

VACCINATION
OR
BLOOD POISONING WITH ANIMAL DISEASES.
—
HEATH.

M17976



22102067357

G. L. Otley
5th January 1899.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014



VACCINATION

OR

Blood Poisoning with Animal Diseases

BY

ED. ALFRED HEATH, M.D. PHA., ETC.

*Doctor of Medicine of the Hahnemann Medical College of Philadelphia
(by Residence and Examination)
Fellow of the Linnean Society of London
Member of the Academia Homeopatica Española*

PUBLISHED BY

HEATH & CO.,

114, EBURY STREET, LONDON, S.W.

[1892]

9/2/73
114 200/61

301623

M17976

WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	we!MOmec
Call	
No.	W.C. 585
	1895
	H43V

Dedicated

TO HER MAJESTY'S MINISTERS,
THE MOST ABLE AND THE STRONGEST GOVERNMENT
OF MODERN TIMES,
WHO REMOVED THE OPPRESSIVE MEASURE
OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION



Blood Poisoning by Vaccination with Animal Diseases.

DURING the great and sustained opposition to vaccination in this country, tens of thousands of people have refused to allow their children to be vaccinated, and numbers preferred to pay fines or to have their goods taken (this often leading to riots and imprisonment) rather than [^] have their children ~~should be~~ contaminated with animal diseases which have often caused death. These circumstances necessitated the appointment of a

ROYAL COMMISSION

to inquire into the matter. This Commission was composed of members of Parliament, men of tried experience and of Parliamentary and social status, many of them medical men, and *all* of them men believing in the teaching of Jenner, and therefore advocates of vaccination.

This Commission sat for eight years, and summoned before it many of the leading medical men, both those in favour of vaccination and those against it. The *result* of the inquiry was that these statesmen, after hearing *both sides* and thoroughly sifting the evidence,

to their eternal honour recommended that the *compulsory clause* of the Vaccination Act should be abolished. In spite of this recommendation a Bill was brought before the House of Commons of 1898, formulated no doubt by the "lights" of the profession, absolutely ignoring the recommendation of the Royal Commission.

There was a very small party in the House of Commons in opposition to the compulsory clause, and the Press, with few exceptions, was in favour of compulsion—the Press which is free decided against freedom! There was almost a certainty that the Bill would become law. But there were statesmen, *leaders* in the House who saw beyond the narrow and perhaps bigoted medical opinions that could not be demonstrated or proved; they recognised as statesmen that the minority had legal rights also, and that whatever may be done in autocratic countries, the minority could not be sacrificed in Great Britain in such a vital matter as this, especially after the recommendation of the Royal Commission, for that Commission must have had strong evidence given before it, to show the more than doubtful advantages of vaccination. This being the case, the leaders of both the Lords and Commons, when they might have had an easy victory, determined, to their everlasting credit, to allow the compulsory clause of the Bill to be removed. Whatever their private opinion may be respecting vaccination, they have saved all who will from a loathsome contamination, and posterity will approve their action.

It is now my intention, as one who has seen a good deal of the ill-effects of vaccination, to try and show to all those who are in *favour* of vaccination not only

WHAT VACCINATION MEANS,

but to prove that any advantage that may be supposed to follow vaccination is far outweighed by the evils that are sure to come after it. I shall also show that many of the evils that we suffer from, and which in spite of the perfect system of sanitation and drainage we have, and the better housing and feeding of the poor, are increasing by leaps and bounds. Why should disease increase thus under such perfect sanitation. First let me quote from Jenner

HOW VACCINE IS PREPARED.

In the third edition of his work, "The Cowpox," page 2, he says: "There is a disease to which the horse, from his state of domestication, is frequently subject. The farriers or veterinaries have called it grease. It is an inflammation and swelling of the heel, accompanied at its commencement with small cracks or fissures, from which issues a liquid fluid, possessing properties of a very peculiar kind. This fluid seems capable of generating a disease in the human body (after it has undergone the modification I shall presently speak of) which bears so strong a resemblance to small-pox, that I think it highly probable it may be the *source of that disease* (italics mine.—AUTHOR).

"In this dairy country a great number of cows are kept, and the office of milking is performed indiscriminately by men and maid-servants. One of the former having been appointed to apply dressings to the heel of a horse affected with the malady I have mentioned (grease), and not paying due attention to cleanliness, incautiously bears his part in milking the cows with some particle of the infectious matter adhering to his fingers; where this is the case it fre-

quently happens that the disease is communicated to the cows, and from the cows to the dairymaids, which spreads through the farm until most of the cattle and domestics feel its unpleasant consequences.

“This disease has obtained the name of cow-pox.

“Thus the disease makes its progress from the horse (as I conceive) to the nipple of the cow and from the cow to the human subject. *Morbid matter of various kinds* (italics mine.—AUTHOR), when absorbed into the system, may produce effects in some degree similar. But what renders the cow-pox virus so extremely singular is that a person who has been thus affected is for ever after secure from the infection of the small-pox (italics mine.—AUTHOR), neither exposure to the variolous effluvia nor the insertion of the matter into the skin producing the distemper.”

The above is what Jenner says; he also says that *spontaneous* cow-pox is not protective. On the foregoing Jenner formulates his idea of vaccinating people with horse-cow-pox to protect them from small-pox.

IN THE SMALL-POX HOSPITAL OF LONDON

ninety-four to ninety-five persons out of every hundred admitted there with the disease have been vaccinated, and have the mark of the vaccine disease on their arms.

This shows that vaccination is not, as Jenner stated, an absolute protection, or a lasting one. The question, under this doubtful state of things now arises, How long will vaccination protect? Some doctors say that vaccination once in seven years is sufficient to protect, but there are numerous cases on record of persons having taken small-pox a few months after being

vaccinated.¹ I have known a vaccinated person to have *small-pox three times* under the age of thirty years. If small-pox will not prevent certain persons having the disease a second time, it cannot be supposed that vaccination will be more certain.

Therefore it is clear that the way to prevent small-pox must be sought for elsewhere. The best guard against small-pox is health, as I shall show further on.

So much for Jenner's lifelong immunity.

ARM-TO-ARM VACCINATION.

It was always maintained that if the vaccine fluid was taken free from blood no other disease could be communicated; *it was denied that any disease could be carried by means of the lymph*, notwithstanding that the lymph vesicle is the outcome of the diseased state, the fruits, so to speak, the external evidence that the vaccine disease is in the person. It is clear also that the lymph must carry *every* taint, for if a person suffering from scarlet fever were vaccinated, would not lymph from such a source produce scarlet fever, as well as the vaccine disease? But, strange to say, the utmost care was exercised by the doctors before lymph was taken even from a healthy-looking child; all sorts of questions were asked as to the health of the father and mother, and if these were not answered satisfactorily, or there was the least taint of constitutional disease apparent, the child was refused—every one knows this was so.

¹ One of the most remarkable cases that has come to my knowledge took place during the epidemic of 1872; it was that of a family of nine persons, the parents and seven children. Two of the children, fearing small-pox, had themselves vaccinated, a few weeks afterwards they both contracted small-pox, *and were the only members of the family who had it.*

If, as was asserted by the profession, no disease could be carried, so long as the lymph was free from blood, there was no need to inquire as to the health of the child or parents. If no taint was carried by the lymph free from blood in one case, what was to cause it to be carried in the other? *Any diseased child would do as well as a healthy one.* This seems to show that what was asserted by the profession was not always believed by them to be a matter of certainty.

This state of things has continued up to quite recently. It is *now admitted* that there are disease germs in the *vaccine fluid*, no matter from where obtained, and a plan has been originated, and is included in the Act of Parliament just passed, that is said to remove those germs. I refer to

GLYCERINATED VACCINE.

As I have said it has always been maintained that human vaccine was harmless, and would not carry disease other than the vaccine disease, if free from blood. Now arm-to-arm vaccination is abolished, the vaccine must come from the heifer alone, but it is claimed that by mixing it with glycerine it is made harmless. If mixing with glycerine makes it harmless by destroying the microbes, why will not human lymph do as well as animal lymph? But now

ANIMAL LYMPH (COW-POX)

is alone to be used. If human lymph is known to invariably contain microbes of other diseases surely the same is the case with animal lymph, which is now to be mixed with glycerine. Are not the animals subject to all kinds of diseases? Do they not die of these diseases by thousands? Are they not slaughtered by

order of the Privy Council *because they cannot be cured of these diseases*, and yet we deliberately stamp animal diseases into human beings, at the same time order the stamping out or slaughter of animals diseased, because they cannot be cured. Up to now most doctors have laid great stress on antiseptics and the absolute necessity of taking the utmost care to prevent disease germs from entering the blood, whilst at the *same time* they have advocated the use of vaccine fluid taken from the horse and the cow, or the human being, which they *now state is known by them* to have "*adventitious microbes*" *invariably present*. Anti-vaccinationists have always maintained that vaccination increases disease and *mortality*, and is believed to be the most likely cause of the increase of *consumption* and *cancer*, and probably many other forms of disease, such as fistula and wasting diseases. The practice of vaccination began in the early part of this century, and was much in vogue about 1830 or 1840 (by the Act of 1840 it was endowed). I take the following from the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, September, 1898 (no statistics of any value were kept before 1840). The deaths from cancer in 1840 were 177 per million persons, or 2,786 for the year; in 1850 the deaths per million were 279, or 4,966 for the year. Every year since that date the deaths from cancer have steadily increased until in 1896 the deaths were 764 per million, or 23,521 for that year. So much for the yearly mortality from cancer. The Registrar-General's return for *phthisis* for the year 1896 was 47,872, more than double the deaths from cancer. I believe these figures relate only to *phthisis pulmonalis*.

Now let us suppose that the bacillus or the microbe is destroyed by the glycerine, the ptomaine or poisonous

animal alkaloid which is formed by them¹ during the decomposition of animal matter still remains, and this very poison is no doubt increased in power by the glycerine, which is a natural solvent of animal ptomaines and animal poisons generally. But if the bacillus of consumption is dangerous on account of its power of producing tuberculosis, surely the deadly ptomaine obtained from the bacillus must be also. Further, how can it be possible to prove without years of experience and of careful observation that the germs of consumption are *not* sown, as is the case in so many other diseases?

Professor Koch carefully filtered out the bacilli of consumption from his preparation so that it contained none, and he added glycerine to the fluid, but even then the patients were killed by an aggravation of their disease from the *weak* injections he used. The position of the introducer and the advocates of the glycerine vaccine is rather a peculiar one. It has always been maintained that the bacillus or the microbe are the active disease-producing agents, so that if you take the bacillus or the microbe of the vaccine fluid away, or destroy them, as it is said the glycerine does, it *ought not to produce the disease cow-pox*. As it does do so, it follows that the bacillus is not the primary or only cause of disease, but a result of it, and I believe that its products, as well as the bacillus, are capable of transmitting it to susceptible people.

It is thus admitted that disease can be produced without the bacillus or microbe, since vaccine without the microbe of its kind can produce the vaccine pustule just as well as with it, for before the vaccine pustule can be produced the

¹ "Since all putrefaction is dependent upon *micro-organisms*, the formation of ptomaines is also dependent upon them."—Gould.

system must be impregnated with that *disease* which is taken from the *horse* and *cow*, and further, the vaccine fluid taken from the arm of the person thus vaccinated with glycerine-vaccine will also contain the microbes of vaccine, if diagnosis by microbes means anything. If the vaccine should also contain the bacillus and ptomaine of tuberculosis (a disease common to the cow), or any other ptomaine and bacillus derived from the horse, or the cow, *although* the micro-organisms *invariably* present are said to be destroyed by the glycerine, the ptomaine of bacilli, whether of tuberculosis or other diseases, is not destroyed, and *it equally has the power to produce the disease from which it is derived and carry infection, as the vaccine fluid free from micro-organisms has of producing the vaccine pustule.*

It would be a good test of the efficacy of the action of glycerine to destroy contamination if the introducer of this plan were to inoculate himself with the fluid of, say, the "lues venerea"—of course mixed with glycerine. He will, according to his theory, destroy the bacillus in the ptomaine. Will he prevent infection? I maintain that we have never had any proof that vaccination *alone* has lessened small-pox, but what can be proved is that it increases the *death-rate* from all diseases.

Small-pox had gradually subsided all over Europe, England included, before inoculation, or vaccination was thought of. The practice of inoculating with modified small-pox, introduced about the middle of the last century, increased the mortality from that disease to nearly double, and spread the disease all over England, until at the beginning of this century *nearly every one* had had small-pox, so that it is no wonder that pock-marked faces were common fifty or sixty years ago. Inoculation was strongly recommended by

the College of Physicians in 1754—*they considered it highly beneficial to mankind.*

As the limit of time for vaccinating children is now to be twelve months instead of three months it would be well to compare infant mortality under the age of twelve months in the future with the mortality under the age of twelve months before the passing of this Act.

We are apt to think that because we do not get so much small-pox as we did *before* the introduction of vaccination that it is owing to vaccination, but it is owing to nothing of the kind. As I have said, immediately previous to vaccination with the horse-cow virus *people were inoculated directly with the small-pox fluid itself.* This plan of putting the disease into the blood, although in a modified form, was found to *so spread small-pox* that it was put a stop to by *Act of Parliament* on that account alone. During the last forty years the mortality during epidemics of small-pox has increased. As a proof that small-pox is not lessened by vaccination, is it not now advocated by the medical believers in vaccination that one vaccination is not sufficient to protect, but that it must be *repeatedly* done to insure protection? The protection is therefore of a very uncertain character. Almost any illness will benefit the person, if that person is properly treated. What we call disease is an effort of nature to get rid of a chronic morbid condition which interferes with the proper nourishment of the body and disposes one to infection. Certain infectious diseases take root in this morbid state—the spark to the train—and would not take root but for that diseased state. If the person is then *properly treated* he not only gets rid of the infection but his constitutional state is improved, so that he is less likely to be again

troubled with that disease. Does not every one know how much better they feel after an illness, provided they have not been poisoned by drugs? Even small-pox itself cures numerous troubles—blindness, tumours, consumption, &c. In the

“BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL”

of January, 1891, an account was given by Dr. Lawrence, supported by Sir W. H. Broadbent, M.D., of two cases of consumption in the last stage, with large cavities in the lung, having both been cured by the patient contracting small-pox; they are said to have put on flesh and were living images of health; when attacked by small-pox one of these persons weighed 7 stone 12 lbs., now he weighs 13 stone. I have often had people tell me who have had small-pox that their health was much better for years after.

I believe there is no more protection from vaccination than is produced by the temporary illness arising from it, the same as after other illnesses, and, further, until they have recovered from the immediate effects produced by vaccination, they are probably *more* liable to contract the disease. Again, as evidence in support of the truth of what I state, and in spite of the great advance in sanitation which has done so much to lessen all kinds of diseases that we are *not* vaccinated for, I will show by the following facts, which were taken from the Registrar-General's returns, and published in “Vital Statistics,” that instead of lessening the mortality in small-pox epidemics it is increased, showing that vaccination, besides being hurtful, is useless, tending rather to increase other *diseases* and *mortality* by adding animal impurities to the blood.

Vaccination was made compulsory by Act of Parliament in 1853 and again in 1867, and still more stringent in 1871. Since 1853 we have had three epidemics of small-pox.

	Deaths from small-pox in England & Wales.
<i>First epidemic</i> in 1857-58-59	14,244
(Increase of population between first and second epidemic was 7 per cent. with vaccination enforced by law.)	
<i>Second epidemic</i> , 1863-64-65	20,059
(Showing an <u>increase of small-pox of nearly 50 per cent.</u>)	
<i>Third epidemic</i> , 1870-71-72	44,840
(With an increase of population 10 per cent., showing an <u>increase of small-pox of 120 per cent.</u>)	

There are tens of thousands of people in this country who object to vaccination, not on sentimental grounds but owing to the terrible experience they have had under this most stupid and arbitrary interference with the liberty of the subject. If any one wishes to be vaccinated, by all means let them be, but let those who object have *their rights respected*. Oh! some will say, but if the minority have their way they will become centres of infection to the detriment of the majority. How can that be? I reply. Does not your vaccination *protect* you from such risk; if it does not protect you what is the use of it? But I say it will do something else, it will sow the seeds of far worse diseases than small-pox. Who can explain the cause of the terrible increase of consumption and cancer and other diseases, in spite of all the improvements in sanitation? what more likely than that it is the outcome of disease put into one by inoculation with

taints from the brute or lower animals? I have myself seen tubercular meningitis follow *immediately* after vaccination in a previously perfectly strong and healthy child with no family history of tuberculosis, and I am convinced that vaccination with grease or cow-pox (call it what you will, it does not alter its character) is one of the first and foremost causes of the increase of the various forms of consumption and other malignant diseases. The laws that govern epidemics are very little understood, but to make people more diseased artificially is not the way to protect them from disease; it will only increase their tendency to disease. Who can explain the law of vicarious mortality? When cholera is raging, mortality is less. In 1849-50 cholera killed 71,000 people in this country, but the whole of the deaths from every cause during those two years, including cholera, was 10,000 less than during the two preceding years when there was no cholera.

In 1866-67 cholera killed 52,000 people in England; the whole mortality, including cholera, was 14,000 less than the two previous years when there was no cholera. It is the same during epidemics of small-pox and other diseases: the death-rate during these epidemics is less than when there is no epidemic, always excepting *deaths from drugging*, as in influenza.

I presume there are few physicians who will disagree with me when I say that the more healthy a man is, the more free he is from morbid taints, the more likely is he to be protected from disease of *any kind*. The perfectly healthy man does not need protection against disease; his health protects him (note, for instance, the healthy man who goes to the tropics and escapes fever). If he is not protected, on account of *morbid condilions making him susceptible*, the adding of

another morbid state (by vaccination) to the blood will only confirm and increase his morbidity, and he lays himself more open to disease, especially epidemic or infectious diseases, by thus increasing his morbid state, as I have pointed out, in small-pox epidemics. I would say here that I do not suppose unvaccinated people are sure to escape disease on that account *alone*, unless they also obey the laws of health and use proper means of protection ; unvaccinated people are often in a condition to contract any disease, but vaccination makes their condition worse. The

STANDARD OF PERFECT HEALTH

is the only protection against disease, therefore every departure from that standard, by inoculation, is a step toward active disease. The African Kaffir is more logical : he fails to see why a healthy beast must be made sick in order to keep it well. How much more terrible it is to poison the healthy human being (sapping the vitality of the nation)—how absurd to treat the diseased and healthy in the same manner !

Even Jenner, the introducer of vaccination, says that the system is *permanently altered by vaccination*—in other words, permanently diseased. Of course it is, when animal taints that are often *perfectly incurable* are put into human beings. What is needed to prevent disease is to improve the health of the body by sanitation, healthy living, and removing by careful treatment constitutional conditions that make one susceptible, not by adding disease to disease and thereby complicating and increasing the morbid condition. If the people, generally, knew that they or their children were inoculated or vaccinated from the “greasy” heel of a diseased horse, which is practically Jenner’s theory

of vaccination, they would not have it at any price. Calf lymph, as I have said, is "grease" from a diseased horse applied to the udder of the calf, the blister forming contains the same virus "grease" (*plus all the taints of the cow*). This is what is advocated by the profession, and for which an Act of Parliament (fortunately frustrated by the wisdom of our executive) was to have been passed to compel us to put into our healthy or unhealthy children, to protect them, it is said, from small-pox—a disease they may never have, and will not have if in good health and if the laws of health are observed. I have spoken to many *believers* in vaccination, but *none* of them knew the source of the rottenness they put into their children. You who are ignorant of this, go to the knacker's yard for yourselves and see a horse in the *last stage* of "grease"—that will be enough for any sane man ; he can form some idea of what that poor brute has suffered and can imagine what it means to put *that disease into his child*. I think I hear him saying it is not the opponents of vaccination that are mad. But some may raise a quibble by saying that "grease" is not now taken from the horse direct and applied to the udder of the cow as recommended by Jenner, but the virus is passed on from cow to cow—may I say from tuberculous cow to tuberculous cow ? My reply to that is, if small-pox was taken from a horse or a human being and put into the cow, and on from cow to cow, would it not be always small-pox ? Is its nature changed ? Not as long as it has the power to produce the disease it originally was, *but every cow it passes through may add fresh taints to it*.

Any morbid matter will poison the blood ; pure blood, uncontaminated by any poisonous matter, gives life and health, but blood made impure by all kinds of animal

disease can only entail misery and a greater death-rate. In this latter part of the nineteenth century there seems to be a *mania* for blood poisoning by inoculation with *animal diseases*; to this end every animal in a *diseased state* is requisitioned and the diseased condition implanted in the blood of human beings. Amongst physicians it is a case of "follow your leader"—like a flock of sheep, if one jumps into a bog all the flock go likewise. The spread of small-pox would be a trifling matter compared to the terrible evils that are spread by the constant inoculation of animal diseases into the human system. Small-pox, like many other diseases, as I have previously stated, is a ferment that cleanses those it attacks, and often cures hitherto incurable constitutional diseases (see paragraph *British Medical Journal*)—but for this constitutional state they would not be susceptible to it—but these animal disease poisons come to stay with all their accumulated evils, and not even small-pox would remove the taints, because by putting them into the blood they become a "constitutional heritage."

The laws of nature, which, when obeyed, are capable of curing or preventing every evil, are disregarded or despised on account of their simplicity. We must needs have some virulent product of disease from the brute beast injected into the blood in the vain effort to cure or prevent disease, but the effects of which will *permanently* poison the life (or, as Jenner says of vaccination, *permanently* alter the system) by causing all kinds of diseases, making life a burden, a fruitful cause of

MANIA AND SUICIDE.

I have seen children after vaccination develop the most violent maniacal tempers, not previously existent. I

have seen a child of two to three years of age assume the most fiendish expression and kick and strike its mother, and I have removed this condition entirely with anti-phthisic remedies.[†]

It is a little remarkable that all the agents put forward

[†] I saw in a daily newspaper the other day that in the last fifty years eighty thousand men of the British army alone had committed suicide. *Every man* in the army is vaccinated, and probably re-vaccinated, more than once during his term of service. This is worthy of note, as it was about forty-five years ago that vaccination was made *compulsory* by Act of Parliament ; but it was in vogue long before, as in 1840 an Act was passed to *extend* the practice of vaccination. This seems to me very significant side by side with the increase of all diseases since 1840, as I have already stated.

In the German and French armies all the men are vaccinated ; yet during the war of 1870 between these countries there are said to have been 30,000 cases of small-pox.

The whole of the men comprising the American army destined for Cuba and Manilla were *re-vaccinated* on mobilisation ; small-pox attacked numbers at Manilla, and in a few days there were many deaths.

If we add the deaths from suicide, the mortality due to the *increase* of consumption and kindred diseases, such as the various forms of cancer (for there appears to be a close relationship), the mortality from influenza, &c., what a fearful state of things is produced if, as is more than probable, it be due to tainting the blood with animal diseases ; for if it can be proved that *one* case of cancer or consumption has been caused by vaccination, it is enough to establish my contention that it is a cause of consumption and cancer, and probably is the chief cause of the alarming spread of these and other kindred diseases. Dr. Chas. Creighton, in his book, "Bovine Tuberculosis in Man," mentions twelve cases of bovine tuberculosis in human beings, verified by post-mortem ; he does not say they were caused by vaccination (see paragraph "Bovine Tuberculosis").

But do not forget this : although it is called bovine tuberculosis, it is probably in most cases engendered by vaccinating the cow with a disease from the horse.

The whole human race for the last fifty or sixty years has become intensely liable or susceptible to every kind of disease, and men have lost their disease-resisting power. If we have an epidemic,

by the allopathic profession of late years for the cure or prevention of disease, to which I shall presently again refer, have a strangely close relationship to the disease treated ; in fact, are similar. The lymph taken from an animal disease (to wit, horse-cow-pox vaccination) is used to prevent small-pox, a similar disease, no matter what other malady it produces. The saliva of the mad dog is passed through a rabbit to meet the effects of the rabid dog's bite, hydrophobia.

THE POISON OF CONSUMPTION,

prepared by breeding the bacilli of consumption, and then separating them from the resulting ptomaine or animal alkaloid (a poisonous fluid generated by the bacillus, causing death when *injected*, in far less quantities than may be found in the patient's own lungs) is injected into human beings, as well as animals, to cure consumption, and recommended as a test to show whether consumption exists or threatens ; if it

say of influenza, few people escape it. Those that do are the exceptionally healthy ones. Many of those affected with influenza develop pneumonia, and then consumption. Medical men have been greatly exercised about the *cause* of influenza, and busy looking for the microbe. All sorts of absurd theories were started about its cause ; even millions of dead Chinamen were supposed to have something to do with it.

Influenza is a very common, and often fatal, disease in horses ; it is an eminently psoric disease, hence its easy transition to pneumonia and phthisis. We need not look about for its *cause* and its microbe ; it is here in our midst, staring us in the face, emplanting in the blood of every one by the constitutional changes (the permanent alteration, as Jenner says, of human beings) induced by vaccination. The human race is, so to speak, "saltpetred" by it, so that the smallest spark of any disease we come in contact with is often irresistible, and will always be a source of danger. When will men learn that healthy bodies only will protect them from the inception of disease ?

does exist, the temperature is raised and the disease aggravated, and death comes more quickly ; if consumption does not previously exist, the germ[†] is produced by the inoculation, and sooner or later the disease comes to those also *who were previously free from it.*

EXTRACT OF THE THYROID GLAND

of sheep is recommended as a cure for myxœdema, a disease of the thyroid gland, with dropsical gathering in the connective tissue, and atrophy of the gland. There is a disease with dropsical symptoms common to sheep called rot or fluke disease, and one *peculiar* symptom of this disease consists in a soft indolent tumour of the upper part of the neck and the lower part of the jaw. It seems to me that extract of the thyroid gland of supposed healthy sheep may be an *extract of the morbid constitutional state*, as most sheep kept on certain insanitary land will develop the rot or fluke disease ; for in all disease there must be a constitutional predisposing, as well as an exciting cause.

The good results obtained by the use of a preparation made from the thyroid glands of healthy sheep, Thyroidin, in curing myxœdema, shows how closely the old school are working on homœopathic lines. The removal of the thyroid glands by surgical means is a cause of myxœdema. The injury done by removing glands from the body shows what important functions they play in

[†] To many the germ means the bacillus. The poisonous fluid without the bacillus is evidently just as capable of promoting the disease or morbid state, and I mean that also when I refer to germs, and that comparatively healthy people or animals who may be inoculated with this fluid have the consumptive habit put into them, and in certain conditions of ill-health it will develop sooner or later.

the economy of nature, their use being to absorb and then neutralise and destroy poisonous or morbid conditions. If, as I have said, a preparation of the thyroid gland is made from the gland in a morbid constitutional state, it is evident that these glands (and all glands), acting as filters or neutralising organs, will contain in a marked degree that morbid matter ; for many eminent men have pointed out that the glands exist for the purpose of absorbing, and then destroying, these taints.

In the *Daily Telegraph* a few days ago appeared a paragraph by an eminent specialist on the dangers of milk from tuberculous cows (but he does not say why tuberculosis has increased so much in cows), producing a greatly increased death-rate from *tabes mesenterica*, a form of tuberculosis in which the mesenteric glands are affected—no doubt by the absorption of a poison ; but I think this disease is far more likely to be induced by the actual absorption of the horse-cow-pox disease by vaccination. If tuberculous milk will produce this trouble, surely the disease “grease” poison put into the blood will do so. Further, babes have often had milk from tuberculous mothers and tuberculous cows without developing *tabes* in any form.

One of the latest introductions is

ANTI-TOXIN.

Made by injecting the diphtheria poison from a human being into a horse until saturated with the poison, when the blood is drawn as wanted from the poor suffering beast, and the serum of this blood is injected into the circulation of human beings to cure diphtheria, as if the patient had not diphtheria enough, and as if there were

not far better remedies for that disease. I presume the animal selected is not a poor, worn-out, diseased horse, but one absolutely free from every other kind of contamination ; it will, I presume, be *guaranteed* that it has never had farcy or glanders, grease, strangles, poll-evil, skin diseases, fistula, diseases of the bone, and that it is not consumptive, and that it has not inherited any of those diseases. When a child is vaccinated, as I have stated, particular inquiries are made as to the health of the child the virus is taken from—for virus it certainly is—also the health of its father and mother ; and if this is not found to be good, it is refused. If there is only a possibility of constitutional taint being so carried, is that possibility not sufficient to prevent any wise parents running the risk of contaminating their children ? One has only to read the daily papers to be informed that such contaminations have frequently taken place, and are constantly being reported where children in previously perfect health have died from the most loathsome form of blood poisoning caused by vaccination. It was thought necessary that great care should be exercised in taking the lymph from a child that it should be free from blood, otherwise taints or germs of constitutional disease *would* go with it into the constitution of the child into whose arm it was put, and so spread those evils to untold generations ; but in this preparation, anti-toxin, it is the *blood that is taken (heifer lymph also contains blood)*. Supposing that it has the power to control the disease diphtheria, is not the remedy *applied in this way* likely to be the greater evil of the two ? If the morbid conditions of the lower animals are transmitted to the human race, will not the last evil be greater than the first ? After a time

HEIFER LYMPH

was recommended as the safe and proper thing to vaccinate with. Why? Is the animal not liable to disease either by inheritance or otherwise, and cannot these diseases, many of them, like rinderpest, be transmitted to the human races? By putting animal disease into the blood we produce a monstrous taint in human beings that will cause them to more readily contract diseases from the lower animals, diseases that had not previously been communicable to man, and to become far more liable to contract diseases generally. What manner of people will the future race of man be, mentally and physically, when his progenitors are engrafted with the diseases of the cow, the horse, the ass, the dog, the pig, the sheep, to say nothing of human complications?

The treatment of diseases in this way by the allopathic profession is to me astounding; whilst saying everything they can against homœopathy, they are *absolutely advocating* "like curing like"; but although they treat by "*similia similibus curantur*," they are applying the similar remedy *antipathically*, if I may so call it, because thus used its evil effects far outweigh any fancied good. Let me explain my meaning. Take a virulent snake poison, inject a small portion into the blood (snake bite), and death is the result. Take the same poison, but instead of a small quantity, let it be a tangible one; it can be swallowed without danger to life, *provided it does not come in contact with any abraded surface*.¹ Take this

¹ There is a snake in South Africa called the spitting snake (*Scpedon hamachates*). It spits with marvellous accuracy directly into the eye. The fluid ejected produces violent inflammation—the natives say ultimate blindness—but not death. The blindness may be the result of the inflammation—a false cataract. This is one of the most dangerous snakes, and its *bite* is generally fatal to man.

same poison, potentise it on the homœopathic plan up, if you like, to the 30th potency ; it will cure, if taken internally, conditions similar to those produced by the crude poison, and potentised snake poisons have often been found useful in snake bite itself. By this plan the preparation is made useful, and it does not enter into the blood ; nor is it strong enough to poison, but it is enough to do good.

The poison of the crotalus, its use borrowed from the homœopaths (who use it in bad forms of diphtheria, scarlet fever, and in the deadly black-water fever of East Africa with success), is recommended, and is used in allopathic practice in the treatment of malignant scarlet fever, taken in three-drop doses of a solution of one in one thousand.

Now all these preparations that have recently turned the world and medical opinions upside down—save perhaps the thyroid extract—have been used by the homœopaths, *but used by them in the same manner as the snake poison before mentioned*, and such has been their success in curing certain malignant diseases of a similar character that I verily believe it was this success that first brought them under the notice of old school physicians and chemists.

Take the first, introduced by a chemist of the old school (Pasteur), to be injected hypodermically (hydrophobin), made from the saliva of the mad dog passed through the body of a rabbit. It was *originally* introduced by the celebrated homœopathic physician the late Dr. Constantine Hering in 1833 (see Hering's "Materia Medica," and his "Domestic Physician," published in 1851, also the *North American Journal of Homœopathy*, 1879, also "provings" by other homœopaths in 1835 and 1853. It was used

successfully by the introducer on the same lines as the snake poison.

PASTEUR FIRST INTRODUCED HIS MODE OF TREATING HYDROPHOBIA

by injecting the weakened virus of the mad dog in 1883 or 1884. His plan was to first inject the virus into rabbits—in other words, produce rabies in them. The virus or ptomaine obtained from the spinal cord of the rabbit so poisoned, in a weakened state, is then injected into the veins of human beings who are said to have hydrophobia. But if the bite in some of these cases should not have been from a rabid dog, then the poisonous ptomaine of rabies is put into the blood. It has been said that since this mode of treating rabies was introduced, there has been a larger mortality from hydrophobia.

TUBERCULINUM

was first introduced by Dr. S. Swan, an American homœopathic physician, about twenty-five or thirty years ago; and at the time the medical journals in this country took the matter up and spoke of the disgusting nature of the proceedings. In 1890 Dr. Koch brought before the world his form of Tuberculinum (as in the case of Swan's, a product of phthisis) *to be injected* into the blood; not disgusting this, although in a tangible quantity, because, I presume, done by an allopath! All the allopathic medical profession fell down and worshipped him and his remedy, and numbers of people were sent to their graves by it, as in the case of the snake poison, by having it injected into their blood. This mode of treating consumption in human beings by

the old school has now had its day, because, being improperly applied, it hastens death. In animals it is the test to see if they are consumptive, as it increases this trouble. If this be so in animals, why not in human beings? The homœopathic plan is to sterilise the preparation and then potentise it so that it becomes a curative remedy.

The *ptomaine* of a disease is undoubtedly a remedy for that disease when properly used, as in snake poison. I have myself proved that this mode of preparation and use gives absolutely perfect results in numberless cases. In 1883 I prepared Tuberculinum from the tubercular ptomaine *naturally* formed, sterilised and potentised it with alcohol, and this same preparation is now being used with the greatest success in the cure of consumption all over the world, and constant reports of consumption and idiocy cured by it appear in the homœopathic journals. A book has also been written on the wonderful effects of this preparation by another physician, detailing cases he has cured with it. By this mode of preparation and of use the blood is not poisoned.

As I have before said Jenner stated that by vaccination the

HUMAN SYSTEM IS PERMANENTLY ALTERED.

Does he mean that to vaccinate with horse-cow-pox a previously *healthy* child that its state of *health* is permanently changed? In this particular I have always supported Jenner. There is no doubt that the system is permanently changed, permanently made more diseased, so that it is much more liable to contract diseases. What is small-pox, even if it were prevented by vaccina-

tion, compared to a life long susceptibility to any disease that one comes in contact with? I tremble to think how the plague would blaze if once we got it here. Sanitation is good—but it is the impurities *within* that would be the danger, and which are always a danger. If vaccination causes such a radical change, is it not reasonable to suppose that anti-toxin and every other form of vaccination will do the same? What is the cause of the great increase of malignant disease? It cannot be on account of neglected sanitation, as sanitation has been vastly improved of late years. What more likely than that the blood is poisoned (the system permanently altered, as Jenner says) by filthy animal diseases put into it, and by the constant check to the evolution of diseased conditions caused by vaccination or inoculation with disease?

Hahnemann says that, “ placing on one side protracted diseases arising from unwholesome habits of living, together with countless *drug diseases*, produced by the debilitating treatment often employed by old-school physicians, we shall find that *all* other chronic diseases without exception are derived from the development of one or more of *three chronic miasms, internal lues venerea, internal sycosis, but chiefly, and in far greatest proportion, internal psora*. Each of these must have pervaded the entire organism and penetrated all its parts before the primary representative local symptoms peculiar to each miasm makes its appearance for the prevention of the *inner* disease. When the local symptoms are suppressed the internal disease will be developed sooner or later in obedience to the laws of nature. It will be followed by endless misery in the form of innumerable chronic diseases which have been the scourge of the human race for thousands of years, and these would never have

prevailed to such an extent had physicians endeavoured rationally and zealously to cure and eradicate each miasm by internal curative homœopathic (by the law of similars) medicines, instead of tampering with their local symptoms by topical applications."

What Hahnemann says in the above quotation applies absolutely to treatment by inoculation, and there is no doubt by this mode of treating diseases we shall add other and *greater* miasms derived from the lower animals to the cause and production of disease.

PREVENTION OF DISEASE.

Small-pox and all other diseases can only be prevented by attending to the laws of health and the eradication of morbid or disease-producing conditions. Disease can only be resisted by healthy bodies, not by inoculating them with diseased matter.

The ingrafting of human beings with animal diseases and animal taints will no doubt, to coin a word, *animalise* man, or, in other words, make him still more readily liable to contract diseases from the lower animals, such as glanders, rinderpest, consumption, fistula, venereal disease, and trouble arising from it, such as fig warts, cauliflower excrescences, epithelioma, locomotor ataxy and a host of other diseases.

It is thought by some that grease in the horse is a form of venereal disease (the *secondary symptoms of both are similar*). It is probably a combination of the two venereal diseases with psora.

Dr. Creighton in the book referred to, "Bovine Tuberculosis in Man," says, speaking of

BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS :

"It is to the bovine species, what glanders is to the equine species, and what syphilis is (perhaps) to the human species." This reads as if tuberculosis, glanders, and syphilis were closely allied if not identical diseases. He further says "the disease in man is a mimicry of the parent disease in the bovine animal," and also "bovine tuberculosis has precisely the same relation to human tuberculosis as glanders in the human subject has to equine glanders." "That bovine tuberculosis is identical with the ordinary indigenous tuberculosis of man." "Bovine tuberculosis may be somewhat modified when communicated to man, just as glanders is not quite the same."

The only difference between the bacillus of glanders and that of consumption is that the former is a little thicker. When we consider also that grease in the horse is similar to another form of disease in the human being closely allied to phthisis, namely, fistula, I think it will be seen that the less we have to do with the plan of inoculating horse diseases into man, the better it will be for the human race. It is said that those who are operated on for fistula generally die of chest disease, showing the intimate connection between fistula and phthisis.

Horse, or animal diseases, when communicated to man or to other animals, no doubt assume different forms, or vary in some particulars—for instance, grease from the horse applied to the udder of the cow produces quite a different-looking disease to the hard tubercle and cracks of grease as it is in the horse; moreover, the disease in the cow heals up, in the horse it is a most troublesome disease. When this

disease is again taken from the cow and put into man, is it strange that it produces tubercles and pustules in human beings.

I must not omit to mention

GLOUCESTER.

We have heard a great deal about small-pox at Gloucester, but it may not be known to many that the epidemic *commenced* amongst the *vaccinated* portion of the community, and *that for four months after the outbreak no case of an unvaccinated person was notified*. For the last fifteen years there has been a great diminution of vaccination, and during this period there has been much less small-pox.

In highly vaccinated Sheffield, eight years ago, there were as many cases of small-pox in a single fortnight as there have been in unvaccinated Gloucester in the whole eleven months of that outbreak. With such facts as these, is there any wonder that the people rebel ?

TUBERCULOSIS IN COWS.

Before concluding my remarks on the subject of vaccination, there is another aspect that I feel I must touch on. Just lately, say more especially within the last ten or twenty years, in spite of the better feeding, attention, breeding, &c., of animals, the question of tuberculous cows and tuberculous milk, and the flesh of tuberculous animals, has come very much to the front ; but it never seems to occur to those who have taken up this matter that this great increase of tuberculosis in cows must have a cause, and that it is only by removing that cause we can get healthy animals. It is now advised that all cows should be tested to see if they

are tuberculous, and this test is to inject into animals who show signs of disease of a doubtful character a preparation of tuberculous matter; if they *react*—that is, show signs of increased illness—they are said to be tuberculous, and must be destroyed. What about those non-tuberculous animals that do not show signs of disturbance from this injection? Are they not tainted by the injection of tuberculous matter, and will they not probably become tuberculous sooner or later? Of what use is it, then, to try and stamp out consumptive animals, if we are all the time inoculating the healthy with the virus of consumption? also by inoculation *into the blood* we produce many other *constitutional* changes quite incurable.

Further, I believe that the most probable cause of the great increase of tuberculosis in cows, which disease has been gradually on the increase in cattle for the last twenty or thirty years, is the vaccinating them with the grease disease, for before that time we heard very little about consumptive cattle. It may be answered that the advancement and improvement of “scientific” research has discovered what was not known thirty years ago (perhaps did not exist). My opinion is, that scientific improvement as regards inoculation will improve the cattle off the face of the earth, and man as well.

I believe that tuberculosis in animals can be produced by the same cause that induces phthisis in *human* beings (and which I have myself seen so produced), namely, the gradually increasing practice of inoculating the cow with the grease disease of the horse for the purpose of keeping up the supply of lymph from the cow for human use. In one vaccine institution alone in London as many as 250 to 300 calves are annually

treated in this way, and this has been going on, I believe, for fifteen or twenty years. The animals operated on are thus tainted with grease, and all their descendants more or less inherit this taint of the diseased horse. A morbid condition is produced, and, as Jenner says respecting human beings, the system is *permanently altered*—in other words, *permanently diseased*; this must apply to animals as well as human beings.

The very fact that the constitutional state is *permanently altered without permanent protection against small-pox* to my mind proves the fallacy of, and the injury done by, vaccination or inoculation with *any other* disease. There is strong reason to suppose that the seeds of consumption or of other *organic diseases* are sown in *human beings* by vaccinating with grease *either direct from the horse, as Jenner also advocated, or passed through the cow, and if so then we have the cause of the spread of consumption in animals.*¹ The practice of inoculating unhealthy human beings with animal diseases is opposed to science, reason, and common sense; *to do so to those who are healthy is a crime.* One or two hundred children are *directly sacrificed annually* in Great Britain by vaccination (they are certified as dying directly from vaccination), and indirectly tens of thousands. What should we say of some savage African tribe that every week sacrificed to an idol two children to guard them against small-pox?

It is my earnest hope that I shall live to see vaccination and all kindred methods not only not enforced by

¹ Since the publication of my paper on Vaccination, in which I made this statement, Mr. Chaplin stated to the House of Commons that in future all calves inoculated for vaccine purposes would be destroyed when done with.

law, but *absolutely forbidden* by Act of Parliament, as was the case in small-pox inoculation once recommended by the College of Physicians of that day.

I often think what a fearful tyranny this law is to our soldiers or sailors, to all in Government offices, in our schools, &c. They have to submit to have their bodies *again and again* contaminated by an animal disease of the worst kind, or, in the case of civilians, are debarred from being accepted. All the Board schools, I believe, exact the same compulsion, and large private business houses compel every one to be vaccinated before they are engaged.

Truly vaccination, or the stamping in of animal diseases into man, is one of the greatest oppressions and crimes of the nineteenth century.

Just after sending the foregoing to the press, I have had sent me a book entitled the "Wonderful Nineteenth Century," containing an article by Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace, "Vaccination a Delusion," which I recommend every one interested in the question of vaccination to read. The following are extracts from it, and worthy of note :—

THE EPIDEMIC IN LEICESTER AND BIRMINGHAM,
1871-72.

Both Leicester and Birmingham at this time were well vaccinated.

		Leicester.		Birmingham.
Small-pox cases per 10,000 of population	...	327	...	213
„ deaths	„ „	35	...	35

Since then Leicester has rejected vaccination to such

an extent that in 1894 it had only seven vaccinations to ten thousand people, while Birmingham had 240, or more than thirty times as much. The Royal Commissioners themselves stated that the disease was brought to the town of Leicester on twelve separate occasions during the recent epidemic, yet the following is the result :—

1891-94.		Leicester.	Birmingham
Small-pox cases per 10,000 of population	...	19	63
„ deaths	„ „	1.1	5

Leicester had less than one-third the cases of small-pox, and less than one-fourth the deaths, in proportion to population, than well-vaccinated Birmingham.

Another example of an extremely well-vaccinated town in this epidemic, is Warrington, an official report on which has just been issued. It is stated that 99.2 per cent. of the population have been vaccinated.

1892-93.		Leicester.	Warrington
Small-pox cases per 10,000 of population	...	19.3	123.3
„ deaths	„ „	1.4	11.4

Here in a thoroughly vaccinated town the cases are more than six times and the deaths more than eight times that of an almost unvaccinated town, proving that the most efficient vaccination does not *diminish* the number of attacks, and does not *mitigate* the severity of the disease.

Curiously enough, Dewsbury, which has only partly neglected vaccination, but not nearly to the extent that Leicester has, stands between Leicester and Warrington.

Leicester	had	1.1	mortality	per	10,000	living.
Dewsbury	„	6.7	„	„	„	„
Warrington	„	11.8	„	„	„	„

Again comparing the mortality in Leicester with the mortality in the army and navy (where *all* are vaccinated and revaccinated), during the period 1873 to 1894—

			Per million
Army	(1873-94)	small-pox death-rate	... 37
Navy	"	" "	... 36·8
Leicester, ages 15 to 45	"	" "	... 14·4

In the whole of the nineteen years, 1878 to 1896 inclusive, unvaccinated Leicester had so few small-pox deaths that the Registrar-General represents the average by the decimal 0·01 per thousand, equal to ten per million ; while for the twelve years, 1878 to 1889, there was less than one death per annum. This immunity is obtained by attending to sanitation and isolation, with the almost total neglect of vaccination. Neither army nor navy can show such results.







✓



