



Über dieses Buch

Dies ist ein digitales Exemplar eines Buches, das seit Generationen in den Regalen der Bibliotheken aufbewahrt wurde, bevor es von Google im Rahmen eines Projekts, mit dem die Bücher dieser Welt online verfügbar gemacht werden sollen, sorgfältig gescannt wurde.

Das Buch hat das Urheberrecht überdauert und kann nun öffentlich zugänglich gemacht werden. Ein öffentlich zugängliches Buch ist ein Buch, das niemals Urheberrechten unterlag oder bei dem die Schutzfrist des Urheberrechts abgelaufen ist. Ob ein Buch öffentlich zugänglich ist, kann von Land zu Land unterschiedlich sein. Öffentlich zugängliche Bücher sind unser Tor zur Vergangenheit und stellen ein geschichtliches, kulturelles und wissenschaftliches Vermögen dar, das häufig nur schwierig zu entdecken ist.

Gebrauchsspuren, Anmerkungen und andere Randbemerkungen, die im Originalband enthalten sind, finden sich auch in dieser Datei – eine Erinnerung an die lange Reise, die das Buch vom Verleger zu einer Bibliothek und weiter zu Ihnen hinter sich gebracht hat.

Nutzungsrichtlinien

Google ist stolz, mit Bibliotheken in partnerschaftlicher Zusammenarbeit öffentlich zugängliches Material zu digitalisieren und einer breiten Masse zugänglich zu machen. Öffentlich zugängliche Bücher gehören der Öffentlichkeit, und wir sind nur ihre Hüter. Nichtsdestotrotz ist diese Arbeit kostspielig. Um diese Ressource weiterhin zur Verfügung stellen zu können, haben wir Schritte unternommen, um den Missbrauch durch kommerzielle Parteien zu verhindern. Dazu gehören technische Einschränkungen für automatisierte Abfragen.

Wir bitten Sie um Einhaltung folgender Richtlinien:

- + *Nutzung der Dateien zu nichtkommerziellen Zwecken* Wir haben Google Buchsuche für Endanwender konzipiert und möchten, dass Sie diese Dateien nur für persönliche, nichtkommerzielle Zwecke verwenden.
- + *Keine automatisierten Abfragen* Senden Sie keine automatisierten Abfragen irgendwelcher Art an das Google-System. Wenn Sie Recherchen über maschinelle Übersetzung, optische Zeichenerkennung oder andere Bereiche durchführen, in denen der Zugang zu Text in großen Mengen nützlich ist, wenden Sie sich bitte an uns. Wir fördern die Nutzung des öffentlich zugänglichen Materials für diese Zwecke und können Ihnen unter Umständen helfen.
- + *Beibehaltung von Google-Markenelementen* Das "Wasserzeichen" von Google, das Sie in jeder Datei finden, ist wichtig zur Information über dieses Projekt und hilft den Anwendern weiteres Material über Google Buchsuche zu finden. Bitte entfernen Sie das Wasserzeichen nicht.
- + *Bewegen Sie sich innerhalb der Legalität* Unabhängig von Ihrem Verwendungszweck müssen Sie sich Ihrer Verantwortung bewusst sein, sicherzustellen, dass Ihre Nutzung legal ist. Gehen Sie nicht davon aus, dass ein Buch, das nach unserem Dafürhalten für Nutzer in den USA öffentlich zugänglich ist, auch für Nutzer in anderen Ländern öffentlich zugänglich ist. Ob ein Buch noch dem Urheberrecht unterliegt, ist von Land zu Land verschieden. Wir können keine Beratung leisten, ob eine bestimmte Nutzung eines bestimmten Buches gesetzlich zulässig ist. Gehen Sie nicht davon aus, dass das Erscheinen eines Buchs in Google Buchsuche bedeutet, dass es in jeder Form und überall auf der Welt verwendet werden kann. Eine Urheberrechtsverletzung kann schwerwiegende Folgen haben.

Über Google Buchsuche

Das Ziel von Google besteht darin, die weltweiten Informationen zu organisieren und allgemein nutzbar und zugänglich zu machen. Google Buchsuche hilft Lesern dabei, die Bücher dieser Welt zu entdecken, und unterstützt Autoren und Verleger dabei, neue Zielgruppen zu erreichen. Den gesamten Buchtext können Sie im Internet unter <http://books.google.com> durchsuchen.

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

GoogleTM books

<https://books.google.com>



Sent by the Author.

VACCINATION
AND THE
VACCINATION LAWS:
A PHYSICAL CURSE,
AND
A CLASS-TYRANNY.

BY THE
REV. WM. HUME-ROTHERY

(A Clergyman of the Church of England, who gave evidence last year before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Vaccination).

Price 2d. each; 1s. 6d. a dozen; 10s. a hundred.

MANCHESTER:
PRINTED BY W. TOLLEY, 7, SPRING GARDENS.

1872.

7561

g 50



7561 950

VACCINATION
AND THE
VACCINATION LAWS:
A PHYSICAL CURSE,
AND
A CLASS-TYRANNY.

BY THE
REV. WM. HUME-ROTHERY

*(A Clergyman of the Church of England, who gave evidence last
year before the Select Committee of the House of Commons
on Vaccination).*

Price 2d. each; 1s. 6d. a dozen; 10s. a hundred.

MANCHESTER :
PRINTED BY W. TOLLEY, 7, SPRING GARDENS.

1872.



VACCINATION AND THE VACCINATION LAWS:

A PHYSICAL CURSE,

AND A CLASS-TYRANNY.

THE VACCINATION QUESTION REGARDED FROM DIFFERENT POINTS.

THERE are, on all sides, persons of truth-loving and earnest dispositions, who are drawn to the Vaccination question, with an eager desire to understand it according to its real deserts. Others there are whose minds are evidently a complete blank on the subject, because as yet they have not felt the necessity of giving it a serious thought. Others, from unworthy personal or worldly considerations, may have hitherto shrunk back from the idea of loyalty to unfashionable truth. Others committed, without due thought or reference to conscience, to the practice or defence of Vaccination, may, up to the present time, have refused to see and acknowledge that they have been cherishing and abetting a mischievous and cruel delusion. To the hearts, and rational insight, and common sense, of persons falling under any or all of these descriptions, the following aspects of the Vaccination question—one of the most momentous questions that are pending—are respectfully presented, with the earnest wish that God's righteous will, as revealed to the individual mind in its highest conception of right, may be the standard of judgment in reference to these views, and that, whatever verdict may be distinctly pronounced thereon, it may be unreservedly proclaimed and faithfully carried out into act:—

I. Vaccination, generally said to have been discovered by Edward Jenner, though it was practised by Edward Jesty, a farmer, twenty years before Jenner made his first experiment as a Vaccinator (see Mr. Shaw Lefevre's speech in the House of Commons, in 1807), was the artificial creation of a disease in a human being, by insertion into the blood of corrupt matter, first taken from the foul heels of the consumptive horse, and then passed through the cow, upon whose teats or udder it appeared in a pustular form. Jenner taught that a person once Vaccinated was "for ever after" protected from small-pox (see "an Inquiry into the Causes and Effects of Variolæ Vaccinæ," by Edward Jenner, M.D., page 7). He also asserted that "pustulous sores which appear spontaneously upon the nipple of cows" do not yield the protecting matter, which, be it observed, is mere corruption (see Jenner's "Inquiry," pp. 7, 8, 22, 27, &c.). He, moreover, declared (see the 34th page of his "Inquiry"), that "the virus from the horse, when it proves infectious to the human subject, is not to be relied upon as rendering the system secure from variolous infection, but that the matter

produced by it on the nipple of the cow is perfectly so." It may here be mentioned that Dr. Davy, at the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association, held last year at Plymouth, stated in his paper on "Jenner and his Teachings," that Vaccinators of this day fail to practice Vaccination "in the light of the first great teacher of the art:" that the "quality of the vaccine lymph now too much in use" is "comparatively useless," and that "no time can be so opportune as the present to ask the best attention of medical men" to "the teachings of the famous physician of Berkeley," viz., that it is grease from the heels of the unhealthy horse, "taken before it has lost its early pellucidity, which in its passage through the cow is converted into what is the only reliable antidote to that most terrible of all contagions—small-pox." (See *Lancet*, of Aug. 12, 1871, at pp. 240 & 241). From the above it is clear and indisputable that at the present day there is no such thing as Vaccination, according to the standard of Jenner, and that the medical practice which now bears that name is a gross and reprehensible fraud upon the public.* But were the original superstition reinstated, I defy any rational being, in his conscience, to deny that it would be a bestial and corrupting practice which would have no right whatever to exist upon God's earth.

II. As lymph is to be found only in the lymphatic vessels, and as there are no vessels of this description in the pock or pustule produced by what is falsely termed Vaccination, it is clear there can be no such thing as "pure lymph" in this connection. It is, therefore, manifest that these oft-repeated words, and the rottenness they denote, are embodied falsehoods, which for duty's sake and the public weal, ought to be exposed and condemned.

III. The practice called Vaccination is in violent opposition, as any one may see, to the Divinely-established order of nature, the effort of which, in every living organism, is always to expel an invading evil, never to engraft one, to promote perfection. It must, therefore, be injurious to the nature which the All-good and All-wise Creator has given us. Surely no conscientious man, with his mind open to this fact, would be a party to the perpetration of this unnatural deed upon the tender body of a helpless babe.

* It is a fact within my own knowledge that the fraud sometimes goes still further, Vaccination being performed with glycerine and cathartics instead of the rotten tissue called vaccine. This humane, but fraudulent practice, which produces a pustule like that of Vaccination, and is resorted to in order to avoid the well-known dangers of Vaccination, speaks for itself

IV. There is no principle, or eternal law, which is God's will as revealed to man, underlying, justifying, or illustrating this unnatural practice, which must, therefore, be unprincipled or atheistic, and, consequently, not merely opposed to all that is good, but fraught with evils which it would be difficult to estimate.

V. The theory of this so-called Vaccination is that we must do evil that good may come; create a disease to prevent a disease; a minor, which may be followed by life-long sufferings or a speedy and untimely death, to prevent a major, which might never occur, and could not possibly occur if the laws of health were faithfully obeyed. This theory would justify every description of wickedness within certain bounds. It, and the practice alluded to, which is based upon it, must, therefore, be indefensible on any Christian or rational ground whatever.

VI. It being an unchangeable law of God, that whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap, if we allow surgeons to sow rotten tissue in the blood, by the rite of Vaccination, it must inevitably follow that we shall reap a miserable harvest of disease and death.

VII. The blood, which is the life of the flesh, is so jealously guarded from whatever might be injurious to health, that nothing from without *immediately* enters it. The skin, the lungs, and the digestive apparatus, which are the organs provided for conveying nourishment to the blood, are endowed with a discriminating and sifting power, so that they may exclude or reject, as is done in normal conditions, whatever might be detrimental to the system, and accept only what is necessary to repair and sustain it. Now, by lancing or tattooing the skin, and putting the product of a sore *directly* into the blood, the protection established by the All-wise Creator is infringed, and the bodily organism deprived of its right of selection of such substances as are needed for its well-being, whilst a poison, which has been expelled by Providence in nature is nevertheless forced into the blood of a healthy babe. A practice which begins by outraging some of the simplest laws of physiology, to say nothing of the insanity of its fighting against God, is self-condemned, and can be productive of nothing but mischief.

Dr. Tanner informs us that "there are some poisons, as that of the viper, which although most deadly when introduced into the blood through a wound, are harmless when swallowed;" and that "it is well known that the poisons of venomous reptiles may be smeared upon the lips and tongue, or even swallowed with impunity," though any of them inserted into the blood would be speedily followed by a fatal result. (See Memoranda on Poisons, by Dr. Tanner, pp. 3, 124, & 125). By the right of the analogy as here presented, it may be seen how exceedingly dangerous is the practice of wounding the arm of a babe, and putting an animal poison, called vaccine, directly into its blood. With this truth upon his heart, no good man could consent to be a Vaccinator, or approve the venomous practice of Vaccination.

VIII. A clear view of the cause of small-pox is alone sufficient to convince any rational mind that Vaccination is, at least, an insane and useless practice.

Impurity having entered the blood from an impure source, which may be a poisoned atmosphere, polluted water, sewer-gas, an ill-ventilated house or factory, or an ash-pit or midden radiating pestilence, the vital powers of the body, if strong enough, throw it out, under the direction of Providence, from the centre to the circumference, it may be in the shape of small-pox, from which the poison may be rapidly exhaled. Small-pox, then, must be a purifying process. Now, if when the blood has been poisoned, this eruptive method of eliminating the poison were prevented, let us say by Vaccination, performed either in infancy or at a later period, the inevitable consequence would be that the poison, imprisoned in the blood, would produce either a sudden death, or lay the foundation of some internal disease which would lead to death.

If, then, Vaccination were even a preventive of small-pox, whilst the originating cause of the disease remained untouched, it would nevertheless be a curse instead of a blessing.

IX. As impurity is the cause of small-pox, impurity in the blood being expelled in impurity on the skin, it is clear that nothing can prevent small-pox (or any other disease), but genuine purity. If we cultivate pure motives and pure principles, pure hearts and pure lives, if we have pure homes, pure meats, pure drinks, pure air, and pure surroundings, we may rest assured that no plague can approach our dwellings.

This is the Gospel of health.

By the light of this Gospel we may see that, so long as the laws of health are violated, God's air polluted with smoke, God's water fouled with refuse, and God's poor children herded together in places unfit for human abode, disease must be the Providential consequence, that we may thereby learn that disorder is disorder, and may thence be induced to reform our lives and our ways.

Vaccination, or any other device, as a substitution for obedience, must, thank God, prove itself to be wretchedly disappointing.

X. The cry for re-vaccination is a proof of the signal failure of vaccination, of unwillingness to learn a lesson from experience, and of blind determination to uphold the system of Jenner, notwithstanding the evident collapse which falsifies his teaching respecting it.

Perseverance in a good cause is commendable; but to repeat a practice which is not justified by principle is simply to repeat a crime. To continue in such practice, in defiance of the light shining around, is to continue in darkness.

When the prodigal in the parable found that husks would not sustain him, he abandoned them, and returned to his Father's home. Had pro-vaccinators the practical sense represented by the prodigal, they would not, after witnessing the disappointing character of vaccination, recommend re-vaccination, but would openly and gladly repudiate the whole system as a deplorable mistake.

Truth comes simply to save and to bless. Kind Reader, whether will you confess the Truth before men or deny it; faithfully obey it, or condemn and crucify it? May you forsake all, take up your cross, and follow the Truth, assured that you are thus following the leading of God's Providential Love.

THE IDOL OF MEDICAL AUTHORITY GROUND TO DUST.

One of the stock assertions frequently put forward as argument in defence of State blood-poisoning is that doctors alone are competent to deal with this question, and that as they have decided in favour of vaccination, "we ought to accept their decision as true." Mr. Serjeant Simon, M.P. for Dewsbury, told a deputation of anti-vaccinators that the issue raised before a late Parliamentary Committee was an issue based upon medical supposition, on which none could be permitted to form an opinion but those acquainted with medical science and practice; that the House of Commons, in reference to this question, was in the hands of medical experts; and that any decision finally come to on the subject must be based entirely on medical testimony. Now, what is the plain English of all this? That medical men are infallible on medical subjects, and that non-medical men should accept their opinions without question or doubt; that, nevertheless, gentlemen who had not received a medical education consented to sit on a Committee of inquiry into a subject on which neither they nor the laymen they undertook to examine could be allowed to form an opinion; and that Parliament, consisting chiefly of laymen, presumed to legislate on a question entirely beyond the grasp of the lay understanding. Our forefathers had to war against priestly despotism. It is our lot to battle against medical assumption and medical despotism.

Let us now see what is the real value of medical supposition in reference to State blood poisoning, usually called vaccination.

The medical world is divided in opinion upon this point, men of eminence having discarded the practice as a crime against nature, and a sin against God. I may mention some who, within the last twenty years have written and spoken against vaccination. In *England*, Collins, Garth Wilkinson, Pearce, Mitchell, M.P., Benton, Welch, Forbes Laurie, Andrews, Kitchener, W. J. Laurie, Hor. Johnson, Tuthill Massey, *John Skelton, *Borman, *T. Jones, *A. Cooke, *John Pratt, *Alf. Pearce. In *France*, Verdé de Lisle, Physician to the Princess Mathilde, Ancelon, Bayard de Cirey, Villette de Terzé, Caron, de Biermont, Cayal, Chassaingnac, Diday, Devergie, Guepin, Guer-sant, Herard, Herpin, Lecoq, Noirot, Rey, Roux, Teissier, Viennois Bretonneau, Chretien, Trousseau, Henri Favre, editor of *La Franco Medicale*, Duché, J. Lapeyrène. In *Germany*, Nittinger, Grieb, Griesinger, of Stuttgart; Hammerick, of Prague; Steinbacher, of Munich; C. F. Winter, of Luneburg; Clotar Muller, of Leipzig; Betz, of Heilbroun; Brefeld, of

Breslau; Coemarar, of Ulm; Fischer, of Hanover; Frankel, of Berlin; Wegeler, of Cologne; Hochstetter, of Erlangen. In *Russia*, Volk, of Moscow. In *Denmark*, Carl Otto, Copenhagen. In *Hungary*, Schaller. In *Holland*, Capadon, the Hague. In *America*, Shew, Trall, Schiefel-decker. In *Canada*, Codorre, of Montreal.

These have all denounced vaccination. The late Dr. Copland, in his *Cyclopaedia*, at p. 823, declares that a majority of medical men in all countries are doubtful of any good results from vaccination. The late Dr. Gregory, for fifty years physician of the London Small-pox Hospital, said in a paper published in the *Medical Times*, June 26th, 1852, "The idea of extirpating it (small-pox) by vaccination, is absurd and chimerical, and on the part of Jenner was as hasty as it was presumptuous." Dr. Gregory refused to have his own children vaccinated.

But even those who applaud the practice, present to us little besides a mass of contradictory opinions.

(a) Jenner said that horse grease was the origin of the protecting matter. Most medical men now a-days say that on this point Jenner was in error.

(b) Jenner taught that one puncture was sufficient. Sir William Jenner told the Vaccination Committee that his great namesake would have changed his opinions with advancing science; anything, he said, as to one puncture being sufficient, would now be of little worth. (Yet for these worthless opinions Parliament gave Jenner £30 000.) Mr. Marson says, "The more punctures the better."

(c) Mr. Simon "sees no necessity for reverting to the cow for a supply of matter." Dr. Bakewell "thinks the vaccine lymph has deteriorated from being taken from the arm, in lieu of the cow." Mr. Marson "thinks the cow, inoculated from the human subject, or having the disease in a natural way, the best source for supply of lymph." Jenner distinctly taught that the spontaneous disease upon the teats or udders of cows did not yield the protecting fluid.

(d) Mr. Simon says, "The purity of vaccine lymph is easily detected by the eyesight." Dr. Wood declares that medical men "cannot always detect by sight any impurity in the lymph." Sir William Jenner "can conceive it possible that blood may be in the lymph unseen, and that impure blood may convey disease."

(e) Mr. Marson says in his evidence, "Large numbers are badly vaccinated; there are very few indeed who do it thoroughly well." Dr. Wood, of Edinburgh, is of opinion that "a person incompetent to perform the very simple operation of vaccination would, *a fortiori*, be unfit to perform a hundred other surgical operations."

(f) Mr. Simon says, "Vaccination is the only protection against small-pox, except isolation;" yet he also declares that "natural small-pox is a greater protection against another attack than vaccination." Sir William Gull "considers vaccination as protective as small-pox itself." Mr. Marson affirms that "small-pox is a much greater protection than vaccination

* These have been prosecuted, for non-compliance with the Vaccination laws.

against small-pox." Dr. Wood "considers vaccination gives only the same protection that a previous attack of small-pox would give; the worst case he ever attended had been vaccinated; was deeply pitted with small-pox, and died of a second attack in its most virulent form."

(g) Mr. Marson holds that good vaccination is where it is done in four or more places, leaving good cicatrices, *i.e.*, distinctly indented with well-defined edges." Dr. Wood believes with Dr. Hein, that "the character of the cicatrix cannot be relied on." Sir William Gull thinks that, "to look at the vesicle at the end of the week is the best way of testing vaccination."

(h) Mr. Simon holds that "vaccination well done, is protective for life;" nevertheless, he recommends re-vaccination between the ages of 15 and 18, because of the large number of bad vaccinations, performed by duly qualified vaccinators, who would find a difficulty in guaranteeing that a second operation would be any better than the first, which, notwithstanding its worthlessness, was paid for under a very different impression. Sir William Jenner declares that "if a person be thoroughly protected 8 or 10 years, when exposed to small-pox, if an epidemic comes, he shall not be then protected though he had been a week before."

(i) Mr. Simon, in his report of 1857, puts down the annual mortality from small-pox for 30 years prior to vaccination, at 3,000. Afterwards he is willing that the number should be 2,500. Mr. Marson does not know whether small-pox is more or less prevalent since vaccination than before. From the Registrar-General we learn that in the 17 principal towns and cities of England, there were 13,174 small-pox fatalities last year; in the last quarter of last year there were 6,380 deaths; and in the whole year 22,907 deaths from small-pox.

(j) Jenner said a person once vaccinated was protected for life. Sir J. Clarke Jervoise, of Idsworth, Hordean, Hants, has two relatives who were vaccinated by Jenner, but who subsequently, when still young men, had such an attack of confluent small-pox that at the time their father did not know them.

(k) Dr. Alcyne Nicholson says in his pamphlet that if even one case of disease from vaccination could be made out, which he does not believe to be possible, the Compulsory Law should be repealed. Dr. Blanc, also an ardent pro-vaccinator, declares in his pamphlet, that persons who thus dogmatise are greater foes to vaccination than the anti-vaccinators themselves! Moreover, Mr. Jonathan Hutchinson proved, even to the conviction of Mr. Simon himself, that the foulest of all diseases had been transmitted by vaccination to eleven out of thirteen adults vaccinated from one child.

(l) Sir Dominic Corrigan declares that "in deference to popular ideas he would select a healthy child, but thinks a competent operator will take nothing but lymph from the vesicle, and that such, taken from a syphilitic child, may be used without any but the proper vaccination result." Sir William Gull

says that Hunter and others maintained and made experiments to prove that syphilis could not be communicated by vaccination from syphilitic subjects. Dr. Bakewell testifies that "scraping the lymph of the vesicle will bring away epidermic scales, and thus other diseases may be inoculated without blood."

(m) It is often stated that a larger percentage of un-vaccinated persons die of small-pox than of those who are vaccinated. Mr. Marson states that "in certain unmodified cases, where the mortality was light, he had assumed, though there was no cicatrix to show, they were protected to some extent, or they would have died in the same proportion as the unvaccinated." And Mr. Simon tells us that six unvaccinated persons died on board Her Majesty's Ship Octavia, as if he had forgotten that in the appendix to his Report of 1857 he had stated that the Royal Navy was, according to regulations, a perfectly protected class; all men and boys entering the service, who have not satisfactory marks of vaccination or previous small-pox, being immediately vaccinated.

(n) One writer in the *Lancet* says that re-vaccination lymph is protective; another that it is criminal to use such lymph.

(o) According to instructions issued from the late Medical Department of the Privy Council, lymph should be taken before the development of the areola: according to Jenner such lymph is unripe and useless.

Enough has been said to show that medical opinion on the subject of State blood poisoning is self-contradictory and unreliable. It is a mere *will-o'-the-wisp*. Indeed, medical opinion on any medical subject whatever is of a very doubtful character, seeing that medical men, even of the first order, have confessedly no principle to guide them. Dr. Samuel Wilks, F.R.S., lecturer on medicine at Guy's Hospital, told his class that the method he had to teach them was empirical. His words are, "All our best treatment is empirical. . . . I should have preferred to offer you some principles based on true scientific grounds, and on which you could act in particular. . . . At the present day this cannot be done, nor is it wise to speak of principles when framed from conclusions whose premises are altogether false. To say that I have no principles is a humiliating confession. . . . For my own part I believe we know next to nothing of the action of medicine and other therapeutic agents. . . . There was a time when I scarcely dared to confess these opinions to myself; this is the first occasion on which I have been bold enough to assert them before my class. (See *Lancet*, Feb. 18th, 1871.)

Reader, what is the plain duty now before you? It is to throw down the idol of medical authority, and to take the will or thought of God, as you may find it in your own soul, for your guide in solving for yourself, if you still need to solve it, the momentous question under consideration.

THE VERDICT OF STATISTICS.

Medical gentlemen employ no other argument in support of vaccination than that

which is based upon figures. Statistics, they declare, prove that vaccination has been a blessing to the world.

Reader, I bespeak your earnest attention to my reply. Should you be able to discover any flaw in it, it would then be your bounden duty to cast it to the winds. But should it fully approve itself to your conscience and judgment, then, whatever may have been your prepossession on the subject, you would be obliged, by the demands of honour and duty, to confess the truth and act accordingly.

I. Figures cannot possibly prove that the blood-poisoned who have not had small-pox would have been visited with that disease had they not been operated upon; neither can it be demonstrated by figures that the unvaccinated, as they are termed, who have had small-pox, would have been shielded from the disease if their blood had not been poisoned according to Parliamentary Law. If this argument be sound—I challenge refutation—then the only prop which the doctors have to support the nostrum in question, at once breaks and falls to the ground.

II. Figures are not truth, *per se*; they are artificialities, which may be applied to confirm either truth or untruth, but they have no power to change the one into the other. All the statistical tables that men can construct cannot make it right to do wrong; cannot justify the artificial creation of a disease, which may be the means of transmitting the most loathsome disease, indeed any kind of constitutional disease, or may so poison life as to be the cause of death, to prevent a supposititious disease which may never arise, and could not possibly arise except as the consequence of a breach of the laws of health.

III. But to indulge the doctors for a moment by meeting them on their own ground, I may again bring forward an argument which I adduced before the Vaccination Committee, and which passed unchallenged by every member of that Committee. The *Lancet*, of January 21, 1871, declares, in a leading article, that four-fifths of the small-pox cases are to be found amongst the vaccinated. Now, as but two-thirds of the people of this country are vaccinated, as has been found from returns made to Parliament by the late Poor Law Board and the late Medical Department of the Privy Council, it follows indisputably, if figures are to be relied upon, that the blood-poisoned are doubly susceptible of small-pox as compared with those whose blood has not been similarly poisoned. If figures are to settle the question, here, I submit, is a settlement which cannot be disturbed.

IV. Mr. Simon is willing to estimate the annual mortality from small-pox before the introduction of Vaccination at 2,500. Last year, according to the Registrar-General, there died in England alone of small-pox no fewer than 22,907 persons!

V. From Rees's Cyclopædia, we learn that small-pox fatalities before vaccination were 18 per cent. of the cases. The average mortality in Mr. Marson's Hospital for 17 years, all of course under the Vaccination Acts, was 19 per cent. Small-pox, according to Mr. Simon, is a

greater protection against another attack than vaccination itself. Yet deaths from small-pox, after small-pox, are on an average a little over 20 per cent., as we find from Bousquet, Mr. Simon's papers, and Dr. Seaton's Handbook of Vaccination.

VI. Sir Dominic Corrigan stated before the Vaccination Committee that in 1862, before the Compulsory Vaccination Act, there was a severe small-pox epidemic in Ireland, but since that time there had been none worth speaking about. He thought the freedom from small-pox in Ireland was owing to vaccination being carried out well. Small-pox mortality prior to 1863, had been 1,000 annually; in 1864, it was 854; 1865, 347; 1866, 187; 1867, 20; 1868, 19; in the first quarter of 1869, 3; and in the second quarter, none; which represented the effect of the Compulsory Act in Ireland.

In the *Lancet* of Feb. 11, 1871, at page 216, we have the following words confirming the statement of Sir Dominic Corrigan:—"In Ireland Vaccination arrangements, carried out exclusively by the Poor Law Medical Officers, have proved eminently successful in stamping out small-pox." But in the same number of the *Lancet*, at page 214, there is this paragraph, under the heading of "Small-pox in Belfast." "In consequence of the prevalence of this disease, the Committee of the Belfast General Hospital have fitted up and appropriated five wards, detached from the main buildings, exclusively for the reception and treatment of small-pox patients. Two of these wards can be used by private patients who pay for the accommodation."

The *Weekly Dispatch*, of Oct. 29, 1871, says:—"It was stated on Thursday, in Dublin, on the authority of the Poor-law Commissioners, that small-pox was rapidly increasing in that city;" and of Nov. 26, 1871, "Small-pox has become lamentably rife in Dublin, not only among the poor, and in the crowded and noisome parts of the city, but even among the better classes who live in fashionable districts, and enjoy all the advantages of good food and cleanly homes." The *Lancet*, of Dec. 2, 1871, informs us that "small-pox is rapidly increasing" in Ireland. "At first it was limited to adults who had been either badly vaccinated, or not vaccinated at all, and, on the commencement of the present epidemic, was clearly traceable to importation from England. It came over with the Guards last August; since then it has been gaining ground, and now it has spread to such an extent that, as might have been expected, it has appeared amongst the upper classes, and several fatal instances have occurred amongst them during the past week."

(a.) Here is an attempt to make it appear that at first none had small-pox in Ireland—which, according to Dr. Seaton, is, with Scotland, now getting to be one of the best protected countries in Europe—but the unvaccinated and the badly vaccinated, the latter being persons upon whom surgeons are now virtually charged with having done bungling work, though they had certified that their work had been well done, and had been paid for accordingly.

(b.) It is afterwards said that small-pox appeared amongst the upper classes, and that several fatal cases had occurred amongst them. It is not pretended that these were unvaccinated or badly vaccinated. Had the former been admitted it would have implied a condemnation of vaccination, the upper classes having in such case discarded it. Had the latter being admitted—worse still—it would have involved a censure upon doctors.

(c) It is not said that the Guards, who are here reported to have introduced small-pox into well-protected Ireland, though small-pox was epidemic in Belfast before last autumn, were vaccinated to a man. As such an honest statement would have been impolitic, the fact is carefully suppressed.

VII. Dr. Wood, of Edinburgh, stated in his evidence before the Vaccination Committee that there were very few unvaccinated persons in Scotland; that up to 1860 the small-pox mortality in Scotland was greater than anywhere else; that in several towns having an aggregate population of 854,000 the small-pox deaths in 1856 were 645—2.8 per cent. of the total mortality; that an epidemic occurred every three or six years; but that there had been no epidemic for eight years since 1863, when the Compulsory Vaccination Act was passed.

Dr. Wood omitted to state whether the small-pox epidemics in Scotland, before 1863, occurred amongst the vaccinated or the unvaccinated. Such a statement, accurately made, might not have been flattering to the judgment of a vaccinator.

The *Lancet*, of January 20th, 1872, presents to us the following intelligence:—"Health of Scotch towns. The deaths from small-pox in the last month constituted 11.4 per cent. of the total mortality of the towns. In Paisley and Greenock there were no fatal cases; in Glasgow the proportion was 1.6 per cent.; in Perth, 7.1; in Aberdeen, 7.6; in Edinburgh, 17.3; in Leith, 31; and in Dundee, 38.8 per cent. Wolverhampton and Dundee appeared to have suffered from the epidemic in about an equal degree, while in Edinburgh it has been three times as fatal as in London."

In the *Lancet*, of Feb. 17, 1872, we read as follows:—"Health of Scotch Towns.—In the eight principal cities and towns in Scotland, there were registered during the month of January, 3,174 deaths, equivalent to an annual mortality of 36 per 1,000. The rate was 23 in Perth, 31 in Paisley, 33 in Glasgow, 34 in Greenock, 36 in Edinburgh, 36 in Aberdeen, 45 in Dundee, and 46 in Leith. Small-pox continued to increase, the fatal cases having risen to 461 from 354 in December, constituting 14.5 per cent. of the gross mortality. Leith, Dundee, Edinburgh, Perth, and Aberdeen, are suffering most severely from the epidemic."

VIII. From a Report on Vaccination in France in 1867, with an Appendix relating to the years 1865 and 1866, presented by the Imperial Academy of Medicine to his Excellency the Minister of Agriculture, Commerce, and Public Works, we see that the Departments in which Vaccination is least performed, are the

least visited with small-pox; whilst those in which Vaccination is most practised, are most afflicted with small-pox. For instance, "for every 88 cases of small-pox occurring (1867) in the ten departments least Vaccinated, there occurred 427 in the ten most Vaccinated. Small-pox deaths:—For every one occurring in the ten departments least Vaccinated there occurred 49 in the ten most Vaccinated." The tables for 1865 and 1866 exhibit similar results.

IX. Sweden has been held up as an example of the protective power of Vaccination. But, though in 1846 there were but two deaths from small-pox in that country, in 1850 there were 1,376; in 1851, 2,483; and in 1852, 1534, from the disease which Vaccination had been said to have extinguished.

X. The *Lancet*, of December 2, 1871, states that about 10 per cent. of the Chinese probably escape an attack of small-pox, and of those vaccinated probably 80 per cent. are protected. Yet the same authority informs us that "The epidemic of 1869-70 prevailed in an aggravated form along the whole coast of China, attacking and carrying off foreigners and natives," that that of 1870-71, was "felt more severely at Peking and in Japan than in the former year." That "it is difficult to find a Chinaman entirely free from pits;" and that "there is ample evidence of the ravages of small-pox in the number of blind persons found in the streets."

Now the Lyons Society of Medical Sciences appointed a Committee, of which MM. Chanveau and Viennois were prominent members, to experiment upon the transmission of small-pox and cow-pox (see *Medical Times and Gazette*, June 10, 1865). From ample data they concluded that these diseases were perfectly distinct, the one from the other, and could never be transmuted, the one into the other. Small-pox given to the cow, horse, ass, &c., and transplanted into other animals, ever so many times, and thence brought back to the human subject, was still small-pox, and nothing but small-pox.

Further, Dr. Seaton informs us that Dr. Thiele, of Kazan, infected the cow with small-pox virus; from this he raised a stock of lymph for human vaccinations, which, at the time his account was published, had been employed in the vaccination of more than 3,000 subjects. Mr. Ceely, of Aylesbury, got "lymph stocks" by the same process, and in a few months vaccinated more than 2,000 children. Mr. Badcock, then of Brighton, got matter in the same way. "He has from 1840 to the present time, by inoculation of cows with the lymph of human variola (small-pox) raised stocks of vaccine lymph for use on no fewer than 37 separate occasions. The lymph thus obtained by him is now largely employed; it has been supplied to many hundreds of practitioners, and very many thousands of children have been vaccinated with it." (*Handbook of Vaccination*, pp. 48, 49, 50).

After this industrious sowing of the seeds of small-pox, it would be wonderful if we had not harvests of small-pox, and if statistics were not condemnatory of the practice of medical blood-poisoning.

RE-VACCINATION : A DOUBLE CRIME.

Vaccination having failed to accomplish the end for which it was designed, doctors, and those who have faith in doctors, recommend re-vaccination for protection against small-pox.

I. To such as are willing to make use of their common sense, laying aside all prejudice on the subject, it must appear that as vaccination is an outrage upon the laws of health, re-vaccination cannot be anything else but a double outrage committed upon the same person; and that wisdom would dictate, not that the crime should be repeated in any one subject, but that the unclean and deadly practice itself should be entirely abolished.

II. It was but the other day stated by the authorities of the Leicester Small-Pox Hospital that not one re-vaccinated person had been as a patient in the hospital. Yet it is a fact, which I challenge these authorities to gainsay, that Daniel Moore, of Court A, Belgrave Gate, Leicester, was vaccinated when a child, and re-vaccinated last year when in the militia, and yet died of small-pox in the Leicester Small-Pox Hospital, Feb. 5th, 1872.

III. There is not a naval station, nor a ship in Her Majesty's service, where there has not been small-pox after re-vaccination.

IV. I have a relative who had a severe attack of small-pox after repeated vaccination; I travelled but the other day by railway with an Irish gentleman, who told me he had but recently recovered from small-pox after re-vaccination. I am convinced that any one who looks into this subject must know of cases of small-pox after re-vaccination, whether in the army or amongst the civil population.

V. Dr. Copland, in his Medical Dictionary, vol. III. part 2, page 829, says, in reference to vaccination, "What was then predicted has been so generally fulfilled that re-vaccination has been adopted in many places, and has often failed, natural small-pox having, notwithstanding, appeared in the re-vaccinated."

VI. In the French Report by the Imperial Academy of Medicine, above referred to, we are advised that Dr. Ducharme, 1st class *aide major* of the 1st Regiment of Voltigeurs of the Guards, in 1867, re-vaccinated 437 youths of "sound temperament, and free from acquired or hereditary disease." Towards the end of 1868, a small-pox epidemic of a highly confluent form, broke out in the regiment. Many died. Yet in the 2nd Regiment of Voltigeurs, lodged in precisely the same barracks, situated in the same court, with the same hygienic conditions; but on whom no vaccination had been made, there was not a single case of small-pox. Dr. Ducharme asks, "May I not consider that I had caused a development of the small-pox germ?"

VII. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, of the 24th of May, 1871, says:—"Prussia is the country where re-vaccination is most generally practised, the law making the precaution obligatory on every person, and the authorities conscientiously watching over its performance. As a natural result, cases of small-pox are very rare." Now, during the three weeks ending, respectively, on the 4th, 11th, and 18th of

May, 1871, there died of small-pox in Berlin 291 persons. During the three weeks ending, severally, on the 6th, 13th, and 20th of May, 1871, there were 776 deaths from this disease in London. As the population of London is four times greater than that of Berlin, it may be easily computed that the death-rate from small-pox in re-vaccinated Berlin was twice as great as that of London.

Mr. Chambers (now Sir Thomas Chambers), said, in the House of Commons, Aug. 15, 1871, "Prussia is the best vaccinated country in Europe, yet in Berlin 164 persons died in one week, being at the rate of 12,000 in the million, and a mortality three times greater than that of London. And yet there every one is vaccinated and re-vaccinated."

As these facts tell their own tale, which can be confirmed by but too abundant evidence, everywhere to be gathered, it is unnecessary that I should here say another word upon the subject.

MORTALITY AMONG THE VACCINATED AND UNVACCINATED.

The Bishop of Manchester is reported in the *Manchester Guardian*, of Feb. 1, 1872, to have said, speaking on behalf of the Manchester General Hospital and Dispensary for Sick Children: "It was perfectly lamentable, for instance, to witness an agitation to promulgate what seemed abstract *à priori* principles against vaccination. The persons who held these views seemed to maintain that God made man as He knew best how, and that to introduce a poison into his blood for the purpose of keeping out other poison was on the face of it a logical inconsistency. The facts, on the other hand, that out of 100 small-pox cases treated at the Hospital only five died, these being unvaccinated children, and that the same proof could be corroborated in almost every hospital in England, were in themselves a practical common-sense answer to the loud-tongued crusade which was being carried on against the principle of vaccination."

I have had sent to me a tract, entitled "Prayers and Rules for District Visitors," issued by the Bishop of Winchester, who therein directs that inquiries be made as to "the number and sex of the children; whether all have been baptized; whether all have been vaccinated."

It was the Bishop of Chichester's vote which gave Lord Redesdale a majority of one in favour of repeated fines and imprisonments, handcuffs, and the treadmill, to crush down all opposition to State medical blood-poisoning.

The Bishop of Manchester, then, has episcopal co-adjutors in the defence of vaccination, which, he will learn, though perhaps not in this world, has its root in our national corruption, and is permitted in its legalised and despotic form, by Divine Wisdom, to reveal this corruption to us, that we may remove it from our midst. The Bishop will have to open his eyes to the truth, though, may be, not till his arrival in the next life, that he is an episcopal exponent and defendant of that deep and cruel corruption, of which we are all more or less partakers, otherwise the unclean prac-

tice of vaccination could never have obtained a footing amongst us. One or two doctors are blindly censured as the sole cause of all this mischief. The Good Father does not allow His children to be deceived after this fashion. We pollute and deceive ourselves, and then tyrant representatives of our own evils are permitted to arise and afflict us as to the body, that we may awake to the causes of the calamity, and put it away from our spirits, when the evil felt in our bodies would cease as a matter of course.

That the Bishop of Manchester, like the other Bishops, is an apt exhibitor of the spiritual taint which has given birth to vaccination, is indisputable from his own words, above quoted.

He, alas ! deprecates *à priori* principle.

He implies that God has not made man as He knows best how.

He intimates that it is right to introduce a poison into the blood to keep out another poison.

He thinks that vaccination has fulfilled its promise when in an hospital containing 100 small-pox patients, mostly vaccinated, only five die, these being said to be unvaccinated, and similar statements being made respecting "almost every hospital in England."

He brands the anti-vaccination movement as a loud-tongued crusade.

He speaks of the principles of vaccination.

Clearly, the Bishop—I fear he is like other Bishops in this respect—has yet to learn what principle is ; that it is not a thing of human contrivance, but an eternal law of life, or the will of God as apprehended by man ; that it is our bounden duty to obey this *à priori* principle, leaving results to Him who claims our allegiance ; that it is wrong to do wrong, to prevent another wrong, as it would be wrong to cherish one demon spirit to exclude another even of a fiercer stamp, that the All-and-ever-loving and All-wise God, our Maker and Preserver, doeth all things well ; that the stigma of being loud-tongued comes with a poor grace from him who speaks so much that is not always instinct with sound wisdom and discretion, and that, as to the *principle* of vaccination," there is no such thing, vaccination being entirely devoid of principle.

The Bishop of Manchester declaims against the Anti-Vaccination Movement, and is loud in his praises of vaccination, not because this superstition, which is destined to be destroyed, is a shield against small-pox, but because a larger per centage of the unvaccinated are said to die of the disease, than of those who have undergone the operation. This is a new issue, which ought not to have been raised, till there had been a manly confession that judgment had gone against the vaccinators on the first issue, whether, viz., vaccination were a protection against small-pox. But the second issue must share the fate of the first. The whole thing being unsound at the core, must in every phase be condemned when subjected to righteous judgment.

(a.) Who has checked the figures which Bishop Fraser has adduced ? What impartial tribunal has pronounced them correct ? How

many of the unvaccinated children, said to have died, had been pronounced by doctors themselves to be unfit for vaccination ? Hydrophobia and others have no difficulty in the successful treatment of small-pox. Deaths from small-pox before vaccination were, according to an authority already cited, 18 per cent. of the cases. Last year Mr. Marson tells us deaths among the unvaccinated in his hospital were 66.2 per cent. ; whilst deaths from small-pox, after a previous attack of small-pox, were 33.3 per cent., though both he and Mr. Simon say that natural small-pox is a greater protection against another attack than vaccination. (See Blue Book on Vaccination.) Where, then, is the protective power of vaccination ? And what must be thought of the skill of those medical gentlemen in whose hands so many patients die of small-pox ?

(b) Mr. Simon gave the following evidence before the Vaccination Committee :—"Of 610 persons on board the Octavia (1865-6) 589 were reported vaccinated, and 21 unvaccinated. Among the 589 there were 152 cases of small-pox, five of which were confluent, but there were no deaths. Among the 21 all were attacked, 18 were confluent, and six died." The old tale. Let us see what it is worth. In the Appendix to his Report of 1857, Mr. Simon says, "We have no means of ascertaining the relative proportions of men bearing marks of vaccination and of previous small-pox in this force (the Royal Navy), but as it is a standing order that all men and boys entering the service who have not satisfactory marks of either, shall be immediately vaccinated, we may look upon them as a completely protected class." Comment would diminish the force of such evidence as this.

(c.) Mr. Marson tendered the following astounding evidence :—"In certain unmodified cases, where the mortality was light, he had assumed, though there was no cicatrix to show, they were protected to some extent, or they would have died in the same proportion as the unvaccinated." Yet, notwithstanding this unwarrantable assumption, which nullifies such deductions as the Bishop of Manchester deems it his duty to publish, Mr. Marson stated that "of 104 cases of corymbose small-pox (the most severe form, save one, and very rarely seen) admitted in 30 years, 29 were unvaccinated, and 74 vaccinated. Of the 29, 13 died, or 44 per cent. : of the 74, 32 died, two having had superadded disease, which, if deducted, would leave 41 per cent." Taking the figures as they stand, who can forbear to condemn vaccination, when it cannot even protect from this rare and severe form of small-pox ? But seeing how figures are tampered with by the vaccination authorities, it is impossible for a cautious and discriminating mind to admit, from them, any conclusion which tells ever so slightly in favour of vaccination, which, strictly speaking, is rottenness from beginning to end.

HOMEOPATHIC DEFENCE OF VACCINATION INDEFENSIBLE.

Many homœopaths, who cry out fiercely against allopaths, are nevertheless united with

them in the horrible practice of vaccination, persuading themselves that it is within the law, as they term it, of *similia similibus curantur*. In the first place, I have to observe that there is no such law as is pretended to be formulated by the misleading words, *Likes are cured by likes*. It was the opinion of Hahnemann, as it is that of most of his followers, that homœopathy set up a minor disease similar to the major prevailing in a patient, and that the minor possessed the power of killing or curing the major—an absurdity similar to that of vaccination. If we apply to this conceit the test of generalisation, which every truth will stand, we shall see, in some short measure, how fallacious and monstrous it must be. Hypocrisy, swindling, and garotting, are diseases; priestcraft, statecraft, and doctorcraft, are diseases. Homœopathic doses of similar diseases would make matters worse instead of better. Only begin to universalise the homœopathic *dictum*, and its untenableness stares you in the face. In the next place, no man of sense would give a healthy babe this, that, and the other homœopathic medicine, that it may not in after-life have this, that, and the other disease. Suppose there were such a simpleton, where would he draw the line? Lastly, no homœopath cuts holes in the skin of a child, and forces his pilules, tinctures, and triturations immediately into its blood, which would be necessary to render his ordinary practice a parallel to vaccination.

The homœopath overlooks these simple facts if he says that vaccination is sanctioned by homœopathy.

Homœopathy, which I hold to be a true system of medicine, never creates the smallest particle of disease. Its operation cannot be understood except from the light of the dynamicorspiritual law, of which homœopathy is the earthly type or expression. There is no such thing as evil *per se*. An evil is simply a good run to excess, misapplied, or unused. For instance, miserliness and extravagance are evils, the one being the abuse of economy, and the other the abuse of generosity. Now, what is the cure for these great evils? Why, the normal and healthy operation of similar virtues to those which have been abused. Then, whatever disease may be torturing the body of man, we have to ask ourselves, what substance given in excess would produce a similar disease in a healthy frame? That substance, triturated or reduced to a harmless and wholesome state, is the specific for the disease in question.

Homœopaths may thus see that homœopathy, rightly understood, gives no countenance whatever to the practice of vaccination.

OTHER ARGUMENTS DISPOSED OF.

I. Before vaccination small-pox was a greater scourge than it has since been. Vaccination must therefore have done much for the world.

II. No Small-pox Hospital nurse, after re-vaccination, has ever had small-pox. Vaccination must therefore be a boon to mankind.

III. The more cicatrices the greater the security. This shows the high value of vaccination, well performed.

REPLIES.

I. The black death, sweating sickness, and plague disappeared without any process analogous to vaccination. If small-pox had not been kept alive by inoculation and "vaccination," might it not have vanished too? As small-pox and cow-pox can co-exist in the same person, is it not absolutely impossible for the latter to prevent the former? As vaccination proposes not to remove any one of the causes of small-pox, but only so to affect the body that small-pox cannot appear upon the skin, would it not, when the blood is polluted by any of these causes, be, could it attain its object, an unmitigated calamity?

II. (a.) People do not go to a Small-pox Hospital to catch small-pox, but to be cured of it. If small-pox were bred in such a place, it would be a satire upon its hygienic arrangements.

(b.) The argument under notice is a narrow one, and can only be used by a narrow mind, unless re-vaccination could effect wonders outside the hospital similar to those ascribed to it within. It has been demonstrated, past all doubt, that it has notoriously failed of its purpose beyond the precincts of the Small-pox Hospital. The argument in question, then, must be absolutely worthless in the judgment of any man who can take a broad view of the subject.

(c.) Dr. Pearce gave it in evidence that "a nurse at Stockwell, already pitted with small-pox, had been re-vaccinated by Dr. McCann, and was then in bed with confluent small-pox."

III. None but a man of empirical intellect could have constructed this theory of cicatrices. Dr. Tanner, in his "Memoranda on Poisons," page 5, says:—"The ferrocyanide of potassium injected into the jugular vein of a horse was discovered throughout the entire venous system in 20 seconds; and Mr. Blake has inferred from his experiments that a poison may be diffused through the body in nine seconds." If, according to Dr. Peter, of Paris, and Trousseau, the arm of a child immediately after vaccination be washed, and the punctures cauterized, the development of cow-pox vesicles cannot be prevented. As then the vaccine venom can be introduced into the blood through one puncture, and be swiftly swept by the vital current throughout the whole system, it is downright foolishness to pretend that a number of such punctures are required to afford protection against small-pox. If one be not enough for the purpose, which is admitted, then one hundred would not suffice.

As these clouds are swept away, surely the light of truth must now be seen, except by those who are wilfully blind.

VACCINATION A SOURCE OF DISEASE AND DEATH.

I have now to show, in some small degree, some of the pernicious results of vaccination.

(a.) Mr. Jonathan Hutchinson, a surgeon of standing in London, proved last year before a meeting of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, even to the conviction of Mr. Simon himself, and afterwards stated before the Vac-

cination Committee, that out of 13 adults, servants and shopmen, who were revaccinated on the 7th of February, 1871, from one child lent to the operator, by a surgeon with a vaccination certificate, 11 had on their arms sores characteristic of syphilis—the primary sore of syphilitic contagion. It was on the 4th or 5th of April that he saw these persons. He had no doubt they had the venereal disease. A few days later he saw the child (six months old), from whom the matter was taken. Though it appeared in good health, he had no doubt it was the subject of inherited syphilis: it had an eruption on the body, then very slight indeed, and probably not present at that time of vaccination, which was successful. Mr. Hutchinson stated before the Committee that he had then another series of similar cases under investigation, and that many supposed cases had been sent him within the last fortnight. Two children, four years and one year, had been recently brought to him. They were vaccinated, at a public station, from a syphilitic child, selected out of a number offered as the most healthy children present, with nothing which could have led to suspicion.

(b) Dr. Bakewell, Vaccinator-General, of Trinidad, testified before the Vaccination Committee, that he had seen several cases of leprosy resulting from vaccination. He had no doubt death resulted from syphilis, produced by vaccination, in the Rivalta cases. There were 258 such cases mentioned by Lancereau as having occurred in France, Italy, and Germany. Mr. Whitehead, of Manchester, a very distinguished man, had reported several such cases.

(c) At a meeting of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, May 9, 1871 (see *Lancet*, May 13, 1871), Mr. Startin declared that when Mr. Simon sent out his circular in 1856, inquiring if any bad results had been seen from vaccination, he collected several cases, giving the names and addresses of the patients, but no notice was taken of them.

(d) Towards the end of May, 1861, a child eleven months old was vaccinated at Rivalta, in Piedmont. On the 10th day, 46 children were vaccinated from this child. Ten days after 17 children were vaccinated from one of the 46. The Medical Congress at Acqui appointed a Committee to investigate these cases. The Committee found that of the first batch 38 beside the vaccinifer had had the venereal disease given to them; and that of the latter group, seven had been similarly afflicted. Forty-six innocent little children had thus had the foulest of diseases planted in their tender frames. In Milan, a little boy, whose father was diseased, was vaccinated from a healthy child. From this boy 56 children were vaccinated. In a few months, 35 had syphilis, with which they diseased their mothers. (See *Lancet*, Nov. 16, 1861.)

(e) During the American civil war, the Federal prisoners confined in the Camp Sumpter, Georgia, were vaccinated. In a number of cases gangrenous ulcers appeared at the points where the vaccine matter had been inserted. Between Feb. 24, 1864, and October 1st, over 10,000 prisoners died. The prisoners believed the surgeons had introduced poison-

ous matter into their arms whilst vaccinating them. A Commission appointed by the War Office at Washington acquitted the surgeons. It was found, on inquiry, that the Confederate soldiers in the Northern prisons suffered quite as severely from vaccination. (See Pamphlet by Joseph Jones, M.D., Professor of Physiology in the University of Nashville, U.S.)

(f) The following cases of disease and death, directly resulting from vaccination, were collected in a few days, and entrusted to me that I might lay them before the Vaccination Committee:—

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH DOBSON, of Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, respecting Vaccination.

"(1.) During three years' labour as a Town Missionary in the city of Durham, and two years like occupation in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, visiting from house to house, particularly amongst the sick, I had special facilities for witnessing the effects of vaccination, and I solemnly affirm that I have seen scores of cases of injury from vaccination, the particulars of which I cannot relate for many reasons.

(2.) Mr. Fall's child, well before vaccination, was sadly afflicted with glandular swellings and abscesses, discharging unhealthy pus, after vaccination. Its parents were healthy people, and I have no doubt that vaccination had injured it.

(3.) Mr. Robinson's child suffered, after vaccination, from a very painful skin affection, which had the effect of covering her whole body with ulcers and scabs, rendering her an object of misery and loathing to herself. She was well before vaccination; her parents were healthy; and I believe vaccination was the cause of her misery.

(4.) A little boy, whose name I have forgotten, and who was healthy before vaccination—his parents were also healthy—was, 12 days' after vaccination, afflicted with an eruption on the skin, causing death in a fortnight. His medical attendant gave it as his opinion that the lymph had been impure. This gentleman vaccinated the child.

(5.) Kate Dobson, my own daughter, a healthy child, was kept waiting by her medical attendant for nearly three weeks for 'good matter.' Within a fortnight after vaccination she began to waste away, and was for some time in a critical condition.

She afterwards lost her life by an accident, or I believe she would have suffered much from vaccination.

(6.) John Joseph Dobson, my second son, was killed by vaccination. The doctor vaccinated him, making two incisions in the arm. The operation was unsuccessful, and the child took ill the same week, and died within a fortnight of unsuccessful vaccination.

The foregoing cases are only specimens of the large number that have come under my notice; and the sufferings of each, if detailed at length, would call forth the sympathies of all humane persons."

(Signed), JOSEPH DOBSON,
Declared before me at Barrow by Joseph Dobson, the 8th of March, 1871.

(Signed), JOHN FELL, Justice of the Peace, Lancashire.

STATEMENT OF JOHN FRASER.

"Johnstone, Renfrewshire, Scotland,
March 8th, 1871.

"I, John Fraser, living in retirement, hereby affirm (the same as if on oath) that after the ordinary vaccination of one of my children, the lanced wound never healed, and that shortly afterwards a great many small ulcers broke out on the arm, neck, breast, and face; that on the face they became confluent, the upper part of it presenting one entire foul wound, nearly eating out the eyes; that the child died of these wounds a few weeks afterwards, a ghastly object to behold; that on subsequent inquiry it was discovered, one of the parents of the child from whose arm the vaccine poison was taken, had throughout life been afflicted with what we call in Scotland Cruels, or King's Evil—the disease of which my child died; that the attending doctor, now dead, admitted the vaccine matter taken from that child was the cause of my child's disease and death, observing in defence of himself, 'How am I to know with certainty whether the blood of children be tainted or untainted with disease; how am I to know whether the parents of such children be pure-blooded or otherwise?' Moreover, another child of a different family, vaccinated with the same lymph, died in a manner similar to mine!

I further affirm that on an occasion of my visiting a friend in Saltcoats, with three of my daughters, that friend having at the time a boy bedfast with small-pox, the consequences were, the three (who had been vaccinated in youth) were shortly afterwards seized with the same disease, their previous vaccination affording no protection against it; that shortly after the vaccination of one of these three, *scrofula* broke out for the first time, on various parts of her body, and so continued to her womanhood, when on one occasion catching cold, *scrofulous* matter was driven from the skin to the lungs, causing consumption, which terminated in death, the parents, with their numerous offspring, being neither *scrofulous* nor consumptive. I more than suspected the vaccine lymph used in her case imparted *scrofulous* taints to her blood, which were the remote cause of her death.

I had a nephew, a very healthy child, vaccinated successfully. Immediately after the operation, its health declined, losing its wonted vigour and sprightliness, till overtaken with measles, under which it perished, there being little vital force in the system (owing to the injurious effect of its previous vaccination) to withstand the influence of the disease.

I knew a family, one of whose children being vaccinated was shortly after the operation affected with loathsome eruptions over the greater part of the body, and has so continued for two years, being in great distress, and requiring constant attendance of two nurses, one for the day and the other for the night. The child still lives, somewhat better, but in a frail and helpless condition. For such trouble the parents blame vaccination, as I do also.

I could fill a great many pages with cases of disease and death that have come under my

own observation occasioned by vaccination. I have had occasion to lecture on various departments of science, physiology, and anatomy, throughout many of the towns of Scotland; I have had most extensive opportunities of becoming acquainted with the history and effects of vaccination, and the result of that experience is, that vaccination, like its kindred sister inoculation (now a penal crime), is a universal curse to the world, instead of an universal blessing. Vaccine lymph is an unmitigated poison, come from what source it may; to call it pure, when it is intensified, concentrated corruption, is a gross error. To introduce it into the blood is an outrage on nature, to be infallibly punished, and never blessed by nature. It not only is no protection against small-pox, but an active promoter of that disease, whilst it at the same time communicates every other disease to the blood of those vaccinated, when the vaccine lymph or poison is taken from diseased families; such disease or diseases breaking out at every period of life."

(Signed) JOHN FRASER.

Mr. John Fraser appeared before me this day, the 9th of March, 1871, and gave his affirmation that the above statements are true.

(Signed) ROBERT COCHRAN, J.P.

MARYPORT CASES.

"The following are a few particulars as to some of the cases of death and suffering after vaccination, of the children of parents resident in Maryport, Cumberland. Many other cases could be given:

John Bell, hairdresser, Senhouse-street, had a daughter born July 5th, 1870; a particularly fine, healthy child until vaccinated when nearly five months old. From that time it gradually pined away, and died in less than five weeks.

The father was only induced to accede to its being vaccinated by threats of prosecution, because a previous child, a fine little boy, born April 6th, 1866, quite healthy till vaccinated when about three months old, had suffered so severely after the operation. He began to break out within two or three days, and very soon his face, hands, and feet, were a mass of scabs. The child has had recurring attacks of eruptions up to the present time.

John Moore, Furnace Road, (blacksmith,) had a child born March, 1867, which had very good health till vaccinated when four months old; but from this time he never looked up, broke out in large bluish-looking lumps on his body and legs, and lingered on in a very sad state for fourteen months, when death relieved his sufferings.

Edward Green, nailer, King-street, had a boy born July 1st, 1856, a very healthy child till it was vaccinated when three months old; a few days after which, it began to break out in its head and face. Its face soon became in a dreadful state, and it lingered on in great agony for ten months, when it died.

His next child, a girl, born Nov. 11th, 1857, was quite healthy till vaccinated when about ten months old. It was then very suddenly attacked, and continued to suffer till it died at the age of eleven months.

The father has now three children unvaccinated, although he has been threatened many times with prosecution. He states that he will rather go to prison than have them vaccinated.

John Brown, sailor, Strand-street, had a fine little girl born about four years ago. At nine months of age, it was able to walk. A week or two later it was vaccinated; soon after which it broke out in blue lumps, and never recovered good health. At two years of age it took scarlet fever, of which it died.

John McGrevy, ship carpenter, King-street, had a girl born 1850, a fine healthy child till vaccinated when five months old; within a few days of which it became ill, and broke out in its head, face, and body, in a shocking manner. It lingered till eleven months of age, and died in a dreadful state.

The parents (as in all the previous cases) are strong healthy persons. They have resolutely refused to have any of their younger children vaccinated, though threatened with prosecution.

Dennis Trainer, sailor, Eaglesfield-street, had a daughter born October 16th, 1856, a healthy child till vaccinated when three months old. Directly afterwards her ears broke out; then her eyes became much inflamed, and continue extremely sore and inflamed up to the present time—hardly able to bear any light upon them.

John Bryce, sail-maker, Catherine-street, has a little girl three years of age, who although quite healthy till vaccinated, suffered much in health from that time for nine months.

—M'Lintock, High-street, had a child born about five years since, quite healthy till vaccinated at the usual age; after which it soon became very ill, turned black down one side, and died in less than two weeks from the time of the operation.

Peter Brown, Senhouse-street, steam-boat man, had a fine healthy girl born March 14th, 1868; was vaccinated when ten months old, up to which time it had the best of health. A few days after the operation it broke out in its face, and as this eruption went back it gradually failed, got worse and worse, till it died April 5th, 1869—less than three months after vaccination.

James Fitch, trimmer, Nelson-street, has a boy now twelve years of age, who was vaccinated when three months old; soon after which an eruption broke out over all parts of its body, and it was ill for twelve months.

Owing to the knowledge of so many cases of death and suffering following vaccination, there is, amongst the working-classes especially, in this part of the country, a large amount of objection to vaccination, (in this Union there were recently reported to the Board of Guardians 268 cases of neglect), and amongst the population generally, a decided feeling against compulsory vaccination.

About twelve months ago, I was fined once for not vaccinating my youngest child. Had the fine been repeated 20 or a 100 times, my sense of duty to my child would not have allowed me to have given way.

In addition to the above cases of injury after vaccination, I could give 15 others that

have occurred in this small town and immediate neighbourhood."

(Signed) WILLIAM ADAIR,
Draper, Maryport.

Declared before me at Maryport, the 9th day of March. 1871.

(Signed) ROBERT RITSON, J.P.,
For Cumberland.

ROCHDALE CASES.

Case No. 1.—Martha Alice Jackson, daughter of James Jackson, of Stoney-field, Rochdale, vaccinated when three weeks old by Dr. Booth, public vaccinator. About nine days after vaccination it broke out of a most loathsome disease, designated by the medical attendant, Dr. Morris, as a very bad case of syphilis, caused, the medical man said, by vaccination. It suffered dreadfully until seven months old, and then died, a pitiable object.

Case No. 2.—Robert Henry Fielding, son of Thomas Fielding, Radcliffe-street, Rochdale, was vaccinated when four months old. The arm immediately began to swell towards the fingers, then across the chest and down the right arm, which was very much swollen, and after death the arm burst. The child died one month after vaccination. The medical attendant told the father that vaccination had killed the child. It died January, 1870.

Case No. 3.—Martha Cudworth, daughter of James Cudworth, the Alley, Lower-place, Rochdale, was vaccinated December, 1869. The arm became very much swollen and inflamed, and it died in less than three weeks from the time it was vaccinated. Dr. Crompton, the medical attendant, said that vaccination was the cause of its death; it was vaccinated by Dr. Booth, the public vaccinator.

Case No. 4.—Joseph Chadwick, son of John Chadwick, Hartley's-buildings, Buersill, Rochdale, was vaccinated when four months old, and died four weeks after being vaccinated; was a fine and perfectly healthy child previous to being vaccinated. The arm of the child healed up in a fortnight after being vaccinated, then broke out again because very much swollen and inflamed, after which convulsions set in, and the child died in December 1, 1867. It was vaccinated by Dr. Morris.

Case No. 5.—Edwin Kershaw, son of Emmanuel Kershaw, of Greenhalgh's-buildings, Oldham-road, Rochdale, was vaccinated when five months old, in January, 1870, and died a fortnight after being vaccinated. The arm of the child was so bad that it began to mortify, and burst before death. It was a most deplorable object. Dr. Booth, the Public Vaccinator performed the operation of vaccination. Dr. Morris, the medical attendant, certified the cause of death as being vaccination, &c.

Case No. 6.—Rochdale, March 11, 1871. This is to certify that I, John Robert Witham, had a child called Sarah Ellen Witham, who was vaccinated in December, 1869, at the age of fourteen weeks, by the Public Vaccinator for the Borough of Rochdale. Immediately after vaccination erysipelas inflammation set in, which terminated in death on the eighth day of vaccination. This case was certified by Dr. Wood—Erysipelas from vaccination.

Case No. 7.—This is to certify that I, John Ashworth, of Union-street, Rochdale, mechanic, had a child named Daniel Ashworth, which said child was vaccinated by the Public Vaccinator, in December, 1869, at the age of twelve weeks, the next day erysipelas inflammation took place, which in fourteen days terminated in death.

Case No. 8.—Solomon Crabtree, of Sun-place, Albert-street, had a child named Hannah Crabtree, vaccinated by the Public Vaccinator for the Borough of Rochdale, at eleven weeks old. The day after the operation, convulsions seized the child. It broke out in sores on the arms and other parts of the body, and died in nineteen days after the operation. The child was vaccinated in January, 1870.

We declare the above statements to be correct.

(Signed) { JOHN HALLIWELL.
JOSEPH E. E. GREAVES.
BENJAMIN WOOLFENDEN.

Declared before me at Rochdale, this 13th day of March, 1871.

(Signed) GEO. L. ASHWORTH,
Mayor.

SMALLBRIDGE CASES.

1. Joseph Taylor: My child was vaccinated when thirteen weeks old. In two months it was dead. After vaccination it was seized with convulsions, which continued until death.

2. Richard Matthew: My child was vaccinated at the same time as the above, and with the same kind of matter. It was seized with convulsions which continued until death. After death it went as black as a coal. It was such a mass of corruption that the burial suit had to be thrown over it, instead of being put on.

We believe that vaccination killed them both.
(Signed) JOSEPH TAYLOR,
March 12, 1872. RICHARD MATTHEW.

3. James Lees: Vaccination in infancy; re-vaccinated when eleven years of age. Before re-vaccination, very healthy and strong. Parents healthy also. In three days after re-vaccination I became very sickly; my whole body was covered with a rash; my elbow then formed into a pulpy substance, and broke out in a running sore; since then almost every joint in my body has broken out in running sores; even at present there is one on my hand and another on my foot, and I feel that I shall never be right as long as I live. I am now eighteen years of age, and my parents have paid for the last seven years, no less than 2s. 6d. per week, on an average, for medical attendance, and I am confident that re-vaccination has been the sole cause of my own suffering and my parents loss.

We certify that the foregoing statement of James Lees, our son, is correct.

Yours truly,
(Signed) EDWARD LEES,
ELIZABETH LEES,
Green, Smallbridge.
11th March, 1871.

4. Sarah Ann Roydes, was vaccinated when about three years of age. Before vaccination was a healthy child; after, her eyes swelled

up, and she was troubled with fits for nine days. She completely lost all power of speech, and we had to carry her up and down stairs like a new-born child. She had an abscess in her head which had to be lanced. She has never been well since. Her memory destroyed for life. She is now 23 years of age.

We, the parents, believe that vaccination has been the cause of our daughter's imbecility.

(Signed) ABRAHAM ROYDES.

Smallbridge, March 12, 1871.

5. I, Sarah Whipp, do hereby testify, that my child Betty Whipp was vaccinated when about three years old. Before vaccination she was a fine healthy child, but immediately after vaccination she broke out of erysipelas all over her body. Afterwards she also suffered with sore eyes. In short, after vaccination she was always sick, and at the age of twelve she died of small-pox.

Yours truly,

(Signed) SARAH WHIPP.

March 11th, 1871,

Brickfield, Smallbridge.

6. Mary Jackson: My child was a strong healthy child before vaccination. After vaccination it broke out in boils on the left leg and will be a cripple as long as it lives. I believe that nothing but vaccination has caused it.

(Signed) MARY JACKSON.

Brickfield, March 12, 1872.

7. Robert Clegg: My child was healthy before vaccination. Afterwards it had sore eyes for nine months; then it broke out with sores and scabs, both on its face and arms, which greatly disfigured our child. After a year and nine months of severe suffering, it died; and I believe that vaccination killed it.

(Signed) ROBERT CLEGG,

Smallbridge, near Rochdale, March 12, 1871.

8. John Crabtree, my child, was healthy before being vaccinated. It has been troubled with fits ever since, and is now very weak and sickly. I believe that vaccination has been the sole cause.

(Signed) MARY CRABTREE.

Smallbridge, March 12th, 1871.

9. Betty Fitton, daughter of Robert Fitton. Parents healthy, child also previous to vaccination. After vaccination, its arms were badly inflamed. Inflammation of the arms was succeeded by inflammation of the chest, of which it died, after eleven weeks of sickness. We the parents, believe that vaccination was the cause of its sickness.

(Signed) ROBERT FITTON, Jun.

ROBERT & MARY FITTON.

Smallbridge, March 12, 1871.

10. Heningale Robert Cook, son of the Vicar of Smallbridge, was vaccinated in infancy, and re-vaccinated on entering the Civil Service, at the age of 23, and in three years after was afflicted with small-pox in the confluent form. His medical attendant stated that he would have died had he not been vaccinated. (!)

(Signed) R. K. COOK,

Vicar of Smallbridge.

11. Ernest Holt, son of John Holt, was vaccinated when eight months old. Before being vaccinated was very healthy. He had

been afflicted with erysipelas ever since. At present his back is covered with skin eruptions. Ever since vaccination, he has been taking sarsaparilla. He is now three years of age. We, the parents, believe that vaccination has been the cause of our child's suffering.

(Signed) JOHN HOLT.

MARY HOLT.

Hamery Bottoms, Star Garden.

12. James Riley, son of Hugh Riley. Parents healthy; child also before vaccination. Was vaccinated when 15 months old. Immediately was covered all over with a rash. It began to swell and inflame, first in its arm, then in its chest. Its whole body seemed to be filled with corruption. Just before it died, both of its thumbs and one finger burst open. It died in 15 days after the operation. We, the parents, believe—nay, are sure—that vaccination killed our child.

(Signed) HUGH RILEY,

SARAH ANN RILEY.

Hamery Bottoms, March 11, 1871.

We, the undersigned, John Wild, John E. Dewhurst, and John Dean, hereby declare that the statements hereby accompanying this declaration were made and signed by the respective parties in our presence.

(Signed)

{ JOHN WILD.

{ JOHN E. DEWHURST.

{ JOHN DEAN.

Declared before me this 18th day of March, 1871.

(Signed) JAMES BUTTERWORTH, J.P.,

County of Lancaster.

These cases, all attested before Magistrates, were entrusted to me that I might lay them before the Select Committee of the House of Commons. The Committee, to their lasting condemnation, would only allow me to read Middleton cases, though before I was called, Mr. Forster, M.P., knew from myself that I had been charged with these affidavits, which would be admissible in any court of law. My own impression is that the Committee, evidently wishing to prop up vaccination, felt that forty more of such cases as I had given would crumble it to dust.

The Committee sent Dr. Seaton, a well-known vaccinator, to investigate the Middleton cases (which are recorded in the Blue-book). Parents were not merely to have their children diseased and murdered, but their own solemn word was to be questioned. This State-paid vaccinator had so little sense of fairness and propriety that he actually went about from house to house, accompanied by the very surgeon who had performed some of these wretched vaccinations. To appreciate this proceeding, think of a notorious house-breaker being employed to investigate a case of house-breaking, and taking into his council the very man charged with the act. Though two of the worst cases were never looked into at all by Dr. Seaton, he actually had the face to say, that the Middleton cases were "moonshine." After this outrageous proceeding, this protest was sent to the Vaccination Committee:—

"We, the undersigned, who have all suffered in our families through what is falsely termed vaccination, do hereby enter our strongest

protest against the pretence made of investigating some of the cases of death and injury attested by us, and laid before the Vaccination Committee by the Rev. William Hume-Rothery; the person sent by Government being a medical man, and a known pro-vaccinator, who moreover actually visited some of our homes accompanied by Mr. Knott, the Union Vaccinator for the district, and the vaccinator of several of the cases above referred to. We submit that an inquiry thus conducted exclusively by parties committed to one side of the question is absolutely valueless, and cannot weigh for a single moment with any candid mind

THOMAS BROOKS, Long-street, Middleton, Manchester.

JOHN FAIRBROTHER, Back-o'-th-Brow, Middleton, Manchester.

JOHN BOARDMAN, Cross-street, Middleton, Manchester.

ANN REED, Lark-hill, Middleton, Manchester.

SAMUEL SCHOLES, Manchester Old-road, Middleton, Manchester.

SAMUEL HORROCKS, Lime-field, Middleton, Manchester.

JAMES HORROCKS, Lark-hill, Middleton, Manchester.

Middleton, April 24, 1871."

(g) Mr. Benjamin Thorpe, Honorary Secretary of the Middleton Anti-Vaccination League, is acquainted with fully fifty cases of disease and death from vaccination in this neighbourhood that have incidentally come under his notice; and he would, any day, for any one of influence interested in the question, make affidavit as to the sad reality of these cases. I may here add, that, knowing that this blood-poisoning can never have any other than an injurious effect, though a very strong child may appear to recover from it entirely, and, judging from irresistible evidence, I am sure that at least 50 cases of serious injury and death may in a very short time be found by any one in any vaccinated population of 20,000 persons. I have addressed a good many meetings in various parts of the country and I have every where met with abundant confirmation of the belief I have just recorded.

(b) After her re-vaccination last spring, the papers stated that Her Majesty the Queen suffered from general disturbance of her health. Afterwards we were told Her Majesty had had a tumour under her arm, which had been lanced. Now in a little work, entitled, "Plain Facts on Vaccination, by G. Oliver, M.B." an ardent pro-vaccinator, who dates his pamphlet "Redcar, Feb., 1871," it is said at page 59, that vaccination may disturb for a time the general health; at page 42, that vaccination may produce "the bad arm. The vaccinated part may swell considerably—the inflammatory blush spread to adjoining parts—the vaccine spots ulcerate, and an abscess even form in the arm-pit from simple irritation." With these facts before him, can any one safely deny that Her Majesty may have thus suffered from the foul operation to which she yielded, especially when, at page 50, it is de-

clared that "these effects more frequently follow re-vaccination than vaccination in infancy?"

(i) His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales was re-vaccinated. He has had a severe attack of typhoid fever. His groom Blegg died of it. Now, Bayard, Nittinger, Verdé de Lisle, Ancelon, &c., maintain the identity of small-pox and typhoid fever. Bayard says, "Experience tells us that it is always the young man, the young woman, vaccinated, not variolated, always at the most valuable age, who become victims of this internal small-pox." Who that loves truth dare deny that re-vaccination may have killed the groom Blegg, and nearly killed his Royal Master?

Though these cases are but as a drop to the ocean, they ought to suffice to convince any sane mind that vaccination is a horrible and deadly delusion. To clench this fact I may briefly mention a Glasgow case which I sent to the Vaccination Committee, mentioning the father's name in confidence, as he did not wish it to be published. Father and mother with their children were all remarkably robust till the vaccination of their sixth babe. The foulest disease was thus given to it. It infected all the others save the eldest, who was at school. It infected the mother. Her seventh babe was born with this disease, and was put through a course of mercury a fortnight after birth. The eighth the same, and, when the father wrote, still had grey powders of an evening. The ninth babe worse than the rest. Its sufferings were dreadful for three months. Then it began to amend; but, within a few days of being six months old, it suddenly had a convulsion fit, and died in a moment. No breeder of fancy dogs, poultry, shorthorns, or racehorses, would allow an accused practice like this to be perpetrated upon any of his creatures. The Lords of the Privy Council were ill-advised enough to try vaccination upon sheep, in 1862-3, but absolute failure compelled them to abandon their ridiculous enterprise. Are God's little children of less value than sheep, in these days of sordid mammon worship? No! the least is of more worth than the whole material universe, and by God's help this piece of doctorcraft shall cease to afflict them.

THE DUTY OF THE STATE.

As there is a Divine Government, what necessity for a human Government? It is simply needed to protect individual life, liberty, and property from unjust aggression, so that each may live freely and conscientiously under the Divine Government, whereby alone he can be prosperous and happy. Whenever the State goes beyond its legitimate function of a police, in protecting every citizen alike in the free full exercise of all his God-given faculties, it inevitably does harm instead of good. The State has nothing of itself: it derives all that it has from the people. The more the State has, the less the people have. The more the State does for the people, the less the people can do for themselves; and as it is only by the voluntary and judicious exercise of their own powers that the people can pro-

gress, it is clear that so far as the State does for them, at their expense too, the duties which are within their own sphere and competence, to that extent it hinders and retards their development. Instituted to guard them against injustice from without, that they may lead free and virtuous lives, it becomes, when they culpably invest it with illegitimate power, the chief centre of demoralisation and oppression. In the first instance criminal themselves, they in the next place suffer, and deserve to suffer from the crimes of Government, that they may be thus led to feel the necessity of reforming both themselves and the instrument of their national rule.

Now, from what has been advanced, it cannot fail to be seen that if even vaccination were the greatest blessing in existence, it would not be the duty of the State to enforce it; that the State would have no more right to do this than it would have to enact that every man should bathe himself regularly every morning. If vaccination were prophylactic against small-pox, those who believe in it could practice it, and so protect themselves. They could be in no danger whatever from the unvaccinated, who should be left to the Providential correction of experience, the only method by which they could be effectually corrected. As to their children: If good parents may not do what they conscientiously believe is best for them—keeping them, for instance, in good health as the only protection against disease—then there would be an end to civil and religious liberty; against the very idea of which every honest mind must zealously protest.

THE VACCINATION LAWS A CLASS TYRANNY.

When it is shown, and proved beyond the possibility of all reasonable doubt, that vaccination is a fraud and a curse, what verdict must be passed on the Vaccination laws? Clearly, none but that of utter condemnation. These laws were bred of tyranny. They are supported by tyranny. They can be enforced and executed by nothing else but tyranny. They are class laws, inasmuch as they benefit only the doctor class, and the despicable class of spies who sell themselves to the inhuman work of prosecution under these anti-Christian and merciless enactments. They are class laws, a mere nothing to the rich who may oppose them, but ruin to the poor who may resist them. A rich man could easily pay fine after fine for years. Thousands of the poor have never a pound to spare. Besides, magistrates as a rule, would deal very leniently with the rich, whilst they, especially if they be clerical magistrates, or the *nouveaux riches* who abound in our manufacturing districts and the chief centres of trade, and who are simply put upon the bench because they have made money or been political tools, are too generally, I am very sorry to be obliged to say, haughty and cruel towards the respectable poor, who are not unfrequently quite equal to themselves, to say the least, in birth, breeding, education and conduct.

The following may serve as an example of

the persecution perpetrated under the authority of these laws.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES WASHINGTON NYE,
OF CHATHAM.

"On the 19th October, 1869, I was sentenced to fourteen days' imprisonment for refusing to have my child, *Jemima Mary*, vaccinated; but managed to elude the police until the 9th December, when I was apprehended by Police-constable Morgan, just as I was going to tea; but that individual would not let me stay to have any. I was lodged in the police-station for the night, and next morning took by train to the county gaol, at Canterbury, where I found the officials tolerably civil. After being weighed and measured, and having a description of my eyes, hair, and general appearance entered in a book, I was taken to the doctor, who examined my arm for the vaccination mark. I was then supplied with the prison dress, and placed in the cell that I was to occupy during my stay in the prison. My employment was oakum-picking, but I had no regular task. I had a hammock to sleep in but no bed. The diet for the first nine days' of my sentence was, six oz. bread for breakfast and supper, and four ounces bread, with six oz. Indian-meal pudding for dinner. I was visited several times by the chaplain, who I found to be a very nice man: he had the small-pox himself after being vaccinated. He believes that vaccination lightens it, but that a great deal of mischief is done by careless vaccination.

"On the 1st March, 1870, I was again sentenced to fourteen days' imprisonment for the same offence (as I had lost most of my work by hiding myself on the first occasion, I made up my mind not to do so again, but to go on with my business as usual); but from some cause that I am not aware of, I was not sent to gaol.

"On the 19th of May, 1870, I was apprehended on the third conviction for the same offence (sentence twenty-one days). By this time I had gained the confidence of the police, who allowed me to do pretty much as I liked. I went with the man that arrested me to hire the cab that was to convey me to the county prison at Maidstone. On arriving at the police-station, where I had to wait about an hour for the conveyance, I received many expressions of sympathy, and was not locked up. When I got to the gaol the aspect of affairs was quite changed, and I experienced nothing but cruelty. I was employed barrow-running at a foundation that was being dug for a new cook-house. I worked at that until my hands got so bad that the handles of every barrow I wheeled were stained with my blood, and I refused to work at it any longer. I was then put on task at oakum-picking, and after I had been supplied with my supper a cruel warder came and took it away, remarking that as I was too lazy to work I was not entitled to it.

"I was next apprehended for the same offence on the 28th July, 1870, and took to the county gaol at Canterbury for 31 days, and treated the same as on my first conviction. I was next apprehended on the 16th December,

1870, for the same offence, and took to Canterbury gaol for 31 days. Treatment the same as on my first conviction, with the exception that I was kept in a small cell in one of the passages a day and a night waiting for the doctor, who wanted to vaccinate me, but I refused to be done. Some bed-clothes were given me, but as they were evidently damp, I spread them on the floor to stop the sound and walked about all night. I was apprehended on my sixth conviction for the same offence, but for another child, on the 11th January, 1872, and sent to the county gaol at Maidstone for 31 days' hard labour. The constable that arrested me came without his warrant, as his instructing-sergeant told him I would not object to go without it. I was kept in the police-station all night, and treated with the usual civility by the police until next morning, when I was told by the man that was to take me to the prison that I must have the 'cutis' on, as he had orders to handcuff all prisoners for the future. I made no resistance, but in putting them on he pinched my flesh in the lock, and had to use some force to get it open again; my wrist bled a good deal, and I have the scar now. On being admitted to the prison I was ordered to strip, and the warder took my description, while a prisoner that was acting as his assistant, commenced spoiling my clothes by stamping them into a bag about half big enough to hold them. I was then told to write my name in a book, but could hardly do it as I shook so with cold. I then had a warm bath which was very nice. After getting the prison clothes on and my hair cut, I was took to the doctor and had to undergo an indecent examination, and was then put on the treadmill. My diet was six ounces of bread for breakfast and supper, and six ounces of bread, with six ounces of Indian-meal pudding for dinner. After seven days I had a pint of gruel extra for breakfast and supper. My bed-clothes consisted of three blankets, a rug, and a sack they call a pair of sheets, but I had neither bed nor pillow. On the Thursday before the expiration of my sentence, Warder Thompson took the card off my gate, which meant that I should be reported in the morning; but as I knew No. 9 and No. 10 were to be reported for talking in church, and from No. 9 telling the officer in charge of our ward that Mr. Thompson had took my card instead of No. 10's, I thought the matter would be set right in the morning, but to my surprise I was not allowed to speak, and was sentenced to two days' punishment. In the punishment cell I had two halfpenny rolls at twelve o'clock, and at supper time a pail of water was brought to the door, and I was asked if I wanted any. Since I have been home I have written to the governor explaining the matter, but have received no reply."

CHARLES W. NYE.

To Rev. Wm. Hamer-Rothery.

This is but a specimen of the cruelty, misery, and oppression, wrought under the sanction of these unhallowed and insane laws, which the venal press is mean enough to support, and political Bishops are blind enough to applaud.

Magistrates are too often thoughtless and inhuman enough to administer, and the country is cowardly enough to endure, though as they conflict with the laws of God as written upon the soul, they ought to be quietly and firmly resisted, it being a paramount duty to obey God rather than man.

Under these atheistic laws the Magistrates of Leicester, have acquired the unenviable distinction of having sent more dutiful anti-vaccinators to prison than any other Magistrates. Brave Peter Hitchen, of Wigan, was handcuffed and treadmilled in Kirkdale gaol, from which, as his ancle which had been broken 14 years previously was failing him, his wife redeemed him by the payment of £3 11s. 9d. Brave Mr. Farr, of Manchester,—a good man who worked fifteen years to support his aged parents—a respectable citizen who has never injured any one—a man 64 years of age, and a grandfather—was imprisoned in Gorton Jail, for refusing to have his youngest child vaccinated, after he had seen a previous child of his own and two grandchildren cruelly murdered by this nostrum. Mr. Clark, of Derby, Mr. Lawton, of Chesterfield, even women—now let me stop!—have been imprisoned under these Acts, which I refrain from characterising in such terms as they deserve. To escape the operation of these Acts homes have been broken up, good parents living in concealment, whilst I know some have left the country, and others are about to leave it.

MR. PEASE'S BILL.

Mr. Pease's Bill would relieve conscientious objectors to vaccination from liability to further prosecution after they had paid one full penalty, or two minor fines, which the really poor could not afford. Should Mr. Pease's Bill become law, he will have succeeded in establishing the sale of indulgences afresh in this country; politico-medical, in place of the ecclesiastical indulgences of Luther's day. What here calls for most determined protest is the cowardly spirit of compromise which the Bill embodies; its concession to money of freedom refused to conscience; and the bad example which Parliament would thus set to the whole country. For if Parliament may thus sell liberty of conscience to parents, will it not be too readily inferred throughout the country that nothing is too sacred for sale and barter? Thus God is dethroned, and Mammon exalted in His place. Thus are insincerity, meanness, and unmanliness cultivated; whilst loyalty to God, conscientious courage, and thoroughness of character are disregarded, or rendered absolutely penal—at least in the poor who cannot pay the price of such expensive luxuries!

CONCLUSION AND APPEAL.

In face of the overwhelming evidence above collected, that Vaccination is a delusion and a snare, and that the Vaccination Laws are no less a political crime than a blunder, since Vaccination neither prevents nor even modifies small-pox (otherwise such fatal epidemics of small-pox in such highly vaccinated cities

as London and Berlin would have been impossible), whilst it transmits all kinds of constitutional diseases, and too often results in horrible deaths and cruel sufferings to helpless infants, surely the duty which lies before us as a nation is abundantly manifest. Who but a political tyrant or medical fanatic can desire to sustain such laws? Who but a man largely unmanned by a spirit of self-interest and servility to the powers that be (a spirit which, as has been justly remarked, is the spirit of tyranny turned inside out) could stoop to administer such laws, chaining down the better impulses of his nature so as to consign to prison, handcuffs, and treadmill the faithful parent who seeks to protect his child from harm, in obedience to the holiest God-given instincts of his nature? Who but an abject and pitiable being could stoop to play the disgraceful part of spy and informer under these laws? Who, in short,—but those who bravely resist them—can come in contact with these laws without being demoralized by them?

Moreover, these Vaccination Laws possess a yet more baleful importance as being one arm of the Medical Despotism, of the Doctorcraft, which enlightened men in all parties are awakening to recognise as the great danger of our country at this time. It has been well said by a venerable Conservative politician, "Priestcraft was bad, but Doctorcraft is intolerable." And, to avert this danger, medicine must be wholly separated from the State, all charters and monopolies to one medical school withdrawn, all power to enforce medical nostrums abrogated, and liberty of conscience accorded to the humblest subject of the realm in matters of health, as well as matters of religion.

As a first step, therefore, in this work of liberation—a work vitally essential to the preservation of any pure moral sense or possibility of social regeneration amongst us—I would appeal to all lovers of their country, of freedom, of purity, of justice, of God, to band themselves together against this unclean tyranny of Compulsory Vaccination, which not merely sanctions but enforces, in violation of all constitutional right, one of the foulest quack-nostrums ever puffed or practised; the sowing, namely, of corruption, of literal rotteness, of dead matter expelled from diseased surfaces, in the live, healthy blood of helpless infants or deluded adults! Oh, that this nation would arise as a nation and cast out this unclean thing from its midst, and make thus some amends to the world at large for the bad example ignorantly set in respect to this physical curse called Vaccination, when the English Parliament gave Edward Jenner £30,000 for his vaunted discovery of what was in truth the wretched superstition of uneducated peasants!

Oh! that every man who believes in cleanliness of soul and body would resolve henceforth to let nothing stand in the way of removing a curse from the land, which, while it is deteriorating year by year the physical health of the population, and demoralizing both those who cruelly enforce and those who reluctantly submit to it, cannot fail to stir

up among the braver and more enlightened, who resist and denounce it, a spirit of contemptuous resentment against the Government which sustains oppression amidst professions of unbounded liberalism—a dangerous spirit to those who nourish, as well as to those who evoke it.

For the sake, then, of peace and order ; for the sake of national health and purity ; for the sake of the Great Parent of all, who never made little children for doctors to practise their filthy blood-poisoning on, and of poor human parents who suffer untold agonies in witnessing the cruel blighting and tortures it so often inflicts on their helpless little ones, look back to any one of the cases I have recorded, Reader, and realise your own feelings had this been your darling!—for the sake, too, of old English courage and pluck and manliness, I call upon all true Britons to rise and demand of their rulers, of their members of Parliament, their Boards of Guardians, and all the rest, that this plague of the Vacci-

nation Laws—worse than any small-pox epidemic, any black death, any plague of old, because so subtle and continuous in its operation—be stayed at once and for ever ; that men be at least left free to choose whether they will fall into the hands of God rather than of doctors, in preferring the risk of natural to the certainty of artificially created disease, the limits or consequences of which in “the blood, which is the life,” no man can determine ; and then we may hope it will not be long ere the common sense and better judgment of a more enlightened age will learn to reprobate as it deserves, and utterly exterminate in practice, if it cannot wholly banish from remembrance, that loathsome offspring of an age of infidelity and materialism (which would have had us believe that a bestial disease could better the best health of humanity), that most foul and offensive medical delusion yecept Vaccination.

8, Richmond Terrace, Middleton, Manchester,
June, 1872.



