Are we to be driven to the necessity of being subjected to the meddlesome interference of officials? Are our doors no longer to be shut against all but whom we choose to admit? Are we to have Austria transferred to England? . . . . . The late Sir Robert Peel thought differently; he maintained, when application was made in Parliament to make vaccination compulsory, that such a procedure was not in accordance with the spirit of the institutions under which the people of Great Britain lived, and was in opposition to the freedom of action so characteristic of the British people."—*Report of the Royal Jennerian and London Vaccine Institution*, for 1855.



### VACCINATION.

"A return of the sums voted for the National Vaccine Institution since 1833, and the appropriation, in detail, of such sums," made on the motion of Mr. Thomas Duncombe, has just been printed, by order of the House of Commons, and shews a total receipt, by Parliamentary grants, of £43,446 6s. 6d.

The following is an analysis of the expenditure :—

|                                                                                         | £       | s. | d. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----|----|
| President of the College of Physicians, <i>ex officio</i> President of the Board .....  | 2,200   | 0  | 0  |
| Senior Censor of the College of Physicians, <i>ex officio</i> member of the Board ..... | 2,200   | 0  | 0  |
| President of the College of Surgeons, <i>ex officio</i> member of the Board .....       | 2,200   | 0  | 0  |
| Director, since called Inspector .....                                                  | 4,800   | 0  | 0  |
| Registrar .....                                                                         | 4,400   | 0  | 0  |
| Other members of the Board and staff .....                                              | 17,759  | 0  | 0  |
| House rent .....                                                                        | 2,602   | 7  | 6  |
| Fitting, furnishing, and repairing house .....                                          | 1,030   | 16 | 1  |
| Rates, taxes, and stamps .....                                                          | 925     | 9  | 1  |
| Coals .....                                                                             | 413     | 7  | 0  |
| Law expenses .....                                                                      | 44      | 0  | 0  |
| Cutlery "points" .....                                                                  | 2,086   | 18 | 7  |
| "Glasses," lymph-holders .....                                                          | 387     | 10 | 8  |
| Printing .....                                                                          | 984     | 10 | 2  |
| Stationery .....                                                                        | 276     | 2  | 4  |
| "Disbursements by Director and Inspector" .....                                         | 871     | 9  | 9  |
| Balance in hand, <i>April 12, 1855</i> .....                                            | 264     | 15 | 4  |
|                                                                                         | £43,446 | 6  | 6  |

A CURIOUS FACT.—Jenner, who petitioned Parliament for national remuneration for his appropriation of the milk-maid's discovery of vaccination, and who received ~~grants~~ in return, vaccinated his first, ~~but did not~~ his second ~~son~~.

*was paid,*

*£ 30,000.*

*£ 30,000, and made good*



# MEDICAL DESPOTISM.

[From *The Westminster Review*, No. 18, April, 1856.]

"We protest, then, against Mr. Headlam's Bill because it is contrary to the principle of local self-government; because, in the important respects in which we have indicated, it violates the personal freedom of the subject and the profession; because it would tend to establish medical uniformity of doctrine and practice, and thus encourage conservatism, frown on genius, oppose new ideas, and sanction persecution; because the constituent elements of medical science (so called) are for the most part too crude, incoherent, and even antagonistic to admit of organization into a system, to be exclusively taught as orthodox; because any attempt at such organization would infallibly retard the progress of medical knowledge; because all experience proves that no council is competent to represent the interests of truth, while the history of all authoritative councils is a history of error; and finally, because while State-registered diplomas would be no additional guarantee of professional skill, they would, nevertheless, greatly foster the dangerous habit, already far too prevalent, of relying exclusively on their testimony of competency, and hence charlatans would derive, from their possession, additional facilities in practising on the credulity of those who put their trust in such parchment assurances."

## The Hastings and St. Leonards NEWS.

April 11. 1856.

**COMPULSORY VACCINATION.**—The following petitions against the Compulsory Vaccination Bill, have been presented to the House of Commons, from Hastings and St. Leonards:—From Mr. John Gibbs, Maze Hill Cottage, by Mr. Duncombe, 1 signature; from the inhabitants of St. Leonards and St. Mary Magdalen, by Dr. Michell, 221 signatures; from the inhabitants of Hastings, by Mr. Brotherton, 311 signatures.

HASTINGS, FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1856.

**PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT.**—The following additional petitions from these towns, against the Compulsory Vaccination Bill, have been presented to the House of Commons:—Roger Dawson, 1 signature, by Mr. Brotherton; inhabitants of Hastings, who had not signed the previous petition, 254 signatures, by Dr. Michell; inhabitants of St. Leonards-on-Sea who had not signed the previous petition, 242 signatures, by Mr. Thomas Duncombe—making a total of six petitions, and 1,042 signatures. There was an error in our report of the previous petitions: the number of signatures to the Hastings petition should have been 323.

HASTINGS, FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1856.

**THE COMPULSORY VACCINATION BILL.**—A petition against this bill has been presented, by Dr. Michell, from Dr. Hale, of St. Leonards; making the seventh petition from these towns, and the number of signatures 1043.



# ENNISCORTHY

## MATHEW TESTIMONIAL COMMITTEE.

SIR,—I am directed by the Committee to forward to you a copy of the Resolutions unanimously agreed to at a Public Meeting, held in the Market-house, on Monday evening, the 3rd instant, and to acquaint you that Subscriptions will be received by FELIX MURPHY, Treasurer, Market-street, or by any other member of the Committee. I am also directed to add, "that some great and noble institution that may be permanently useful to the country, and advantageous to the cause, is the object contemplated;" and that the Committee will be happy to receive suggestions from you on the subject. Requesting the favour of a reply,

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

JOHN GIBBS, *Hon. Secretary.*

### COPY OF RESOLUTIONS REFERRED TO ABOVE:

Proposed by the Rev. JAMES PARLE; Seconded by LAURENCE WM. CORCORAN,

*Resolved*—That, under God, the Temperance Reformation has been attended with the happiest and most beneficial results.

Proposed by THOMAS WILKINSON; Seconded by GEORGE C. ROBERTS,

*Resolved*—That the active benevolence and unwearied exertions of the Very Rev. Mr. MATHEW, in promoting Temperance and kindly feelings between man and man, demand the warmest expression of our gratitude, and our cordial co-operation with the Metropolitan Mathew Testimonial Committee.

Proposed by JOHN GIBBS; Seconded by JAMES DEVEREUX,

*Resolved*—That to carry into effect the last Resolution, a Committee be appointed to consist of the following persons, namely:

ROBERT T. RIDGE,  
REV. JAMES PARLE,  
LORENZO WALTERS,  
PATRICK O'ROURKE, M.D.  
LAURENCE CORCORAN,  
THOMAS WILKINSON,

GEORGE C. ROBERTS,  
ROBERT SINNOTT,  
PETER DIXON,  
FELIX MURPHY,  
JAMES DEVEREUX,  
JOHN GIBBS,

ROBERT T. RIDGE, *Chairman.*

JOHN GIBBS, *Honorary Secretary.*



146

EXTRACTS FROM THE  
"VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE  
OF COMMONS."

"No. 109.] 9<sup>o</sup> die Julii, 1855.

"Notice~~s~~ given on Monday, 9th July, 1855.

- "1. Mr. Brotherton,—Vaccination—address for Copy of a Letter, dated the 30th day of June, 1855, addressed to the President of the Board of Health, by John Gibbs, esquire, entitled 'Compulsory Vaccination briefly considered in its scientific, religious, and political aspects.' [Wednesday, 11th July.]"

"No. 111.] Mercurii, 11<sup>o</sup> die Julii, 1855.

- "12. Vaccination,—Copy ordered, 'of a Letter, dated the 30th day of June, 1855, addressed to the President of the Board of Health, by John Gibbs, esquire, entitled "Compulsory Vaccination briefly considered in its scientific, religious, and political aspects."—(Mr. Brotherton.)"

"No. 113.] Veneris, 13<sup>o</sup> die Julii, 1855.

—" (Mr John George Phillimore.)

"Paper~~s~~ laid on the Table —

- "18. Compulsory Vaccination,—Return [ordered 11th July.]"

"No. 33.] 31<sup>o</sup> die Martii, 1856.

"Notice~~s~~ given on Monday, 31st March, 1856.

- "2. Mr. Thomas Duncombe,—Vaccination—to move that the Copy of a Letter addressed to the President of the Board of Health, by John Gibbs, esquire, entitled 'Compulsory Vaccination briefly considered in its scientific, religious, and political aspects,' [presented 13th July 1855], be printed. [Wednesday, 2nd April.]"

"No. 33.] 31<sup>o</sup> die Martii, 1856.

- "52. Compulsory Vaccination,—Return [presented 13th July 1855], to be printed [No. 109]."

"No. 42.] 11<sup>o</sup> die Aprilis, 1856.

"Sessional Printed Paper~~s~~, delivered on 10th April, 1856.

"Par. Numb.

- "109. Compulsory Vaccination; Copy of a Letter, by John Gibbs, esquire."



### THE NEW MEDICAL BILL.

SIR,—I shall esteem it a favour if you will allow me to invite attention, through your columns, to a new Medical Bill (the third this session), entitled "A Bill [as amended by the select committee] to alter and amend the Laws regulating the Medical Profession." It might, with propriety, be styled "A Bill to enforce uniformity in Medical Practice."

Apart from the principle of the bill, it does not contain so many obnoxious clauses as its predecessors, but it has a novel feature especially inviting comment and opposition. Whereas the previous bills proposed that the expenses attending a system of registration of medical practitioners should be met by fees payable by practitioners, this bill proposes to tax the public instead of the profession, as may be seen in the following clauses:—

"VIII.—There shall be paid to the members of Council, except the President of the General Board of Health, such remuneration and such reasonable travelling expenses as shall from time to time be appointed or allowed by the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, out of any moneys which may from time be provided by Parliament for that purpose."

"XX.—The President of the Board of Health shall from time to time appoint, from among persons qualified to be registered under this Act, a Medical Registrar for the United Kingdom, and one Assistant Medical Registrar for Scotland, and one Assistant Registrar for Ireland, and also shall appoint a Treasurer, and such Clerks and other Officers as the said President of the Board of Health may deem necessary, and may from time to time remove any Registrar or other person so appointed; and the salaries of said Registrar, Assistant Registrars, Clerks, and other Officers, shall be fixed from time to time by the said President of the Board of Health, with the approval of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, and shall be paid, together with all reasonable expenses incurred by the Medical Registrar in the execution of his duties under this Act, out of any moneys which may from time to time be provided by Parliament for that purpose."

In these clauses it is proposed to confer much patronage upon the President of the Board of Health, and to create a number of snug berths for hungry expectants. Such an expenditure of public money would be unjust, and would open a door to a system of enormous jobbery. Why should the public have to pay the expenses incurred in "regulating" the medical profession? If that profession need the "regulating" control of the President of the Board of Health and a Medical Council, the members of the profession should themselves pay the attendant expenses.

Clause XXI. threatens the punishment of erasure from the Registry for the commission of undefined transgressions.

Clause XXXV. enacts that—"After the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-seven, no person shall hold any appointment as a physician, surgeon, or other medical officer, either in the military or naval ser-



178

vice, or in emigrant or other vessels, or in any hospital, infirmary, dispensary, or lying-in hospital (not supported wholly by voluntary contributions), or in any lunatic asylum, gaol, penitentiary, house of correction, house of industry, parochial or union workhouse or poorhouse, parish union, or other public establishment, body, or institution, or to any friendly or other society for affording mutual relief in sickness, infirmity, or old age, or as a medical officer of health, unless he be registered under this Act."

Why should any distinction be made between "any hospital, infirmary, dispensary, or lying-in hospital," supported by voluntary contributions, and any "other public establishment, body, or institution, or any friendly or other society for affording relief in sickness, infirmity, or old age," likewise supported by "voluntary contributions?" And why should men be deprived, when associated, of the right each individually enjoys to choose his medical adviser without hindrance or molestation from the State?

Clause XLII.—"After the said first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-seven, no person shall be entitled to recover any charge in any Court of Law for any medical or surgical advice, attendance, or for the performance of any operation, or for any medicine prescribed, administered, or supplied by him, unless he shall prove upon the trial that he is registered under this Act."

Thus, at one fell swoop, are confiscated the rights (of remuneration for services rendered) of dentists, corn-cutters, mid-wives, nurse-tenders, bath-servants, and bone-setters, persons very useful, and some of them indispensable, to the poorer classes, especially in remote districts. The vested interests of patent-medicine vendors, for which they are highly taxed, are also unceremoniously confiscated. The rights of "chemists and druggists" are conserved in Clause LII.

Clause XLV. deprives the practitioner of medicine or surgery practising without a diploma, of his right to style himself physician or surgeon. A diploma may create a doctor or bachelor of medicine, but it cannot make, and the want of it should not unmake, a physician or a surgeon.

If the registration of medical practitioners be a State want, then *all* practitioners alike, with or without diplomas, should be registered as whatever they may be.

If exclusive registration be essential to the interests of that portion of the medical profession possessing diplomas, what is to prevent them from arranging, with each other and with their respective colleges and licensing bodies, a system of registration, and an annual publication of the registry, *at their own cost*?

The public do not need medical registration and uniformity. There cannot be too many licensing bodies. Free competition in the practice of medicine, as in other things, is essential to the advancement of science.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards,  
June 18, 1856.



179

**"IMPORTANT PROSECUTION."**

SIR,—The report of a trial (reprinted from an Irish paper), headed "Important Prosecution," in your last issue, suggests the reflection that it is very well to talk of equal laws and justice, but that it would be better to have them.

Apart from the question if it be right or politic to punish a parent for doing, it may be in ignorance, but in all kindness and according to his judgment, what he conceives to be best for the welfare of his child—apart from all discussion of the relative merits or demerits of the rival prophylactics, vaccination and variolous inoculation—it is manifestly unjust to visit with legal pains and penalties the person who shall use the one nostrum, whatever be its effects, and to exempt from punishment the person who may use the other nostrum, even though death should be the result. Many cases of death from vaccination (erysipelas supervening) have been reported in your columns, but it does not appear that, in any case, there has been an inquest or a prosecution.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Maze Hill Cottage, JOHN GIBBS.  
St. Leonards-on-Sea, June 23, 1856.

*To the Editor of the Homœopathic Record.*

SIR,—Will you allow me to say, that the analysis in your current number of the grants of public money since 1833 to the Royal Vaccine Institution, represents but a fraction of the cost of the vaccine delusion to the country.

Parliament voted two grants, amounting ~~(£30,000)~~ to £30,000, to Dr. Jenner, in reward for a discovery which he did not make.

There is a large annual expenditure under the Poor-Law Board, for fees to public vaccinators; last year it amounted to £45,728.

There are also two heavy items in connection with the Registrar-General's Department, for printing, and fees to Registrars, the amount of which I have not ascertained.

I am, Sir,

St. Leonard's-on-Sea,  
June 4, 1856.

Your obedient Servant,  
JOHN GIBBS.

**The Hastings and St. Leonards  
NEWS.**

HASTINGS, FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 1856.

DR. VERDE DE LISLE, Physician to the Princess Mathilde, and author of *La Degenerescence de l'Espece Humaine par le Vaccin*—a recent able publication already translated into several languages—who is now in England collecting statistics for a new work, *L'Histoire Critique de la Vaccine*, has been passing some days at Maze Hill Cottage, on a visit to Mr. Gibbs.



180

## FORM OF PETITION.

---

To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal  
[or, To the Honourable the Commons] of the United  
Kingdom in Parliament assembled.

The HUMBLE PETITION of the undersigned Inhabitants of

Sheweth,

That your Petitioners view with alarm the introduction of a Bill into your Lordships' [or Honourable] House entitled, "A Bill to consolidate and amend the Laws relating to Vaccination;" for rendering the practice of Vaccination compulsory.

That the recognition of compulsion on any question whereon difference of opinion may exist, is in direct opposition to the spirit of all free institutions.

That much difference of opinion on the subject of Vaccination does, in fact, exist; and

That the said Bill proposes to invest the General Board of Health with highly dangerous and unconstitutional powers.

Your Petitioners, therefore, humbly pray your Lordships' [or Honourable] House, that the said Bill may not pass into a Law, and that the compulsory Law now in force may be repealed.

And your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

N.B. Petitions must be in writing; at least one signature must be on the same sheet with the Petition; if the signatures should extend to two or more sheets, they must be pasted together. Petitions will go free by post, if left open at the ends, and marked on the back "Petition to the Commons," or "Lords," as it may be, and addressed to the House of Commons, or Lords, to the care of some Member.

---



## COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING PACKET.

"IMPORTANT PROSECUTION" (INOCULATION.)

SIR,—The report of a trial headed "Important Prosecution at Ballinasloe Sessions," in a recent number of your Journal suggests the reflection that it is very well to talk of equal laws and justice, but that it would be better to have them. Apart from the question if it be right or politic to punish a parent for doing, it may be in ignorance, but in all kindness and according to his judgment, what he conceives to be best for the welfare of his child—apart from all discussion of the relative merits or demerits of the rival prophylactics—vaccination and variolous inoculation—it is manifestly unjust to visit with legal pains and penalties the person who shall use the one nostrum, whatever be its effects, and to exempt from punishment the person who may use the other nostrum, even though death should be the result. Cases of death from vaccination, erysipelas supervening (of which I append some examples), are frequently reported by the Registrar-General; but it does not appear that a death under such circumstances is ever followed by an inquest or a prosecution.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
St. Leonards-on-Sea, June 30, 1856. JOHN GIBBS.

Deaths from Vaccination—Extracts from the "Weekly Returns" of the Registrar-General:—

"In Bethnal-green, at 19, Warner-place, South, on the 15th July, the son of a cabinetmaker, aged seven months, died of vaccination, erysipelas."—Weekly Return No. 30, vol. xiv., for week ending Saturday, July 23, 1853.

"In Mile-end Town Lower, the daughter of a gentleman, aged three months, died of 'erysipelas.' The medical man states that it supervened on vaccination."—Return week ending Saturday, April 1, 1854.

"At the German Hospital, Dalston, both on 30th March the son of a mariner, aged ten weeks, and the son of a sugar-baker, aged thirteen weeks, died of general erysipelas, after vaccination, effusion on the brain." . . . In Ratcliff, at 2, Devonport-street, on 6th April, the son of a coal merchant, aged three months, died of 'erysipelas' all over the body (one day) succeeding vaccination, which was considered to be fine."—Weekly Return, Nov. 14, vol. 15.

"In Mileend Newtown, at 1, George-street, on the 17th July, the daughter of a carman, aged three months, erysipelas after vaccination (three weeks) convulsions (twenty-four hours)."—Week ending Saturday, July 22, 1854.

"In the sub-district of St. Giles, at 8, Barker-street, on 13th April, the daughter of a mason, aged one month, irregular vaccination when a fortnight old."—Return week ending April 15, 1854.

"At the Cock and Castle, Kingsland, on 1st May, the son of a licensed victualler, aged four months, died of vaccination, inflammation of cellular tissue of arm and thorax. In Haggerston East, at 54, Union-street, on 1st May, the son of a hot-presser, aged four months, died of gangrene, after vaccination (fourteen days)."—Weekly Return for week ending May 6, 1854.

"At 10, Hart-street, St. Paul, Covent-garden, on 25th March, the daughter of an ostler, aged three months, traumatic erysipelas, resulting from vaccination (nine days)!"—Return for week ending Saturday, March 29, 1856.

## The Evening Packet.

DUBLIN, THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1856.

### IMPORTANT PROSECUTION.

SMALL-POX INOCULATION—DEATH OF TWO CHILDREN. X  
Thomas Carroll, of Killiney, was summoned at the suit of the Crown, at Ballinasloe Sessions, on Monday, for that he at sundry times had inoculated divers parties with small-pox variolous, contrary to the statute. The case produced the greatest interest, and the Court-house was densely crowded.



182  
The parents of the children inoculated were in attendance, but they gave their evidence with the utmost reluctance.

Mr. Blake appeared for the defendant.

Michael Deane examined—Four of his children had small pox; one of them, Bridget, died, there was no doctor with her; knows she had small-pox, but does not know who inoculated her.

Bench—Remember you are on your oath. Do you not know who inoculated the child?

Witness—Am I bound to tell?

Mr. Blake—You are not.

Bench—We are of opinion it is a proper question.

Witness could not swear who inoculated the child, because he did not see it done.

Bench—Had you any conversation with Thomas Carroll about the inoculation of your children?

Mr. Blake—I object to that question.

Bench—We think it admissible, and shall put it.

Witness—He had been talking to Carroll about the children, but did not get them inoculated at that time; he had a conversation with him about Bridget after her death.

Bench—Did Carroll say he inoculated her?

Witness—He did not.

Bridget Deane was next called up, and gave similar evidence, endeavouring at first to evade the interrogatories of the Court.

Bench—Who inoculated your child that, you say, died?

Mr. Blake—Do not answer.

Witness hesitated.

Bench—Mr. Blake, you have no right to interfere with the witness. Do you (addressing the witness) refuse to answer?

The witness positively refused.

Bench—Then you must be committed for refusing.

It was here agreed to adjourn the case for a fortnight, the law officers in the meantime to be communicated with.

The last witness, who had by this time retired, returned and stated to the Court that Thomas Carroll had inoculated her children in her presence; that her daughter Bridget had taken the pox and died, but she did not think she died from the effects of inoculation.

The Bench considered the case had assumed a very serious aspect—two children having lost their lives in consequence of inoculation, and the system having been extensively practised.

Evidence was given in four cases against Carroll. Mr. Blake then, considering discretion the better part of valour, pleaded guilty, and submitted to the Court, imploring the Bench to deal mercifully with the defendant, who had acted as he had done in ignorance.

The Bench inflicted a very moderate punishment for the three cases—viz., imprisonment for twenty-one days—but refused to adjudicate in the case of the child that died.

#### THE GENERAL BOARD OF HEALTH.

SIR,—I had written to you, inviting closer attention to the various attempts of the ravenous and unscrupulous officials of the General Board of Health to procure a prolonged existence to their expiring powers, their salaries and their jobs, and reporting progress, but the work is so much better done in a speech delivered last evening by Mr. Thos. S. Duncombe in the House of Commons, in the debate on the "Public Health Amendment Act Bill [as amended in committee]," that I destroy my letter, and send you instead a copy of Mr. Duncombe's speech, with a request that you will have the goodness to reprint it.

The (third) Medical Profession Bill " [as amended by the select committee]," and the "Public Health Act Amendment Bill [as amended in committee]," have fallen; let us hope that the Bill for transferring the administration of the Burial Acts from the Home Office to the Board of Health, and the "amended" Compulsory Vaccination Bill (on the orders for to-morrow) shall have the same fate.



183

The president of the Board of Health has given notice of a "Bill to continue the Board of Health for one year." This job will be opposed, and, it is to be hoped, defeated. The few duties of this Board should be transferred to the Home Office. Until the Board of Health be put down as a public nuisance, we shall be continually troubled with proposals for all sorts of expensive and impertinent jobs.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, July 9, 1856.

"Mr. T. Duncombe said, he was much of the same opinion as the hon. gentleman who had just sat down. He could not give his vote for the bill on the ground laid down by the hon. member opposite (Mr. Greene)—namely, that the Board of Health would expire next year. The hon. member for Leeds had endeavoured to alarm the House by representing that some dire calamity would befall the country if the Board of Health were altogether to expire. Before, however, the House or the country felt any alarm upon the subject, it would be well to inquire what that board had done, what it had cost the country, and what it proposed to

do. During this session he moved for a return, in order to ascertain what the board was about. Since 1848 the act was applied to nearly 300 towns, during the five years for which that act was passed. The act was then renewed for another year, and to the end of the next session of Parliament. In 1853 the act was applied, by order of the General Board of Health, to six towns, and by order of the Privy Council, to three towns, making together nine towns; in 1854 and 1855 the act was applied, by order of the board, to thirteen towns, and by order of the Privy Council, to six towns, making altogether twenty-eight towns from 1853 up to the present year; and the expenses incurred amounted to £36,000, being a very pretty sum to be dealt with for these towns. It was now proposed to continue the board for three years longer. The last bill did not propose to renew the board for more than two years, one of which had already expired. He did not know whether there was any member present who was what is called an administrative reformer. He did not see the honourable and learned member for Sheffield. [Hear, hear, and laughter.] That honourable and learned member was going to reform the Administrative Reform Association itself [hear, hear]; he ought, therefore, to be here. He is going to set us all to rights, not only in Leadenhall street, but in New Palace Yard, at Somerset House, at the Admiralty, at the Horse Guards, and at Downing street. But if the honourable and learned gentleman would come to this neighbourhood, he would find in a corner of a street a little hole called the Board of Health [laughter], and where he would find comfortably ensconced a near relation of the Prime Minister, a brother of a Cabinet Minister, and the relative of another Cabinet Minister—all very snug berths for Ministerial patronage to bestow. [Hear, hear.] No wonder Ministers want to continue the Board of Health. [Hear, hear.] The honourable member for Lancaster says, 'Continue the board for another session.' Why, I undertake to say that before the discussion closes, the right honourable gentleman below me (Mr. Cowper) will jump at the proposition and be anxious to accept the boon for another year. But if the chairman of the Administrative Reform Association would just call in at the Board of Health he would find those three gentlemen I have named sitting there, and if he were to ask them what they were about, and say to them—'You cost the country a great deal, and we have a right to ask you what you are about?' I am sure the right honourable gentleman the member for Hertford would reply—'That is the great difficulty. [Cheers and laughter.] We have nothing to do; we want to know what we are to do, and how we are to humbug and delude Parliament, in order to get it to continue the board. We have one plan in our head; we are going to adopt the cowpox throughout the country, and we mean to superintend it. [Laughter.] We had also another plan, which we tried to accomplish; we proposed that the president of the Board of Health should be president of the new council of medical men.' But that bill (said the honourable member) has all of a sudden dropped; so that one of their supports is gone. But there is one more chance, and what, the House will ask, is that? Why, the Home Department proposes to transfer the administration of the Burial Act to the Board of Health [laughter]—a very pretty sequel! First, you superintend the general health of the people; next, you promote vaccination; then you would preside over the medical board; and then, when the curtain drops, you come to the Burial Board—the last shot you have. [Loud laughter.] I am against all the powers which this bill confers. Let the people do the work themselves. I oppose the board on any terms. It has got one year to live; I hope it will be its last, and that we shall never hear of it again. [Loud cheers.]"

"The House then divided, when the numbers were—  
For going into committee ..... 61  
Against it ..... 73  
Majority ..... —12

The bill was consequently lost."

"Mr. Cowper said that, under the circumstances, he should adopt the suggestion of the right honourable gentleman the member for Lancaster, and propose a continuance bill for one year. The statement of the honourable member for Finsbury as to the expenses was not correct. He could assure the House that the only desire of the Board of Health was to do some work [laughter] for the benefit of the public."



184

---

### COMPULSORY VACCINATION AND THE GENERAL BOARD OF HEALTH.

SIR,—Before my last note to you was in print, the remaining bantlings of the General Board of Health—the Burial Acts Amendment Bill and the amended Compulsory Vaccination—Bill were slain.

Upon the defeat of the infamous Compulsory Vaccination Bill let me specially congratulate the 1,277 men and women of Hastings and St. Leonards, who, with true English hearts and heads, had the good sense and courage to protest against it.

We are threatened with a renewal, next year, of the warfare against our rights and liberties; but, both in and out of Parliament, the battle, in defence of the sanctity of our homes and the inviolability of our persons, shall be fought out to the last.

Upon the re-assembling of Parliament, the table of the House of Commons must be loaded with petitions against the partial and atrocious Act of 1853. Meanwhile, any attempt to enforce its provisions must be sternly resisted.

Great praise is due to Dr. Michell, and Messrs. Duncombe, Grogan, Barrow, Henley, Brotherton, Miall, and other members, for the efficient support they have accorded to our cause.

Thanking you very cordially for the aid, you, too, with other brethren of the Press, have manfully given to the good cause,

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, July 14, 1856.

---

### "ANTI-PREJUDICE" AND VACCINATION.

"Doubtless, the pleasure is as great  
Of being cheated, as to cheat."

SIR,—“Anti-prejudice” and vaccination! what a droll combination of words! Can “Anti-prejudice” know the meaning of the compounds comprised in his signature? Prejudice has been defined as “judgment without enquiry,” and it is more than a hundred years since an Essayist wrote:—

“Prejudice is that habitual notion of things and persons that a man receives from the information of others; it is early engrafted in the mind and the last to be got rid of. It is the sense of a *second person*, which a man makes use of for his own, and is led into the fatal mistake of believing that the effect of his judgment which came to him another way. . . . The exertion of this *no-principle* will produce equally terrible or equally calm actions of life, and a man shall reckon it either his duty to *sit still*, or *murder* just as any young imbibed opinion directs him. . . . Thus, whatever is done upon this foundation, though never so faulty, shall find advocates, because it meets with some similitude of action in your neighbour, and that is reason enough for his approving it.”

Before “Anti-prejudice” again assumes his pen and a *nom de plume*, I would tenderly advise him to consult some sensible friend, if he have one.

“Anti-prejudice” would cram Mr. Marson down our throats; but, who is Mr. Marson? He is a member of a self-constituted clique of medical quacks who have the vanity to style themselves the “Epidemiological (*query* illogical?) Society,” the folly to thrust their unasked-for advice upon Parliament, and the impertinence to require power to coerce into the acceptance of their opinions and their nostrums a free and thoughtful people. Mr. Marson is likewise resident surgeon to the Small-pox and Vaccination Hospital; he is a mere trader in cow-pox vaunting his wares, and what is death to others is more than sport—it is life—to him.



185

Mr. Marson states that he vaccinated more than 40,000 persons—poor things!—and that he has never seen any evil results traceable to vaccination. When evil results follow, he would attribute them to other causes. Is Mr. Marson sincere? Because he can wield a lancet and inflict disease, is he therefore qualified to trace cause and effect? Is Mr. Marson fitted with even ordinary powers of observation? I have seen a man daily, for months, stand before a fire, and that same man afterwards printed a book descriptive of certain scenes, in which, describing that very apartment, I had so often seen him warming himself, he says: "Of course there was no fire there." Some persons have not the gift of observation.

Wherein,

Even if Mr. Marson be qualified to observe and to trace cause and effect, has he honestly endeavoured to do so? How many cases has he followed to their homes and watched through subsequent years after they had passed from his cruel hands and without the doors of his slaughter-house? Mr. Marson reminds me of a celebrated quack who kept a record of all persons who consulted him. An inquisitive friend of mine visited him, and, on looking through the record, observed opposite every name the word "cured," although it seemed that the great majority never paid the second visit. "How is this," said my friend, "those people do not seem to have come a second time, and yet you mark them cured?—how do you know they are cured?" "For that very reason," said the quack, "because they never returned." But if those patients swallowed the quack's prescription, perhaps their friends could tell a different tale, and thus it may be with many of the victims of Mr. Marson's quackery. Go where one will, one hears lamentable accounts of the evil consequences of vaccination.

In your columns deaths from vaccination have been frequently reported on the authority of the weekly returns of the Registrar-General. Is Mr. Marson ignorant of those important papers? *Apropos* to this question, in the current weekly number, he may find the following:—

"Greenwich, East.—At 3, Bromley place, on 19th September, the daughter of a waterman, aged 3 months, 'erysipelas (after vaccination), convulsions.'"

Poor murdered innocent!—the victim of quackery misnamed science! How many similar cases are never reported? How many deaths from convulsions are attributed to teething, which should be attributed to vaccination?

Is Mr. Marson acquainted with the opinions of his late colleague and senior, Dr. George Gregory? who declared that vaccination does not lessen the general mortality—that its blessings (whatever they may be) are met and counterbalanced by the law of vicarious mortality; and that, contrary to what obtains amongst the unvaccinated, the susceptibility to small-pox increases amongst the vaccinated as life advances. In short, vaccination is a great juggle.

Does Mr. Marson know that Gregory neither vaccinated nor inoculated in his own family? and that Jenner (!) inoculated his second child?

Can

Mr. Marson is not aware of any evil consequences resulting from vaccination. Has he read the writings of Copland, Bayard, Carnot, De Lisle, Lutze, Zimpfel, Schreiber, Nittinger, and others? If not, the sooner he informs himself the better. A few extracts may be useful here.

inahn, Dube,

In his "Dictionary of Practical Medicine"—a text-book of the Profession—Dr. Copland, after quoting Rilliet and Barthez, says, "that scrofulous and tubercular affections have increased since the introduction of vaccination is undoubted.... As already shown, it cannot be doubted that vaccination favours the prevalence of the several forms of scrofula." (Part 15. Article, Scrofula.) Again:—"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 barely 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 amongst those who observe and think for themselves, the middle of the 19th 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 from inoculation or from vaccination." (Part 15. Article, Small-pox.)

2 affirm

2 alleged to

2 moral for?

This revival of the controversy as to the respective merits (or demerits) of vaccination and inoculation—of tweedledum and tweedledee—is the condemnation of both.



186

Dr. Bayard says:—"Since vaccination, mortality has doubled amongst the French youth. The military hospitals are doubly peopled. The number of marriages has augmented in proportion double the number of marriageable females by the rapid succession of second marriages. Fertility has diminished. Constitutions and the public health have become worse. Mental and bodily infirmities have increased. Existing generations have deteriorated. The proportion of adults to minors is no longer what it was in the eighteenth century, consequently the tables of mortality of Davillard and Duparcieux are no longer correct. The nation, by the daily loss of its best strength, overburthened with old people and children, beholds the public misery increasing, and hastens on rapidly to decay. \* \* \*

Mr. Herpin and others had noticed this displacement of smallpox in the age of the vaccinated, which caused M. Serres to say—"Whereas, amongst the unvaccinated, mortality strikes the young under ten years and afterwards declines; amongst the vaccinated, on the contrary, it is from this age up to 28 or 30 that the mortality is highest." —*Influence de la Vaccine sur la population*, p. 10.)

M. Ancefon shows that "The vaccinated child, of five years is more liable to smallpox than the unvaccinated child of the same age."

M. Carnot says:—"The babe just born had, in the 18th century, a probability of living 16 years; in the 19th century, 26 years. On the other hand, in the last century, the young man of twenty years had a probability of adding 37 years to his life; to-day the young man of the same age can only hope for 26. The budget of death has not diminished, it is filled with the corpses of the youth of from 18 to 30 years old."

M. Carnot finds the cause in vaccination.

Dr. Woirot is of opinion that,—"Notwithstanding that the mortality of all ages has successively diminished, that of the period from 10 to 30 years has considerably increased. A disturbing cause has therefore appeared in our day, not only to arrest, during that period of life, the progressive decrease of mortality, but even to give it an impulse in the opposite direction."

Dr. Woirot is of opinion that this cause is vaccination.

M. Castel says of vaccination:—"How much this practice (on which we had built the most flattering hopes) has left of taint in the animal juices, has caused of dissolution in the elements of life, is manifest; so great is the temerity to oppose an obstacle to an eruptive malady, so difficult is it to supply the place of nature."

M. Ancefon says:—"One is moved at the thought of a vaccine constitution." "Vaccination," says Professor Trousseau, "is an error which has had its turn." "Government," says Professor Chrestien, "will perhaps be obliged to repel it with as much energy as they propagated it."

In another place, M. Ancefon says:—"The German populations, astonished at having to confide in the assertions of a few vulgar milkers, have never yielded with a good grace to the interested zeal of the vaccinators; the medical police, armed in this country with the rigour of a Draconian law, could never make them comprehend that inoculation with the product of the morbid secretions of cattle should be without danger, when the same police forbids them, under pain of hideous and mortal diseases, to use the flesh of these same contaminated animals. They have instinctively divined, even before M. le Docteur Boissot (1815), before MM. Teuffer and Berlan, before the publication of those satires, the orders for re-vaccination in the Prussian army, that cow-pox has its errors, weakness and eccentricities, and that far from causing variolous epidemics to recede a hair's-breadth, it only facilitates their development. This sentiment of popular hostility, partaken successively by a considerable number of learned physicians in different states of Germany, found on the borders of the Rhine a worthy interpreter in Dr. E. Schreiber, who wrote an eloquent argument against vaccination, in 1832. In his opinion, 'the vaccine juggleries have been accepted too carelessly and without examination.'"



182  
Dr. Zimpfel says:—"Every practical physician, whose conscientious efforts are directed, not to treat the maladies of his neighbours superficially, but to cure them radically (which can only be done by discovering the cause of the evil, as far as the fundamental laws of nature permit), is forced to confess that, notwithstanding the immense progress of science in every country, the general infirmities increase more and more, in a dreadful manner, amongst all civilised people."

Dr. Zimpfel attributes this deterioration to vaccination.

Dr. Lutze says:—"If by these communications we are satisfied that there is sufficient proof of the inutility and absolute uncertainty of vaccination, another question arises, namely, as regards the danger of the proceeding. \* \* \* Reil alleges that malignant cow-pox is accompanied by violent inflammations, fevers more or less violent, and ulcers difficult to cure. \* \* \* Exanthematic cow-pox displays, in its diverse modifications, scurf, corroding scabs, erysipelatous inflammations, &c., noticed by Pearson, Sedgwick, Balhorn, Val. Müller, and Stromeyer. Häfeland, Reil, Jaraudt, and others, make similar mention of this exanthem, and Jöng communicates several cases where it degenerates into furuncle. Michaelis gives several cases of scurf and corroding scab. Schreiber gives many cases of metastases from this exanthem—inflammation of the eyes, affections of the glands and bones, of which even Schoenlein makes mention, as the consequence of vaccination. That during dentition vaccination carries off many children, is a fact beyond the least doubt, although they attempt to place it to the account of the teeth. The Court physician, Rublack, at Dresden, although a zealous partizan of vaccination, warns respecting this period. \* \* \* At this time it is greatly to be feared, lest, exacting too much activity from the system of lymphatic vessels by means of vaccination, and the disturbing consequences thereof, a vicious weakness be engendered of which scrofulous diseases are somewhat later the pernicious results. Also Schoenlein, as well as Aken, pronounce similarly, and, nevertheless, so many children are vaccinated at this period! Moreover, every year we have distinctly recognised that the vaccine lymph not only is the principle of contagion of simple cow-pox, but that it propagates darts, scab, scrofula, s—s. \* \* \* There are numerous examples of the communication of s—s by vaccination. Dr. Evertzau relates a remarkable one:—"An infant, apparently full of health, who had not a single defect in his whole body, but whose mother had been attacked by s—s, communicated this disease to six children by means of its cow-pox. These children infected their mothers who nursed them. French doctors, especially Ferguson and Raspail, furnish abundant similar examples. Raspail alone observed 60 cases in 1845." \* \* \* Very recently, Nov. 10, 1853, many cases, in which, through the medium of vaccination, s—s had been transmitted to children, and by them to their mothers, were tried before the tribunal at Bamberg, putting beyond doubt the gravity of the danger of vaccination. Similar cases which occurred at Cologne were communicated by the public press."

Dr. Verdt de Lisle says:—"The human race degenerates. \* \* \* The present generation is the prey of new maladies, and a number of old ones have become more frequent, more grave, more deadly. \* \* \* The efforts of Government are useless; progress is paralysed; there is a radical evil. \* \* \* The sole cause of multiplied disasters is vaccination."

Dr. P. Pearce  
Drs. Michell, M.P., Hering, Liedbeck, Chapman, Shew, Trall, Johnson, Newman, Schiefferdecker, Laurie, Cheppell, and a host of others, bear similar testimony. The compulsory vaccinator, Mr. Borham, confesses that "this vitiated virus is transmitted to scores of others, who shortly after suffer from fulsome eruptions, or the foundation is laid for scrofula or tuberculous consumption." And the *Lancet* admits that "few medical practitioners would care to vaccinate their children from a source of the purity of which they were not well assured."

Here are a few opinions with which "Anti-prejudice" may season the opinions of Mr. Marson.



188

Mr. Marson will not admit that the diseases which frequently immediately follow vaccination result from it. Has he quite considered what he says? of what avail in such cases is his vaccination? With all his boasted experience, does he really know cow-pox when he sees it? Does he ever mistake another exanthem for cow-pox? Is he aware that, according to the best authorities, genuine cow-pox cannot be communicated when another disease lurks in the blood, but a spurious cow-pox is the result of vaccination?

"Anti-prejudice" desires to know, "from statistics, the proportion of blind now and before vaccination was introduced." I know not if "your energetic correspondent" (whoever he may be) to whom "Anti-prejudice" appeals, will respond, but, in case he should not, let me advise "Anti-prejudice" to apply to his friend, Mr. Marson, and perhaps he may oblige him with the desired information. In the meantime, "Anti-prejudice" might profitably cogitate upon the influence which enforced inoculation must have had (before the practice became illegal) in spreading death and blindness throughout the community.

As "Anti-prejudice" and Mr. Marson betray so much fondness for statistics, let me indicate two more directions in which they might usefully push their researches:—the one is to ascertain the relative proportion of children respectively attaining a healthy maturity in a thousand vaccinated and a thousand unvaccinated:—the other is an enquiry into the cause of the "constant tendency in the general mortality of the country to an increase," as noticed by Dr. Farr, in a recent blue-book.

In return for Mr. Marson's statistics of deaths from small-pox, allow me to present "Anti-prejudice" with the following:—In 1850, in the General Hospital, Calcutta, the deaths from small-pox, amongst the vaccinated, were twenty-four per cent.

For my part, it would require something more than the interested vaunts of Mr. Marson to tempt me to buy and use his filthy, pernicious nostrum. To ask a rational being to believe that health can be propagated by the transmission of disease, is to insult his intelligence. A belief in the transmigration of souls, or in the Popish dogma of transubstantiation, is a trifle to the belief in vaccination. Cow-pox repelling, or expelling, small-pox! Satan casting out Satan! *Credat Judæus!*

What share of good sense, independent thought, and reasoning power, can be accorded to the believers in vaccination? The root of this fallacy may be traced far back to barbarous times and the love of the marvellous. Achilles imagined he had found a prophylactic in his dip in the Styx—but his heel showed he was vulnerable. The alchemists sought for the *elixir vitæ*, which was to confer immortality, and fancied they had found it. The belief in prophylactics still lingers to testify to the credulity and cowardice of a part of mankind. They would be wiser than their Maker, and improve their organization. Jenner dexterously ministered to their weaknesses, or their vices, and made his fortune. Recent imitators propose inoculation with s—s as a prophylactic against scarlatina, and inoculation with mingled adder's poison and rotten liver as a prophylactic against yellow-fever. Madness and impiety!

Physicians find their account in upholding delusion. Doctor-craft aspires to an equality with priest-craft, and humbug in physic is fashionable and profitable. But common sense and science repudiate the belief in a prophylactic. There is no such thing, in the sense in which vaccinators use the word. The only protection against disease is to be found in maintaining the *vis vitæ* by living in accordance with the natural laws—by attention to diet, temperance, air, temperature, ventilation, exercise, rest, clothing, cleanliness, and the due control of the moral and mental faculties.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ANTI-HUMBUG.

Tunbridge Wells, Oct. 6, 1856.

*John Gibbs.*



# VACCINATION.

SIR,—Permit me to give an extract, from a current number of an official document, for the information of Mr. Marson's investigating friend, "Anti-prejudice."

"Greenwich, Woolwich Arsenal.—At 12, Mount street, on 7th October, the son of a tailor, aged seven months, 'erysipelas and abscesses (three months); consequent on purulent infection of blood after vaccination.'"—Weekly Return of the Registrar-General, for week ending October 11, 1856.

Can any sane man, not wholly ignorant of such subjects, believe that if Mr. Marson should merely scratch the arms of 40,000 children with a clean, instead of a foul, lancet, a certain proportion of them should not suffer from erysipelas?

"Keep yourself, as long as possible, out of the hands of the doctor," is sage advice. "Compel all parents to put their new-born children into our hands," is the impudent demand of Mr. Marson and his confederates. Every honest, straightforward man, who *thinks*, must indignantly repel the assumption that any clique, in or out of Parliament, has the right, under whatever pretext, or with whatever object, to inflict disease. That cow-pox is a disease—a disease both disgusting and dangerous—is a fact, notwithstanding the ignorance, assumed or real, of the vaccinators.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ANTI-HUMBUG

October 21, 1856.

*John Gibbs*

*percentage  
and another per-  
centage of the  
escape of from  
smallpox*

# VACCINATION.

SIR,—It is said that "the third time is the charm." Will you kindly permit me for the third and, I hope, "the last time," to minister to "Anti-Prejudice's" evident thirst for information, by offering him one more short extract from the "Returns" of the Registrar-General? In the current Quarterly Return, for the quarter ending August, 1856, may be found the following:—

"LOUGHBOROUGH—Leake.—Births, 65; deaths, 31. In one instance, death resulted from erysipelas, in an infant, after vaccination."

This poor victim of prejudice was as surely murdered as if his foolish parents, or the parish tyrants, had cast him beneath the chariot of the Indian idol.

Facts like this sternly rebuke the presumption of those quacks, who, in their ignorance of the secret springs of life, blindly attempt to improve the wonderful masterpiece of the Creator.

I am, sir, your obliged and obedient servant,

ANTI-HUMBUG.

St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
November 4, 1856.

*John Gibbs*



190

## VACCINATION.

SIR.—After the lapse of more than half a century, Jenner's discovery is again upon its trial. Its defenders continually shift their ground. Time ~~seems to have~~ vindicated the opposition of Goldson, Brown, Birch, and others. Objections, which at first met with unqualified denial, are now generally accepted, and palliated. Vaccination engages the thoughts and pens of deep, earnest, and independent thinkers, especially in France and Germany. Drs. de Lisle, Bayard, Ancelon, and Mons. Carnot, Drs. Nittinger, Gleich, Steinbacher, Klöber, Krüger, Ennemoser, Steudel, Schanfeld, Bez, Durr, Lutze, Zimpfel, Winter, Kranichfeld, Hamerick, &c., on the Continent; and, in England, Drs. Michell, Johnson, Pearce, &c., are examining the subject in various aspects in independent publications and in the 'Revue Medicale Franco-chirurgicale,' 'Journal des Connaissances Medico-chirurgicales,' 'l'Union Medicale,' 'Gazette des Hopitaux,' 'Journal des Connaissances Medicales,' 'Die Gesundheitswächter,' 'Med. Corresp. Bl.,' 'Medicinische-briefe,' 'Wiener Med. Wochenschrift,' 'Homœopathic Journal,' &c.

In examining the pretensions of vaccination, one question prominently presents itself: How does the practice affect population? This question received but little attention from Jenner and his immediate disciples. They satisfied themselves with asserting, in an off-hand way, that, as small-pox yearly slew some 40,000 victims, vaccination would yearly preserve that number of subjects to the State; but, ever since, they have neglected to shew that their prediction has been fulfilled, and we vainly enquire for that 40,000 and the natural increase thereof during half a century. Indeed, we were told by that vigorous vaccinator, the late Dr. George Gregory, that they are not to be found, having been disposed of by 'the law of vicarious mortality'—that is, killed off by other causes. But thoughtful enquirers do not rest satisfied here; they ask—Is there not something more than the law of vicarious mortality at work? Does not vaccination itself re-act injuriously upon population? Does not the unnatural practice of puncturing healthy bodies and impregnating them with an animal poison produce effects prejudicial to health and longevity? This question, which has many branches, could never occur to the thoughtless and headlong; even now, it will not be entertained by those who cleave to authority, and who hate the trouble and responsibility of thinking; but it has ever presented itself, *in limine*, to every thoughtful mind uninfluenced by prejudice, self-interest, or vanity. Accordingly, it could not escape such a mind as that of Kant, and therefore we learn, without surprise, from de Quincey, that,

'As to Jenner's discovery of vaccination . . . . . he (Kant) apprehended dangerous consequences from the absorption of a brutal miasma into the human blood, or at least into the lymph.'

were,

Miller,

4/

Honles,

Record,



Is there no reason to admire the sagacity of Kant? French and German authors deplore the injurious influence of vaccination upon their respective countries. The proofs are too manifold to recapitulate here. I will only refer to an article published at Paris, in 1854, in the 'Revue Medicale Francaise et Etrangere,' and translated, in 1857, into German and printed at Stuttgart, under the title—'The Vaccine-poison at the Tribunal of Arithmetic,'—in which Mons. Carnot has advanced and proved this theorem:—

'In every locality where the population does not vary in a marked degree in consequence of immigration or emigration—in time of peace, under the operation of similar laws, all things being equal—when the fruits of marriage augment or diminish in a certain degree, it has been proved that the mortality of women, married and at the productive age, diminishes or augments in an inverse ratio.'

Applying this theorem to a comparison of the mean-condition of England at an interval of sixteen years, we arrive at the following results:—

*Mean of the yearly fluctuation of population in England and Wales from 1821 to 1856 inclusive.*

| Periods compared.                   | Mean yrs.                                              | Deaths. | Births. | Marriages |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------|
| From 1821 to 1840<br>(20 years)     | 1831                                                   | 253,115 | 434,855 | 99,108    |
| From 1838 to 1856<br>(18 years)     | 1847                                                   | 383,406 | 559,400 | 139,078   |
| Difference . . .                    | 16 years                                               | 130,291 | 124,545 | 49,970    |
| Excess of births over deaths        | { 1st period . . . 181,740<br>2nd period . . . 175,994 |         |         |           |
| Deaths compared with 1000 births    | { 1st period . . . 582<br>2nd period . . . 685         |         |         |           |
| Births compared with 1000 marriages | { 1st period . . . 439<br>2nd period . . . 404         |         |         |           |

Diminution in the results of marriage in 16 years . . . 35  
Average diminution of ditto 8 per 100.

*General deductions.*

The fruits of marriage have diminished in England at the rate of 8 per 100 in 16 years; that is  $\frac{1}{2}$  per 100 yearly. In France the diminution is double, or 1 per 100 yearly from 1831 to 1847.

Hence it results that the mortality of women at the productive age has increased in England, in 16 years, in the proportion of 92 to 100—that is 87 in the 1000; while in France the increase has been in the proportion of 84 to 100—that is 190 in the 1000.

In fine, the condition of England is less calamitous than that of France, in the proportion of 87 to 190, or nearly of 5 to 11.

Here it should be observed that, owing to the arbitrary measures of the French Government, the practice of vaccination in France has greatly exceeded, probably doubled, the practice in England.

Moreover, on comparing London with Paris, we readily observe that, while the infant population suffers more, the adult population suffers less in England than in France, from small-pox.

England has therefore yet time to stop on the edge of the precipice to which the credulity of its men of science has led it, but from which the good sense of its people as yet recoils. As to France, after nine years of repeated warnings, after nine years' warfare with paralogisms and absurd hypotheses, scarcely less than a miracle can arrest her ruin.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, March 30, 1857.

2129,078



## COWS AND COWPOX.

SIR,—Allow me to thank you for inserting my note of the 31st ult., and to request permission to offer some further remarks upon a subject of growing interest and vast importance.

Not long since, when an opinion was expressed that the Jennerian practice might prove injurious, the sceptic was encountered with the dogmatic assertion that, even when fevered with disease and foul with pustules, the blood of the cow was purer than that of man in the normal state. He was reminded that he ate her flesh and drank her milk, and was told that therefore inoculation with her morbid secretions should not disgust and could not injure him. And this was accepted as science and logic!

How idols fall! The healthgiving cow, of late the theme of song, is now an object of terror. State and medical authorities sound the alarm. The legs of this pure-blooded animal rot off in London stalls—her lungs waste away in one district, the murrain consumes her in another. Her milk is poison. Her flesh is deadly carrion. Yet, strange to say, both medical and State authorities, opposing nature, still combine to saturate us with the morbid secretion of her filthy sores. Stranger still, they would force upon us this seed of disease, not by the ordinary inlet of food and physic, but, more unnaturally, through the punctured skin. And yet those same authorities are aware that an animal poison taken into the system by the mouth and stomach is harmless compared to the same poison when imbibed through the wounded cuticle.

In Russia, as well as in France, population declines. Wurtemberg mourns over fifty years' poisoning of her sons. The declension is manifest amongst ourselves in proportion to the extent of the cause. Dr. Farr states that 'there is a constant tendency in the mortality of the country to an increase.' Dr. Letheby finds, in the metropolis, 'some lurking but all-powerful influence that is at work in undermining the strength and vitality of the population.' The *Medical Times* of this date says:—'Since this period (1837), every physician is well aware that a peculiar "epidemic constitution" has prevailed. It has been characterized by peculiar and very marked symptoms in many diseases. Not only have we been visited by diseases to which we had hitherto been strangers, but every known and familiar disease exhibited itself under an aspect of malignancy quite new to it.' The *Medical Times* might trace this 'epidemic constitution' to an earlier date; indeed, it notices the 'malignancy' of the 'epidemic' constitution of 1823. Where vaccination is much practised, there also are the symptoms of decay, and there men of science grope for the cause, which lies potent and unheeded upon the surface.

Amongst the results of this deterioration of the constitution, dentists observe the prevalent decay of the teeth in very early life. Vaccination was to preserve the beauty of woman. But is there an admirer of the sex who would not prefer, to the nicest handiwork of the dentist, a healthy mouth, snowy teeth, and ruby lips, even if accompanied by a few extra dimples?



193

Infants die of erysipelas, gangrene, or convulsions, caused by vaccination. Horrible and deadly diseases, we are told, are transmitted with the virus of diseased children. Other diseases are evoked by the action of the vaccine poison. Two-thirds of the patients admitted into the Smallpox Hospital have smallpox after vaccination. Adults, who have been vaccinated, die of smallpox. The general mortality is not diminished, it is only displaced. And yet the constant cry is, vaccinate—vaccinate—vaccinate!

What folly! Is it any wonder that the ignorant still believe in fortune-telling and witchcraft, while the educated trust to specifics and prophylactics?—those modern substitutes for the *elixir vitae*, or the more ancient dip in the Styx.

Ah, but, we are told, by an authority great with the unthinking, 'smallpox is the virus of the camel, and it is neutralized by the virus of the cow.' How scientific! Where is this virus of the camel? Does it lurk in the blood of the human race? If so, would not the wise and obvious plan be to eliminate it as soon as possible? But, if in the blood, how does it happen that the vast majority of mankind lived and died, live and die, without having either cowpox or camelpox? If not in the blood, is it in the atmosphere? Then, in the name of all that is ~~good~~, neutralize it there—do not experimentalize upon our bodies, but saturate the atmosphere with cowpox!

But they, who talk so sagely about the virus of the cow and the virus of the camel, ignore, or do not know, that Jenner and some of his disciples employed the virus of the horse, the dog, the pig, the goat, and other animals, as well as that of the cow, and, as they state, with precisely similar results.

Could such tampering with the secret springs of life result otherwise than in a host of deadly diseases transferring to adult life the debt of infancy? Could it be otherwise than that diseases, once comparatively harmless, should assume a deadly type?—that the virus of smallpox (repelled by vaccination), or the virus of cowpox itself (a cognate disease), should fall upon the inner membranes, imparting a fatal virulence to various infantine disorders, as whooping-cough—causing a vast increase of other diseases, as consumption, with us, and typhoid diseases, as noticed by French physicians?

It is curious that diseased lungs should be so prevalent and fatal amongst cattle, and that Jenner's first vaccinated patient, Phipps, and also his eldest son, Edward, whom he swinepoxed, should both have become victims to pulmonary consumption.

The Jennerian juggler has had a long reign; but, forced by State patronage—by forgery, fraud, bribery, and coercion—by every means, legal and illegal—and opposed by the natural instinct and good sense of the masses, it never had any real vitality, and there are indications that it will soon be numbered with effete medical superstitions, and furnish a new theme to the historian of extraordinary delusions.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Maze Hill Cottage,  
April 18, 1857.

JOHN GIBBS.

and still,

absurd,



194

---

## FRENCH STATISTICS AND VACCINATION.

(To the Editor of the Sentinel.)

SIR,—As you have noticed the declension of population in France, perhaps you would kindly allow me to offer a few words upon the subject.

The declension of population is observed not only in France, "Ireland, Spain, and Italy," but also in Russia, Germany, and even in England. The fact that it is common to the whole civilized world suggests that the cause may be common, too. It commenced about the time when a vaccinated generation reached the adult age, and has been gradually and steadily progressing, with the spread of vaccination, to the present day.

In the opinion of eminent, thoughtful, unprejudiced, scientific men, facts, figures, and theory combine to connect Jenner's discovery, and many of the physical ills which afflict this generation, as cause and effect. Should proof be challenged, it is ready.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

St. Leonard's-on-Sea, April 20, 1857.

---

X VACCINATION.—The following queries have been sent on behalf of the General Board of Health to the French Government, and to various foreign medical societies and Continental physicians: 1. Whether vaccination, in most cases, protects from small-pox, at all events, prevents death thereby? 2. Whether individuals who have been vaccinated, and are consequently less liable to small-pox, become more susceptible to typhoid fever and other zymotic diseases, or to scrofula, phthisis, or exhibit any other injurious consequences? 3. Whether in the lymph of a genuine Jennerian pustule the seed of syphilitic, scrofulous, or other constitutional disease, can be conveyed and inoculated through the vaccination; and whether a skilful physician can commit the error to take from a vaccinated arm any other morbid secretion than the vaccine lymph for further transmission? 4. Whether, if every necessary precaution for the proper performance of the operation be taken, and that in the individual case no reasons against it be present, the universal vaccination of children is to be recommended?



195

## THE NEW MEDICAL BILLS AND THE GENERAL BOARD OF HEALTH BILL.

SIR,—The medical liberties of the people are again assailed. There are now before Parliament three medical bills, numbered 1, 2, and 3. Of No. 2, not having seen it, I shall not speak. Numbers 1 and 3 bear the same title—"A bill to alter and amend the laws regulating the medical profession." There are at least eleven Acts of Parliament already "regulating" the profession. However, these new bills appear under a misnomer. Were they what they pretend to be, we might wonder why the profession should need so much "regulating," but could have no motive to interfere in a matter not of general concernment. The sponsors of these bills affirm that they do not in any degree trench upon private or popular rights; but, notwithstanding, they confiscate, in a measure, the right to labour—that is to live—and the right to employ—that is to purchase needful service. As a rule, the State should not interfere between the employer and the employed, unless there be something criminal in the relation between them, or that interference be desired by one or both of them.

Bill No. 1 enacts that a medical council, having extensive powers, be formed with branch councils, and that every medical practitioner in the United Kingdom, having certain qualifications, shall pay certain fees and cause himself to be registered in manner provided, under pain of being treated as an unqualified practitioner liable to certain penalties. If the gentlemen of the medical profession choose to submit to such thralldom, for the benefit of a few hungry place-seekers, no one has a right to remonstrate. But the bill further enacts (section xxxiii.), that any person taking or using "any name, title, admission, or description implying that he is registered," shall be liable to certain penalties. This clause is very insidious. The word "implying" may be tortured by legal ingenuity to create a multitude of offences. For example; any person now legally entitled to call himself "surgeon," though not entitled to be registered, who, after the passing of the Act, should continue to use an appellation distinctive of his calling, might be brought within the penalties of the Act. It would be about as wise and just to punish a man for acting as and being called a carpenter, unless "legally qualified." But the clause might be made to take a wider scope. Even you, sir, might be entangled in its meshes. It would only need that some person should address a letter or packet to you, adding "surgeon" to your name, and that you should receive it. This may seem an improbability; but, judging from analogous facts, it might well happen. A gentleman lately received two accounts, one from a country tradesman, who addressed him as "Colonel," and the other from a London bookseller, who addressed him as "Reverend." Now, legal ingenuity might construe the receipt of those documents as "implying" an "admission" that the receiver was a "Reverend Colonel." But what would the tradesmen have thought and done if their letters had been returned to them, marked "refused?"

Section xxxi. enacts that, after a certain date, "no person shall be entitled to recover any charge in any court of law for any medical or surgical advice, attendance, or for the performance of any operation, or for any medicine prescribed, administered, or supplied by him to his own patients, unless

he shall prove upon the trial that he is registered under this Act." This clause directly confiscates the right to labour in a useful calling, and to seek remuneration for services rendered. It requires no proof of false pretences—no complaint on the part of the person served. The service may be *bona fide*—it may be the skillful extraction of a tooth or a corn, the setting of a broken bone, the reduction of a luxation, the staunching of a hemorrhage, the cure of a scald or a burn, attendance as a midwife, the administration of a bath, of galvanism or of mesmerism—it may extend to the saving of limb or life, perhaps when no other means of salvation were available; and yet the person benefitted would be justified by law in refusing remuneration, although it might have been promised. What is this but to encourage dishonesty by Act of Parliament?



196  
Bill No. 3 has similar provisions. Section xlii. corresponds to section xxxi. of Bill No. 1; section xlv. corresponds to section xxxiii., but is more explicit and directly forbids the use of the designation surgeon, except by registered persons. Section xxv. forbids the employment of unregistered practitioners, not only in any public office, but even by any "friendly or other society for affording mutual relief in sickness, infirmity, or old age;" thus again unduly interfering with the rights of the employer and the employed, while respecting those rights as regards "any hospital, infirmary, dispensary, or lying-in-hospital," wholly supported by voluntary contributions. The corresponding section (xxxii.) of Bill No. 1 goes further, and enacts that no unregistered person "shall be capable of holding any office or appointment, either by direct or indirect terms confined to legally qualified practitioners."

If, for the "legally qualified," Acts of Parliament could always give us the really qualified, there might be some excuse for legislation; but the objects of these bills are evidently to crush all independent practitioners, and to create a number of lucrative and influential offices.

The General Board of Health Bill is entitled "A Bill for transferring the powers of the General Board of Health to a Committee of the Privy Council." Last year, Parliament and the people having condemned the Board to extinction, in consequence of the incompetency and meddlesome and jobbing spirit which it betrayed, this is an attempt to revive and prolong it under a new name. It would be a work of supererogation, and would fill too much space, to recapitulate the failures, extravagances, and impertinences (from the Board of Health malaria at Croydon to the ruinous litigation in so many places) of this bantling of centralization and jobbery, which, having little to do for its £18,000 a year but to concoct blue-books, and only kept "alive by giving it the administration of small Acts of Parliament," after a private meeting of its officials "to consider what they should do to give an appearance of importance to their sinecures" (*Engineers and Officials*, p. 159), sought "to centre in its own hands the control of the whole local government of England and of the metropolis, including water supply, gas, funerals, and burials, and aimed at extinguishing all progress in engineering works, by forcing on all places, under all circumstances, one fixed stereotyped and empirical system" (*ib.*, p. 227); to which may be added, the regulation of the medical profession and the forcible vaccination of the whole population. Had the Board succeeded in perpetrating these jobs, it is not improbable that it would next have demanded to regulate our daily exercise, and food and clothing; and it might not have disdained to take in hand the pap-spoon and the nursing-bottle. It must be confessed there was method in the plan. It would be fitting that, being killed, we should be buried, by authority, and no doubt the great undertaking establishment would have known how to cut out work for itself. But, happily, they failed to make us "believe that the men, who have made old England what she is, live, not on bread and beef, earned by industry, but on Acts of Parliament, with the help of official commissioners; that no one is capable of taking care of himself, that every community requires the horn-book and rod of a salaried professor, like he of the Black Rod who starved the governor of Barataria to save him from indigestion."

Having slain the monster, it behoves us to take care that he does not revive to devour us under another name.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, May 20, 1857.



## VACCINATION.

*To the Editor of the Brighton Examiner.*

SIR,—As you have done me the honour to enquire what I would say to a statement which you quote from the *Lancet*, I shall endeavour to satisfy you. How far I shall succeed, must depend upon yourself. I shall assume that you are really desirous of information, and that, casting away the mental microscope, through which a little corner of a vast subject is commonly viewed, you are willing to survey the whole. With this hope, I address you.

The "facts," over which the *Lancet* exults, may be briefly stated. Smallpox is said to have raged in Cork in 1856; the "unremitting attention of medical men failed to check its progress," probably because the right means were not employed; the disease attains a "frightful intensity"—the writer fails to intimate what degree of intensity is "frightful" in his eyes, but, indeed, people in a fright are seldom very exact; but a Dr. Sandham, assisted by an Arch-deacon, who had better have been trying to save souls, commenced an "energetic course" of vaccination, and in three weeks "stayed the plague." This is certainly a marvellous statement. But plain, common-sense people—who distrust the marvellous—who do not respect superstitions, even when clothed with the authority of "science," so called because it teaches, not to know—will ask what it really all means. This, then, seems the rational solution, that the epidemic attained a "frightful intensity," that is, it reached its acme, and then, as epidemics do—it is a way they have—began to decline. Just at this moment—the right moment—by a fortunate coincidence, Dr Sandham stepped in with his "fluid lymph," just like any conjurer of old, or barbarian medicine-man now—it is a way they have—and so the fluid lymph performs a miracle even more wonderful than St. Januarius' drop of blood—this dissolves—that staid the dissolution.

As to the alarming phrase, "frightful intensity," a little examination enables us to perceive that it is only one of those rhetorical flourishes used by persons whose imaginations surpass their descriptive powers. On dissecting the statement, we find that the epidemic, if it deserve the name, lasted two months and three weeks. An exact observer would give the dates of its first appearance and departure—if it has departed. At the lowest computation, it lasted eleven weeks, that is, 77 days. The deaths, as given by the *Lancet*, were 74. Thus the "frightful" mortality was less than one death a day in a population of about 190,000, all of whom are not the cleanest persons in the world. In what glowing terms Dr. Sandham, or the *Lancet*, would depict the mortality by those real plagues, typhus or cholera, when they ravaged Cork, and when the daily deaths thereby, probably, did not fall short of—did they exceed?—the whole mortality from smallpox in 1856! We are not told what the annual average mortality in Cork is, or that the mortality in 1856 exceeded the average. Indeed, vaccinators are generally careful not to tell more than just suits their purpose. But it does not necessarily follow that the mortality is higher in years when smallpox is epidemic; on the contrary, we have evidence that it may be considerably lower, as the following table will show:—

### DEATHS IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

|                                                |              |               |         |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|
| 1838..Smallpox .....                           | 16,268 ..... | All causes .. | 342,529 |
| 1840.. " .....                                 | 10,434 ..... | " ..          | 359,561 |
| 1847..Typhus .....                             | 30,320 ..... | " ..          | 423,304 |
| 1849..Cholera.....                             | 53,273 ..... | " ..          | 440,839 |
| 1852..Scarlatina....                           | 18,117 ..... | " ..          | 407,826 |
| 1853..HoopingCough                             | 11,200 ..... | " ..          | 421,775 |
| 1854..Cholera.....                             | 20,097 ..... | " ..          | 438,239 |
| Average of deaths from all causes from 1838 to |              |               |         |
| 1854 (17 years) inclusive .....                |              |               |         |
|                                                |              |               | 380,435 |

Thus, when small-pox was epidemic, the general mortality was low, in fact, far below the average; and the year the mortality from small-pox was highest, the general mortality was lowest; while under scarlatina and hooping-cough the general mortality is above, and, under typhus and cholera, far above, the average.



198

In sixteen days Dr. Sandham vaccinated 2,474 persons; this is at the rate of a fraction less than 155 daily. In three weeks he staid his hand. Giving him credit for the fractions, and including Sundays, he vaccinated 775 more persons, making a total of 3,249. The population of Cork is about 190,000. Are we to believe that vaccination is unpopular and neglected in Cork; that, notwithstanding, only some 3,000 and odd of its inhabitants, or about one-sixtieth of the whole, were found to be unvaccinated; that, nevertheless, small-pox raged with "frightful intensity," and that the vaccination of that small portion of the people stopped its further progress? Now this, divested of all eloquence, is the sum of Dr. Sandham's loose and contradictory statement.

That the epidemic had already seized all its victims, and had begun to decline when Dr. Sandham, opportunely for his empirical practice, began to vaccinate, is corroborated by the known laws—that small-pox incubates about fourteen days; that during all that time the patient is a source of contagion; and that, once the poison of small-pox enters the system, the poison of cow-pox, if introduced, does not neutralize it, but both diseases run their course together. It is, therefore, by no means surprising that, in three weeks small-pox ceased to be epidemic.

"I have been long assured," said Jenner, "that infection may be received and expelled again from the constitution, if no debilitating power should arise to call it into action." (*Baron's Jenner*, vol. 1., p. 106.) Here we find the explication of such facts as those mentioned by Madame Pleiffer and Captain Canot. Madame Pleiffer was a passenger in a steamer in the East; the women and children of a harem were in the cabin; they had brought small-pox with them; five of them died; the pestilential vapour pervaded the vessel, but the disease did not spread. Captain Canot had been some weeks at sea with his slave-cargo, when a case of small-pox occurred—in the true spirit of an officer of health, he destroyed the source of contagion, simply by throwing it overboard; the disease did not spread. In these cases all on board, closely pent together, must have been exposed to contagion in its most condensed form, and, as regards one vessel, for a long time; happily for them they were in a condition to resist it. Had it been scarlatina, typhus, or cholera, the results would have been the same. Unfortunately for the vaccinators there was no one on board either vessel to vaccinate all, and claim a cheap triumph for their nostrum.

It may seem strange that Jenner could catch a truth, like that just quoted, and make so ill an use of it. But his habits of thought were not favourable to comprehensive views. His friendly biographer admits that he had not the mind to grasp a large subject. Practical little experiments—watching cuckoos and rivalling them in robbing birds-nests—cutting open live dogs, rabbits, bats, and other hapless animals—and writing harmless verses—these were his congenial pastimes. No wonder then, that when the learned and patient Dr. Watt—the author of that great work, the *Bibliotheca Britannica*—showed that vaccination, by weakening the resisting power of the system, actually favoured the ravages of epidemics—Dr. Jenner could only exclaim, "How absurd!" Beyond that point he never could get; and there is the *pons asinorum*, that not one of his disciples has ever been able to cross.

"Epidemics," says Dr. Southwood Smith, in his "Lectures"—"Epidemics resemble each other in being produced by the same causes. The whole tenor of experience shows that whatever produces an especial liability to one epidemic, produces a similar liability to another.... The predisposing causes of epidemics may be divided into two classes—external and internal. The external are those which vitiate the atmosphere; the internal are those which more immediately vitiate the blood." These remarks are rational and according to experience.

But, if Dr. Smith's theory be true, the converse must be also true; if "whatever produces a liability to one epidemic, produces a similar liability to another," then, whatever strengthens the system to resist the aggression of one



149

epidemic must likewise strengthen it to resist the aggression of another. Therefore, vaccination should strengthen the system to resist all epidemics alike; but this is not pretended.

251  
We know that, no matter what the reigning epidemic in any one year may be, the mortality on an average of years does not diminish. Dr. George Gregory, one of the most vigorous and experienced of vaccinators, was struck with this fact, and attributed it to what he termed the "law of vicarious mortality"—which, in plain English, signifies, that vaccination only seems to preserve; that the epidemic poison, under the influence of vaccination, develops, not into smallpox, but into scarlatina, measles, typhus, cholera, or some other form of epidemic disease, and kills the patient just as surely—perhaps more surely than—smallpox.

"Where any one of the predisposing causes is present, epidemics break out and spread just as readily as when all are present together. Where there is overcrowding alone epidemics break out and spread; and so of the whole number. The removal of one of these causes, therefore, or the removal of two or three of them, will not suffice for safety; every one must be removed before there can be safety... the most perfect drainage, combined with the most ample supply of water, will not alone secure for the public health all which it is practicable to accomplish, there must also be provision for the better construction of the houses of the poor; for the prevention of overcrowding; for street ventilation and cleansing; and for the exclusion from the neighbourhood of human dwellings of filth-creating animals and of noxious trades. When all this is done, epidemics would disappear, the more formidable of them immediately, and all of them, I believe, in the end."—*Southwood Smith on Epidemics*—p. 55.

Here we have the real prophylactics indicated. Here are no puerilities. How absurd, then, to expect protection by poking an animal poison, on the point of an instrument, into the arm. How unphilosophical to hope to strengthen the system against, by first weakening it by, disease. Empirics may try, but they cannot mend, although they may mar, the masterpiece of the Creator.

This brings us to the real—the only question worthy the attention of the philosopher, philanthropist, and statesman:—How does vaccination affect the general health and longevity of a people?

A few years ago some enquiring minds discovered that a period of decay had commenced amongst European populations; they sought for the cause and could only find one cause common to all. Vaccination alone was constant in its operation and coeval and co-extensive with the evil. In proportion as it was diffused, so were the evidences of decay. Unprejudiced, scientific men took up the enquiry here, and have demonstrated from theory, confirmed by pathological and morbid-anatomical investigations, that the increasing mortality arises from suppressed smallpox imparting peculiar virulence to other diseases. To analyse here the able works of Carnot, De Lisle, Bayard, Nittinger, Ancelon, Vilette, Gleich, Steinbacher, Houles, Hammernick, Klöber, Geiger, Bez, Lutze, Zimpfel, de Feulins, and others, would occupy too much space.

When the anti-vaccinators, or anti-poisoners, pointed out, in 1849-50, the decay of populations, their facts were peremptorily denied and their deductions derided by men intrenched in obstinate ignorance, or fortified by self-interest. But they clearly foreshadowed the present state of things. The decay of populations is now too evident. No one presumes to deny it. But the obstinately ignorant and self-interested, while any longer unable to deny the results, attribute them to all sorts of contradictory and impossible causes. At one time it is war, that is to blame,—then it is some peculiar law—then the spread of Malthusian doctrines,—now immoral habits. And, parrot-like, writer after writer re-echoes these absurdities. This has one manifest advantage—it saves the trouble of thinking.

That the decay of population is not confined to, nor greatest in France, and therefore, owing neither to French immorality nor to revolutionary and civil war, nor to the law subdividing property, we learn from the 16th Annual Report of the Registrar General, for 1853, Appendix, p. 122,—



"The actual health and vigour of the respective races are represented by the mean mortality and the mean life-time; in both these respects England and France stand the first, Russia the last of the States from which data can be obtained.

|          |   | ANNUAL MORTALITY. |       |
|----------|---|-------------------|-------|
| "England | . | 1                 | in 45 |
| France   | . | 1                 | " 42  |
| Prussia  | . | 1                 | " 38  |
| Austria  | . | 1                 | " 33  |
| Russia   | . | 1                 | " 28  |

So much for the general health and vigour of these three forcibly vaccinated races—Prussia, Austria, and Russia.

The French wars ceased in 1815. In 1817, France had an adult vaccinated population. What have wars which are past and gone to do with the following figures?—is it not more rational to connect them with a cause ever in operation and ever renewed?

Mean yearly increase of population in France—

|                   |   |         |
|-------------------|---|---------|
| From 1817 to 1828 | . | 218,766 |
| " 1829 to 1840    | . | 159,962 |

In France, the nearer they are to any hostile influence that war might exercise on population, the more rapid is the increase; and the farther they are removed from the influence of this cause, and the more saturated they become with cowpox-poison, the slower is the increase of population.

But the state of France yearly becomes worse. In Paris, in 1854, the deaths greatly exceeded the births:—

|              | Births. | Deaths. | Excess of deaths. |
|--------------|---------|---------|-------------------|
| Males .....  | 473,834 | 498,265 | 24,431            |
| Females .... | 449,672 | 494,514 | 44,832            |

What has war to do with this excessive mortality of women?

That vaccination is telling, in like manner, in proportion to the extent of the cause, upon population in England, is evident. The deaths, in England, to a thousand births have increased in sixteen years from 582 to 685. The births to a thousand marriages have decreased in the same period from 439 to 404; that is at the rate of 8 per 100 in 16 years, or  $\frac{1}{2}$  per 100 yearly. In France the diminution, in the same time, in the ratio of births to marriages, is double; and vaccinations in France, as compared with England, are probably in the same proportion.

In England, Doctors Farr and Letheby perceive the effects, upon population, of a cause, to them, occult (because they shut their eyes to it), baffling medical and sanitary science, and ever operating to increase mortality. To those who will not allow themselves to be led blindfold by authority, or to be frightened into embracing a delusion, that cause is very obvious.

So little self-possessed are the partizans of the Jennerian juggle, that they always omit to cite the most weighty argument for upholding it. ~~It is~~ that, not content with an enormous amount received in private fees, they dip their hands deeply into the public purse. Jenner began by receiving £30,000 from Parliament, and his followers have not been slow to profit by the example. The National Vaccine Board has had over £100,000 from the same bountiful source. The public vaccinators have received a vast sum, which, for want of items, I cannot estimate; in 1855 alone, it amounted to £54,727, and next year, if they obtain but a moiety of the increased fees they demand, it will not fall short of a quarter of a million of money. Other sums, too, which I cannot estimate, have been voted to sustain this monstrous delusion. Was ever quack nostrum so lucrative?

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,  
St. Leonards-on-Sea, May 23, 1857. JOHN GIBBS.



# A DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

A Compulsory-Vaccinator and an Anti-Vaccinator.

*C. V.*—Friend, actuated by philanthropy, I beseech you to guard yourself and your family from a great evil, by a simple, safe, and salutary process.

*A. V.*—Pray, what are they?

*C. V.*—Small-pox and vaccination.

*A. V.*—May I ask you a few questions?

*C. V.*—(*Condescendingly.*)—Certainly, my dear friend.

*A. V.*—Are you certain that the operation you call vaccination, affords an assured protection against small-pox?

*C. V.*—Undoubtedly.

*A. V.*—And you think that the only way to avoid the evil is to undergo the operation?

*C. V.*—Unquestionably!

*A. V.*—And you are quite certain that, in trying to avoid one evil, you do not incur another?

*C. V.*—Quite certain: we have "the concurrent and unanimous testimony of nearly 2,000 medical men," who assert that vaccination is a "safe and efficient prophylactic" against small-pox.

*A. V.*—Well, that 2,000 medical men should agree upon any one point is sufficiently marvellous, but not quite conclusive in my opinion.

*C. V.*—(*Dogmatically.*)—But it is in mine, and that is enough.

*A. V.*—Softly, my good Sir. Pray, are those 2,000 gentlemen as disinterested as yourself?

*C. V.*—Of course; what, but philanthropy, could influence them?

*A. V.*—Why it appears that Jenner, in addition to diamond rings, pieces of plate, presents in money to the amount of several thousand pounds, and other valuable considerations, received £30,000 from Parliament for his disinterested discovery, and that his disciples, besides their private fees, receive some £60,000 per annum of the public money. This is rather profitable philanthropy.

*C. V.*—It is a very insufficient remuneration for



their great public services. I hope that Parliament will soon increase it to £250,000 at least.

*A. V.*—We shall see. By the way, it is said that Jenner did not vaccinate his son Robert, but inoculated him with small-pox; how was that?

*C. V.*—It is true, but then circumstances justified the act; he could get no vaccine virus.

*A. V.*—So it is said; but I should like clearer evidence than has been given. We want dates to enable us to judge of the validity of the excuse. It is also said, that he inoculated his eldest son, Edward, with swine-pox; is this true?

*C. V.*—Yes, Jenner's love of scientific experiment was very great. How many bird's nests he robbed! what numbers of dogs, hedgehogs, and other animals he cut up alive! Ah, he was a great man?

*A. V.*—And a great poet! But, with respect to Edward, poor youth, he died of pulmonary consumption?

*C. V.*—He did.

*A. V.*—Jenner's "first vaccinated patient," Phipps, was also a victim to pulmonary consumption?

*C. V.*—Why, yes; that was a curious coincidence.

*A. V.*—Very. But to return, is it not matter of notoriety that many persons have small-pox, nay, die of small-pox, after having undergone vaccination?

*C. V.*—(*Hesitatingly.*)—Ah, well! why, yes, it does sometimes happen. But, (*briskly*) you know that nothing is certain in this world.

*A. V.*—Very true; But two-thirds is rather a large proportion, and that is the proportion of the vaccinated to the unvaccinated amongst the patients in the small-pox hospital.

*C. V.*—Oh! they should have been re-vaccinated.

*A. V.*—A pretty jest, truly! Having run the risk once, to venture again. But you know that cow-pox and small-pox run their course together in the same patient, without the one neutralizing the other; nay, the patient sometimes dies of one or both. These facts are curious.

*C. V.*—They are.

*A. V.*—And then, the great majority of mankind live and die without having either small-pox or cow-pox.

*C. V.*—(*Unwillingly.*)—Well, yes, that is true; but then it ought not to be so.

*A. V.*—Moreover, you know that vaccination does not diminish the general mortality, but—

*C. V.*—(*Interrupting.*)—But that is not the fault of vaccination, that is due to the "law of vicarious mortality."

*A. V.*—Indeed! Further, you know that many persons die of vaccination, die of erysipelas, gangrene, or convulsions, consequent upon your harmless practice.



C. V.—(*Frankly.*)—Why, yes; but patients will die under other operations too.

A. V.—So they will. And then it is said that various loathsome and deadly diseases are propagated by vaccination.

C. V.—Oh, no! not propagated, only developed.

A. V.—“Only developed!” Well, developed or propagated, they are caused by it. And then, some conscientious persons object that the voluntary infliction of disease, no matter with what intent, is irreligious.

C. V.—Twaddle! the end sanctifies the means.

A. V.—No doubt you think so; but, candidly, do you persist in believing that your nostrum is a “perfectly efficient prophylactic,” notwithstanding that so many have so vainly confided in it?

C. V.—I do.

A. V.—And that it is a “perfectly safe prophylactic,” notwithstanding the deaths that result from it?

C. V.—All that you object only confirms my belief.

A. V.—Well, I can only say, that you seem but slightly acquainted with the laws of evidence or logic; but as you are entitled to your opinion, however ill-founded it may be, pray go and protect yourself with your “safe and efficient prophylactic,” and leave me in peace.

C. V.—(*Unguardedly.*)—No, no! that won't do. My prophylactic can't protect me unless you share it.

A. V.—You joke, surely! But I'll not have it.

C. V.—(*Warmly.*)—What, not have it? It is essential to my peace and comfort that you have it, and have it you shall.

A. V.—Necessary to your peace and comfort that I should be vaccinated! What can you mean? Are not you vaccinated?

C. V.—To be sure; but that is not enough. I am not safe while you are unvaccinated. You may get small-pox and give it to me.

A. V.—Poor man! How irrationally human beings can think and act when under the influence of fear. Did I not once hear you say that “no one has a right to put in jeopardy the lives of his fellow subjects?”

C. V.—(*Eagerly.*)—To be sure, that's it; ah, after all, you will listen to reason.

A. V.—Yes, I'm always ready to listen to reason, but not to yield to threats of coercion; and, meeting you on your own ground, I beg to decline putting my life in jeopardy for any good, near or distant, real or imaginary, that you may expect therefrom.

C. V.—But you must, I tell you, or you shall be punished.

A. V.—Ha, so that is your fine philanthropy! I wish you a good morning, some common sense, and some regard to decency. Let me add, that I don't relish practical jokes—it would not be quite safe to play one upon me; so, good day.

John G. Gibbs.



204

## SALE OF POISONS BILL.

[To the Editor of the *Hastings and St. Leonards News*.]

SIR,—This bill contains some provisions which probably will not be considered unobjectionable by some of your readers.

Section III. defines "poison" to be "any drug, or substance referred to in the Schedule (A) to this Act, and also any compound, preparation, or mixture containing any such drug or substance, except only such compounds, preparations, or mixtures as are specified in the Schedule (B)."

Section IV. empowers the Privy Council to order that any other "drug or substance," not mentioned in the Schedule (A), which, in their opinion, may require it, shall "be subject to the restrictions of this Act."

Section V. provides that "No person shall sell any poison, on any pretence whatever, unless the sale be made to a person of full age, and in the presence of a witness of full age, who is known to the person selling the poison, and to whom the purchaser is known, and unless there be produced and delivered to the seller, before such sale, a written certificate, signed by the clergyman of the parish or district, or a legally qualified medical practitioner, or a Justice of the Peace acting for the county or place, and dated, stating that the person giving such certificate knows the applicant, and believes that the poison may be safely supplied to him, and is to be used for the purpose of his trade, or for some other lawful purpose," &c., &c.

Section X. provides that the gift of any poison, "whether gratuitously or in exchange for any other article or thing, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed a sale," and subject the giver to the penalties of the Act.

The other sections may be passed over as requiring no especial comment.

Several drugs, prohibited in the Schedule (A), are in use as Homœopathic medicines, but the only preparations of them exempted in the Schedule (B), from the provisions of the bill, are those according to the three Pharmacopœias. Surely the preparations, according to the Homœopathic formula, are quite as harmless and incapable of being abused to improper purposes, and therefore equally entitled to exemption.

Section V. seems unnecessarily stringent. It may operate to prevent a patient from obtaining some wanted medicine on an emergency. He may be taken ill in some quarter where he is entirely unknown, and it might be very inconvenient to him to call in and fee a strange physician. Might it not be remitted to the discretion of a chemist to supply such a passing customer, evincing symptoms of indisposition, with such a dose, to be then and there taken, of his usual medicine, as may be considered an ordinary dose? A similar exemption should be made in favour of any kind Samaritan sharing the contents of his medicine chest with any sufferer, known or unknown, in a case of need. Why should a penalty of fifty pounds be held up *in terrorem* to quench one of the gentle charities of life?



In Schedule (A) is prohibited lobelia, which, rightly or wrongly, is held by many to be a safe and salutary medicine, and is used as such. The claims of this drug should be freely examined before including it in the schedule.

The power proposed to be given to the Privy Council to insert any other "drug or substance" in the Schedule (A), is exorbitant and unnecessary. Under such a clause, what would there be, except the love of revenue, to prevent them from putting alcohol, tobacco, or anything else, into this schedule, at their own pleasure, or at the request of Neal Dow? Should it hereafter be necessary to amend the schedule, Government should be obliged to appeal to Parliament for the purpose.

Stringent as the bill is, it is doubtful if it embraces, in its penal clauses, those cases in which, through carelessness, stupidity, or ignorance, a drug is given in too large a dose, or one drug substituted for another, to the injury of the patient.

On the whole, it is to be apprehended that the measure, if it pass, will disappoint public expectation. The best security against poison, as against other dangers, is in knowledge, watchfulness, and self-reliance. The law can really do little more than punish the administration of poison, whether through design or culpable ignorance, unless an Act of Parliament could be framed sufficiently strong to put down the numerous familiar poisons which grow so lawlessly in the fields and hedgerows.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, June 1, 1857.





## Chronique de Jersey.

SAMEDI 6 JUIN 1857.

### DE LA VACCINE.

Nous traduisons du *Morning Herald* la lettre suivante adressée à son Rédacteur :

“ MONSIEUR.—La découverte de Jenner date de plus d'un demi-siècle, et on en discute de nouveau les bienfaits. Ses défenseurs changent continuellement de terrain. Le temps a justifié l'opposition de Golhson, Brown et autres. Les objections qui furent tout d'abord accueillies par des dénégations formelles sont aujourd'hui généralement admises et palliées. La vaccine est le sujet des méditations profondes, des écrits sérieux de penseurs indépendants,—surtout en France et en Allemagne. Les docteurs De Lisle, Bayard, Ancelon, Mons. Carnot, les docteurs Nittinger, Gleich, Steinbacher, Klöber, Krüger, Ennemoser, Steudel, Schaufeln, Bez, Durr, Lutze, Zimpfel, Winter, Kranichfeld, Hamernick, etc., sur le continent; et en Angleterre, les docteurs Mitchell, Johnson, Pearce, Lawrie et autres discutent la question sous ses divers aspects, dans des publications indépendantes, et dans les colonnes de la *Revue Médicale Française et Etrangère*, du *Journal des Connaissances Médico-Chirurgicales*, de l'*Union Médicale*, de la *Gazette des Hôpitaux*, du *Med. Corresp. Bl.*, du *Medicinische-briefe*, du *Wiener Med. Wochenschrift*, de l'*Homœopathic Record*, etc.

“ L'examen des prétentions de la vaccine fait surgir naturellement cette question :—quel est l'effet de la pratique sur la population ? Cette question n'a attiré que fort peu l'attention de Jenner et de ses disciples immédiats. Ils se sont contentés d'affirmer, sans preuve préalable, que comme la petite vérole fait chaque année 40,000 victimes, la vaccine doit donc conserver ce nombre de sujets à l'humanité; mais jusqu'ici ils ne se sont point attachés à prouver la réalisation de leur prédiction, et nous avons vainement cherché à constater l'existence de ces 40,000, et par conséquent l'augmentation proportionnelle de la population pendant le demi-siècle dernier. Il est vrai que nous avons entendu l'intrépide vaccinateur, feu le docteur George Gregory, dire qu'on ne les trouve point, parce qu'ils ont été enlevés par la loi d'une autre mortalité, c'est à dire qu'ils sont morts par d'autres causes. Mais ceux qui veulent approfondir la question, ne se contentent point de cette réponse et se demandent s'il n'y a point sous tout cela quelque chose de plus que la loi d'une mortalité supplémentaire ? La vaccine elle-même ne réagit-elle point d'une manière nuisible à la population ? Cette pratique contre nature de piquer des corps sains et d'y infiltrer un poison animal, n'a-t-elle point un effet préjudiciable à la santé et à la longévité ? Cette question qui offre de nombreux sujets de méditation, ne saurait jamais se présenter aux esprits irréfléchis et inconsidérés; même aujourd'hui, elle n'occupera point l'attention de ceux qui s'attachent à une autorité, et qui ont en horreur la peine et la responsabilité qu'entraîne la réflexion; mais elle s'est toujours présentée *in limine* aux esprits réfléchis, dégagés de toute prévention, d'intérêt personnel ou de vanité. En conséquence, elle ne pouvait échapper à un esprit tel que Kant, et nous lisons sans étonnement dans De Quincey que—

“ En ce qui a rapport à la découverte de la vaccine par Jenner.... il (Kant) craignait les conséquences dangereuses de l'absorption dans le corps humain d'un miasme provenant d'une brute.”



209

“ Ne doit-on pas admirer la pénétration d'esprit de Kant ? Des écrivains français et allemands déplorent les effets pernicious de la vaccine dans leurs pays respectifs. Les preuves sont trop nombreuses pour les récapituler. J'en citerai qu'un article publié à Paris en 1854, dans la *Revue Médicale Française et Etrangère*, traduit en allemand en 1857 et publié à Stuttgart sous ce titre : *La vaccine-poison devant le Tribunal de l'Arithmétique*, dans lequel Mons. Carnot a avancé et prouvé le théorème suivant :

“ Dans toutes les localités où la population n'éprouve point de variations marquées par suite d'immigration ou d'émigration—en temps de paix, sous l'action de lois semblables, toutes choses étant égales—quand les fruits du mariage augmentent ou diminuent en un certain degré, il est prouvé que la mortalité des femmes mariées ou en âge de puberté diminue ou augmente en sens inverse. ”

“ Appliquant ce théorème à la comparaison de la condition moyenne de l'Angleterre durant un intervalle de 16 années, nous arrivons aux conclusions suivantes :

“ Moyenne de la fluctuation annuelle de la population en Angleterre et dans le pays de Galles, de 1821 à 1856 inclusivement :

| Périodes comparées.      | Années moyennes. | Décès.  | Naissances. | Mariages. |
|--------------------------|------------------|---------|-------------|-----------|
| De 1821 à 1840 (20 ans.) | 1831             | 253,115 | 434,855     | 99,108    |
| 1838 à 1856 (18 ans.)    | 1847             | 383,406 | 559,400     | 139,078   |
| Différence.....          | 16 ans.          | 130,291 | 124,545     | 49,970    |

|                                               |               |         |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|---------|
| Excédant des naissances sur les décès.        | 1ère. période | 181,740 |
|                                               | 2e. “         | 175,994 |
| Décès comparés avec 1,000 naissances.         | 1ère. “       | 682     |
|                                               | 2e. “         | 685     |
| Naissances comparées avec 1,000 mariages..... | 1ère. “       | 439     |
|                                               | 2e. “         | 404     |

Diminution dans les résultats du mariage en 16 ans. 35  
Moyenne de la diminution des mariages, 8 pour cent.

#### “ DÉDUCTIONS GÉNÉRALES.

“ Les fruits du mariage ont diminué en Angleterre de 8 pour cent en 16 ans, c'est-à-dire d'un demi pour cent par année. En France la diminution est double, ou d'un pour cent par an, de 1831 à 1847.

“ Il en résulte que la mortalité des femmes en âge de maternité a augmenté en Angleterre, en 16 ans, dans la proportion de 92 à 100 ou de 87 par 1,000 ; en France l'augmentation a été dans la proportion de 84 à 100, ou de 190 par 1,000.

“ En un mot, la condition de l'Angleterre est moins malheureuse que celle de la France dans la proportion de 87 à 190, ou de près de 5 à 11.

“ Il est bon de remarquer que, par suite des mesures arbitraires du gouvernement français, la pratique de la vaccine en France a de beaucoup excédé, probablement doublé la même pratique en Angleterre.

“ Toutefois, en comparant Londres et Paris, nous devons reconnaître que si la population enfantine souffre plus de la petite vérole en Angleterre qu'en France, la population adulte en souffre moins.

“ L'Angleterre a donc encore le temps de s'arrêter sur le bord du précipice où la crédulité de ses hommes de science l'a entraînée. Quant à la France, après neuf années de guerre avec des paralogismes et des hypothèses absurdes, il ne faut guères moins qu'un miracle pour arrêter sa ruine.

“ J'ai l'honneur d'être, Monsieur, etc.,

“ JOHN GIBBS.

“ St. Leonard-on-the-Sea, Mars 1857.”



## THE MEDICAL AND SURGICAL SCIENCES BILL.

*To the Editor of the Hastings and St. Leonards News.*

SIR,—The partizans who desire a State-endowed "Priesthood of Science," are more than ordinarily active this session. Besides the measures already noticed in your columns, and the new (coming) Compulsory Vaccination Bill, they have brought in "A bill for securing the more effectual promotion of the Medical and Surgical Sciences in the Queen's University in Ireland, by enabling the ratepayers of the Unions of Cork, Belfast, and Galway respectively, to provide for the enlargement and better maintenance of certain hospitals in the said cities and towns; and for the further extension of the provisions of the Act of the eighth and ninth years of her present Majesty, to endow new Colleges for the advancement of learning in Ireland."

The framers of this bill cannot be accused of having "seen double;" but they must have had strange visions, prompting them to imagine that three are at least four, when reciting one city and two towns as "the said cities and towns."

However, the bill has a purpose, and proposes to empower a majority of the ratepayers in all or either of those places to levy rates to provide hospitals, each to contain "not less than one hundred beds for intern patients" (sec. xiii.); and to admit students "to the wards of the said hospitals for the purpose of receiving clinical and other instruction from the medical officers of said hospitals," who are to deliver lectures.

The other provisions of the bill do not require present notice.

At first sight it may seem that this bill can not much concern us at this side of the water. But vicious legislation in any part of the United Kingdom concerns the whole, and a bad precedent can readily be made to apply.

This bill has other objects than those which are avowed. One is to promote the private interests of certain medical officers and professors, at the public expense; another is to establish a convenient precedent. The taxation of a few places, in the name of science, under the pretext of the general good, would soon be discovered to be partial and unjust, and could only be regarded as a step to the long and much-coveted establishment of a State-endowed "Medical Priesthood." That is the "promotion" which is really desired. Therefore, it is to be hoped that persons who, on broad grounds, are opposed to such legislation, and ratepayers, who wish to maintain principles of economy, will successfully resist this innovation.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, June 6, 1857.



209

## REPEAL OF THE COMPULSORY VACCINATION ACT OF 1853.

*To the Editor of the Hastings and St. Leonards News.*

SIR,—You are doubtless aware that two Vaccination Bills have been announced this session in Parliament. One of them confirming, if not extending, the compulsory enactments of the Vaccination Act of 1853, emanates from the mis-named Board of Health, but is cunningly withheld to await the fate of the Board of Health Bill. If this piece of official thimble-rigging succeed, we shall be pestered with all kinds of impudent attempts at pilfering our pockets and our liberties; if it be defeated, we may hope for some little peace and quiet in the future.

The other Vaccination Bill is brought in by Mr. Duncombe, to repeal the Act of 1853. This bill is for the second reading on Wednesday, July 1. Petitions supporting it will be sent in. The men and women of Hastings and St. Leonards will, therefore, have another opportunity of declaring that their homes are their castles, and that they will not submit to be driven and branded like dumb cattle; and I venture to hope that they will again rally to the support of those personal and parental rights, and those principles of civil and religious liberty, for which they so nobly and successfully contended in 1856.

Owing to its defects, and to the determined attitude of the people, the atrocious Act of 1853 has been but partially, and therefore unjustly, applied. In some places it has been wholly inoperative. In other places, to the disgrace of the English name, and the detriment of the English character, conscientious, but timid parents, have allowed themselves to be terrified into a base compliance by threats of petty tyrants, covetous of paltry fees. The following extract from a letter from a provincial town affords an example:—

“W— C—, grocer, has been summoned twice by the Registrar, but influenced a medical gentleman to certify that the child, though perfectly healthy, was not fit for vaccination. His objections to the practice are most convincing. Mr. W— M—, of C—, had a child vaccinated, which died of erysipelas. He was a beautiful, healthy child. Mr. J— F— had a child vaccinated in 1848, which died in fourteen days. He obtained a doctor's certificate, stating that the child died from the effects of vaccination. He was summoned by the Registrar in January last. He told the magistrates that he had one child killed by vaccination, and he feared, that if forced to vaccinate another, it also would 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 to which some of the family of the child from whom the vaccine matter was taken were subject.”

We may pity those murdered innocents, but what shall we think of parents who, against the light of knowledge, submit to such wrongs, and have not the manliness to resist the ruffians who bereave them? Can such things be in free, enlightened, religious England, and philanthropists and Christians look on with indifference, if not with approbation? Are all our sympathies to be reserved for the outraged negro?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, June 16, 1857.



## FORM OF PETITION.

TO THE HON. THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED  
KINGDOM IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The humble petition of the undersigned inhabitants  
of .....

Sheweth

That your petitioners cordially approve of a Bill before your Hon. House to repeal the compulsory vaccination Act of 1853.

That the Act of 1853 is partial, and therefore unjust in its operation;

That in some places it has tended to provoke a defiance and contempt of law and authority.

That the employment of compulsion to decide a question upon which so much difference of opinion exists, as that of vaccination, is opposed to the spirit of free institutions;

That vaccination is regarded by many medical and scientific authors, at home and abroad, as a practice highly injurious to public health and prosperity;

That learned and conscientious divines have maintained that the inoculation of disease is opposed to the will of Him who made man in his own image—of Him in whom we live and move and have our being; and

That the forcible infliction of a disease—whether cowpox, or any other—upon the person of adult, or infant, were an outrage not to be endured by free men, or Christian parents.

Your petitioners therefore pray your Hon. House that the said repealing Bill may pass into a law.

And your petitioners will ever pray. [Over.]



N. B.—Persons copying the preceding form are requested to alter it according to their own views.

### Directions for Petitioning.

Petitions to the House of Commons should commence—"To the Hon. the Commons of the United Kingdom, in Parliament assembled, the humble petition of the undersigned, ..  
.....showeth." Petitions to the Lords should commence in similar form;—"To the Right Hon. the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the united Kingdom", &c., &c.  
A petition must be entirely in writing—no printed matter whatever will be received; should a petition extend to two or more sheets, they must be pasted together in the form of a book, by the upper edges, or in the form of a scroll; a petition must conclude with a specific prayer; it must not be written on two sides of a sheet; signatures on the back of a sheet are not counted; at least one signature must be at foot of the sheet on which the petition is written; each signature must be in the hand writing of the petitioner, unless when a petitioner makes his mark X, or in case of sickness, when another may sign for him stating the cause. The neglect of any one of these rules would cause the rejection of a petition. Petitions are post-free, if left open at the ends; marked outside "Petition to Parliament;" and addressed to a member by name, "House of Lords," or "House of Commons, Westminster, London, S. W.," as the case may be.

*in English only*

*without any erasure or interlineation*

*not state a grievance and*



212

## COMPULSORY VACCINATION ACT.

---

SIR ROBERT PEEL, "when some one proposed to make vaccination compulsory, as it is in some despotic countries, objected, remarking that such a proceeding would be so opposite to the mental habits of the British people, and the freedom of opinion in which they rightly gloried, that he would be no party to such compulsion."

[*Royal Jennerian Institution's Report, January, 1854.*]

Three years after the death of that great statesman, the Compulsory Vaccination Act of 1853 was smuggled through Parliament. The working of this Act is exemplified in the following extract from a letter dated "Barnsley, May 5, 1857," and signed "Æneas Daly":—

"Mr. Joseph Frith had a child vaccinated in 1848, which died in fourteen days [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] from the effects of vaccination. He was summoned by the Registrar in January last. He told the magistrates that he had one child killed by vaccination, and he feared, that if forced to vaccinate another, it also would 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 to which some of the family of the child from whom the vaccine matter was taken were subject."

This, unhappily, is not a solitary instance—similar cases of enforced infanticide have come to the writer's knowledge—but, crushed by the tyranny of parish doctors, unchristian ministers of Christ, and other petty despots, bereaved and indignant parents are forced to weep in secret, and dare not openly complain—dare not even to make known their grievous wrongs to their representatives in Parliament.

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage,  
St. Leonards-on-sea,  
June 24th, 1857.



## VACCINATION.

*To the Editor of the Brighton Examiner.*

SIR,—Many years ago, a leading barrister advised a junior, when he had a bad cause, to abuse the opposing counsel. It is evident that the ex-"Visiting Vaccinator," Mr William Henry Sandham, whatever be his qualifications as a physician, has attained, at least, the obsolete lawyer-like qualification of abusing an opponent. Indeed, so perfect is he in this respect, that any person of ordinary intelligence and candour, who has read in your columns the extract from the *Lancet*, my letter, and Mr Sandham's replication, cannot but admit that that gentleman has dis-entitled himself to a reply. Consequently, I should abstain from noticing his strange exhibition of passion and prejudice, but that I have a duty to perform, from which nothing can deter me—least of all, abuse, to which I am now well inured. That high-born, if not well-bred, senator, the Right Hon. W. F. Cowper, ex-President of the Board of Health, President of the Education Committee of the Privy Council, availing himself of his privilege to say what he pleases in a place where I may not reply, may do me the honour to call me a "lunatic;" Mr Sandham, obsequiously copying so illustrious an example, may pay his court to the dispenser of the loaves and fishes, by reiterating the compliment in more classic language, and pronounce me "demented;" and more fiery, if not more refined, Jennerites may blandly "wish that the author and his works were burned together"—all can but provoke a smile.

Mr Sandham undertakes to prove that his "frightful intensity" is a "*bonâ fide* fact," and seeks to establish his point by cuckoo repetitions of the phrase. He does not condescend to acquaint your readers with the average mortality from small-pox amongst the vaccinated and the unvaccinated respectively, and the total mortality from small-pox and from all causes, in Cork, in 1856; the relative proportions of the vaccinated and unvaccinated there in that year; and the average annual mortality in that city; although those items are necessary elements to a full investigation of his statement. Again, he omits dates. He likewise overlooks one other point of detail—he forgets to state the amount of fees he earned in his daily perambulations, or how far they stimulated his zeal before he could have "been so convinced of the beneficial and preservative influence of vaccination from his experience during the late epidemic." His emoluments may not have equalled those of Mr Simon, who has been rewarded with £1,500 for changing the opinions he held in 1853, and writing a blue book advocating compulsory vaccination; but they must have amounted to a pretty sum.

Mr Sandham is angry with me because, in my anxiety to do him all possible honour, I allowed myself to be misled into giving him credit for greater activity than he manifested. Why should he be offended at a mistake imputing to him that he performed 155 vaccinations daily instead of 69? and that, on the whole, his operations amounted to 3,249, instead of the actual number, 2,474? Those errors told in his favour. Why then should he recklessly accuse me of "distorting the extract from the *Lancet*?" He knows that I have not done so, and he allows his knowledge to escape in a parenthesis, in which he admits that those errors are due to the "*Lancet*," which "erroneously quoted three weeks" instead of six. Mr Sandham's corrections strengthen my case; if 3,249 vaccinations could exercise a very small influence on a population like that of Cork, it follows that 2,474 vaccinations could exercise a lesser influence; if it is not surprising that ~~vaccination~~ should disappear in three weeks after reaching its acme, it is not surprising that it should disappear in six. But Mr Sandham's corrections amount to very little; as far as respects one portion of Cork, "the flat," he now states that small-pox did disappear in three weeks, and it is not yet clear that it did not follow a similar course in the other portions of the city. It is evident, from Mr Sandham's own statement—if, indeed, you are not hoaxed by some person simulating him, with the intent to make him appear ridiculous—that the

*smallpox*



small-pox had reached its acme, before he chivalrously sallied forth against it, armed with lymph and lancet. Instead of preceding, in the hope of stopping the advance of the enemy, he followed in its track, and thus pursuing it, he found it in "every lane and alley of the city and suburbs"—that is, in all the dirtiest localities, where everybody either already had it, or had been exposed to its contagion.

But, although Mr Sandham is angry at the statement, that, while hawking about, pedlar-like, his nostrum, he supplied 3,429, instead of 2,474 dupes, he seems to have some idea that, after all, it would rather strengthen his case, if he could make it appear that a much larger number had been operated upon, and accordingly he states that, in addition to himself, "there were eight dispensing physicians, besides numbers of private practitioners, vaccinating in the city and suburbs." He affords no data for even a conjecture at the number of operations perpetrated by private practitioners; but we might hazard a guess at the number perpetrated by the "eight dispensing physicians," for he states that they "could only vaccinate at the rate of one a day." It is not clear if it took the whole eight to perform one operation daily, or if each, in Irish parlance, "killed a Hessian for himself," but credit may be freely given for the greater number. However, as Mr Sandham forbears to estimate it, I shall copy his prudent reserve, lest I should only provoke another explosion of his wrath.

Mr Sandham naturally considers the statistics quoted by me as "most unsatisfactory." Is that my fault? I did not make them. If he can contest the figures in my first table, which seem to give him peculiar uneasiness, let him send his corrections to the Registrar-General. If, in Mr Sandham's opinion, those figures "go to prove that small-pox must be a positive blessing," and, if he dislike the deduction, how can I help him? Let him blame what or whom he will, but let him excuse me if I decline to express either assent or dissent to his deduction, it not being my wont to jump to hasty conclusions. Nevertheless, I may be allowed to ask, Why, if one disease be a blessing, another disease might not also be a blessing?

Mr Sandham is free to sneer at Dr. Geo. Gregory's theory of "vicarious mortality;" as free as Mr Simon, in his recent defence of vaccination, forgetting Jenner's contempt of Dr. Watt, is to exult over that theory as "what Jenner would have most wished to hear;" it being, it would seem, in the estimation of vaccinators, to the credit of vaccination, that persons killed by measles, &c., cannot again die of small-pox!

Mr Sandham invites my opinion of re-vaccination. He might have surmised it. Individual examples of the evil results of re-vaccination could be adduced, but, as they might not be acceptable to Mr Sandham, I beg to refer him, for more extensive proof, to the second table of my former letter, where he may see that the annual mortality, in vaccinated and re-vaccinated Prussia, is 1 in 38; it being, in comparatively un-vaccinated England, 1 in 45. But does it not strike Mr Sandham that re-vaccination is a practical condemnation of the nostrum of Jenner? who obtained £30,000 from Parliament, on his representation that it "is attended with the singularly beneficial effect of rendering through life the persons so inoculated perfectly secure from the infection of small-pox."—*Jenner's Petition to Parliament.*

Mr Sandham betrays some sense when he says—"I ask Mr Gibbs is the annual mortality less amongst the non-vaccinated portion of such a population?" That, in other words and a restricted sense, is a question which I propounded, in 1855, to the Board of Health, in the letter which the House of Commons did me the honour to print last year, and it is the question which the author of the Blue Book, alluded to above, admits cannot "be answered exhaustively" by him. Having waited patiently for the solution of that question, I am content to wait, and must decline to undertake it myself. I remit it to them who are liberally paid to do it; who have access to public offices and official records; who can command an army of subalterns, and can draw almost *ad libitum* upon the public purse. But if Mr Sandham is not content to wait the convenience or convictions of officials, he may consult with



215

advantage the works of Messrs. Carnot, de Lisle, Bayard, Ancelon, Nittinger, de Terze, de Feulins, and others, wherein he may find proof of the evil influence of vaccination upon the public health of foreign nations, and, by parity, he may arrive at an approximate estimate of the evils of vaccination, as practised on a more limited scale at home. Meanwhile, I thankfully accept Mr Sandham's kindly implied permission to ride my hobby. But why will not he and his brother nostrum-venders allow me to ride in peace? Not to be out-done in courtesy, I would allow Mr Sandham liberty to ride his—protesting, however, that, in default of his blandishments, neither scolding nor threatening shall induce me to mount behind him. Honey is generally esteemed a good thing, but may become distasteful if rudely forced down the throat: thus given, even if given *gratis*, it would be dear at the price. Having succeeded by argument, in his house-to-house visitation, Mr Sandham would now have recourse to compulsion. To what end? Has he not already slain the ravager, and saved his "beautiful city?" Does he not reflect that, if coercion be substituted for argument, he never again can have a similar opportunity to display his eloquence and disinterested energy—never more reap such laurels—never more win a similar right to sound his own glorification? May these, where graver considerations might in vain be suggested, operate to moderate his rash desires.

Permit me, Sir, to seize this opportunity to thank you for your kindness, and believe me to be,

Your obedient Servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
July 16, 1857.

### Vaccination.

SIR,—May I again trespass so far on your kindness as to request the correction of a typographical error in my letter in the *Examiner* of this date? In paragraph 3, line 17, "vaccination" should be "small-pox."

I am, Sir,

Your obliged and obedient servant,

St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
July 21st, 1857.

JOHN GIBBS.

### "A Voice from the Mute."

SIR,—It is not often that your facetious cotemporary is caught napping. You may relieve the apprehensions of *Mr Punch* by informing him that the petition presented from Brighton by Admiral Sir G. B. Pechell, was in favour of, not against the Vaccination Bill—that is, the Bill of Messrs Duncombe, Coningham, and Barrow, to repeal the Compulsory Vaccination Act of 1853.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. G.

July 21st, 1857.

### THE VACCINATION BILL.

THIS Bill is put off till next Session, when, according to agreement, and former understanding that enquiry shall precede all further legislation, a select committee is to investigate the subject. Petitions against Compulsory Vaccination were presented this Session from HOR. JOHNSON, M.D., Brighton; from Brighton (3); Bexhill; JOHN GIBBS, St. Leonard's-on-Sea; Rye; Rev. C. GAUNT, Rector of Isfield; St. Leonard's-on-Sea; Hastings; and Battle.



---

THE COMPULSORY VACCINATION ACT.

---

SIR ROBERT PEEL objected to a proposal to imitate despotic governments by making vaccination compulsory in England, alleging that such a proceeding would be opposed to "the mental habits of the British people and the freedom of opinion in which they rightly gloried." Three years from his death, a Compulsory Vaccination Act was smuggled through Parliament. Through the defects of this Act, it is mostly inoperative, and if its provisions were always rightly resisted, it would be impossible to enforce them. But in some places, for want of a sufficient knowledge of its defects, on the part of parents, it has been used as an instrument of outrage and oppression. The following cases furnish some illustrations:—

At Droitwich, in December, 1856, Robert Hunt was summoned before the magistrates for refusing to have his child vaccinated. His defence was that vaccination is contrary to the laws of God. He was fined 2s. 6d., and costs 11s. 6d. The money was paid.

Francis Morris was summoned for a like offence, and stated that it was his wife who had an objection to the child being vaccinated. He was fined 6d. and 11s. 6d. costs.

All honour to Robert Hunt, Francis Morris and the wife of the latter, who preferred doing their duty towards God and their children, to an obedience to the unrighteous commands of man.

"Mr. Joseph Frith had a child vaccinated in 1848, which died in fourteen days. He obtained a doctor's certificate, stating that the child died from the effects of vaccination. He was summoned by the Registrar, in January last. He told the magistrates that he had one child killed by vaccination, and he feared, that if forced



217  
to vaccinate another, it also would be killed. He was forced to comply, and in less than three weeks, the child, although previously perfectly healthy, died of fits, similar to attacks to which some of the family of the child from whom the vaccine matter was taken

were subject." [Extract from a letter from Mr. Æneas Daly, of Barnsley, dated May 6, 1857.]

Similar cases of enforced infanticide are not uufrequent, but in many of them, in this free land of England, the voice of outraged nature is repressed by the fear of provoking the resentment of parish officials,—lay, medical, and clerical,—and bereaved parents are condemned to weep in silence over their losses and their wrongs.

It would be strange indeed if the English people did not strive by might and main to obtain the complete repeal of this iniquitous law.

We are therefore glad to make known that a Bill for its repeal, brought in by Mr. T. S. Duncombe, is to be read a second time on Wednesday, and that numerous petitions in support of Mr. Duncombe's Bill are being sent in. From this neighbourhood Bexhill has been the first to petition. Battle has followed with a petition most numerous and respectably signed, the list being headed by Sir A. Webster, of Battle Abbey, followed by Herbert Martin, Esq., and other leading inhabitants. Petitions are also in course of signature in St. Leonards and Hastings; and we hope these towns will continue to sustain the reputation they acquired last year, for attachment to personal and parental right and those principles of civil and religious freedom, upon which the greatness of England is founded.

44



## VACCINATION.

(To the Editor of the "Brighton Examiner.")

SIR,—It needs not the petition of the "Cork Medical Protective Society" to prove that the profession, to its discredit, numbers many Jennerites, who, puffed up with vanity, or avaricious of fees, are dissatisfied with the ordinary and legitimate means of pushing their traffic. Who are the "Cork Medical Protective Society," and what do they want to protect? Imagine the lawyers getting up a "Legal Protective Society!" or the clergy establishing a "Clerical Protective Society!" They are too discreet. The "Cork Medical Protective Society" are merely a multiple of the "Cork Vaccinator"—they are struggling for the loaves and fishes, for the possession of human beings from their birth, for a lucrative and long-cherished error, to renounce which would wound both their interests and their pride. Their position shows that they are no better acquainted with the laws of the land than with the laws of the human system. They assert that if the Compulsory Vaccination Act of 1853, be repealed, "a door will be at once opened to the spread, by inoculation, of smallpox. The Act of 1853, being confined to England and Wales, does not extend to Ireland. Smallpox-inoculation is not named in that Act, and therefore its retention or repeal can have no legal effect upon a practice, which is the subject of special legislation. But why should Jennerites adhere to facts? Why should they not in all things copy their master? He did not hesitate to make bold and unfounded assertions—he could counsel concealment—he could ally himself with compulsion—he could dip his hands deeply into the public purse; when the public showed no haste to adopt a nostrum, for which they had so dearly paid him, he could lose his temper, and perhaps not without reason, though with a want of gratitude and good taste, exclaim—"The town is a fool—an idiot;" and, on occasion, he could chuckle over the gullibility of that same public, and slyly suggest, as a device for a piece of plate about to be presented to him, "The cow jumping over the moon!" Was nursery tale ever more aptly applied?

"The Cork Vaccinator" has been peculiarly fortunate—he has never seen a death from small-pox after successful vaccination. He out-Marsons Mr Marson, who confesses to a mortality, from small-pox, of seven per cent. amongst the vaccinated. But, in 1850, the deaths from small-pox amongst the vaccinated, in the Hospital at Calcutta, were 24 per cent.

Mr Sandham and his brother Jennerites insist much upon their "modified small-pox." Are they ignorant that a mild form of small-pox was known before Jenner? What right have they to take credit to their nostrum for every case of mild small-pox presenting itself subsequent to vaccination, and to class it under the head of "modified small-pox."

Mr Sandham boasts that, since he vaccinated a mere fraction, about the 76th part of the population of Cork, and thereby banished small-pox, no other epidemic has prevailed in that city. Would he persuade us that vaccination prevents measles, scarlatina, hooping-cough, &c.?—or that results are no results in medicine unless they be immediate? He abstains again from giving the health-statistics of Cork, and substitutes bare assertions couched in convenient generalities.

Mr Sandham will permit me to decline accepting his summary of my objections to compulsory vaccination.



219

I object to vaccination because it does not afford that protection which Jenner promised; because the operation is frequently an immediate cause of death; because medical authors and others affirm that the attempt to transplant cow-pox often results in the transfer or development of other diseases; because vaccination, contrary to the boast of its first advocates, does not diminish the general mortality, and is, therefore, a delusion; because statistics show that vaccination acts injuriously upon population; because amongst the vaccinated the susceptibility to small-pox increases as life advances, whilst amongst the unvaccinated that susceptibility diminishes; because to taint the pure juices of infancy with corruption is a filthy and irrational practice; because to induce morbid action and lower the vital energies is contrary to every known principle of Hygiene; because the infliction of a disease (cow-pox being a disease), of which it is impossible to foresee the result, is a folly and a crime, and the attempt to improve the masterpiece of the Creator an unnatural and presumptuous sin.

I object to compulsion, because it is contrary to the spirit of free institutions to employ coercion to extinguish difference of opinion; because the invasion of the nursery to enforce any medical or surgical practice, much more to inflict disease, upon its inmates, is an unjustifiable violation of parental authority; because to cut the shoulders of human beings in opposition to their wishes and convictions, is to reduce them to slavery and to brand them like cattle; because a medical confessional and inquisition are not desirable, and because freedom of thought and action with self-reliance form the basis upon which the greatness of nations securely rests.

I am, Sir,

Your obliged and obedient servant,  
Tunbridge Wells, JOHN GIBBS.  
August 15th, 1857.

---



THE  
HOMŒOPATHIC RECORD.

MEDICAL, SOCIAL, AND SCIENTIFIC.

No. 11.—Vol. 2.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1857. NEW SERIES.—PRICE 2D.

TO OUR READERS.

THE Vaccination Bill is put off till next session, when, according to agreement and the former understanding that enquiry shall precede all farther legislation, a select committee is to investigate the subject. Meanwhile, pending enquiry, irrespective of other considerations, it would be a manifest violation of every principle of law and equity to continue to subject one of the parties in the cause (namely, the anti-vaccinators,) to legal pains and penalties.

So far the object of the recent petitions has been secured. But we cannot avoid adding that a greater impression might have been made upon the New House of Commons, if the friends of medical freedom and parental rights had been as active this year as last.

We strongly urge that *two* sets of petitions be poured in early next session: one set praying for the repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Act of 1853; the other praying that the promised enquiry be full and free, and that, in especial, the foreign *savans*, Messrs. Carnot, Bayard, Verde de Lisle, Ancelon, Nittinger, Hamernick, Villette de Ferze, de Feufins, &c., who have deeply studied the subject, be examined.

J. G.



## THE SESSION.

THE Session just past has been abortive of medical legislation. The vaccination question is postponed until next Session, when a committee of enquiry is to be appointed. The three (so called) Medical Reform Bills were withdrawn. The Poisons' Bill has been modified to meet objections, and is deferred until next Session. Lobelia and patent medicines are exempt from its operation, as concessions to the medical botanists and others. This Bill needs further revision, and the extension of exemption to Homœopathic preparations. The Medical and Surgical Sciences' Bill (Ireland), which aimed at saddling some localities with the expense of hospitals, and lecture and dissection rooms,—doubtless with the intent "to amend and extend" the provisions of the measure at a convenient opportunity,—has been defeated. And the Board of Health was cut down to a simple Continuance Bill. Thus the Board of Health has been once more signally defeated at various attempts at jobbery. The contest will be renewed next Session, when it is to be hoped that the cause of medical freedom and common sense will finally triumph.

Much thanks are due to Messrs. Coningham and Grogan, and pre-eminently to Mr. T. S. Duncombe, for their able, disinterested, and effective services. We would add the expression of regret that Dr. Michell, the late worthy, enlightened, and uncompromising Member for Bodmin, was not in the House to aid, as before, in the contest, and to share in the triumph.

1857. J.G.

## OBITUARY.

WE deeply regret to announce the decease of Captain CLARIDGE, author of "Hydrophathy," and other useful works, and the introducer of the Water-cure into England. A man of rare philanthropy, high talent, and energy: he did much good in his generation, and his memory deserves to be cherished (not only) by his own countrymen. A brief memoir of him appeared in the "Journal of Health" some time ago. To what is there stated may be added that he was patentee of Claridge's asphalt, and the originator of the wood pavement in London. He resided for some years at Nice, and died at Castellamare, much lamented by all who knew him.

1857.

## COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

At Bury St. Edmunds, a Mr. George Ridley has been fined 5s. for refusing to have his child vaccinated. He stated that he had a conscientious objection to vaccination, as tending to introduce disease into the system of healthy children.

About thirty petitions against the vaccination laws of Wurtemberg have been presented to the Parliament of that State.

The Belgian Academy of Medicine report that "vaccination and re-vaccination cannot be rendered compulsory in Belgium."

July. 1858.



## MEDICAL LEGISLATION.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

"We may endeavour to persuade our fellow-citizens, but it is not lawful to force them even to that which is best for them."—*Plato.*

SIR,—As usual the season brings the annual crop of Medical Bills. First, we have three or four rival

### MEDICAL PROFESSION BILLS.

If the members of that profession desire to be specially taxed and ticketed, that is their own affair. But the Bills contain provisions affecting the public, as well as the profession. They are less objectionable than former Bills, in so far that they in part abandon the unsound principle that the legislature should interfere between man and man, to restrain the freedom of employers and employed in their mutual transactions. Nevertheless, all the Bills, excepting that of Mr. Duncombe, contain a clause prohibiting an unregistered practitioner from recovering "any charge in any court of law, for any medical or surgical advice, attendance, or for the performance of any operation, or for any medicine prescribed, administered, or supplied by him." It may be questioned how far this clause could be interpreted to the disadvantage of corn-cutters, tooth-drawers, and barbers; but it is plainly conceived in an immoral spirit, and holds out a direct incentive to dishonesty. It is dangerous to encourage men to repudiate their liabilities. No doubt a timely remonstrance and appeal to sounder principles would ensure the rejection of the clause, and obtain another concession to public opinion.

The medical profession have one grievance of which they justly complain. It is unfair that the graduates and licentiates of any of the medical corporations should not be legally qualified to practice in all parts of Her Majesty's dominions. This demands a remedy, which the medical corporations might themselves apply. They have but to throw down the partition walls which they have themselves erected. If they will not render this justice to their constituents, there is a clear case for the interference of Parliament; which, however, need not extend beyond a short and simple repealing bill, without inflicting injustice upon other parties, and without creating a cumbrous and costly machinery, requiring a host of paid officials to work it—but then, many a promising job would be spoiled, and a host of hungry expectants be disappointed. Surely, with "a clear stage and no favour," the medical profession should be able to maintain their position against all outside rivalry.

The next Bill claiming notice is

### THE PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

The wild doctrines, wasteful expenditure, ruinous litigation, arbitrary acts, and deadly pestilences, attributable to the Board of Health, have awakened a wide-spread and determined opposition. The Board has but one argument in its favour—it distributes some £18,000 or £20,000 annually amongst the relatives and *protégés* of men in power. Nevertheless, it is found impossible any longer to maintain it. Its extinction is decreed. Now comes a job. If possible, the moribund Board is to be galvanised into a new existence. It is proposed to transfer its powers and patronage to the Privy Council. It is a novel idea to get rid of an evil by giving it a renewed existence with a greater chance of perpetuity.

In one clause of this Bill the spirit of jobbery is especially apparent. There is a provision to retain the services of a medical officer, whose chief, if not only, recommendation is that he suddenly changed his opinions, and wielded a venal pen—at a salary of £1,500 per annum—in defence of the Board of Health—in advocacy of Jenner's imposture and of a barbarous and despotic law.

There are also before Parliament a Poison's Bill, and a Vaccination Bill for Ireland, which, not having seen, I forbear further to notice.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea, June 8, 1858.



## WATER :

OR SOME BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES OF ITS PAST AND PRESENT USES  
AS A MEDICAL AGENT.

BY JOHN GIBBS, ESQ., AUTHOR OF 'LETTERS FROM GRÆFENBERG.'

THE Priessnitzian system has been assailed with the objection that 'whatever is good in it is not new, and whatever is new is not good.' It is also sometimes characterised as an 'oft tried, and oft exploded, theory': we shall endeavour to ascertain how far these grave charges can be substantiated.

If we fail, it shall not be for want of materials. Many works, of which we have about twenty now before us, were exclusively devoted to the consideration of the medical uses of water, and countless articles written thereupon, before Priessnitz and his system were even thought of. In advocacy, more or less, of that system, we have, also, now on our shelves, over fifty books, and over sixty pamphlets, English and American, not to mention many works in various foreign languages, but—the only want we feel—we have not, among them all, one solitary work from a hostile pen; nor do we know of the existence of one such.

Here are ample—for us, we fear, too ample—materials, from which, in more competent hands, a most interesting and instructive series of articles might be extracted. We almost shrink from the task we have set ourselves, and would gladly resign it to any one else—if there be any one willing to undertake it.

Our endeavours shall be to do justice to the old practices and the new system; to acknowledge the evidences of the great observation and sagacity of the older writers, in often anticipating, as if by instinct, the conclusions of modern science, while we draw attention to their grievous errors—errors, not so much theirs as of the schools in which they were instructed, but which so often, from the consequences that followed, brought into disrepute, in the eyes of men less enlightened than themselves, even the good which they taught. We shall also endeavour to contrast the sum

of their teachings with what has been accomplished by the new hydropathic school and its founder.

We have said that we know not of the existence of a single work—there have been some scattered articles—from a pen hostile to the Priessnitzian system. Strange to say, the first work we have to notice among those of the past, is from an opponent of the then advocates of the medical uses of water: it is entitled:

'Of Drinking Water, against our Novelists, that Prescribed it in England: by Richard Short, of Bury, Doctor of Physick. Whereunto is added of Warm Drink, and is an Answer to a Treatise of Warm Drink, printed at Cambridge.—Many that seem excellent Physitians are deceived. Galen, 2. de temp. c. 7.—London: Printed for John Crook, at the signe of the Ship, in St. Paul's Church yard, 1656.'

This work is a 16mo., of 173 pages. The author commences with a 'Preface to the Reader,' in which he makes use of the usual stock arguments against novelty. We offer some extracts; he begins:

'Gentle reader, I will not trouble you with a long discourse about the pedigree of physick, fetcht from Æsculapius and Apollo, as the Grecians did, or from Mercury, Isis, Osyris, as the Ægyptians. But I will tell you in brief, that the method of curing was written in the columnes of Æsculapius his temple; and that in Ægypt the wise sayings, and rules of physitians were written in the same, or such columnes. But afterward physick lay in darkness five hundred years, until Hippocrates restored it unto its former lustre, who in writing was the first founder of it. With whose writings no philosopher ever found fault, as Galen affirms. And his writings stand as firme at this day, as if it were written in columnes of brass. Few innovations were ever taken notice of. Galen in his comments makes Hippocrates our great master, and applauds him (as I may say) to the stars. But now we find many to forsake their own and old master.



We see too many new opinions in this later age are crept into the world; but by what right or warrant I will not determine at present. Tis more than enough that we see so many kickshaws in all sciences, as new forged conclusions in philosophy, and new paradoxes in physick, piping out of the novellists braines,

"As new hatcht chickens from Grand Caire,  
Or some strange new castles in the aire."

'The whole world runs a madding in novelties, and our Englishmen will not be left behind; such is the changeable condition of our nation, we cannot be constant, or continue long in our opinions. And although we be divided from the whole world, *toto divisi ab orbe Britanni*, yet we agree and joyn with it in novelties. *Gregorie Oxoniensis*, the late librarie keeper in Oxford, saith the astrologers, put our nation under the domination of Mercury, and quotes Roger Bacon for it. From hence tis much perplext by reason of the uncertain motion, in intricate and deep matters. Eswide quotes an old astrologer, that affirms [*Angli sunt vagi et instabiles, nunc ad summum, nunc ad imum delati*] Englishmen are inconstant and uncertaine, now they are elevated to the height, now again are carried to the bottom.'

Let not the reader imagine that our author is indulging in a fine vein of irony—he is indubitably writing in all sober seriousness. What marvel then that he should be so impatient of 'new forged conclusions' and 'novellists?' Alas! if he would only revisit the world at the present day, how much he would find to grieve him! He continues:

'Thus our physitians, that had wont to be carried to the top of Parnassus, with admirable Galenical methode, now they are carried to the bottom of emperical new experiments.' [Ever the same complaint! He proceeds.] 'Nothing passeth for current now, but new devises. And if they cannot frame themselves to introduce a new opinion, they will create a new paradox of an old one, and furbush it over with a new aereall smooth language: thus [*error fecundus est*, etc.] error is fruitful. Every age of old errors begets and produceth new, which doth not only the authors mischief, but others. A traditional error'—[here he catches a glimpse of truth, but soon loses it again in his warmth]—'winds us every way, and casts us headlong down; we perish by others examples; no man erres alone, but is the cause and author of others errors.'

How amusing is the complacency of our author!—how like some who write, I may not say think, at the present day. He never suspects himself of tripping! How many Drs. Short there are! He goes on:

'This our age thinks nothing supereminent, unless it hath fancy the father, noveltie the mother, and folly the nurse. To finde out some new devise, or to bring into the world a new mode, is more than to win Troy, or to discover some unknown part of America. Here I would not have any mistake me. I commend any ingenious man, that can find out new medicaments, or conclusions in any part of physick. But I would not have them put out their forefathers light, or eyes, that they may see the better, or that they may be esteemed *cœlo delapsi*, and their fore-fathers *γρηγορείς*.'

Now he grows warm:

'My intention is against such as bring innovations against Hippocrates and Galen, which is not only a great temerity and indiscretion; but layes a blasphemous imputation upon all antiquitie: it is impudency for boyes to bring in innovations against men, or children against parents. And physitians were called [*ιατρῶν παῖδες*] boyes, not because they came from the same lineage, as some ignorantly interpret, but because they were posteriores, so the Egyptians called the Grecians boyes as Plato relates in his *Timæo*. Posteriour ages were but children and boyes, in respect of their predecessors, such was their reverence to antiquitie. But let this later age flatter themselves, and admire their new-born fancies, hammerd at the anvil of their own working braines, yet tis not possible to obscure, or obliterate the old dogmatical foundations (which so many ages past have crowned with eternity) from the glory of their heredity.'

Is not this exquisite fooling? I hope the reader is not tired of this farago of sense and nonsense, wisdom and absurdity. We must confess that we are much tickled therewith.

'Shall we dream to see more than our forefathers did? have we any new oriental light breaking through the chaos, or darkness of their ignorance? No, no! these are but pleasing dreams of their own idle Romansies. And if later ages have found anything new, that Hippocrates and Galen were ignorant of, they knew more that we are ignorant of: what novellist can tell me what was *κρυπτόν Hippocratis* or *melca Galeni*? 'Tis not necessary, not to the purpose, that we should



know all things past and to come. [Cardo rei,] the maine point is that Galen left us an absolute and perfect methode in all parts of physick, and hath left nothing for posteriour ages to write'—[Hear this, ye countless medical scribes, whose name is legion!] 'unless they will illustrate the sun, or discourse of trifles, or do that worse, which was admirably performed before. Now we find out such toys which former ages have, and posteriors shall esteem vaine bubbles, and vapours, sprung from ambition and ignorance, as having a more sublime estimation of our own fancies, than of antique and solid literature. Thus, our novellists make themselves the great donnes of physick, at whose tribunal we must expect the sentence of life or death, as from the laws of Medes and Persians that cannot be revoked. These are the ridiculous trepidations of this age. And I for my part, cannot obtaine of my rational part, to subscribe these new fancies, no, not so much as incline to mine own opinion, but shal ever refer myself to the judgment of antiquity, and there rest as content as *Tityrus sub tegmine fagi*. I mean in Hippocrates and Galen, whom the ignorant contemn, because (I think) they have majesty in them, or because they understand them not, few will be troubled with their heathen Greek language, obscure phrases, intricate sentences, and scrupulous method as they suppose, yet all physitians will pretend to draw from these fountaines. All rivers come from the ocean, and to the ocean return again. All physick is from Galen and Hippocrates, and to them we owe tribute as to the founders. . . . I confess reason teacheth me to make use of antiquity, as from whence is all canonical literature, and so much the more, because tis adverse to novelty. I know all literature is immured in the ancients. The later Græcians, Arabians, Latines, are but so many rivelets from these oceans. . . . He that can go cheeke by jowle with these gyants in parallele, is a brave fellow, and he may as well span the circumference of the heavens as go beyond them, or see more than they. Twenty years is nothing to read and understand them, and hardly sufficient to learn the language, without which they cannot obtaine this difficult faculty.'

'Twenty years'!—here at length we light upon the secret of our author's hostility to 'novellists', and of his reverence for the ancients—*twenty years* 'hardly sufficient to learn the language'! no wonder our author recoils with horror from the idea of learning any new thing!

Our author combats several 'objections' urged by the novelists. To one, he replies:

'And that which the novellists object is frivolous and absurd, that a dwarfe standing upon a gyants shoulder sees more than the gyant, but stay a little, tis easier for a dwarfe to get upon a gyants shoulder, than for a pygmie, or an ignorant novellist, to understand Hippocrates and Galen, then how can they stand upon their shoulders?'

The force of his reply must be admitted. Again, he says:

'There is another objection as idle as the former, they say Hippocrates and Galen are no competent judges. It may be they expect new lights to come from Sir Thomas Moores Utopia, or from the man in the moon, or what? Have we new Ranters and Quakers in physick too? for these are the newest lights I know of, new natural reasons are as old as the world. Philosophie and physick is as old as nature herself, but first written by Hippocrates; nothing is new under the sun, saith the wise man. There are no general notions, canons, axioms new coyned.'

He proceeds:

'Others object that there be new diseases unknown to Hippocrates and Galen, as the scurvy, etc. But I utterly deny it, and so doth Julius Pacius, and Langius, and others of the learned. Again, they object an ague, (*ex sparmate*) which is not in Galen. Secondly, that there be many symptomes which are not found in him. These are ridiculous imaginations of novelty.'

Having replied to these objections, our author caps the climax as follows:

'Nay I will be a little bolder, peradventure the opinion of the circulation of the blood so highly cried up, is not new, though it be made more manifest by Doctor Harvie. For Plato in his *Timæo* seems to make mention of the circular motion of the blood. . . . And thus much for novelties.'

'Thus much,' indeed! What 'novelist' could now hope for exemption from the Doctor's lash? He next explains 'his intention in this book:' 'I write,' he says, 'against the Novellists,' and he adds:

'The subject of this book is water, which is the best of things according to Pindar, and Plato quotes Pindar for it.

"Hence cometh (when the Deity please)  
Fountaines, rivers, and scourging sease."



'But in this large extent, I do not treat, my business is physical, that is of drinking cold water, which I think is hurtful in our country of England. And although many have indangered themselves, many have lost their lives by drinking of water, yet because they find no present hurt, they will venter whatever come on't, though it be for nothing else, but to follow the new mode of drinking it.'

A little further down, he concurs with Dr. Venner in asserting it to 'be the most ancient drink.'

'But,' he continues, 'I shall prove it hurtful by diverse reasons, and authorities fetcht from Hippocrates and Galen, and the best physitions. And if our Novellists give not other materials of physick more judiciously, they must kill more, and play with as ill luck as Themison did, and kill a multitude. [Quot Themison ægros Autumno occiderit uno.]'

The author's fondness for quoting Greek and Latin writers cannot have escaped the reader's notice, although, for the most part, we have omitted the quotations. He thinks it necessary to justify himself, by observing:

'Some will object, that I interlace my book with Greek texts more for ostentation than for any necessity: I answer; I regard not what folly may invent. The quotations are very necessary, for translations do not only vary from the Greek copies, but many times are false. Therefore tis necessary to produce the original, word for word, especially against novellists, and such this curious age expect, which shew not only the verity, but more efficacy, more antiquity, more majesty, and shews the dignity of the author. A testimony is not only measured by its own validity, but by the author's worth. Thus the famous orator Cicero did mix Greek with Latin. For mine own profit, I alwayes joyned together the Greek with the Latine, not only in philosophy; but also in the exercise of speaking. Thus I imitate the great criticks, Scaliger, Casaubon, Schottus, Mercurialis, Julius Alexandrinus, Langius, and the learned Duretus.'

Is not this very amusing? For the reasons which immediately follow, we shall omit, for the future, his quotations.

'Lastly, although I cite the Greek, original language, yet, if any man read but the

English alone by itself, he shall find the sense of the Greek, and so of the Latine in most places.'

He concludes a lengthy preface with an appeal to the reader, which we hope has not lost its force—

'Therefore (curteous reader) humane errors judge charitably.'

He dedicates his work—

'To the right worthy, and his much honoured friends, Maurice Barrow and James Colthorpe, Esquires,' and subscribes himself, 'your humble servant, R. Shorte.'

He then quotes — 'Dr. Venner's opinion of drinking water,' as follows:

'Reader, since I wrote the following treatise, I found my opinion seconded, and confirmed by Thomas Venner, doctor of physick, in his book intitl'd '*Via recta ad vitam longam*,' which I will here transcribe, to give you, my reader, more satisfaction than myself.

'His question is, whether it be not wholesome for northern people, that inhabite cold countries, to drink water at their meals, instead of beer.

'His answer is: that although water be the most ancient drink, and to those that inhabit hot countries, profitable and familiar, by reason of the parching heat of the ambient aire, which doth exceedingly heat and inflame, and dry the body. Yet to such as inhabit cold countries, and especially not accustomed thereunto, nor the constitution intensively hot, requiring, and forcing the same, it is by the contrary in no wise agreeable, for it very greatly dejects the appetite, destroys the natural heat, and overthrowes the strength of the stomach, and consequently confounding the concoction, is the cause of crudities, fluctuations, and windiness in the body.'

Upon this our author remarks that it 'is not without Hippocratical authority,' and that it is 'almost the words of Galen,' and he concludes with a sentence in which we emphatically concur; 'and thus much for Dr. Venners his opinion.' The reader will not expect us to controvert the Doctor's conclusions.

Our author next gives us an alphabetical list of eighty-nine 'authors cited in this work.'



AT length we reach the first chapter of the book. Be not impatient, good reader, at the copiousness of our extracts; if you do not instantly perceive their value, we hope that you will do so by-and-by. At any rate, we candidly warn you that we intend to be as liberal as hitherto in our quotations. Our reasons are that this is the oldest work on the subject of Water which has fallen into our hands; that, being written by the determined enemy of the 'Novelists,' it exhibits, in the most favorable light, the actual state of learning amongst the orthodox medical men of two hundred years ago, and suggests the observation of how crude the professional knowledge of that time was, as compared with the information possessed even by many laymen of the present day; and that the admissions of the great therapeutic value of water are numerous, and, as coming from an adversary, have an especial value.

With the exception of omitting the frequent capitals, which abound as in other old works, we have endeavored to preserve the spelling of the original, and shall continue to do so.

After the vehemence of our author's denunciation of 'Novellists,' and his cordial concurrence with 'Dr. Venners his opinion,' one is rather startled by the perusal of the first chapter.

#### 'OF DRINKING WATER.

##### 'CHAP. I.

##### '*The Four Considerations of Water.*

'There be four principall considerations of water. First, as an element, secondly, as an aliment or nourishment, thirdly, as a vehicle of nourishment, fourthly, as a medicine or medicament.

'First, as an element, water is the mother, as heat is the father of all generation. Hence, the ancient poet Homer—

'From water, as from an ocean springs,  
The great generation of all things.'

'Water also is called all-sperme, or all-spawn, as if sublunary things, had their original from water. And when the Divine Spirit saith that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters; this spirit is fire (as Valesius expounds) or, as others, heat, which is celestially: Aristotle calls it more divine, attributing a divine efficacy to this heat which moves upon the water, and

nessles as a hen upon eggs, to produce all living creatures; but this consideration appertains rather to the philosopher than to the physitian; therefore I passe to the second consideration.

'Secondly, water is considered as an aliment, or nourishment: and although, according to Scaliger, and Valesius, water doth not nourish, yet the better part of the learned hold the contrary. And that water nourisheth, is evident by these following arguments:—

'First, water turns to choler, according to Hippocrates, water is choleric to choleric natures; why may it not turne to other humors, as well as to choler? and consequently nourish?

'Secondly, Ayre nourisheth the spirits, as Galen intimateth, and why may not water as well nourish the more humid parts, as the ayre aëriall parts?

'Thirdly, water nourisheth fish, and why not men?

'Fourthly, Costæus reports of a maid in Germany that lived some years by only water, by the command of Ferdinand the Emperour.

'Fifthly, the expresse testimony of Plato, who was numbred among physitians that were elegant, and were opposed to vulgar physitians. Plato's words are these . . . that is, dry nourishment nourisheth the dry parts of the body, so doth moyst and waterish nourishment, the moyst.

'Sixthly, the authority of great Hippocrates, the prince of all physitians, that fire moves all things, water nourisheth all things.

'Seventhly, water maketh some men fat. I knew (saith Hieronymus Mercurialis) two great princes made fat with drinking of water.

'Thirdly, water is considered as a vehicle of nourishment, or as I may say, a waggon to carry nourishment into all parts of the body; and Hippocrates calls it a vehicle or waggon of nourishment. Valesius upon these words of Hippocrates [observes] drink as only drink, as water alone doth not nourish, but serveth to temper the inward parts, helps concoction (for concoction is a boyling or elixation) and distribution. But as I proved before, water doth not only carry down nourishment, as a floud carrieth sticks, stones, rubbish, &c., but nourisheth.

'The fourth and last consideration is, that water is not only an aliment, or nourishment, but also a medicine, or medicament, and not only a bare medicine, but in some cases, the greatest medicine or remedy that



can be, and so 'tis called of Galen. Certainly, in agues nothing better, for the nature of agues are hot and dry, and therefore require cooling, and moistening. This is Galen's discourse. In burning fevers, nothing is better, or a more present remedy than cold water, as Tangius and Alexander Massaria confirm. In thirst nothing is comparable to cold water. Thirst is hot and dry, as all the learned confesse; but nature is actually and potentially cold and moist; *ergo*, water is the best remedy; for 'tis a rule eternally true in physick, contraries are cured by contraries. Besides, water is not only profitable in sickness, but in health. Galen [saith] that hot natures that are in health, find great profit by drinking of water, so that it be moderately taken. Moderate drinking of water is profitable. Last of all, water is convenient in all ages. In very children that are hot and moist, Galen doth not forbid water. Besides many experiences may be produced of the novelists to prove water to be very healthfull. Therefore we see that water is not only healthful in sickness, but convenient in health, and in all ages; wherefore the novelists of this age seem with much reason to exhibit water very familiarly in our country.

Could the most enthusiastic water-lover desire a more glowing eulogium on his favorite beverage than the foregoing? However we may smile at, surely it would scarcely be grateful to criticise too closely, the now antiquated arguments of our author. Without doing so, we may be content so far to accept his conclusions as to believe with him that water is 'an aliment or nutriment, and that it is 'in some cases the greatest medicine, or remedy that can be.' But we cannot so lightly pass over his theory, that 'contraries are cured by contraries,' because this is still a current error, and one that, if accepted, especially in the treatment by water, must lead, as it evidently did in our author's hands, to gross errors in practice. It is clear that our author was ignorant that a patient burning in fever is cooled more effectually, like red-hot iron, in *warm*, than in cold water, and that the proper treatment in rigor is friction in a *cold* wrung-out sheet; and it would seem that he was not aware (or, if aware, failed to draw the right deduction) that, while heat is fatal to a frost-

bitten limb, or to a frozen animal, animation is restored by the application of snow with friction, and that hot water is the fitting remedy to employ to allay the pain and to cure the blisters caused by sun-burn—facts which assuredly rather favor the opposite doctrine that 'like cures like.'

It can scarcely have escaped the reader's notice that, among the testimonies adduced by our author in favor of water, he is forced, however ungraciously, to include the 'many experiences' of the 'novelists.'

After the eulogium pronounced by him, in the foregoing chapter, on water, one is scarcely prepared for the condemnation subsequently fulminated against it.

#### 'CHAP. II.

'Good nourishment and good medicines may be employed sinisterly.'

This truism, which one would suppose would need no proof, is supported by a series of trite arguments.

'But all these authorities, reasons, and experiences will not serve their turnes; there is no venemous medicine, but may be so prepared that it may be healthfull in the highest degree, and there is nothing so good a nourishment, or medicament, but may be employed to a mischief, if not exhibited with method, which is guided by indications. Medicines well used are the hands of the Gods, but ill used, or misapplied, are like swords in madmen's hands, as Erasistratus speaks in Galen: Galen also quotes the same Erasistratus in these words following . . . ., that is, the strongest faculties of meats and drinks taken importunately, bring great hurt, but taken opportunely bring great profit. All this is confirmed by Hippocrates in his book of aliments. Milk (saith he) is a nourishment to some, to others not. Wine is a nourishment to some, to others not. What is convenient to one man's nature, is not convenient for another; what is profitable for one country, is not profitable for another. What is idoneus for one age, is not idoneus and fit for another. What is customarie to one country is not customary to another.'

Our author often seems to forget some of the foregoing axioms in his passion for quoting the opinions of the medical sages of a distant clime and a



long past age as applicable to our land and to modern times.

He continues:—

‘Wherefore tis an happy use makes them good, a sinister makes them bad, although they be good of themselves, Galen saith, ’tis very hard to find a remedy very profitable, and to have no hurt at all. And although water be excellently good itself as Pindar asserts, yet it may be sinisterly and ill-used. How shall we then know, or distinguish, whether water be convenient drink in England?’

‘In which ambiguous and dubious proposall, it shall be in vaine to distinguish curiously of the severall sorts, or species of water: for our discourse is of that which is simple, and without any strange, or aliene qualitie, (such as the ancients mingled with wine, such as they commonly call sweet water. And this is the water we doubt of, for which we need Ariadne’s clue of thred to get out of our labyrinth, or some cynosure to guide us, lest we dash against a rock: and for my part, I know no other way to give us more light, or guid us better, than the consideration of the indications which are not only the basis, and foundation, but the touchstone of all logical investigation. What’s idoneus, or convenient, what not, either in generall to all, or specifically to some, or individually to this or that man’s nature. This is the true Galenicall way, this is the rule of Policletus. Therefore ’tis requisite we should have a touch of indication to know what it is, and whether water be good to drink in England.

‘CHAP. III.

‘Of Indication.

‘Indication saith Galen, is emphasis. And what this emphasis is, Alexander Aphrodisæus in his comment upon Aristotle *de sensu and sensibili*, tells us. Emphasis is the visible species in the pupil of the eye. Plutarch calls the rainbow the emphasis of the sunne, but these manifest appearances are rather external, then internal, but Galen, his emphasis is altogether internall, for as we see in a mirror formes, shapes or species, so in the intellect we see clearly results, and deductions out of present conclusions saith Aphrodisæus.’

From this it would appear that our author holds ‘indication’ to be the result of experience, but experience can result only from experiment; therefore, it is not very clear how our author, and many others like him, arrive at the

conclusions which almost immediately follow the foregoing:

‘He that finds a medicine by indication, finds it by art, but he that finds it by experiment only, finds it by casuality and chance, and is an emperick, and no dogmatical physitian. Therefore, Galen professes himself not to handle of an emperical finding out, but of a logical investigation, foreseeing there may be error in an experimental way, saith Hippocrates. Therefore, the genuine and sublime way is by a logical manifestation, or clear illustration, which is nothing else but Galen’s indication. Therefore, according to Galen, we will consider these indications.’

‘CHAP. IV.

‘The Nature of our Bodies.

‘First, the nature of our bodies is to be considered, which is either sound and haile, or sick, or of a neuter condition, or disposition. Our constitutions that are haile are not so firm and strong as our forefathers. And in generall: men as they are now, as Homer often repeats, are not so strong as in time past. Great Ajax threw a stone at Hector, which was so great, that men of this age could hardly move. Which Agatius the Greek epigrammatist expresseth thus, elegantly the stone speaketh,

“That now, men with all their great endeavours,  
Can scarcely move me from the ground with leavers.”

Besides, we dare not purge with white hellebore, *elaterium* and *peplum*, as the ancients did, we dare not bleed their quantity, which is 72 ounces, as Heurnius affirms. We cannot draw our old English archers bows. For who can shoot (as the proverb saith) in Robin Hood’s bow? Few can handle our old English swords, which are to be seen at this day. Besides, that luxury and distempers have weakened our bodies. Galen saith, that luxury and pleasures are so increased to that height in these our dayes, that scarce any thing can be added to them; for mens bodies of old were stronger, but now they be corrupt with excesse and riotousness, and are grown more dainty, as Andernacus saith.’

Be it well or ill-founded, we shall not now pause to inquire, but shall merely observe that this is the constant complaint of the physical degeneracy of mankind, and the usual side-apology for the deficiencies of the medical art.

Our author proceeds—

‘Therefore, Ludovicus Mercalus, physitian



to Philip the Second and Third, kings of Spaine, (I say) his opinion is discreet, and worth consideration, that the frailty of man's nature is such, or come to that passe, that few there be living that may drink water without hurt, by reason of the weaknesse and languishing condition they got from their first principles, or an ill course of drinking, for he that drinks water must have such strength as man had in the infancy of the world. Otherwise cold water works a secret cold to weak bodies.'

We shall not here attempt to refute our author's conclusions, for that would be to anticipate the arguments of some of the writers whose works are yet to pass in review before us, and we prefer trusting to them to do it for us. Our author's next reason is rather whimsical, but worthy of note, as throwing some light on the dietetic habits of the British in his day.

'And we cannot determine in our countrey, (because we are not accustomed) whether our inward parts may bear the familiarity of water, for the indication of parts, (that I may adde this to the former indication) requires most accustomed things. . . Hence, I conclude that our bodies, especially in England, where luxurie and distempers are not lesse, but rather more than in Galen's time, are much effeminated and weakened, and consequently cannot beare water. And if our bodies could endure, and were able enough to drink it, yet our countrey would not admit it, as is proved in the next chapter.'

#### CHAP. V.

*'Water is not good in cold countries.'*

'By the way I must give my reader notice, that I handle of water as dieteticall, or, as it belongs to diet, and afterwards shal speak of it pharmaceutically, that is, belonging to physick; therefore to goe forward. There is another indication taken from the countrey wherein we live. Hippocrates, in his aphorisms (says) we must consider and regard our countrey: for severall countries require severall diets. A hot region claimes a coole diet. Therefore tis better to drink water in Africa and Lybia, than in Northern countries. Wherefore Avicenna, the prince of the Arabian physitions, affirms that a cold region may tolerate wine, a hot region will not allow of it. But tis Galen's letter that kills; an intemperate time of the year, the inclemency of the ayre, and countrey doe demonstrate the contrary diet. Valesius and Paparella confirme this saying, that the diet of the septentrionall and cold countries must

be like the diet of winter. There be two solid reasons given: the first is because cold and phlegmatique humors are most frequently generated in cold and septentrionall countries: but water increaseth such phlegmatique humors, as Galen saith, sleep and drinking of water, beget phlegme. Therefore we must not drink cold water in cold countries, for, as I said before, the reason or indication demonstrate quite contrary, which rely upon this great and the maynest foundation of our faculty which is the most generall scope of all distempered constitutions.'

According to this argument, 'sleep' must be as injurious to health as 'drinking of water' in 'cold and septentrionall countries.'

'The second reason is, because waters are not well concocted in cold countries; for waters rising towards the north, and averse to the sunne, are of ill consequence.'

But what if they run towards the south?

'So Cardan saith; waters are best in hot, dry, and orientall countries: but worst in contrary countries, and harder to be concocted. Let us therefore conclude with the ever-admirable Galen, where the ayre is cold, there water is not to be given. And there is the same reason of the constitution or state of the heavens, the time of the year, and region, for all these are comprehended under the notion of ayre. . . . And if any object that water in summer time (although I have seen gentlemen drink cold water in winter: let them look to it) is better, and may be drank in our cold countrey. I answer with Plutarch in his naturall questions. Water in summer is more malicious, the heat drawing, or discussing the sweetest and highest part of it.'

Verily, it was not easy to please our author when he was determined to find fault. He rejects water which is exposed to cold, because it is 'not well-concocted'—he will not have water which the sun has warmed, because it is 'more malicious, the heat drawing, or discussing the sweetest, and highest part of it.' How soon our author forgot his assertion that it is 'better to drink water in Africa and Lybia,' and his assent to the opinion of Avicenna! Ah! ye Doctors Short, beware of prejudice!

Our author next imagines this objection—'that in cold countries or regions, men are hotter and stronger inwardly, and therefore may concoct



water better,' the heat being 'concentrated by an antiperistasis;' and he repels this objection by asserting that 'the natural heat is increased in quality, but diminished in quantity, and this is the reason that phlegme is begotten in such countries and in winter.'

Such are some of the crudities and absurdities which passed for arguments amongst medical men two centuries ago! Great as are the advances which science has made since then, doubtless after the lapse of two or more centuries, many of the medical doctrines of the present day will provoke a similar remark!

#### 'CHAP. VI.

'*England is a cold countrey, etc.*'

At first we felt inclined to pass over this chapter with the bare recitation of its title, but on consideration, it does not seem to merit such neglect.

'That England is situated in the north part of the world I think no man will deny; for not only *Bodin*, and *Cardan*, and other Neotericks affirme it, but the old Geographers. France is cold, as the proverb witnesseth in *Euphormio*, colder than the French cold. But *England* is more septentrionall, or northern than *France*. . . . . *Brittaine* is an island imitating the continent after, or beyond France, so this proposition must be expounded, which I could show by diverse authorities, but this is to trifle away the time. For *Strabo*, in his geographie, speaks plaine. I think the *Brittains* to be more septentrionall than the *French*. *Plutarch*, out of *Asclepiades*, reports the Egyptians grow old at thirty yeares, because they are burnt with the sunne. But the *Brittains* live 120, for the coldness of the place which conserves the natural heat.'

Here, again, our author, with his usual happy logic, upsets, with a word, the argument with which he has just concluded the previous chapter. He goes on:

'The *Aethiopian* bodies are more spungious, and rare, but Englishmen which are under the north (for so *Galen*, who hath the same story, expounds it) have bodies more compact and thick, and therefore live longer.

'*Scaliger*, in his exercitations, calls Englishmen gluttons, or great eaters (*Anglos voraces*), which epithet proves England to be cold, for cold countries eat more than other nations. We may read in the Aphorisms:

that in winter we eat most. This much eating, or gluttony, cometh from the coldness of the country. Wherefore *Argenterius* doth not relish in my palate, when he asserts voracity to proceed from a hot distemper of the liver: for cold, both externall and internall, provoke the appetite.'

Here we may offer two remarks. One is, that our author is indubitably right in his assertion, that 'cold, both externall, and internall, provoke the appetite,' although necessarily ignorant of the modern discovery that increased appetite is a wise law of nature, resulting from the greater action of oxygen demanding an increased supply of carbon. The other remark is that our author is again at variance with himself, and has apparently forgotten the argument, borrowed, in his preface, from *Dr. Venner*, that cold water, taken internally, 'greatly dejects the appetite, destroys the natural heat, and overthrows the strength of the stomach.'

'*Plutarch* informs us that the ayre at Delphis, a city in *Boetia*, is sharp and biting, which argue the concoction of meat, so doth water inwardly cause hunger, therefore, great *Hippocrates*, *Sexto Epidem*, as the oracle of *Apollo*, water is ravenous and very hungry, because it maketh men voratores (for I think the Latine hath his original from the Greek) gredy-guts, because tis cold, for cold water and cold meat contract the tunicles of the stomach, and in them the blood which increase the appetite, as *Galen* doth signify. In the same place he shews that heat asswages and blunts hunger. Therefore *Argenterius* his ratiocination is not well biassed in this matter. *Valesius* also saith that water is hungry because it doth not nourish and coole the stomach: but I will not cut to the quick others mens errors. At the present tis enough that externall cold causeth much eating, therefore Englishmen have a good stomach, therefore the country is cold. *Cardan* in his book of subtilities, saith England hath no serpents by reason of the extreme cold. And saith further that sheep in England do not drink water, flocks of sheep quench their thirst with the dew of Heaven, because water in England is very evill and dangerous.'

'As if the 'dew of Heaven' were something different from water!

'Our country affords us no good water, because of the coldnesse: and all other countries that are mountanous have no good



water, because they are cold: so is England cold both by reason that tis septentrionall and northern, and by reason of mountains, as *Ludovicus Mercatus*; . . . therefore called *Albian* [*ab altis et albis rupibus quas mare pluit*] from high and white rocks, which the sea washeth.

Here our author betrays very untravelled ideas of mountains. He next anticipates the objection that it may be advanced on the authority of *Scaliger*, that England is temperate, and replies that 'then it requires a temperate diet,' and that 'water is not temperate in our countrey, but is cold of its own nature, and colder in cold countries;' he also replies 'that England is temperate in respect to Grontland, . . . But 'tis cold in respect of south countries.' He proceeds:

'Now out of this chapter I deduce these following conclusions:—

'First if England be cold, 'tis not good drinking of water in it, because cold distempered countries require hot drink.

'Secondly, the water in England is not well concocted, and will be hardly concocted of us, for 'tis *δύσπεπτος*.'

His next conclusion is rather whimsical.

'Thirdly if water be hungrey, which makes men devourers and eatalls, especially in winter, we may become hunger starved.'

He winds up, 'thirdly' with the praise of beer and wine, and, in his natural enthusiasm, forgetting fourthly altogether, he jumps at once to fifthly, in which he concludes that the 'Shephards in England are more careful of their sheep than the novelists of their patients.'

The seventh chapter is an attempt to prove that

'We may as well give narcoticks, that is, stupefying things, as poppy and opium, as wel as water in our countrey, many countries drink water without harme. So the Mauritians and Persians are so accustomed to eat opium, that when they abstain they are in fear of their lives.'

'And if we may not exhibite opium because it is stupefying, or narcotick, by the same reason, we must not give water, because tis narcotickall, or stupefying, as appears, 5, *Aphorismis*. 25. cold water cures the gout and takes away the paine, because moderate stupidnesse

or stupefying dissolves paine. *Galen* upon this aphorisme noteth, that cold water benumbs and stupefies the parts. So *Christophorus a Vega*, soe *Fonseca*, cold water brings stupidnesse, and generally all cold medicines benum and stupefie the senses. *Galen*—cold things coole and stupefie. And water is cold as well as poppy. *Galen* speaking of those things which are cold, as juice of poppy—the nature of poppy is cold as also is water.'

'If opium be hot, it cannot cause sleep, for all sleep cometh of a cold cause.'

Accepting in a general way, the admissions of our author, as to the effects of water in treatment of gout, we may leave it to those more interested in the question to pursue the discussion whether opium be hot or cold, and pass on, only observing that Dr. Short forgot to mention that the habitual use of opium, *unlike* habitual water drinking, produces morbid conditions, precisely identical with those which follow the habitual use of intoxicating liquors; and, also remarking, that an author of the present day advocates the employment of benumbing cold as an anæsthetic agent, instead of chloroform, in surgical operations.

In his eighth chapter, our author anticipates Vegetarianism—he

'*Marvailles* that some new light of this doting age, doe not bring upon the stage the eating of acornes, as well as drinking of water; for in the infancy of the world, men and beasts had their meat and drink in common. They both eat acorns and both drank water. *Cardan* saith, water is the drink of all living creatures. *Lucretius*—for without doubt all the world drank water in the beginning of the world, and that they eat acornes 'tis no less manifest. *Plutarch*—tasting and eating of acornes, they danced for joy about the oak and beech. *Galen*—and of old time men lived of acornes alone; and the *Arcadians* a long time after. Hence the ancient oracles in *Herodotus*:

"Men in Arcadia eat  
Acornes, for that's their meat."

'But if men did eat acornes in the infancy of the world, why may they not eat them again in the old doting age of it, as well as drink water again? Old men are twice children: and if this decrepid age will eat acornes and drink water, they may be as fat as bruit swine. We know hoggs are fatted



with acornes and water—all countrey blades know this: but I will tell you as much out of Homer—

“Hoggs eat sweet acornes, drink water, that  
Abundantly nourisheth their florid fat.”

‘And if they nourish hoggs (without question) they will nourish men; for men have a similitudinary or proportionable temper to hoggs, as Galen have left to posterity. Therefore they will nourish men as well as hoggs.’

The worthy doctor, at times, somewhat resembles that lawyer who argued against his own cause—here, while meaning to condemn, he appears to be the strenuous advocate, not of ‘rich wine, gallant beer, nappy ale, etc.’ as he really is, but of ‘acornes’ and water.

#### ‘CHAP. IX.

‘There is no necessity of drinking of water in our countrey, for hot men.

‘First, there is no necessity, for God be thanked, we have plenty of rich wine, gallant beer, and nappy ale, perry, cider, &c., &c., and if these be too hot, we may drink small-beer, such as is water scared out of its wits, small-ale, small-wine; neither is it convenient or according to our nature, but contrary to nature, because against custom. Therefore it is a fancy which no excellent physitian ever dreamt of in our kingdome. And although Galen saith that hot natures that be haile, are much helped thereby, for young men are hot, therefore require water necessarily to quench their heat: nothing quenches a hot and dry distemper more than water, and therefore in all such distempers, as also in agues, water is a perpetual remedy. Hippocrates confirms this sentence, hot tempers, or natures, require cooling, drinking of water and quietnesse. These and such authorities are somewhat urging to abecedary criticks, and in haile bodies nothing seems to speak more, and nothing speaks less to the purpose concerning the drinking of water. For Galen or Hippocrates speak not of our English water or England, but is to be understood of hot countries, where the custome of water is familiar, and the water good, and they cannot be understood otherwise.’

At last, the good doctor, after appealing so often to Galen and Hippocrates, suddenly remembers that they ‘speak not of our English water or England.’ Our author was evidently no judge per-

sonally of the qualities of one water as compared with another. His rules for pronouncing water to be good, namely, that it springs in a warm climate, and not in a mountain, and runs through valleys or low grounds, and towards the south, are now sufficiently absurd, when chemistry supplies such positive tests for determining the qualities of water; but no doubt, they were considered very sufficient rules when our author wrote.

#### ‘CHAP. X.

‘Whether we may drink water after dinner.

‘That we may drink water after dinner, seems to have great probability. And it is growne into much use now a dayes.’

This passage is interesting, as showing one of the ways in which the advocates of water two centuries ago enjoined its use, and if the other modes in which they employed it were not more rational, we can easily account for the early distesteem which awaited their system.

Our author continues:

‘This opinion appears to be taken from Cornelius Celsus, that, when any man is full, he concocts his meat better if he shut up his body with cold water, then to watch a little, and after to sleep well.’

Our author takes no exception to the droll physiology involved in the foregoing passage; he merely rejects the intended application of it.

‘This authority of *Cornelius Celsus* is pretended that we may drink water after dinner. But this authority, if rightly considered, or understood, is nothing at all to our novelist’s purpose. For the meaning is, that he that drinks wine at dinner may shut the orifice of his stomach with a cup of cold water; and this we may do with a cup of small beer as well, and better. And had Celsus known our small beer, without question he would have advised us to it. But for them that drink wine, as many of the Romans did, it was very convenient to drink a cup or two of water after dinner; for thus the fierce quality of wine is repressed, and made gentle, and the custome of drinking of water may be introduced.’

Even now, in many places abroad, it is customary to drink water after wine, and after other things too, if they be very hot or very cold, as after hot coffee,



or chocolate, or after an ice, or iced cream.

Our author having denied the use of cold water as a beverage, even to 'young and hot men,' we may conclude that he would also forbid its use to old men and children, which he accordingly does in the eleventh chapter.

'And if the curious criticke shall object Galen: that water is agreeable to all ages.

'I answer, it is true in warme countries, firme constitutions, where they be accustomed, and where the water is very light, which is not in England.'

'CHAP. XII.

*'Of custome that it hath a principall power in diet.'*

'CHAP. XIII.

*'The argument of custome is powerful: we have no custome of drinking water.'*

In these chapters our author dilates upon 'the power of custome,' affirming that it 'can doe wonders'; that 'it is so like nature that it seems the same with nature'; and that it 'is the great Diana in diet, in health, and diseases.' Indeed, he is so enamored of custom, that he finds no time, either in health or in sickness, in which to leave off a custom, be it ever so bad a one in itself. He illustrates his argument by various examples of the results of custom, and lays peculiar stress upon the assertion that 'custome turneth or metamorphizes poyson into nourishment,' in confirmation of which he states:

'Scaliger, in his exercitations reports that a kings son in Cambaia, was educated with poyson and that being a young man, he was so venomous that flies which suckt his skin fell off dead. Avicenna, Prince of the Arabian physitians, tells us of a young maid that was nourished with poyson. Galen relates a story of an old Athenian woman, that was nourished with henbane. She began with a little quantity at first which nature overcame by degrees, at length she came to a great dose and concocted that also. For custom, as Galen asserts, had made it naturall.'

It does not seem to have occurred to our author that Englishmen might get accustomed to drinking water in the same way. On the contrary, he comes to the sweeping conclusion, 'that no

nation must drinke water against custome': as if custom is not of gradual growth, as is exemplified in the very cases with which he illustrates and supports his arguments. There must have been a day when Englishmen were as unaccustomed to drinking wine and beer, as the 'old Athenian woman' was to eating henbane.

In the five following chapters, he largely expatiates in praise of wine and beer, particularly English beer, while he condemns ale and water as beverages, especially 'the best, the purest water,' which he paradoxically maintains to be the worst.

'CHAP. XIX.

*'Two grosse errors in our new lights about the exhibition of water.'*

'In muggy and foggy weather candles burn not so clear, for then we see about them, a spongiuous concrescence about the snuffe. And our new lights burn dimme, when a damp, or obscure fume cloudes their braine, but such lights must be snuffed. They want a payer of snuffers. I will be their servant, if I can to take away two gross errors that be spongiuous . . . For first they give well, or pump water commonly as I have seen myself . . . The second error is, that they exhibit well-water, and that raw without boyling.'

He condemns well-water for the old reason, on which he so often dwells, that it 'is hard and crude, as wanting the sunbeames,' and he denounces 'raw' waters under the whimsical pretence that they 'lye heavy in the hypochondrials, or lower parts of the short ribs, and stick there a long time.'

'CHAP. XX.

*'Whether water be convenient in feavers, many things about custome.'*

'Thus far I have handled of water as dietetical, that is as drink belonging to diet. In the next place tis convenient to speak whether water as pharmaceutical, or as a medicine, be good in agues. I confess that Galen did give water in burning feavers, and in hecticks; but much curiousness is to be used . . . Galen [saith:] in giving of water in continual feavers we must especially consider custom; in such feavers we may give as much water as the patient please, and so much the more boldly, if he



# MEDICAL LEGISLATION.

*To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."*

SIR,—Accept my thanks for inserting my letter of the 8th instant, and allow me to add a few words with reference to the Bills at which I only glanced.

## THE SALE OF POISONS BILL

is the Bill of last Session amended. Some objectionable clauses, affecting the Medical Botanists and others, are omitted, but the Homœopaths, who seem asleep, may find the measure rather inconvenient. A short sentence would render the Bill harmless as regards them; and, if they would request its insertion, doubtless the request would be granted; but, if they do not choose to take the trouble, it need give no one else any concern. On the whole, the Bill is, perhaps, as good a one as could be devised, but too much must not be expected of it. Probably human ingenuity would fail to frame a measure that would satisfy expectation.

## THE IRISH VACCINATION BILL,

a Government measure, is important as indicative of the progress of liberal opinions in connection with the subject. The Bill comprises but two sections, providing merely for the formation of vaccination districts, and the attendance of medical officers, at convenient times and places, to "vaccinate all persons who may come for that purpose," a fee of sixpence for each vaccination being paid by the Board of Guardians. Thus, notwithstanding the strenuous efforts of an unscrupulous and intolerant medical clique, the odious principle of compulsion is abandoned in the sister isle. This is encouraging, as respects the efforts of the friends of medical liberty, and of personal and parental rights, to obtain the repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Act of 1853, in England; and they are not the less determined to persevere, nor the less sanguine of success, that they have generously forborne to agitate the country or to press their claims upon the justice of the Legislature and the Government, at a time when other great imperial interests demanded the most earnest attention. It is evident that, with perfect freedom in one part of the United Kingdom, parents cannot be permanently enslaved in another. Apart from the principle upon which this odious law is based, its partial operation furnishes another argument for its repeal. In some districts it is a dead letter, and the people successfully defy it. In other places, parents are persecuted for their conscientious convictions upon a scientific question, and subjected to penalties. This is quite repugnant to English ideas of justice.

Abroad, the anti-vaccine agitation extends. Messrs. Carnot, de Lisle, de Terze, Bayard, Ancelon, Nittinger, and Lutze bravely sustain the fight, and other able allies have entered the field in Messrs. Hamernick, Kurtz, Hochstetter, Mertens, &c. Several petitions against the vaccination laws have been presented to the Parliament of Wurtemberg, and the Belgian Academy of Medicine have reported that "vaccination and re-vaccination cannot be rendered compulsory in Belgium." Will England be content with a less measure of personal liberty than other European nations?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN GIBBS.

Maze Hill Cottage, St. Leonards-on-Sea,  
June 15, 1858.



## SMALL-POX AND VACCINATION.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

SIR,—The *Times* of this day contains, in its Indian correspondence, a passage strikingly characteristic of the mental idiosyncrasy of a Jennerite:—

"The increase of small-pox has attracted attention, and Dr. Tice has recommended the re-vaccination of the soldiers. The disease is propagated by the camp followers who will not permit vaccination."

Jenner's infallible specific fails, and his infatuated disciples, instead of perceiving its worthlessness, would blindly fly to it again. Small-pox attacks both vaccinated and unvaccinated, and the unvaccinated alone are held responsible. Do the vaccinated never communicate the disease the one to the other, or are we required to believe that in each case the disease is communicated by the unvaccinated to the vaccinated? But why should the vaccinated catch the disease at all? Are they not "protected?" Are they not proof against contagion? If not, of what avail is their nostrum? Moreover, if the source of contagion be amongst the unvaccinated camp followers, how is it to be cut off by the re-vaccination of the soldiery?

Long before Jenner's day, Pringle remarked, "Small-pox is rare in camps and armies." Is it so now? Does it spare our vaccinated soldiers and sailors—officers, or privates? We have heard of the dismay it caused in our Baltic fleet—of a troop-ship, bound to India, obliged to return into port with the pest on board—of small-pox in our barracks—and now we hear of small-pox in our Indian army.

Jenner boasted that vaccination "is attended with the singularly beneficial effect of rendering through life the persons so inoculated perfectly secure from the infection of small-pox." For this audacious assertion he was loaded with costly presents, with panegyrics in prose and verse, and with £30,000 voted by Parliament. "Re-vaccinate—re-vaccinate!" is the senseless cry of his bigoted disciples.

Jenner considered vaccination so simple an affair that he encouraged all sorts of volunteers, and vaunted even the success of his vaccinating ladies. His disciples now gravely assure us that the operation requires great skill.

"One puncture," said Jenner, "is always sufficient;" "four or more" are essential, exclaim his disciples.

There is no end to the absurd and contradictory excuses with which the traffickers in cow-pox seek to cover their failures. When will beings, considered rational, cease to confide in this hideous imposture?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Maze Hill Cottage,  
St. Leonards-on-Sea, June 17, 1858.

JOHN GIBBS.

## THE "PUBLIC HEALTH BILL" AND VACCINATION.

To the Editor of "The Hastings and St. Leonards News."

SIR,—By one of those surprises, familiar to Jennerites, Board of Health Officials, and Sanitary Reformers in search of place, in the absence of members who had amendments to propose, the "Public Health Bill" has been hurried through committee in the Commons, and a clause has been added enacting that:—

"Proceedings for penalties under the Acts for the time being in force on the subject of Vaccination may be taken on the complaint of any registrar employed for the registration of births, deaths, and marriages, public vaccinator, or officer authorised by the Board of Guardians, or by the overseers respectively, and the cost of such proceedings shall be defrayed out of the common fund of the Union, or out of the poor rates of any parish not included in the Union."

Hereby, registrars and public vaccinators are converted into an army of spies, common informers, domestic inquisitors, and public prosecutors.

Moreover, faith is broken with the opponents of compulsory vaccination. A promise was given, over and over again, that investigation by a select committee should precede any further legislation on the subject of vaccination. That promise has become widely known, not only at home, but in France and Germany, in which countries the appointment of the committee is expected with anxious interest. The Jennerites shrink from investigation, violate the agreement, and, by a side wind, attempt to attain an advantage they dare not openly seek. They snatch a short lived triumph, by which, assuredly, they do not serve their cause. Neither can such a disingenuous proceeding elevate our legislators in public esteem, or raise the national character in the estimation of observing foreigners.

Relying on the plighted faith of the Commons of the United Kingdom, and unwilling to obtrude their wrongs upon the nation and the Government, in a season of great public calamity, the anti-compulsory-vaccinators have abstained from any demonstration since last year. Behold their reward! In future they will know how to act, and the remembrance of the treachery just practised upon them will not tend to cool their zeal or to slacken their exertions.

Is it wise to persecute peaceable citizens, because they choose to form their own opinions upon a scientific subject? Is it well to provoke them into a contest with constituted authority in defence of their deliberate and conscientious convictions, their religious scruples, their rights as men and fathers, the sanctity of their homes, and the inviolability of their persons? In such a contest, which side, the persecutors or the persecuted, is likely to triumph?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Maze Hill Cottage,  
St. Leonards-on-Sea, June 19, 1858.

JOHN GIBBS.

P.S.—What should be thought of a "Public Health Bill" which has no reference to the polluted condition of the Thames, and of legislators and sanitary reformers whose chief care is to secure a continuance of large salaries for doing nothing?





8. 104

3. 28



