

haps he is awaiting the opportunity to take a special "refresher" course in the subject at some uncertain time in the future.

There is nothing but himself to prevent any physician from keeping up with the times and as for clinical material every patient is in some degree both a psychotic and a somatic problem.

—*The Homœopathic Recorder, April, 1950.*

SMALLPOX VACCINATION

Carl H. Enstam, M.D.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

This subject has been chosen for several reasons. The practising Homœopath is brought face to face with the question, innumerable times, from families that have been led to believe by the Health Authorities, that there is only one means, one dependable method of prevention of smallpox, and one alone. The public is oftentimes so misinformed through official statements and even campaigns, with the result that fear, and not reason too often influences decisions. It is, therefore, healthful and good that Doctors of Medicine, irrespective of school, periodically take stock of both methods and means of practice.

Our literature, from the Organon to the present day, offers undisputed evidence that the homœopathic school advocates and practices prevention sincerely. We do not believe, however, that campaigns of fear have any place in the intelligent, scientific practice of medicine whether preventive, palliative or curative. We accept from the enlightened and scientific knowledge and discovery, all that is best in medicine to date. We correlate it and study it and try to apply it in the framework of our knowledge of homœopathic philosophy and good practice.

In view of the above it seems very unfair to us that the homœopathic point of view as it pertains to the broad subject of prevention should receive but scant attention from the world of science at large, and in more specific cases, in particular.

Our attention was drawn to the general subject just a few years ago when a campaign was carried on, up and down the Pacific Coast. A paper dealing with the subject, was presented before our State Society resulting in a most interesting difference of opinion. At that time, May, 1946, we said: Conditions being what they are on the Pacific Coast, in so far as smallpox contagion is concerned, it seems to us fitting and proper that we as homœopaths can well take stock of the situation as we find it, together with our interpretation of the relative values of preventive medicine, in terms of homœopathic principle and law.

We have all been recently asked the questions many times: "Must I be vaccinated?" "What is *your* opinion of orthodox vaccination?" "What value has it to me?" etc. We believe, that before these questions can be properly answered, a survey must be made, taking into consideration as many factors as are obtainable before reaching a conclusion.

Let us look at the record. What is the story? As it comes to us it runs something like this.

All recent known reported *original* cases of smallpox are to be found *only* among the military personnel returning from the various parts of the Orient. These men have travelled by boat or plane bringing the disease with them. The officers and personnel of the armed forces supposedly have all been officially vaccinated against this disease, either prior to joining the forces, or shortly thereafter. What protection if any has their vaccination produced? Some of these men were ill en route. The stress, strain and rush of war days are over, and therefore it seems to us there is little reason for the carelessness on the part of the medical officers on shipboard as well as the quaran-

tine services of the United States Public Health co-operating with the immigration service in failing to screen out these few cases prior to or immediately upon landing.

The Health Departments and almost all other medical or related organizations have initiated a campaign, predicated very largely on fear rather than figures or facts, in an attempt to compel as large a percentage of the population as possible to submit to orthodox smallpox vaccination. No discrimination being made between the well and the sick and the allergic and the normal, to whom this advice or implied compulsion has been given.

In view of the above occurrences, this campaign of fear, applied without much reason, under the direction of the local health officials has been on for weeks, to vaccinate literally millions of people against the few. A most illogical position to be placed in. The record further shows that the outbreak of the disease was limited both in number of persons involved, and communities; among the latter, were three, two in the northwest, and one in our state. Latest reports indicate cases are being released from quarantine and no new ones reporting, but the campaign continues with unabated fury. Why? Is it necessary? Is this preventive measure really effective, or could there be another method, at least as effective if not more so? Homœopathically trained minds can well ask some of these questions. What proven value does official vaccination have in preventing domestic smallpox? In preventing the oriental type which is the present etiological provocator? Public health officials have openly expressed doubt that the present official strain of cowpox vaccine, will prove of sufficient prophylactic value in the oriental type of case. As for treatment of the disease itself, the latest published opinion contains the simple phrase *cowpox vaccination*. In other words, my friends, vaccinate prophylactically with cowpox and if the patient contracts the disease, re-vaccinate him.

To homœopaths, this does not make much sense but to one unfamiliar with what homœopathy has to offer, we

find an entirely different reaction, which in our opinion might go a long way in explaining allopathic medicine's attitude toward this present problem.

In December 1948, an article by Dr. C. Killick Millard, M.O.H. for Leicester, 1901-35, under the title of "The End of Compulsory Vaccination" appeared in the British Medical Journal, the official publication of the British Medical Society. The author offers a very comprehensive coverage of the subject from which we will quote at some length as follows:

"The year 1948 will ever be memorable in the history of vaccination in this country as seeing the end of compulsory vaccination of infants, a measure which has been the subject of such acute and bitter controversy for so many years. Having regard to the great importance attached to universal vaccination of infants as our 'first line of defence, and to the firm belief that only by compulsion could this be secured, it is rather surprising that the proposal to abolish compulsion did not arouse more opposition. In the event the opposition was almost negligible."

HISTORY OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION

Jenner's great discovery was made just at the end of the eighteenth century, and the practice of vaccination gradually came into favour in the early part of the nineteenth. In 1840 an Act was passed providing for free vaccination by public vaccinators, to be appointed for the purpose by Boards of Guardians, but this was only permissive.

It was in 1853 that vaccination of infants was first made compulsory. By an Act passed in that year every parent who refused or neglected to have his child vaccinated within three months of birth was made liable to a fine of 20s. and costs. Thus compulsion was in force (theoretically) for 95 years, but it was only really in operation for part of that time. The Act provided no machinery for enforcing the law, but this omission was remedied to some

extent in 1861, when Boards of Guardians were empowered to appoint vaccination officers for the express purpose of instituting legal proceedings against defaulters. Six years later, in 1867, a further Act was passed consolidating previous Acts and making the penal clauses more stringent. In the debate on the third reading Sir Thomas Chambers, in opposing it, made this prophetic utterance: "I am persuaded that when the Bill is passed an agitation will commence which will never cease until the Act is repealed." It has taken 81 years for the prophecy to be fulfilled.

OPPOSITION TO COMPULSION

The Leicester Revolt.—With the passing of this Act active opposition began. An Anti-compulsory Vaccination League was formed in London, and branches soon followed in a number of provincial towns. The movement was greatly stimulated by the numerous prosecutions for default which took place. Fines were imposed, and, as many refused to pay, distrains on goods or imprisonment followed. The first parent to go to prison was a William Johnson, of Leicester. At a public meeting after his release he was presented by his admirers with a silver watch. This meeting may be regarded as the beginning of the movement against vaccination in Leicester, which became so strong that it led to the town being regarded as the "Mecca" of the anti-vaccination movement throughout the country.

After the serious smallpox epidemic of 1870-01, part of the pandemic which swept over Europe, the appointment of vaccination officers was made compulsory, and the authorities in Leicester, as elsewhere, attempted to enforce vaccination more rigorously. Prosecutions in the town increased from two in 1869 to over 1,100 in 1881, the total for the twelve years being over 6,000. Of these, 64 had involved imprisonment and 193 distrains upon goods, the latter often being effected with much difficulty owing to popular sympathy with the defendants. All classes of the

community were represented among those who set the law at defiance, and those who were prosecuted were regarded as martyrs. Ultimately, in 1886, the Guardians decided by an overwhelming majority to cease prosecuting for vaccination default, and thereafter the vaccination laws became a "dead letter" in Leicester. As a result the number of vaccinations rapidly fell off, and for the past 40 years have averaged only about 5 per cent of the births.

Why Vaccination was Objected to.—It would be a mistake to regard this widespread hostility to vaccination as merely the result of organized agitation. Primarily it was due to the serious after-effects and injury to health of which many people had had personal experience in their own families, or believed that they had had, and which undoubtedly were much more common in those days of arm-to-arm vaccination, when the importance of a sepsis was unknown or little understood. Even after glycerinated calf lymph had replaced the use of lymph taken direct from another infant's arm public vaccinators were required to do the operation much more "thoroughly" (four "good" marks) than is the case today, and "bad arms" were not uncommon. To be compelled to have a healthy and beloved child vaccinated when it was sincerely believed that injury to health might follow seemed to many parents to constitute an intolerable interference with individual liberty.

The "Conscience Clause."—In 1897, in consequence of persistent and growing agitation and following the strong recommendation of the Royal Commission, new legislation was passed which included the famous "conscience clause." This enabled parents who could satisfy two justices in court that they "conscientiously believed that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of their child" to obtain exemption from the law. Nine years later the obtaining of exemption was made much easier by substituting the making of a statutory declaration before a magistrate or commissioner of oaths for having to go into court. The effect of this

loop-hole, which was very largely taken advantage of, together with the fact that by this time smallpox had greatly decreased, led to a steady and continued fall in the percentage of children vaccinated.

WARNINGS OF DISASTER TO COME

Naturally, grave warnings were uttered regarding the great risk which the country, in particular, the town of Leicester, was running. The then M.O.H. for Leicester, Dr. Tomkins, in his annual report for 1888. wrote as follows:

"The sad feature about the whole business is that it is the young children of the two who are growing up in thousands unprotected and are running a risk to their lives. They have but to come in contact with the least breath of infection of smallpox to at once catch this loathsome disease."

No doubt, had I been M.O.H. for Leicester at that period *without the experience since obtained*, I should have been as much alarmed as Dr. Tomkins was.

Similar warnings were re-echoed by medical experts throughout the country. Dr. J. C. McVail (1886), a recognized authority, wrote:

"The antivaccinators of Leicester . . . having to a great extent thrown off the armour of vaccination, are waging a desperate and gallant, though misguided, conflict against the enemy. . . . But in Leicester, when its time arrives, we shall not fail to see a repetition of last century's experiences, and certainly there will afterwards be fewer children left to die from diarrhoea. It is to be hoped that, when the catastrophe does come, the Government will see that its teachings are duly studied and recorded . . . Leicester has had little chance of getting its immunity tested."

THE LEICESTER "EXPERIMENT"

Was it Ever Really Put to the Test?—It is now 62 years since those words by Dr. McVail were written. During

this period smallpox has on many occasions been introduced into the town and three times it has attained to epidemic prevalence. When the first epidemic occurred in 1893 the outbreak was duly reported upon for the Government by Dr. S. Coupland, and he was constrained to admit that "the facts would seem to show that in this epidemic at least the natural liability to smallpox, unaffected by vaccination, was not so great as has been supposed." There have been two subsequent epidemics—which I reported upon—but nothing in the nature of disaster has occurred, although on one occasion a sudden outburst took place without warning, when 53 cases occurred in one week, followed by 21, 34, and 48 in the next three weeks. Then the outburst subsided almost as quickly as it had arisen, and six weeks later only one case occurred. The remarkable feature of this outburst was that no clue whatever could be obtained to its cause. For the first fortnight, until secondary cases arose, none of the cases could be traced. No link between any of them was discovered. They were scattered over the greater part of the town, regardless of age, sex, or occupation, as indiscriminately as if the infection had literally dropped from the clouds—which indeed it may have done if there is anything in the theory of "aerial convection," for there were a few cases of smallpox in the hospital prior to the outburst. But at least it afforded the "chance of testing Leicester's immunity" called for by Dr. McVail. At that time infant vaccination had been abandoned for 17 years and at least 90 per cent. of the child population were unvaccinated. A certain number of school children were attacked, as were persons in other age periods, but no school outbreak occurred nor were any schools closed.

Its Lessons.—The abandonment of infant vaccination in a large town like Leicester over a long period of years has undoubtedly provided that "control experiment" which is so necessary if any theory is to be really tested. It is worth

while, therefore, to consider what lessons are to be learned from it. The two most important lessons are:

1. That mentioned by Dr. Coupland and referred to above—*viz.*, that the natural liability to smallpox is not so great as has been supposed. This is not to say that smallpox is not a highly infectious disease; it is probably the most infectious of all zymotic diseases, and very few persons are naturally immune to it. But there is a limit to its infectiousness, and it has been shown in Leicester that it does not "pick out" the unvaccinated persons in a community to nearly so great an extent as has often been alleged. It was quite expected that when smallpox did visit Leicester it would fall with special severity upon the unvaccinated children. McVail expressly prophesied this: "Yet during the 34 years that I was M.O.H. for Leicester, over which period more than 700 cases of smallpox (major and minor) occurred in the town, only 12 infants under 1 year of age were attacked, of whom three died." Incidentally, some of these cases, including all the deaths, were under the age limit for vaccination, so that they cannot all be fairly attributed to neglect of vaccination.

2. The second important lesson to be learned is the efficacy of modern methods of prevention in controlling the spread of smallpox irrespective of the vaccinal condition of the population. This again is quite contrary to formerly accepted teaching. It does not mean, of course, that smallpox will never spread in an unvaccinated community: it will do so even in a so-called well-vaccinated one. The fact is that it is not possible in practice to maintain any general population in a really well-vaccinated condition—at least not in a democratic country. To do so would entail the repeated vaccination of every individual several times during his lifetime, and this is clearly impracticable. In the British Army the rule now is for each man to be revaccinated every five years when on home service and every two years when abroad.

WHY THE PROPHETS WERE WRONG

Looking back it is interesting to consider why medical experts were so mistaken in their prophecies of disaster to come if universal vaccination of infants were abandoned. It was probably due to the belief, then so strongly held, that it was infant vaccination, and that alone, which had brought about the great diminution of smallpox mortality that followed upon the introduction of vaccination. That this was clearly a case of cause and effect was reiterated in every textbook and in every course of lectures on public health. It was hailed, indeed, as the outstanding triumph of preventive medicine. No wonder that medical students accepted it as an incontrovertible scientific fact. Dr. McVail in his book, which was recognised as the standard work proving the case for vaccination, made use of a very "telling" diagram with which, by judiciously selecting the periods, it was possible to show a progressive decrease in smallpox mortality *pari passu* with an increasing efficiency in the enforcement of vaccination. Other authorities made use of similar diagrams, and the apparent correlation, inversely proportional, between smallpox mortality and the amount of infant vaccination was at that time one of the principal arguments in support of the belief. We now know that this apparent correlation must have been a coincidence, because smallpox mortality continued to decrease even after vaccination was decreasing also, and this has now gone on for over 60 years. Obviously there must have been other causes at work which brought about the dramatic fall in smallpox mortality since the beginning of the nineteenth century,* and to that extent vaccination has for so many years been receiving more credit—perhaps much more—than it was entitled to.

*I am not alone in taking this view. Major Greenwood (1930) wrote: "(3) . . . the use of this instrument (vaccination) has been one of the factors but not the sole, perhaps not the most important, factor in modifying the epidemiological history of smallpox during the last hundred years."

It is not contended that infant vaccination had no effect in hastening the fall. The extent to which it did so is arguable. It would practically abolish mortality among vaccinated children; but against this it may have increased it in those children remaining unvaccinated and in persons at older age periods, owing to the detrimental effect of incomplete protection in encouraging the spread of infection by "carriers" (missed cases), which is one of the principal means, as is now realized, by which smallpox is disseminated. Considerations of space make it impossible to pursue this further here. The point it is wished to make is that the fall in smallpox mortality which followed the introduction of vaccination would have occurred sooner or later even if vaccination had never been discovered.

THE FUTURE OF VACCINATION

The official view is that, having regard to the great success which has attended voluntary methods in the case of immunization against diphtheria, infant vaccination will increase with the substitution of persuasion for compulsion. That this will actually happen, however, seems doubtful for two reasons: (1) In the case of immunization we are able to point out that diphtheria is a serious menace to child life, while smallpox has ceased to be a menace, at least for the present. (2) With immunization we can truthfully say that it is "very safe": ill effects are negligible and "bad arms" practically unknown. Dare we say as much for vaccination?

Not so many years ago a married couple living on the outskirts of Leicester, acting on advice, had their two children vaccinated. Both developed post-vaccinal encephalitis and both died, leaving that married couple childless: rather unpleasant for those who gave the advice! Admittedly this case was very exceptional, and the danger of developing encephalitis is less after vaccination in infancy than when the operation is performed for the first time at a later age. But other injuries to health are less uncommon.

Having regard to these facts it will be difficult to work up much enthusiasm for active propaganda in favour of vaccination, and without propaganda infant vaccination will almost certainly go. Unless smallpox should return and again become a menace it seems likely that in the future vaccination will be reserved for doctors, nurses, and sanitary staffs (and all these should be revaccinated much more often than is the case at present), for Service personnel, for persons going out to the East, and for the vaccination of contacts.

THE OUTLOOK REGARDING SMALLPOX

And lastly, what about smallpox? What are the prospects of the disease returning if infant vaccination does fall into disuse? Shall we see a repetition of the ravages in prevaccination times? It is doubtful if any authority really expects this today in spite of the prophecies made so confidently in the past.

Briefly the position is this: in Leicester during the 62 years since infant vaccination was abandoned there have been only 53 deaths from smallpox, and in the past 40 years only two deaths. Moreover, the experience of Leicester is confirmed, by that of the whole country. Vaccination has been steadily declining ever since the "Conscience clause" was introduced, until now nearly two-thirds of the children born are not vaccinated. Yet smallpox mortality has also declined until now it is quite negligible. In the fourteen years 1933-46 there were only 28 deaths in a population of some 40 millions, and among these 28 there was not one single death of an infant under 1 year of age. In passing it is to be noted that during the same period there were, it is officially admitted, no fewer than 51 deaths of infants from "vaccinia, other sequelae of vaccination, and post-vaccinal encephalitis." Had all the children born been vaccinated these figures would obviously have been much higher.

It certainly appears that the conditions of life in this country—"public health," "sanitation," "standard of living," call them what we will—have so changed, quite apart from vaccination, that they are no longer congenial to the spread of major smallpox. Incidentally it may be observed that other zymotic diseases which once caused a very heavy mortality in this country—*e.g.*, scarlet fever, enteric fever, and typhus—have shown a decline in mortality as dramatic as that of smallpox, yet no one is alarmed lest these diseases should revert to their old-time mortality, and certainly there was no vaccination to bring about their decline.

For those who still have misgivings about what may be in store now that compulsory vaccination has gone there is always this comforting thought: should major smallpox again invade this country and ever really get out of hand, we have one trump card to play which we have not got in the case of other epidemic diseases—*viz.*, emergency mass vaccination of the whole population in the affected areas. Such a measure admittedly would be a very drastic one, and should certainly not be adopted except as a last resort. It is not a step to be taken in a moment of panic merely because a handful of cases of smallpox have occurred in a great city, but it would save the situation if effectually carried out, as it could be if the situation were serious enough. For there is one remaining position in the pro-vaccinist line of defense which is quite impregnable in spite of all the onslaughts which have been made upon it by the other side—*viz.*, that a recently vaccinated person does not take smallpox no matter how much he may be exposed to infection (this does not include a person vaccinated during the incubation period). The exceptions to this law are so rare that for practical purposes they may be ignored.

CONCLUSION

We suggest, then, that the abolition of compulsory vaccination is likely to be followed by a still further decline in the number of children vaccinated, until in the course

of a few years the child population of this country will be almost unprotected against smallpox so far as vaccination is concerned. The adult population of course never has been really protected.

As for smallpox, no one can foretell the future. Importations of the disease from abroad may occur at any time, as has always been the case; and there is also the possibility that some day a serious epidemic may occur, as in the past. I suggest, however, that in view of the experience of the unvaccinated town of Leicester, and indeed of the whole country, during the past 60 years there is no real cause for alarm.

The following quotation is taken from a letter by Dr. Emanuel Rosen, of Newark, New Jersey, appearing in the British Medical Journal February 5, 1949, wherein he says that "the end of compulsory vaccination in England has intensified my desire to contribute a letter to the British Medical Journal as further suggestion for more careful discrimination in the process of vaccination."

He gives as an example demonstrating how "the zeal of propagandism may overcome scientific facts" what happened in New York some two years ago. He states that 5,000,000 people were vaccinated there within two weeks of the first of only twelve cases of smallpox reported. (Incidentally it would need nearly a thousand vaccinators, working without stopping for anything at all, for twelve hours a day, seven days a week, to vaccinate 5,000,000 people in two weeks, giving each person only two minutes for the examination and the operation).

Dr. Rosen then points out that "coincidentally there were approximately 2,500,000 people daily in the city who must not have been vaccinated and in which group no case of smallpox developed. (It is estimated that the daily population of New York City is 7,500,000). The incidence, therefore, of smallpox was much lower in the non-vaccinated group than in the vaccinated group."

Of the twelve reported cases of smallpox Dr. Rosen says that "ten were convalescing from some acute infectious disease and an eleventh patient was pregnant."

Dr. Rosen refers to the official excuses made for post-vaccinal reactions, of which there were many. It was argued that since in New York City there are 1,000 people ill daily, and since it was claimed that six millions out of New York's seven and a half million population were vaccinated, it was inevitable that some of these people would become ill and die. Dr. Rosen answers this claim by quoting Hans Linzer, who stated: "It is advisable to examine the reports of cases observed during epidemics, when doctors are expecting them and are more likely to scrutinise all obscure conditions with the disease in mind," and says that Linzer was neither heard nor remembered in New York City "because his admonitions were drowned out by worthless statistics and medical traditions." So the cerebral deaths, haemorrhages, etc., that followed vaccination were excused on the basis of people dying daily in New York City of normal causes.

Dr. Rosen offers one suggestion on the "red-letter day of the abolition of compulsory vaccination in England," namely, "that we do not vaccinate when there is present a possible acute infectious disease."

And now to our side of the picture. What do we as homoeopaths have to offer? Plenty, prophylactically and therapeutically. Yes, indeed we do.

The record of our School points to the fact that prophylactic agents such as *variolinum* which is prepared from the actual smallpox vesicle, distinguished from cowpox derivatives, must still be considered a very potent prophylactic agent, administered by mouth, as we know, thereby bringing into play more rapidly and effectively, resistance factors so important in these cases. We also know that in the majority of instances, patients undergoing homoeopathic treatment, are already, secondarily protected, to a very large degree against epidemic diseases, in whole or in part.

As to treatment, thank God, you are homoeopathically trained and therefore *not* compelled to depend on a cowpox vaccination as your sole official therapeutic agent to combat constitutional as well as local and cutaneous smallpox lesions.

For the reasons and conclusions arrived at above, we have accurately counselled our patients to first of all, decide for themselves, and then have done our best, to counteract these campaigns of fear, which are so useless and unnecessary, but nevertheless emotionally and psychologically destructive.

With an active and positive attitude toward this problem, we homoeopaths must help as best we can, when called upon, but refuse to be stampeded or herded by constituted authorities, or otherwise, into illogical reactions or positions.

—*Journal of the American Institute of Homœopathy, April, 1950.*

Homoeopathic Treatment of

ASTHMA

By Dr. Fortier Bernoville, M.D.

(Translated from French by

Dr. Rajkumar Mukherjee, M.A., L.H.M.S.)

It contains the Chapters on:—

- (1) Therapeutic Plan of Asthma
- (2) Nosodes and Constitutional Remedies
- (3) Functional and Drainage Remedies
- (4) Asthma with Catarrhal Element
- (5) Asthma with Nasal Flow
- (6) Asthma associated with Digestive Troubles
- (7) Asthma with Circulatory Troubles
- (8) Asthma with High Blood Pressure etc.

PAGES 158

PRICE Rs. 1|8

Publishers HAHNEMANN PUBLISHING CO.,
165, Bowbazar Street, Calcutta-12.