

Extracts from an essay on vaccination, after thirty-five years' observation and experience / by Dr. Bayard ; translated by George S. Gibbs.

Contributors

Bayard, Armand.
Gibbs, George S.

Publication/Creation

London : A member of the Ladies' Sanitary Association, 1870.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/x4x4a8my>

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
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

EXTRACTS

FROM AN

ESSAY ON VACCINATION,

AFTER

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS' OBSERVATION
AND EXPERIENCE;

BY DR. BAYARD,

CIREY, HAUTE MARNE, FRANCE.

TRANSLATED BY GEORGE S. GIBBS,
DARLINGTON.

"It is more philosophical to destroy an error than to discover a truth."—H. CARNOT.

LONDON :

PUBLISHED BY A MEMBER OF THE LADIES' SANITARY ASSOCIATION.

SOLD BY

JARROLD & SONS, 12, PATERNOSTER ROW.

B. W. GARDINER & SON, 20, PRINCES STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE.

—
1870

PRICE SIXPENCE.

| |
|---------------------|
| WELLCOME LIBRARY |
| General Collections |
| P |
| 1442 |

B. W. GARDINER AND SON, PRINTERS, PRINCES STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE, W.



22503118934

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THE following pages from the pen of Dr. Bayard, written under the circumstances mentioned in his preface would, probably, not have been so written but for the instigation of the translator. It should be known that the translation is not only free in the ordinary acceptation of that term, but that the translator, without substituting his own opinions for those of the author, has freely used the permission courteously, frankly, and cordially given to condense, expand, or otherwise alter and adapt what he had written to the particular purpose then in view. Neither the author nor the translator, however, attached so much importance to that particular object as to producing such an effect on the mind of the public as should arouse attention to the one all-important fact, that a constant and constantly increasing deterioration of the physical stamina of the people of Europe was taking place, and that, whatever other influences modern civilization may have brought to bear in this respect, there could be, and can be, none more powerful in the first period of life than the transmission and retransmission of morbid matter from one organism to another. At this date, the object is partially attained, the question has been already brought to the bar of public opinion. It has been, and is now being, pretty vigorously discussed in this country, and

especially in the metropolis. The system is condemned. It is not enough, however, that it should be condemned, it must be abandoned. Those who are acquainted with the details of the controversy, extending now over some twenty years, have seen the "highest authorities" on the Continent successively deny with impetuous scorn the very possibility of evil results from Vaccination, then recognize the adverse facts but deny the connexion, for the express reason that the admission of such connexion must cause the abandonment of the practice, and then, under further pressure, admit and declare the connexion to be scientifically proved. Yet the practice survives there as well as in this country, where those whom the people have been willing to regard as guides have more persistently turned the deaf ear and the blind eye to the attitude and voice of suffering humanity. Hence it is plain that more instruction is needed to combat the prejudices which the present generation has in some sense inherited, and the translator, while feeling very sensible how much the arguments and sentiments of Dr. Bayard have lost in force and vivacity by appearing in a foreign costume, is not without hope that coming from a mature and accomplished man, minutely and practically acquainted with the subject in all its details, they may commend themselves to the serious consideration and acceptance of all thoughtful minds, both in the profession and domestic circle.

Nov, 8, 1869.

PREFACE.

AT two different epochs the ladies of England have played a great part in connexion with two discoveries, we allude to those of Variolous Inoculation and Cow-pox Inoculation, commonly known as Vaccination.

Now, a lady, a member of the Ladies' Sanitary Association, offers a Prize, for the best work treating of—1. "The actual value of Vaccination as a preventative of Small-pox:" and, 2. "Its dangers from the introduction of other diseases into the organism;" she desires the "essayists to write without any reserve, and to state on the points named the whole truth as it is presented to their minds."

This programme shews the importance of the question which still divides the medical faculty; it does honour to the loyalty of the donor of the Prize by its characteristics of justice and independence, which are the two motives for my taking pen in hand, after study and experience extending over thirty-five years.

Before judges assembled, neither to approve nor con-

demn but to examine Vaccination, we may go over the ground rapidly.

We will treat of the practice in England, the country of its birth, and in France where it has been adopted with irresistible eagerness. We place ourselves in the background as much as possible to give place to inexorable arithmetic, to the evidence of facts, and to men of authority in medical art.

Is Vaccination a providential or fallacious discovery? Is it a beneficial preservative or a deadly poison in too many cases; a principle of deterioration always?

The perusal of the following pages will contribute, we hope, to the solution of this problem.

ESSAY ON VACCINATION.

CHAPTER I.

SMALL POX.

“ Many persons have Small Pox without suspecting it.”—*Thomset.*

WE shall not here write a monograph on Small-pox, we wish merely to touch on some important points in connexion with this disease, which are intimately connected with our subject.

1. Vaccinators assert that Small-pox is not as old as the human race—in their opinion it is of recent origin, the ancient authors do not mention it, it was not spread over the world, say they, till after the discovery of America.

We reply that it is as old as humanity, of which it is an original taint; that passages of Hippocrates properly interpreted describe it perfectly; that if it were imported only some centuries since it would not have that character of universality which makes it the inevitable appanage of humanity, for every man is condemned from his birth to this crisis, which once traversed leaves him strong, and later on, secured from serious maladies.*

2. Small-pox, like the fabled Proteus, has many forms in which to manifest itself. It is always visceral, we insist on this circumstance; it always commences in the viscera, but it is, in its form apparent or latent, cutaneous or intestinal. We repeat that the eruptive form, the pustules, in a word, are only *one* symptom which often, very often, may be absent; hence the expression of the masters, *variola sine variolis*. To support our conviction and our practice, we will allow some of these masters to speak for themselves:—

“The first effect of the variolous infection is to produce a gastro-intestinal inflammation, *sui generis*.”—*Broussais*.

“In some cases the inflammation of the digestive organs is so violent that the eruption is developed with difficulty or is *even entirely prevented*. Then the fever increases and the gastro-enterité continues its progress.”—*Begin*.

* That is the opinion of some authors who have most studied Small-pox. “If it were really but an accidental and contagious malady, excluding innate disposition, it might be entirely guarded against by means of attention to precautions.” Andrieu, 1781.

Let us follow a little the history of this variolous gastro-enterité and see what has been said formerly by the glorious authors who reflect honour on medicine. We will cite Boërhäave and Stoll. Let us add that nothing is changed in the accidents of Small-pox except its displacement with regard to age, as we shall see in the sequel.

"The variolous agent produces *inflammation of the stomach and intestines*. It combines very easily with any morbid causes prevailing, principally with popular maladies, and this union *alone* renders it dangerous, *et hoc consortio sæpe solo periculum intentat*.* The fever which is manifested six or seven days after the absorption of the virus *alone* constitutes Small-pox to the extent of a guarantee against future attacks, whether there has been or whether there *has not been cutaneous eruption*."

Dezoteus and Valentin follow in their turn to tell us:—"Sometimes the patients have the fever and other variolous symptoms; but at the end of that period *there is no eruption*. Yet the malady must be regarded as *veritable Small-pox*. That is so true that if one inoculates many times and with fresh pus a subject under such circumstances, no success will attend the effort to inflict a disease *for which the predisposition is gone*."

In the course of our medical career we have many times had occasion to observe epidemic Small-pox and to verify the assertions of the authors just cited. The abdominal symptoms always commence the course of the disease, there are pains in the back, loss of appetite, fever, sickness; then comes the eruption, but this eruption may be more or less extensive, the pustules may be large and thousands in number; they become purulent, they harden and scab off.

This eruption is often wanting, now more often than formerly, because the disease occurs generally among vaccinated *adults*, whose skin less soft and less porous than in infancy, rebels against the eruption without diminishing the danger; on the contrary, what is then to be feared is the intestinal inflammation and its combination with prevailing maladies. Many who are seized fall into profuse sweats, which at the end of two or three days entirely carry off the disease, *sponté solvitur sudoribus*—sweats of a characteristic odour, *sui generis*. Some have convulsions similar to those occurring in cerebral fever, whatever their age, always with absence of pustules, also, with a small number there are symptoms slighter still.

All these varieties may be observed in the same village or even in the same family when subject to the epidemic influence. The well-informed physician sees in all a sole and unique cause—the contagion—and repeats with Thomet:—"Many persons have had Small-pox without suspecting it."

3. Small-pox is assuredly a grave disorder, it is so when epidemic, complicated with prevailing maladies and treated in a manner scarcely rational; but apart from these circumstances it is mild, milder than

* We shall see further on into what forgetfulness, to speak mildly, the Vaccination authorities of London and Paris have fallen on

cow-pox, measles,* or scarlatina. But Vaccinators do not care to remember these things.

The celebrated Tissot has written:—"The total of Small-pox epidemics, mild and severe, give a mortality of 14 per cent."

On the other hand, M. Serres, Member of the Academy of Sciences, tells us:—"In 1828, at l'Hospital de la Pitié, out of 162 vaccinated persons seized with epidemic Small-pox, 25 succumbed."

The proportion of habitual mortality by Small-pox is then the same among the vaccinated as the unvaccinated. The partizans of vaccination will not have it so. Small-pox is the *destructive scourge of humanity*. This is what the Vaccine Board and the Paris Committee have been repeating to us these 60 years. By sounding annually these alarms our officials succeed in frightening the people and the governments, thus conserving their sinecures.

In 1805, the learned William Rowley† wrote:—"Vaccinators give themselves much trouble to alarm society with the dangers of Small-pox in a natural state; it is, however, but little dangerous."

CHAPTER II.

IDENTITY OF SMALL-POX AND TYPHOID FEVER.

"Uno avatro non deficit alter."—*Virgil*.

1. IN the preceding chapter, we demonstrated that Small-pox is internal as well as external; simple, isolated, or combined.

Isolated it is always mild, benign; inoculation proves it. Combined it is confluent, malign; always dangerous. "Small-pox," says Stoll, "follows the disposition of *the body and the year*." In his

* "The measles are more to be dreaded than the small-pox, except in the eye."
—RHazes (circ. A.D. 850) *Divisio Morborum*, § 6. (G. S. G.)

† We shall have occasion frequently to invoke the authority of this learned man, and therefore beg leave to introduce him to our readers. William Rowley was a Member of the University of Oxford and of the Royal College of Physicians in London, Physician to the St. Marylebone Infirmary, Physician extraordinary to Her Majesty's Lying-in Hospital, author of "*Scholia Medicinæ Universalis Nova*," "*The Rational and Improved Practice of Physic*," "*Public Lecturer on the Theory and Practice of Medicine*," &c. He was intimate with the learned men of his time.

turn, Servieten writes:—"The malignity of the malady arises from the bad state of the body and not from the nature or abundance of the inoculated virus."

Such is the description of cutaneous, apparent Small-pox. Let us see its likeness in the latent and visceral Small-pox. "If in comparing these two maladies, the fact of eruption is left out of consideration, we find a *perfect similitude* in the phenomena of the secondary fever which constitutes them; the same infection of the blood, the same permanence in the source of the infection, the same saturation of the organism by a deleterious principle. In root and in form typhoid fever repeats the form and root of Small-pox. What a subject of meditation for the Faculty and for Government is this intimate relationship of these two terrible diseases?"—*Serres*.

The relation between small-pox and typhoid fever may be recognized in the commencement, the development, the inflammatory period, the consecutive accidents, the contagion, the duration and the treatment of both. It is no more allowable to stimulate or arrest typhoid fever than it is possible to arrest the course of Small-pox, which has made Serres declare, "Its duration cannot be abridged, it continues for three or four weeks." The contagion of typhoid fever long denied and long debated is here admirably explained; it is one of the most efficient proofs of the veri-similitude of the two disorders now treated of.

In order that a person may be seized by the contagion of typhoid fever, two conditions are necessary, first, he must not have had small-pox nor typhoid fever; secondly, he must be in the critical age for intestinal disorders.

Let us now ask experience the fruit of her researches: she tells us that it is always the young man, the young woman, vaccinated, not variolated, always of the most valuable age, which become victims of this internal Small-pox. Such is the effect of this variolous virus, retarded but not destroyed by vaccination, which leaves it intact in the economy to come out at a later date when uniting and combining with intestinal disorders it gives to them a fatal power.

It would be tedious to cite all the authorities who, like Serres, have studied this similitude between small-pox and typhoid fever—we merely name Nittinger, Verdé de Lisle, Villette de Terzé, Ancelon, &c. We say a word, however, of the famous Bretonneau, author of a work which has become classic, *La Dothienenterie*. At the commencement of his career, he was a devoted partizan of the practice of vaccination, but later on, enlightened by his own experience, he delighted in impressing on his disciples these words:—"My friends, vaccinate no more, above all abandon vaccination!" It is not of him, as unhappily of so many others, it can be said: "Vaccination has made more persons totally blind than small-pox has deprived of one eye."

The following facts occurred in our own practice.

We give three observations:—

First.—We were summoned, some twenty years since, to a farm,

the household of which consisted (besides the father and mother) of six children, between the age of 15 and 24 years, with two young men-servants. This unhappy family, suffering with typhoid fever, had at the moment of my arrival lost a son of 23 years and a man servant of the same age. Among these young people, eight in number, seven were ill, and three succumbed.

The father and mother having passed the critical age for typhoid fever, I was not astonished to see them come safely through this contagious and murderous epidemic, but it was not so with the eldest daughter, whom I saw attending on all the sick. This girl was stout and of scrofulous habit, offering all the conditions of aptitude for typhoid fever. [Note, in passing, that women have more to fear than men from this disorder, in small-pox it is the contrary.] However, that may be, she escaped the contagion, and is to-day the mother of a family. At length, after many reflections caused by the immunity of this young woman, I asked myself whether the small-pox, of which she bore visible traces, was not the cause of the actual protection she enjoyed. The father told me that she had had the small-pox when a year old, and that all her brothers and sisters were vaccinated soon after birth.

From that time my confidence in vaccination was broken up, and every time I have met a person bearing traces of small-pox I have asked him this question, "Have you ever suffered from a bad fever?" The answer, I affirm on my honour, has always been negative.

Second.—Much about the same time, in a theological college with about 200 students, typhoid fever broke out with violence. Eighty of these young people fell ill, of whom twenty died. Ordinary help became difficult to obtain, and an appeal was made to their fellow-students. Three presented themselves to help the sick and dying, and continued for nearly three months without interruption in their work of charity without taking any harm. Thanks were given to their courageous spirit and a merciful Providence; but *all three had had the small-pox*. They are now labouring in their vocation full of health, and we could name them were it desirable in this place to do so.

Third.—This is taken from my own family. My son, who is now 23 years old, was vaccinated. Being myself at the time of his birth fresh from the schools, I am not ashamed to avow that *I* vaccinated him. But, taught by experience, and the first observation contributed much to the result, for the last twenty years, I have not touched the Jennerian lancet. In the course of time my son went to study at an Hospital. He had not been there long before small-pox breaking out in his wards he was in his turn seized in a serious manner. When I reached him I found him in a burning fever with unslakable thirst; his tongue black, rough, and horny, indicated the state of his bowels. He craved nothing but pure water from cool springs. I satisfied his longings, he had water, lemonade, iced drinks, and plenty of fresh air. The regimen was severe for the first few days; at length at the end of a week we were able to start for the country where his cure was completed.

The observation does not end here, it shows, merely, that a vaccinated subject took small-pox like any other person. In the same hospital many deaths from small-pox occurred among the vaccinated.

This took place in the August of last year. My son returned to his hospital. In October I was again alarmed. "Your son," wrote one of his fellow-students, "is threatened with typhoid fever, he is very uneasy, the diagnosis has been made by his chief, and the nature of the prescribed medicine confirms it. He has left the hospital to avoid spreading the contagion if possible." I went to him in all haste, nevertheless I must say, his recent attack of small-pox gave me hope, I had not then the same anxiety as during his previous illness. I was not deceived: he had merely a simple gastric derangement which continued but a short time. He obtained leave of absence, and the physician seriously wrote on the certificate of health—*typhoid fever*.

Typhoid fevers are made cheap in a large town, and it is there small-pox is still treated with ammoniacal acids, sudorifics, sherry wine, and other substances, tonic and heating.

2. We must say a word on Cholera. Let it be well understood, we do not accuse vaccination of having created new diseases, we say merely—In all times, in all places, the agent of small-pox has had two modes of action, the internal and the external.

Since the introduction of Vaccination the external mode has been succeeded by the internal mode which at a later date finds itself complicated with the variolous germ left intact in the system; there are not, then, new diseases but maladies aggravated in the most precious period of life; that is enough—too much—for families, for generations! We retire to allow speech by our masters:—

"Vaccination," says Carnot, "has not brought out any new malady. Operating as a temporary protection it repulses the unknown germ of variolous contagion, and throws upon the fruitful period of life the burdens of childhood.

"All the preventives of infantile disorders," writes Villernée, "in suppressing one cause of disease *give greater force to others*.

Sydenham, Tissot, and Buchan place Cholera among epidemic disorders; they regard it as *non-contagious*, more frequent in the autumn than other seasons of the year; indeed, the first says that it arrives as regularly at the end of summer and commencement of autumn as the swallows come with the spring. According to Tissot:—"In spite of the most formidable symptoms which accompany cholera, it is very rarely fatal." Buchan states that he was himself twice brought to death's door by it. *Quantum mutatus!* But what is more serious is its contagious character, which no physician would now dare to deny.

"Medicine," said Dr. Castel, (Séance de l'Académie de Médecine of the 25th Sept., 1849), "cannot have the etiology of Cholera on the ordinary causes of an epidemic. Every epidemic is circumscribed by

topographical limits. Is it so with Cholera? It is a singular epidemic that surrounds the globe and extends from pole to pole. The etiology, apparently admitted is not applicable to it. Its appearance, its course, its periods of slumber and awakening contradict the observations collected by the most competent authors, disturb received opinions, cross the experience of the past, and disagree with every pathological deduction, whether as to hygiene, to climate, or to the influences of air, water, or soil. What, then, is this guest which has taken possession of the globe and comports itself as Small-pox did formerly? What practice is it *on which we have built the most flattering hopes*, which has left *infection* in the juices of the body, and has produced dissolution of the elements of life? Is it not manifestly revealed in vaccination? So great is the temerity of him who opposes a barrier to an eruptive malady.*

CHAPTER III.

VARIOLOUS INOCULATION.

“Nature and a good mother are the best physicians for childhood.”—*Bayard*.

VARIOLOUS inoculation is very ancient. When first spread in London, 1722, people were astonished to find that it was in use in many parts of the country. Its diffusion at that epoch was due to Lady Mary Wortley Montague. This lady having seen it practised with success at Constantinople, where her husband was British ambassador, resolved to submit her only son, then six years old, to the operation. His consequent illness was very slight. This took place

* This passage needs a little explanation. Dr. Castel was one of the most illustrious members of the Academy, and the most powerful adversary of Broussais. Like the celebrated Bretonneau he received with eagerness the discovery of Jenner; moreover he was a Member, and many times the reporter of the Vaccine Commission. But his enlightened conscience did not permit him to shut his eyes to experience. The discourse, of which we have cited a passage, and which he pronounced on the invasion of Cholera in 1849, struck his colleagues with stupefaction, who remained dumb before this bold speech. The lamentable death of this learned man has lengthened the life of vaccination by some years, for the effect of a few such discourses must have been to disturb opinion and overthrow the idol to which so many human lives are sacrificed.

in 1717, and this child, the first English one, was inoculated at Pera, the suburb of Constantinople.

That this child was the first English subject inoculated abroad we believe without difficulty, and we believe also that the manner of his inoculation was unknown, or not conformed to in the west of Europe, where the practice was recognized, but the modes of operation were coarse, rude, and variable. To decry these would, however, be departing from our subject. Let that be as it may, this lady of active spirit on her return to England had a daughter whom she caused to be inoculated in the same manner as her son, at the age of three months, and with complete success. The attention awakened was very great. Famous practitioners as Sutton, Dimsdale, Young, and Archer perfected the mode of operation, and were said to have proved its harmlessness on thousands of inoculated persons.

In France there was more hesitation, in spite of the force of the example and the reasoning of one of the greatest of her learned men, D'Alembert. Nevertheless, educated persons propagated it. It was deemed a beneficent discovery. From the great and the learned it descended to the people. Voltaire, who at the Chateau de Forges, when thirty years old, was dangerously ill with small-pox, said,—“If I had a son I would give him the small-pox before I gave him a Catechism.” At the end of the last century it enjoyed an amount of favour comparable to that of vaccination, for in the engagement of servants it was customary to ask if they had been inoculated, as now if they have been vaccinated.

Our confidence however is in nature, in a good mother. We dare not anticipate the designs of Providence, and we are repugnant to the idea of inflicting on a healthy, thriving infant the germ of a malady* how small soever it may be.

* Some authors maintain that there is medico-logical ground for the practice of variolous inoculation, (as for instance the Medical Officer of the Privy Council, Report, pp. xv, xvi.) but not a single principle of the healing art makes common cause with the practice of vaccination, the offspring of empiricism, or which would be affected by the condemnation of its errors. It might disappear *in toto* without causing any disturbance, it might fall to the ground as a pernicious parasite, only too long attached to the tree of medical science.

CHAPTER IV.

VACCINATION.

"Hopes, illusions, chimeras, deception, decadence ;
These make the History of Vaccination."—*Bayard*.

SECTION I., HISTORY OF VACCINATION.

THE real origin of Vaccination is rather obscure ; from a period not exactly ascertained, it was known that in certain districts of England persons engaged about horses and cows were subject to contract a pustular disease on the hands which was supposed to protect them from Small-pox. This idea was so far spread that the beautiful Duchess of Cleveland was told that she need not fear small-pox as she had had cow-pox during her childhood.

Before 1780, Nash had practiced vaccinal inoculation, and left papers on the practice. In Moseley's work, written about 1802, this document is inserted :—

"Mr. Thomas Nash, judging from public rumour, believes it probable, that Dr. Jenner knew his father, he himself having been inoculated by his father in 1781, he supposes that it was with vaccinal matter, as it appears by the manuscript and the report of his mother, that his father at that time made experiments in cow-pox."

The same Moseley tells us that the Nash MSS. were the subject of a controversy among many doctors, but, owing to their ambiguity it was decided that the victory was with Jenner: it should equally rest with him from another point of view, for if it is incontestable that others anticipated the transmission of the disease from the beast to the man, it remains undisputed that he was the first to take the animal virus from a man and to transmit it from arm to arm of the human subject.

These experiments do not appear to be older than 1790, and it was not till 1798 that Jenner commenced the publication of the results, in a manner, which, as we shall see hereafter, ought to have been more modest. But from this moment commenced that enthusiastic folly which saluted the discovery of vaccination with a cry of admiration and gratitude almost universal.

Let us look at the contemporary Press :—

"The House," said William Pitt to the Commons, "need not fear that the recompense would exceed the benefit. There never was anything more grand. Let it vote then all that it pleased to the discoverer of vaccination."*

* "Wars, rebellions, fanatical disturbances have had in England relapses and interruptions ; the vaccination mania, on the contrary, commenced moderately and de

Jenner received Parliamentary grants to the amount of £30,000, also many valuable presents of jewels, &c., from his admirers. The boon, praised in prose, sung in verse, paid for so generously in gold, was to *entirely extirpate* Small-pox and speedily *double the population*, by delivering humanity from this destructive scourge.*

For a long time doubt was considered blasphemous, the phrenzy of admiration had stifled the spirit of observation, and scarcely any men of pretensions to learning dared say that they looked to the future for the experience which might bring conviction to their minds.†

The great success of Vaccination at that time was due "To a class of practitioners more or less renowned who followed the example of the first enthusiasts, to clergymen, old women, ladies of distinction, and many philanthropists who united their zeal and their activity to

generated into a blind fury. In these circumstances cool reasoning was impossible. Those who maintained their presence of mind dared not speak out for fear of being treated as ignorant, or accused of bad faith by the fanatical partisans of this novelty. It was then less by conviction than by a species of phrenzy that vaccination was received and propagated. The clergy even, seized with the general vertigo, did not content themselves with preaching vaccination, many of them could be seen performing the operation."—*Moseley*.

"I have already spoken of the two children at Oxford, of whom one died of small-pox after having been vaccinated by Dr. Jenner himself. From the time of this fatal accident I suspected vaccination, and my later researches justified my suspicions. I may say that I have never recommended vaccination, even at the risk of offending many families of distinction. When the first edition of this work was published I was threatened with loss of my estate and reputation if I did not burn or suppress every copy. I also received a quantity of anonymous letters full of threats and insults."—*Rowley*.

Mankind is always the same everywhere! The author of this essay has been caressed and entreated to suppress his works against vaccination, then an attempt was made to bribe him with an honourable and lucrative post. He adhered to his convictions, then came menaces and attempts to destroy the confidence of his patients.

* These absurdities sound like the recital of a dream, they are however very real, the authorities are good; for instance, The Royal Jennerian Institution, acting in London since the commencement of vaccination has in large characters on some of its older documents as an inscription—*Extermination of Small-pox*. As to the promise of speedily doubling the population, it belongs to a member of the Institute of France, named Matthieu, who since 1820, has not ceased annually in the *Annuaire* to repeat the same thing. The population of France was increasing before vaccination at a greater rate than at present, but a *savant* must not contradict himself.

† On the 25th March, 1802, before a Committee of the House of Commons, Dr. Moseley, whom we have frequently quoted, being asked his opinion, replied:—"It requires more time than has yet elapsed since the practice of inoculation for the cow-pox commenced, to enable me to give a correct opinion on a subject of such magnitude to the human race. Neither do I think this can properly be done until the enthusiasm which has hitherto accompanied this novelty in medicine subsides."

Here is a document more weighty still:—"The Royal College of Surgeons, London, *be it said to its honour*, did not adopt vaccination with blind avidity. This learned body had too much discernment and good sense to compromise itself and expose itself to a charge of lacking sagacity and foresight, it pointed out then that a greater lapse of time was necessary for reliable decision on the merit of so important a novelty." Two years later, these reserved sages were asked their opinion by a French Commission, composed of twelve medical celebrities of the time, and although they would not pronounce on the merits of vaccination, without further experience, yet added,—"Vaccination can never supersede inoculation because it does not protect in so sure and durable a manner."

spread and recommend the use of vaccination before the time necessary to destroy the uncertainty caused by a multitude of facts for and against the practice"—*Rowley*.

The infatuation in France occurred a little later, but was quite as great. "Never," says an unknown author of the time, "did the enthusiasm for this kind of inoculation reach in England the height we have seen it attain in France." Only one cannot help thinking that this pushing of vaccination in France was rather the result of a political manœuvre than a work of real charity.

Without William Pitt and the substantial encouragement he gave to Jenner, the light of vaccination would not have dawned on other worlds than that of Medicine. At that time, England contained the greater part of the French nobility. Pitt, in spite of Fox, had thrown down the gauntlet to the Revolutionary ideas of France. On him, then, were fixed the eyes and the love of this nobility, who desired the restoration of royalty and feudalism. One of the most illustrious of the *émigrés* was the Duke de Laroche-foucault, who, returning to his country, thought to carry thither a great boon under the patronage of one of the great ministers of Europe. To adopt his ideas, even in medicine, was for him an act of courtesy, it was also an approach to an act of hostility against the First Consul Bonaparte. The French nobility comprehended the intention. Vaccination was then quickly patronised by all who regretted the ancient *régime*. Its introduction into France was a petty but stupid political manœuvre. Rich people afterwards acted willingly on the paltry maxim of doing much good when it costs little.

Bonaparte, who had somewhat suspected the intentions of the returned nobility—thanks to him—caused a medical commission to examine the discovery. As we have said, this commission kept back its report; at length, under pressure, it was published, but with all the reservations, of which we have already noted some. In short, vaccination was little practised beyond the circle of its protectors until after the fall of the Emperor. Louis XVIII., then, another *émigré*, full of gratitude to the great English statesmen, set himself to patronise vaccination. For that he founded the Academy of Medicine, which received among other duties the mission of propagating vaccination. As this mission is largely paid for, it acquits itself with as much zeal as the National Vaccine Board. It has become despotic, and obtained from Ministers decrees that no infant should enter an orphan asylum, an hospital, a primary school, a Lyceum, or a government college without a certificate of vaccination. These regulations make vaccination compulsory in France; there is, however, no law on the subject. That is not all. The vaccinator is paid and the vaccinated bribed. Annually, three great prizes, four gold medals and 100 silver medals are distributed as rewards to the zealous. If a poor unfortunate is refractory, let him read the notices issued by certain *maires* in Paris and he will see that "poor people who refuse to have their children vaccinated shall have no public assistance."

After sixty years' experience, this deplorable discovery is kept alive

only by pressure, threats, and money. As to money, that is needful, and the need is great. Every year the Vaccine Boards of London and Paris apply for an increase of their budgets. The sums disposed of are fabulous. What *has been* maintained must be maintained still.

SECTION II. NATURE OF COW-POX.

We ought to deplore the unhappy zeal and barbarous tyranny with which it is sought to persuade mankind to inflict on itself the diseases peculiar to beasts.

"We will show," says William Rowley, "how cow-pox, under certain modifications, is always charged with an infectious matter, comparable to that gathered in the lame feet of horses, which will also produce accidents, such as abscess and scrofula. Cow-pox comes, as we know, from the ulcerous and fetid *grease* found at the feet of horses, and which is communicated to cows.* Men occupied in milking these cows after grooming these horses, touched with their infected hands the teats of the cow and gave to these animals the disease which they in their turn have given to men."†

SECTION III. IMMEDIATE EFFECTS OF COW-POX.

Cow-pox by its action renders the skin less supple, less porous, and less apt for eruptive maladies. Just as two electric currents repulse each other so vaccination in infancy opposes the variolous eruption. Vaccination seems to preserve childhood not merely from the eruption of small-pox, but from many other eruptions peculiar to infant life, which have not distinct names, and which generally attack the head. Thus, we do not speak here of measles, scarlatina, nor of miliare, &c., but of scaldhead, scurf, nettlerash, and all the eruptions to which non-vaccinated infants appear to be more exposed than the vaccinated. From the suppression of these natural eruptions results a childhood and youth of mucous and putrid fevers, dysentery, &c., which kill a

* Jenner knew perfectly well that his cow-pox came from the horse and not from the cow, but clever and prudent friends advised him to deny this fetid and disgusting origin, and to attribute it to the fruitful teats of the young cow. "His nephew George Jenner, in the year 1787, went into the stable with him to look at a horse with diseased heels.—'There,' said he, pointing to the horse's heels, 'is the source of cow-pox. I have much to say on that subject, which I hope in due time to give to the world.'" —BARON'S LIFE OF JENNER, p. 135.

† About ten years ago a farrier of Mons in shoeing a horse inoculated himself perfectly with the horse-pox, or cow-pox, or fluid lymph, the euphonious name invented by the National Vaccine Board. The fact attracted some attention, but the Academy of Medicine at Paris, partaking of the secret advice given to Jenner, stifled the discussion. Unhappily the Veterinaries of Toulouse, stirred it up again with new and authentic facts. Prudent silence was still maintained, but the facts were not disputed. The horse has now definitively acquired his honours. It is no longer matter of dispute, but we transmit the Great Grease or Horse-pox to the Cow.

great number of those they attack. Each of these suspended eruptions is evidently a morbid cause, which thrown back from the skin upon the intestinal regions, there combines with some other morbid affection, and renders it doubly dangerous. We here merely quote the opinions of those great masters named Bøerhåave, Stoll, and Buchan. "Children at the breast in the 18th century were very rarely exempt from one eruption or another."—*Buchan*. Now, on the contrary, these eruptions are rare among vaccinated infants.

But let us speak of the vaccine operation, and show that it is not always *mild*, *benign*, and *beneficent* as Vaccinators say. It is a very serious matter that after the lapse of 60 years it is necessary to refute these ever repeated lies. The vaccinal operation is frequently dangerous by its immediate effects, it is now what it has always been. Vaccinators themselves furnish most of the proofs to demonstrate this truth.

About ten years since, M. Legros, physician of the Hotel Dieu, at Paris, published many cases of death after vaccination among young infants. His conclusion was, that the occurrence of such accidents after vaccination ought to cause vaccination to be deferred to a more advanced age. Despite the name of the author, and the authenticity of the facts, the vaccinal authorities kept profound silence.

At a later date, Prof. Trousseau spoke publicly of the *misdeeds* of vaccination; of children of different ages seized after the operation with ulcers and erisypelas. But this skilful lecturer declared himself a partisan of vaccination, and excited the laughter of his colleagues, the academicians, by some pleasantries of a doubtful *taste*. The discussion was held with closed doors. The intemperance of language is spoken of secretly. He was compared to an eel which you constantly think to have caught and which as constantly escapes.

The vaccinal ardour always increasing, the re-vaccination of the soldiers in garrison was thought of. These were men, and not the children of M. Trousseau, or the new-born infants of M. Legros. Nevertheless the accidents were serious, and sufficiently serious to alarm the authorities. Dr. Baron Larrey was then sent to inspect these unhappy men in the garrisons of Toulouse and Montpellier. Of what this honourable adept saw, no one has learned much; we know merely that the conclusions of his secret report, were to re-vaccinate (1) only those who desired it, and (2) never in a time of epidemic.

For my part, when I used to vaccinate, I observed many cases of ulcers sufficiently dangerous to necessitate particular care, and mothers, alas! have said to me, "My child has never been well since it was vaccinated." Consumption seized upon them and many succumbed. With this cow or horse virus I had introduced a germ of dissolution, and my preservative did not preserve them from small-pox. I have cited the case of my own child, and might cite a thousand others, but that is an established fact which defies contradiction, as it dates from the introduction of vaccination itself. Vaccinal syphilis is also as old as vaccine itself, and yet at this very time, the Vaccine Board has not avowed, and apparently will not avow it. Only in Paris a by-way is opened—it is recommended to take lymph

from the beast only, hence the success last year in Paris of a doctor, called, "The man with the Cow," parading his heifer through the streets of the Capital, and offering at the house new lymph just fresh from the cow.

In England, courageous men, among whom we cease not to mention John Gibbs, and other members of his family, have continuously brought into public notice these unhappy consequences of vaccination, ever renewed, though ever passed over in silence, by men to whom the Government has confided the duty of enlightening the public on these questions.

You, all my honoured fellow-labourers in the truth, you fathers of families, and you who guide the reins of the nation, know that we have deceived ourselves these 67 years, for there is nothing new under the sun, as said the wise King. Cow-pox has always been what it is, and what it will be. Retracing our steps, let us again quote Rowley :—

"It results from the general resume of all these authentic facts, that out of 504 persons vaccinated in England 75 died from the consequences, and almost all have had the small-pox, some sooner, some later, after their vaccination. There is no question here of supposition or calculation of probability, *it is truth!* It is evidence which seems to speak and leaves no doubt. Now, if in the space of 7 or 8 years (from 1798 to 1805) vaccination has shown itself so grievous to society,* what may we not fear for the future? It will scarcely be imagined that the facts mentioned are all that might be cited to prove the inefficiency and dangers of the practice. Alas! it is too certain that on all sides we meet with new instances of maladies such as those already detailed. Consider England, France, Germany, Italy, and other countries where vaccination has been received; penetrate into the interior of houses, into the bosom of families; interrogate fathers and mothers, and you will be surprised, shocked and even enraged to see, not only tolerated but maintained, a murderous practice, which carries desolation into families, and compromises the reputation of those who protect or practice it."

Such is the cry of grief and of truth drawn out by the long recital, which is but a lamentable martyrology. Nothing is wanting. Seventy-five infants died after the most cruel suffering, others had tumours, ulcers, erisypelas, rickets, and very often small-pox. Two cases in particular fix the attention. Nos. 36 and 88. Two very fine plates, especially for that time, completely pourtray vaccinal syphilis. "I have made known the frightful state of their unhappy infant in my public lectures," said Rowley. As to No. 88, he adds, that "this young girl," who had been the object of the publications of Messrs. Rogers and Birch, "is perhaps the child on whom the results of vaccination are manifested in the most frightful manner, her appearance inspires horror, eruptions, livid abscesses, nocturnal sweats." Such were her sufferings.

To note with attention this table is the best thing we can do. There with the date we find the age, the name of the vaccinated, the

* Carnot justifies Rowley's foresight.

accidents, and the name of the vaccinator. Nos. 1 and 2 merit, on account of the Vaccinator, our particular notice.* These are the children of Mr. Slatter, of Oxford, vaccinated by Jenner in April, 1799, they had the small-pox eighteen months after, and one died!

Sixty years practice and experience in vaccination do not prevent the Vaccine Board from repeating, that their *fluid lymph* will extirpate small-pox, which is, add they, the desire of all those who love mankind. The French Academy echoes the cry, "Vaccination preserves for ever! *Errare humanum perseverare Academicum.* Men make mistakes and medical men stick to 'em.

SECTION IV. SUBSEQUENT EFFECTS OF VACCINATION.

Since 1847, two propositions mathematically demonstrated remain as an acquisition to science.

1. From the introduction of vaccination mortality has more than doubled in the ranks of youth.

2. This duplication is caused principally and immediately by gastrointestinal affections.

In the 2nd chapter we have shown that the variolous virus carried on by the effect of vaccination, from infancy to the ages of youth and adolescence, becomes complicated with the maladies peculiar to that period of life. We had named these affections, and cited puerperal fever, dysentery, but particularly typhoid fever and cholera.†

* This observation ought to have opened Jenner's eyes since he was the vaccinator, but his conduct does not agree well with his words. A first reproach to his conviction, if he had any, was inoculating, not vaccinating, his own son; a second, having denied the real origin of vaccine, to give the credit to the cow, with a view to more easy propagandism. His contemporaries did not recognize in him either great learning or the most excellent manners. Once when spoken to respecting the accidents likely to happen to children from the practice, he replied, "It will make them grow horns." This joke of such bad taste had nevertheless a great success. What follows is more serious. We quote Villette de Terzé. Delicacy must suffer, but let Moseley be read attentively, and we shall see how just is the following estimate:—"He at first got from his colleagues and friends certificates stating that it was really he, *Jenner*, and not Nash, who had first experimented in a medical manner with this means of preservation known to all the country people; then *adroitly* he inserted into these certificates, that if Mr. Jenner was willing to publish his discovery he ought to be very well paid for it." "This mode of getting certificates," continues Villette, "is generally the most employed and most successful among charlatans for puffing their specifics. Medicine does not know prophylactics any more than beauty depends on 'essence of youth.'" Truth, alas, too much despised!

† From the time of the Crimean expedition a fact has become well known and published, but from which vaccinators do not wish to draw any deductions. It is this—the English and French armies at Varna were decimated by cholera. It was the same with the Russians. The Turks who were in the same camp with the English and French were not touched by the epidemic. English, French, Russians were vaccinated. The Mahometans had not been vaccinated. Is there a physician who can draw from this more than one conclusion, and that the same that I have

At the time when we wrote "there are not new maladies but an enormous aggravation* in the maladies of youth," there came unexpectedly the works of H. Carnot, that "happy concordance of medical observation and mathematical science," according to M. Flourens, secretary of the Academy of Sciences.

To the statistics of Carnot we may add a short table showing the increase of mortality between 20 and 30 years of age, at two different epochs:—

In the Department of the Seine,—

1802.....63 per 1000 of total deaths.

1860.....99 " "

In the whole of France,—

1802.....49 per 1000 of total deaths.

186067 " "

The mortality then at these ages has increased in 58 years 18 per cent. for the whole of France, and 36 per cent. for the Department of the Seine.

Many facts reveal themselves as corollaries of this increased mortality in the age of fecundity, facts exhibited by the general statistics of the French population.

1. Increasing augmentation of still-births, because while the mother suffers the child dies.

2. Augmentation of marriages, 8 in 10,000 inhabitants (France), because the conjugal union in the time of fecundity being more often broken by death than formerly, the young widow or widower remarries.

3. Diminution of infants by marriage, because second marriages are more frequent than formerly, and the young widow who remarries will not have so many children with two husbands as she would have had with the first had she retained him in good health.

The conclusion, a very sad one for the family, for the nation, foreseen as we have already said, by Rowley, is, that cow-pox has done *nothing but displace mortality*.

We much regret here the absence of English statistics ranged according to age as the French are. We can, nevertheless, say with

drawn from the case of the farm people seized with typhoid fever? The army surgeons have stated the fact, but nothing more.

* The Statistics of Mortality for Paris from the 1st of January, 1839, to 1st of January, 1849, inserted in the *Moniteur* of 28th February, 1853, by M. Trebauchet, prove that the deaths by typhoid fevers now amount to 21 per cent. of the total deaths. The mathematical proofs exist; it would be tedious to give them. We content ourselves with repeating after M. Serres:—"Humanity is interested in the thorough knowledge of a disease which becomes more and more frequent and which, since we have made it known, has lost nothing of its gravity or danger, 1847.

Carnot, who had studied all the available figures, that in England the increase of the population is not what it was before the introduction of vaccination. Let us have, then, in this light loving country, statistics of the ages of the deceased, at different epochs, for example, in 1800, in 1830, and in 1866. We ask it earnestly from a Government beloved by the country, that we may be satisfied and know the truth which vaccinators have repelled as a personality, both in France and in England.

SECTION V. AUGMENTATION OF INFIRMITIES SINCE VACCINATION.

Vaccination is an offence against nature. It tends to diminish all the advantages with which the Creator has endowed man in his birth, viz., health, strength, beauty, and intellectual faculties.

"Every artificial action," says Carnot, "is followed by a natural re-action, were it otherwise the creation would be at the mercy of the creature, a thought equally absurd and impious."

In the seven Conscriptions in France, from 1831 to 1837, there were 459,000 exempted on account of infirmity, and 504,000 reckoned fit for service.

In the seven Conscriptions, from 1839 to 1845, 491,000 were exempted, and 486,000 declared fit for service.

Thus, in the first period, out of 100 Conscripts 45·5 were infirm or dwarfish; in the second, 50 were in that sad position.

It seems, at least, that after so many exemptions, all the young soldiers of the French army ought to be robust and fit for service. Well, according to the Report of the 5th April, 1849, presented to the National Assembly by General Lamoricière, there was a mean loss per 100 men—

| | |
|---------------------------|-------|
| Of one year's service of | 7·50, |
| Of two ,, ,, | 6·50, |
| Of three ,, ,, | 5·50, |
| Of four ,, ,, | 4·50, |
| Of five ,, ,, | 3. |

In the sixth year the loss is 2 per cent., and this rate is maintained for the following years.

Such is the state of the French youth, its strength is diminished, and its health interfered with. From the authentic information thus obtained as to the state of young men of 21, we may judge with certainty of the state of weakness, debility, and infirmity of a great part of the French population and of the increase of the evil.

M. de Watteville, Inspector-General of Charitable Asylums, in a

Report to the Minister of the Interior, after having stated that the mortality is, very nearly, the same in 1847 as in 1780, in spite of the immense improvements of all kinds which have been introduced into these establishments, adds:—"As to the number of soldiers treated in our hospitals it surpasses all expectation. In 1847 the French army counted only 300,000 men. The military hospitals had in this year 63,000 patients, the civil hospitals 87,500, which gives a total of 150,500 soldiers admitted into hospital, that is 1 to 2. This seems almost impossible for men in the vigour of life."

Thus, in our modern armies, as well in England as France, soldiers perish in but very small numbers by the bullet or the sword, they rarely find a glorious death upon the battle-field, but they fall in the hospitals victims of typhoid and other dangerous fevers.

Women are not affected by the horrors of war nor the consequences of revolutions. Yet, authentic statistics, too long to repeat, prove that the mortality among them is parallel, age for age, with that of the male sex. Mortality has not augmented without maladies or without infirmities. These last go on always increasing, according to the Statistical Society of France, of which the author is a member. Let us mention merely the after effects of typhoid fever—teeth decayed, deafness, chronic derangement of the stomach, constitution deteriorated, and imbecility—these last, above all, are innumerable. Asylums are multiplied, and yet remain insufficient. Yes, this is the truth, the naked truth. Hence the general cry,—Degeneracy of the population!

SECTION VI. TROUBLE OF FAMILIES BY VACCINATION.

None but a Vaccinator knows the grief, the trouble of families from the moment vaccination is performed. The month of May is habitually chosen for this operation. The Vaccinator fixes his days, his hours, for its performance. But see him arrive at the appointed place, be it either town or country, the mothers carrying their infants, come slowly, embarrassment and fear are printed in their faces. All wish to speak apart with the physician; they all hesitate up to the moment of the operation. At last the most confident draws on the others. The operation commences, but no joy, no satisfaction accompanies it, the poor mother with her child vaccinated returns home as sadly as she came. The Vaccinator is assailed with questions. "Is the matter good?" "Where did you get it?" "I would not have it from that child, he has bad blood?" "I would not like it from the other, his parents have ugly disorders?" "My child has always been well, will it not make him ill?" "His brother who was vaccinated two years ago has been ill ever since, and I fear it will be the same with this one?" "My husband does not wish him to be vaccinated?" "You will come again and give us the lymph from little Francis, because we know his father and mother." If the Vaccinator is a man of honesty and intelli-

gence his heart must bleed every time he practices vaccination ; it so happened to myself. These times of vaccination became more and more painful to me, because at the end of my vaccinal career, which was not a long one, doubt had seized on my mind. I returned always sad and anxious after these operations. Never did I experience the satisfaction with which I have opened a deep abscess, or performed an operation for hernia, or administered at the right time a dose of quinine for a pernicious fever. My dear and young colleagues, who may read this essay, act in good faith, and testify if I have painted in false colours your uneasiness, your embarrassments, or the solicitude and grief of the mothers when you have been vaccinating. Remember the man who had the courage to say 20 years since,—“ We sow cow-pox and reap typhoid fever !”

The sowing of cow-pox has caused the reaping of yet other things—the aggravation of all intestinal maladies, the increasing mortality of youth, the degeneracy of the nation. Let the high medical authorities, whom you will quickly name, teach and counsel vaccination. They resemble those fierce journalists who cry for war in their private rooms. A man may have spirit, but the people have still more. Vaccination in spite of 60 years practice inspires always suspicion and repugnance in the heart of the people. *Vox populi, Vox Dei.* With this popular voice may be associated that of the most eminent men. Vaccination has become a question of *amour propre* with our learned Societies. “ There is not one of them,” said some one to me, “ who would now patronize vaccination after the works of Carnot.” Pressed by public opinion they are dumb, and are careful to avoid the serious questions the subject involves, they quietly let opinion have its way, and spare themselves the pain of pronouncing the words,—“ We have been wrong !” Words which always scorch the mouth. Yet we have named as illustrations physicians and vaccinators—Castel, Bretonneau, and others, who, enlightened by experience have renounced the practice. Here are other names of high repute. One day, in 1851, the academician, Rouchoux, on the occasion of a Report concerning the practice, said in full assembly :—“ We have vaccinated too much. The dangers of this discovery are manifest on all hands.” In 1832, in Germany, Schreiber wrote an eloquent argument against vaccination. He holds that,—“ The boasts of Vaccinators have been accepted too lightly and without examination.” The list of books, pamphlets, &c., is too long to cite here, we mention merely the titles of some :—“ *La Vaccine est un abus.*” Par Ritter, 1851. “ *L’Empoisonnement,*” with this epigraph—*Scientiam profanasti, populum occidisti, terram perdidisti.* (Nittinger, 1852). The writings of these and many other *savants* have done nothing but realize the sad, serious, and reasonable forebodings of the venerable and learned Rowley, when he said in the book so often quoted,—“ Human wisdom cannot foresee the extent of the evils which vaccination is introducing.” Wise, honest, and courageous man, you who have honoured the country of your birth, were you

living I should respond to you. "The follies of the fathers do not make their children wise."

Here are accusations more recent. In the Medical School of Montpellier, which rivals that of Paris in brilliancy, one of its most celebrated Professors, Chretien, said,—“Governments will be obliged very soon to repress vaccination with as much energy as they have displayed in propagating it.” 1854.

We terminate this Section with an extract from a letter of Baron A. Humboldt, in which this illustrious man, well known the world over, gives his opinion on vaccination, and on the merits of a work from which we have had occasion to quote: —“A letter addressed to the President of the Board of Health, by John Gibbs, Esq., entitled, “Compulsory Vaccination briefly considered in its Scientific and Political aspects,” printed by order of the House of Commons:—

“Sir,—The gentle complaints of my long silence do not assuredly attach to any coldness or want of moral interest with which I had received your work, full of sagacity and profound views respecting the degeneration with which humanity appears to be menaced in a large portion of Europe. I have been so much struck with the merit and penetration of mind which distinguish the work of Mr. Gibbs, that I remember having spoken of it with just praise to my illustrious friend, M. Schönlein, the First Physician to the King, who perceives with me the progressive advance of opinion respecting the dangerous influence of Vaccination in France, in England, and in Germany. This opinion in States where military Conscription is in force, presents, without doubt, threatening evidence, by the comparison of the numbers of those who are found unfit for service. The question of the repetition of re-vaccination, supposed to be necessary, becomes from year to year more perplexed.

“ALEXANDER HUMBOLDT.”

“Berlin; Oct. 18, 1858.”

CHAPTER V.

CONTRADICTIONS AND ERRORS OF VACCINATORS.

"If men had any interest in denying the similitude of two triangles with proportionate sides, they would do it. If this truth did but embarrass them, they would oppose it with absurd sophisms."—*Carnot*.

A DISCOVERY which, after 70 years, is sustained only by immense sums of money, is already condemned.

Yet, beyond a doubt, vaccinators are becoming more guarded in their admiration, for now they have more confidence in a determined silence than in assertions, which are alike destitute of modesty and originality. We shall no longer hear these absurdities, be it from the Paris Academy or the London Board, viz., "*Cow-pox preserves for ever!*" "*All vaccinated persons recover from small-pox.*" "*Vaccination will banish the scourge of small-pox.*"

These zealous defenders, among whom we must place the author of the "*Blue Book, or Papers relating to the History and Practice of Vaccination*"* (1857), avow, with some humility, that "*Cow-pox is not infallible; that it has its weaknesses and its failures.*" So says an Academician; and that the "*pitting*" in small-pox announces a certain danger which vaccination is impotent to charm. The same avowal, very painful no doubt, is in the "*Annual Report of the National Vaccine Board.*" There the vaccinated also die of small-pox, but by *super-added disease*.

The natural, logical, and physiological conclusion is that the cow-pox virus, without destroying the germ of variola, merely retarded its growth and manifestation, and that, this moment arrived, small-pox combined with the disposition of the body and with the prevailing maladies; hence that union, that combination which now, as in the time of Stoll, Boerhaave, and Sydenham, renders small-pox malignant and dangerous. This is what might be understood with

* This compilation is one of the most audacious mystifications of the age. The public mind being much disturbed by the writings of John Gibbs, Gregory, and others, an inquiry into the practice of vaccination was demanded and ordered to be made. Everybody expected a serious investigation; but what happened? The commission consisted of a single person (Mr. Simon), just raised to a post of honour with a large salary; and what did he do? To deceive the public, and secure a semblance of impartiality, he issued a circular letter with questions attached, and addressed these to doctors, but principally to those of whose sentiments he had a shrewd guess. The English replies are, in a great majority, those of public vaccinators, while the four French ones are those of well-known partizans of the practice. Nevertheless, very serious differences of opinion are expressed; but all these are ignored in the Report, which, in such a case, ought to have been a summary of evidence, and not an elaborate specimen of special pleading.

the most common knowledge of medicine. In Paris, as in London, they do like the man who took a telescope to discover what lay at his feet.

The retardation and displacement of small-pox by vaccination is mathematically demonstrated. Thus, out of 1000 small-pox deaths, were counted :--

BEFORE VACCINATION.

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
| Under 10 years | . | . | . | . | . | 908 |
| Above 10 years | . | . | . | . | . | 92 |
| | | | | | | — 1000 |

SINCE VACCINATION.

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
| Under 10 years | . | . | . | . | . | 360 |
| Above 10 years | . | . | . | . | . | 640 |
| | | | | | | — 1000 |

Each age has maladies peculiar to itself ; eruptive fevers are the appanage of infancy, the same as derangements of the bowels are that of youth, and cerebral hemorrhages that of old age. But as this crisis comes generally but once on the same subject, the ages following infancy privileged before vaccination are now fiercely threatened.

The celebrated Pringle, in his "Treatise on the Maladies of Armies," has said with much reason :—" Small-pox is rare in camps and armies." It is now the contrary. We find a new proof of it in the Reports of the Vaccine Board. There is self-glorification for the services rendered in the frequent despatch of fluid lymph to the army, navy, garrisons, prisons ; in a word, everywhere among an adult population, which was not formerly, according to Pringle, liable to the attacks of this disorder. But the vaccine committees, well paid for their work, wish to show some work for their pay. Like the idol of the prophet, *Oculos habent et non videbunt*.

We are still far from the end of the contradictions of vaccinators.

" The operation was bad,"* say they ; " the lymph used was too old

* Here is a new explanation just brought out on the bad methods of vaccinating. It is recent (" La France Medicale," May 25th). We owe it to a zealous vaccinator, Du Martineucq. It is curious in more than one aspect : first by its avowals, and then by the practice it recommends. Our author establishes that " the vaccine lymph is so much more pure when taken superficially." All depends, then, according to him, on the *modus faciendi*, and not on the lymph. By not having always taken the fluid lymph superficially he has had, like all other operators, " failures and very deplorable morbid results." It is a pity that Dr. Martineucq has been so long without seeing and making known the "*deplorable morbid results*" of the bad methods of vaccinating pursued up to this time ! His method is so simple. Take the lymph from the top of the pustule, never from the middle, or the base, or deeply. To do that, one may say, is rather difficult, for the pustule is often much flattened ; but we shall have a peculiar lancet, that of Dr. Danet. Without these precautions there is failure—danger. You will understand by comparison. Here is a fine peach ; you bite the top, then you get a delicious and wholesome taste. But if unhappily your teeth penetrate too far (the limit cannot be measured), the worse for you, for

besides," they say; again, "the cicatrices often have not a real value;" and last, "if the vaccinated are attacked, they have the disease in a mild form."

We reply: "Vaccination has been carefully watched over. With regard to cicatrices, everything depends on the nature of the skin and of the temperament, and the small-pox which kills the patient is a *variola maligna*."

"Mothers," add the English Reporters, "with a view to prevent lymph being taken from their children, ought not to open the pustules; they should be afterwards counted: eight are worth more than six, and, for a stronger reason, two than one." (*National Vaccine Board*.)

The French Academy replies with asperity, that a single one is quite as good as six or eight; it is expedient, in this case, to reassure parents on the validity of vaccination. (*Instruction sur la Vaccine*.)

Then comes the question of re-vaccination. The Academy opposed it for a long time, regarding it as likely to throw disfavour on the practice of vaccination. Consulted by the Ministry of Public Instruction, it replied on the 14th July, 1840:—"Re-vaccinations have so little success that they should not be made a rule for the administration." In 1842-3-4, this same Academy persists in its conclusions, supporting them on the consideration that "re-vaccination would have, as its result, the *destruction of the yet ill-established confidence of the people* in the preservative effects of vaccination." Nevertheless, in July, 1845, the Academy saw the necessity of modifying these doctrines; with hesitation it condemned itself, and finished by adopting re-vaccination. Then commenced the difficulty of applying it; some would re-vaccinate in time of epidemic small-pox, others at the age of puberty, others in seven years, others in three years; M. Trousseau said, *every year*. The Report of the National Vaccine Board, on the contrary, would, on no account, hear of it. There never was agreement between these high vaccinal authorities. We shall see it in other things.

The original vaccine, it has been said, is enfeebled by 44 years of successive transmissions; it must be renewed, regenerated, a "new supply from its source would replace it advantageously." The Academy replies: "Nothing is changed in the vaccine; it is now what it was in 1798." This poor Academy has again to change and condemn itself. The idea of regenerating a virus was too beautiful not

immediately you are under the stroke of "deplorable morbid results." It is for this reason and after "experience" of M. Martineucq that (mark the words) "the preservative virtue of vaccination is rendered doubtful," it is even accused of being "*more baneful than useful*," "which," he adds sadly, "is extremely annoying and unfortunate." See what happens on biting your fruit too heartily, and remember that this has been constantly done during 70 years; remember that there has never been found a single vaccinator capable of teaching us the good *modus faciendi* of M. Martineucq! Let us hold to the testimony of this vaccinomaniac, which will be, we venture to say, ill received in his own camp, and as to the rest, we answer him with Horace, "*Spectatum admissi risum teneatis amici!*"

to have admirers, and these soon became numerous. From this moment diligent search was made for *cow-pox*, as rare in France as in England, and when it was believed to have been found, the confidence of these great vaccinators was grand. "We do not deny," say they in their joy, "that the lymph may have lost in the circulation something of its force and its primitive energy." Let not slip then any opportunity of renewing the lymph, cries M. Bousquet, the director of vaccination, forgetting what he had said before.

By the side of these words let us place the following, issued after the lapse of some time by the National Vaccine Board: "The opinion still prevails that the lymph is becoming more feeble, and will eventually lose its effect after many transmissions through a number of subjects. This idea the council opposes *with entire confidence*, and sees *no reason for having recourse to the cow for a renewed supply.*" (Report for 1853.)

In the midst of these contradictions, a decisive voice made itself heard in London. Dr. Gregory, well known by his many works, and Physician of the London Small-pox Hospital, published elaborate statistics of his patients. His paper was entitled, "Vaccination put to the Proof after Half a Century of Experience," and produced a profound sensation in London. Read before the Medical and Chirurgical Society, March 9th, 1852, it was published on the 26th of June of the same year in the "Medical Times."* Inoculation, he informs us, "was prohibited in England and Ireland, by Act of Parliament, in 1840. This Act was rigorously enforced in all parts of the country.† Nevertheless, small-pox is as much spread now, in spite of great watchfulness, as it was before the Act of 1840. The prohibitory clause of that Act has not *in the least degree* diminished small-pox. The idea of extirpating it by vaccination is absurd and chimerical, and on the part of Jenner was as hasty as it was presumptuous. The small-pox *attacks the vaccinated.* During eleven years, 4091 persons attacked with small-pox were admitted into the hospital, 2167 of these had been vaccinated. In the two years, 1850-51, out of 794 *adult* persons, *nearly all vaccinated*, 115 died.‡ Some were between the ages of nine and fifteen years; but under the age of nine years scarcely any vaccinated person having small-

* The "Medical Times" has forgotten this paper, for ever since its publication, as if displeased with its own action, it has shown itself ardently in favour of vaccination; the reason is simple, *virtus post nummos*.

† Now we have a new vaccination bill prepared by Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Hardy, and Mr. Hunt, which provides, clause 31, penalties upon persons inoculating with small-pox.

‡ These propositions accord with those of Tissot before vaccination, and of Serres after, as before quoted. We repeat, then, vaccinated and unvaccinated pass through the same danger, only the latter die in infancy, and the former in a more valuable age, when families, having sustained the burden of their education, look for recompense in support from them, and when they are regarded as the strength and hope of the nation.

pox had been admitted.* That could not be accidental, for numerous cases of unvaccinated children under nine years were admitted. I am brought, then, to the conclusion, that the susceptibility to the variolous miasma among vaccinated persons is augmented as life advances; the contrary of what happens to the unvaccinated portion of mankind, among whom the greatest susceptibility is in infancy."

To point out the evil was not the sole aim of this learned practitioner, he put his finger on one of the causes in the same memoir: we reproduce it, and demand strict attention from the reader: "There are high medical authorities to whom Parliament has committed the care of vaccination, who seek to explain away and palliate its notorious imperfections." This accusation has never met with an answer. There it is; we leave it, for justice, in the hands of conscientious men.

"The members of the National Vaccine Establishment have no reason to retract their strong opinion so frequently expressed, as to their *entire confidence* in the protective power of vaccination; a sincere investigation would easily dissipate the doubts and fears which by sophisms are too easily spread in the public mind."

Thus Gregory was "insincere," and a lover of "sophisms," according to these high medical authorities, so largely paid for sending from their office over the whole world, in each year, about 219,490 charges of lymph. Set to dissipate the fears in the public mind only too easily alarmed, it was diverted with the inquiry made by John Simon, to which we have already referred.

About the same time, the Academy of Paris described as apostasies, heresies, phantoms, paradoxes, what the English medical authorities describe (in the case of Gregory) as sophisms. To this extent in all countries salaried vaccine commissions resemble each other.

This chapter would be an unwieldy length did we attempt to exhaust the errors and contradictions of vaccinators; let us, however, yet cite a few more extracts from the French Reports:—

"Under certain influences small-pox is developed spontaneously." ("Desportes Reporter," 1845.)

"There are physicians who, giving themselves up to a sort of spite against a practice on which they had presumed too much, have dared to propose reversion to the practice of inoculation, and some have been found sufficiently daring to follow this dangerous counsel." (Bousquet, 1846.)

"Small-pox *always* owes its birth to contagion." ("Bousquet Reporter," 1846.)

"Inoculation is a practice, *mild, benign*, and appreciated as it deserves to be." (Bousquet, 1847.)

* The experience of this honest practitioner confirms the statistics of Carnot, and our own. There is in them a "happy concordance," as said M. Flourens, Perpetual Secretary of the Academy of Sciences.

"Small-pox is as common in youth as in infancy." (Bousquet, 1851.)

"Small-pox does not attack all ages *equally*; that it prevails particularly among infants is a fact well known. (Bousquet, 1853.)

"The vaccinated person finds himself *nearly as well preserved* as he who has had the small-pox." (Bousquet, 1853.)

"It must be acknowledged that vaccination does not present the same guarantees as natural small-pox." (Bousquet, 1854.)

It is a pity that the English Reports, made for many years on a flying sheet, cannot be placed with those of France, which take the form of a thick pamphlet, with a beautiful yellow cover. It is almost a drawing-room book. May we conclude that the pay is better in France than England? If so, let Lord Robert Montagu take the hint.

Here is a last circumstance, which, according to the language of the Board, is *lamentable*. You perceive we have to speak of syphilis-vaccinalis. We will be brief. We know that since the origin of vaccination syphilis has been transmitted by this practice. From Rowley to Ricord, examples have not been wanting. It is merely the observers that have sometimes been at fault.* Mr. Simon "had heard speak of it." He put the question then to his four friends in France with a smile of incredulity. Their answers could not be doubtful: it was brief, precise, and conclusive against the transmission. That of the Academy of Medicine ought to have a certain weight; it failed to secure it. M. Bousquet, as the great high-priest of his divinity, made himself, alone, the following answer. It is called in the "Blue Book," "Answer of the Academy of Medicine;" it has a place apart in the book, and deserves it. Here it is; be it for ever memorable:—

"Vaccination transmits cow-pox only; we may take lymph from itchy, scabby, or syphilitic subjects; it reproduces only cow-pox without any admixture. Vaccination exacts *no price* for its benefits."

Mark it well, ye vaccinators of London, and all countries beside! If you are not well convinced of the benefits so *gratuitously* rendered by vaccination, listen again to M. Bousquet, who speaks always with the authority properly belonging to the Reports above mentioned. His tone, perhaps you will say, is a little pedantic, but it is the tone of a master—in fact, of the Director-General of Vaccination:—

"All these questions and many* others have been treated in *detail* in the reports addressed by the Academy every year to the Government, and as we cannot repeat ourselves, we take the liberty of referring the President of the General Board of Health to them, particularly to the last ten Reports from 1849 to 1854."

* The Academy of Medicine has just received two reports from Drs. Guary de Figeac and Clary, local inspectors of public charities, on syphilitic accidents occurring in the Commune of Cardaillac (Cot), in consequence of a vaccination performed on a certain number of children. ("Séance" of May 6th, 1867.) The date is precious. Observers are becoming courageous.

We agree with M. Bousquet. As a well-bred man Mr. Simon ought not to have ignored the learned Reports of 1849 to 1854, all emanating from the man who holds alone the vaccinal sceptre,* and oblige him to repeat himself. There was an authority—fallen now it is true—but which was at least equal to that of Mr. Thomas Mayo. M. Bousquet has many other merits ; he is a thaumaturgist and prophet ; he speaks of miracles and makes prophecies. In 1860, in his Report, he predicted that the Department of the Gironde, where, for a long time, the vaccinations have equalled the births, so great was the zeal for cow-pox, would happily witness the disappearance of small-pox. Well, in 1861, eight months after the celebrated prophecy addressed to the superior authority, the capital of the Gironde, Bordeaux, and all its environs, was seized with a frightful epidemic of small-pox. We may consult on this MM. Ancelon and Nittinger, both called there by the Scientific Congress of France in the month of September. That year and that town had been chosen two years before to crown the author, and award to him a prize of 10,000 francs offered by Nittinger for the work which should refute the arguments which he and others had advanced against vaccination, and prove by consequence the excellence of that practice. The prize was not awarded ; the bait, however, was a fine one, and the prediction of Bousquet very reassuring. The small-pox epidemic deranged things a little, perhaps. But, however that may be, the course remains open, and the prize yet awaits a winner.

Alas ! these venturesome and always dangerous promises are of the same force as those made on the absence of danger from syphilis through means of vaccination.

The so-called learned bodies in London, as in Paris, will not avow that vaccination may transmit syphilis, for fear of disturbing "the confidence, still ill-established, of the people in vaccination." They employ themselves silently in endeavouring to regenerate vaccine on the young cow. That done, it becomes the object of a fruitful industry ; a heifer is led to the door, and the tubes filled on the spot with cow-pox. Adieu, then, to vaccination from arm to arm ; we will have no more of it ; it has too many faults wherewith to reproach itself. Syphilis has revealed the criminal, but now that it is brought before public opinion everybody casts a stone at it.

This is briefly what is passing in France. The Academy, not having courage to break up its idol, contents itself with vague promises of examination, but disturbed public opinion insists on having a solution.

It was then that the Minister of the Interior (note, that this is not at the suggestion of the Academy), ordered a certain doctor to vac-

* The details given by M. Bousquet on the works of Carnot are worth as much as those of the National Vaccine Board on that of Gregory. He has said, and attempted to prove, that the "Essay on Mortality compared before and after Vaccination" was a *heresy*, and that the physicians who approved of this work were the *dupes of the heresy*. Now, unhappily, M. Bousquet is much occupied with other things. After many petty quarrels his vaccinal empire is endangered. The cause is not syphilis-vaccinalis : it is rivalry !

ciate and re-vaccinate all the young prisoners in the country. Dr. Danet, who was charged with this mission, fulfilled it with zeal. He went through the prisons of the empire, vaccinated and re-vaccinated the poor wretches having no liberty or will of their own. Each prison saw the vaccinator once a-week, for the work necessitated it; but the work being too great for one, he got a colleague.* Then, ignorant of what was to happen soon after, he returned, full of satisfaction, and addressed to the Minister a Report which was very well received, for it obtained the honour of publication in the "Moniteur," and of being read at the Academy.

In it the lymph taken from arm to arm is roughly treated. It commences by saying that the heifer is rebellious against syphilis; the lymph from it, then, has never the inconvenience of transmitting this horrible disease. Yet, as with precautions danger might be avoided, the lymph taken from arm to arm, by means of a little confession, might still hope for pardon. But now the opportunity is gone, its reign is over. Hark to the condemnation! "It does not follow that because the eruption of ordinary vaccination has all the appearance of purity, it does not contain the *still latent germ* of one or other of those maladies which only await opportunity to develop themselves and fatally influence one of those great constitutional modifications which we know as crises."—"Séance de l'Académie," 7 Feb. 1867.

The great vaccinator with cow-pox, in the name of the government, does not suspect that there is only a word to change in his argument to make it applicable to his virus from the cow or horse. He ought to read Rowley, and revisit his prisons in a year's time.

The question of vaccination becomes more and more embroiled, not by the public, but by the journeymen vaccinators. Their cry is, "Save vaccination," but the embarrassment becomes greater and greater. The inoculation of syphilis by vaccination can no longer be denied; the vices of the blood, which may also be transmitted from arm to arm, complicate the discussion, which ought to be open and never is open. An unheard-of fact, the famous annual Report, drawn up in January, is not yet (15th May) published! What can be the reason? Merely the most profound dissension actually reigns in the camp of the vaccinators.†

* These two honourable vaccinators have not got on well together. In an interchange of letters worthy to rank with those of MM. Bousquet and Depaul, the head vaccinator has styled his assistant an "arm-hunter." The latter has replied, asserting that cow-pox is no better than ordinary lymph, and that very soon there will be no more disputes on vaccination.

† I am officially informed that the Report for the year 1867 is not yet printed.—Nov. 1869. G. S. G.



