

THE ARCHIVE COLLECTION

THE FOLLOWING SERIES OF LETTERS
PUBLISHED IN THE EASTBOURNE CHRONICLE (1887)
COVER A VACCINATION DEBATE BETWEEN
AUTHOR LEWIS CARROLL (REV. CHARLES L DODGSON)
& WILLIAM HUME ROTHERY, AN ANTI-VACCINIST.

THE LEWIS CARROLL SOCIETY PUBLISHED
A SMALL BOOKLET ENTITLED
'THREE LETTERS ON ANTI-VACCINATION' IN 1976.
UNFORTUNATELY IT ONLY INCLUDED THE
LETTERS BY LEWIS CARROLL.

I WAS CURIOUS TO DISCOVER THE FULL
DEBATE AND SO I VISITED EASTBOURNE LIBRARY'S
ARCHIVE SECTION AND LOCATED & MADE COPIES OF
THE PUBLICATIONS IN QUESTION (STORED ON MICROFILM.)

HERE IS THE FULL DEBATE.

MAGDA TAYLOR
THE INFORMED PARENT
WWW.INFORMEDPARENT.CO.UK

• 2017 •

IS IT WELL TO HAVE CHILDREN VACCINATED?

Sir: Permit me to reply to the paragraph which appears in your paper with the above heading. Admitting for the moment that the statistics therein given are all correct, and that Eastbourne is now free from small-pox, how does this prove that vaccination is a protection against small-pox? What connection is there between forcing corrupt matter directly into the blood, as is done by vaccination, and the freedom of any place from small-pox? Small-pox is an effect resulting from impurity in the blood. As vaccination does not prevent nor mitigate this impurity, but is itself a corrupt and corrupting practice, anyone with an unprejudiced and rational mind may see that it is absolutely impossible for vaccination either to prevent or mitigate small-pox, and not only so, but that it must tend to promote small-pox. But it is not true that small-pox was so destructive in London in 1723 as is set forth in your paragraph. Dr. Jurin, who is admitted to be a high authority and who wrote about that time, says that deaths from small-pox were a fraction over 16 per cent. of the cases. Further on in the last century small-pox was more destructive, because, as Mr. Marson admits, of the practice of inoculation. But even then, the deaths (see Rees's Cyclopædia) were not more than 18 per cent. of the cases, whereas, during the present epidemic in London, the small-pox deaths have been as high as 26 per cent. Let me send you the following translation from the *Hilfe Ruf* (Cry for Help), No. II., to the German diet for the repeal of compulsory vaccination, published last year by Dr. Meyner, of Chemnitz, Saxony. The statistics are official. "If vaccination be a protection against small-pox, how could it have been possible in Berlin, in the year 1871, out of 17,000 persons who contracted small-pox, 14,287 vaccinated were to be found, of whom, according to Privy Councillor Dr. Muller, 2,410 succumbed to the disease." In Bavaria, out of 30,742 persons who suffered from small-pox in 1871, 29,429 were vaccinated. In London, in 1870-72, of 14,808 small-pox patients, 11,174 were vaccinated. In the epidemic at Bautzen, according to District Surgeon, Medical Counsellor Dr. Kapper, 457 persons took small-pox between the 1st November, 1863, and the 4th November, 1864, of whom 284 vaccinated died. (More than 50 per cent). During the small-pox epidemic in Berlin in 1864, 2,719 vaccinated persons suffered from small-pox, and 310 of them died. In Wurtemberg out of 5,629 vaccinated small-pox patients, 200 died. Dr. Frederick Paul Kappler states that out of 518 small-pox patients in Leipzig in 1858-59, 478 were vaccinated and only 40 unvaccinated. To this indisputable evidence anyone who desires it may find in England and elsewhere very much of the same nature which may be added, making a mass of testimony against vaccination, which ought to be sufficient to convince your Guardians and Magistrates that they are supporting a miserable delusion, and cruelly prosecuting an unoffending neighbour because he cannot conscientiously submit his child to this worse than worthless practice.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM HUME ROTHERY.

Merton Lodge, Cheltenham,
July 31st, 1877.

EASTBOURNE CHRONICLE

4th AUGUST, 1877

IF THIS SHOULD MEET THE EYE of anyone

LETTER ONE

Sir: A letter, with the signature of "William Hume Rothery, " in your paper of Aug. 4th, contained an argument in proof of the assertion that vaccination increases the liability to small-pox, based on such facts as the following:- That in Berlin, in 1871, of 17,000 small-pox patients, 14,287 had been vaccinated: i.e. 84 per cent. And reducing his other statistics to per centages, we find that in Bavaria, in 1871, the per centage was 95: In London in 1870-72 it was 75; and in Leipsic in 1858 in 1858-59 it was 92. Now it cannot be too widely known, or too often repeated, that this argument is a fallacy, and that these statistics by themselves prove nothing; we need to know as well what per centage of the population have been vaccinated and then to compare the two per centages together.

Let me illustrate that in some other subject. Suppose a certain city, whose inhabitants are known to be, 80 per cent of them, church people and the rest dissenter; and suppose a great meeting to be held on the subject of drainage, and that it is found that 80 per cent of the meeting are churchmen; what would be thought of my argument if I said, "It is clear that drainage is more interesting to churchmen than to dissenters?" Would not anyone answer at once, "Why, that is the proportion through the whole city! The fact that the same proportion occurs in the meeting merely shows that church principles have had nothing to do with it." But if, in another meeting, it were found that considerably over 80 per cent, say 95, were church people, it would be quite legitimate to conclude that it was a meeting more attractive to church people than to dissenters, or if it were found that only 60 or 70 per cent were church people, we might fairly conclude that some cause was at work to keep church people away.

Now every word of this is applicable to vaccination. We may fairly assume, I think, that at least 98 per cent of the population have been vaccinated. Hence, if in a certain hospital we found the same per centage, we should say "Vaccination has no effect in bringing people in or keeping them out." If we found a larger per centage, we should say "vaccination increases the liability to this complaint." But, if, as in the statistics quoted above, we find that the per centage of vaccinated persons is considerably less among small-pox patients than among the whole population, we may fairly draw the important conclusion that vaccination diminishes the liability to take small-pox.

I heartily wish that these simple facts could be brought to the notice of all members of that well-meaning, but most mischievous association, the "Anti-vaccination League."

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES L DODGSON,
Mathematical Lecturer of Christ Church, Oxford.

7 Lushington Road, Eastbourne. 18th August, 1887

IS IT WELL TO HAVE CHILDREN VACCINATED?

Sir: A letter, bearing the signature of "Charles L. Dodgson," has just reached me. Mr. Dodgson says that my letter contained "an argument in proof of the assertion that vaccination increases the liability to small-pox, based on such facts as the following," a few of which he quotes from my previous letter, though he takes care not to reproduce the following:—"In the epidemic at Bantzen, according to District-Surgeon Medical Councillor Dr. Kupfer, 457 persons took small-pox between the 1st November, 1863, and the 4th November, 1864, of whom 284 vaccinated persons died," over 62 per cent., if all the 457 were vaccinated, and a higher percentage of deaths among the vaccinated, if they were not all vaccinated; i.e., a much higher percentage of small-pox deaths than any on record before the introduction of vaccination. Mr. Dodgson may see that he is entirely in error, as I in no part of my letter attempt, by the figures he has quoted, or by those he has omitted to quote, or by both together, to prove that vaccination increases the liability to small-pox. The official statistics I quoted were quoted solely in disproof, and I submit, in irrefragable disproof, of the paragraph which appeared in your paper with the above heading. Let Mr. Dodgson acknowledge that he has done an injustice, at least to himself. My argument, to which Mr. Dodgson alludes, is given in the following words:—"Small-pox is an effect resulting from impurity in the blood. As vaccination does not prevent nor mitigate this impurity, but is itself a corrupt and corrupting practice, anyone with an unprejudiced and rational mind may see that it is absolutely impossible for vaccination either to prevent or mitigate small-pox; and not only so, but that it must tend to promote small-pox." It would be interesting to see Mr. Dodgson attempt to refute this argument. Mr. Dodgson says that "These statistics (which I have quoted) by themselves prove nothing." I reply that he is again mistaken. They prove that the paragraph or leaflet "laid upon the table at the Guardians' meeting" is incorrect, and they further prove Dr. Edwd. Jenner's teaching, that a person once vaccinated "is for ever after secure from the infection of the small-pox" (see his Inquiry, page 7th), to be without foundation. Hence it may be seen that it is a baseless medical superstition which the Eastbourne Guardians and Magistrates are endeavouring to prop up, and on behalf of which they are stooping to prosecute a respectable and unoffending neighbour, Mr. Philip Luck, as a criminal, because he conscientiously refuses to submit his child to what, at least, is a useless operation. I now return to my argument, which I challenge Mr. Dodgson to refute, that vaccination, for the reason given, must tend to promote small-pox. Surely this conclusion is abundantly confirmed, and illustrated by the statistics quoted in my previous letter, showing, as they do that, notwithstanding medical and sanitary improvements, the death-rate from small-pox is higher now than it was last century, and that the small-pox death-rate at Bantzen, for instance, amongst the vaccinated, is far beyond any small-pox death-rate recorded in the days when small-pox was artificially cultivated by means of inoculation. On this point I offer confirmatory evidence. 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 for Agriculture, Commerce and Public Works, we see that the departments in which vaccinations in proportion to births are lowest are the least visited with small-pox; whilst in those in which vaccination in proportion to births is highest are most affected with small-pox.

I need only give one quotation, "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." In page 7th of this report (a translation of which may be had at Longman's) it may be seen that small-pox was actually given by vaccination in 1868 to the 1st Regiment of Voltigeurs of the Guard. Moreover, Dr. Bakewell, late Vaccinator-General of Trinidad, says, page 40 of his "Pathology and treatment of small-pox" (Churchill, 1872), "I fear that in some instances wholesale vaccination and re-vaccination at the commencement of an epidemic have spread small-pox among those who remained unvaccinated. At least, it happened curiously enough that in the best vaccinated districts in Trinidad there was the most small-pox. One gentleman, Mr. Robert Knaggs, reported that his district of the town was so well vaccinated in the house-to-house vaccination 'that an epidemic is impossible.' A few weeks afterwards he had to resign that very district because the number of cases of small-pox was so large that he was unable to attend on them. A very out-of-the-way district in a distant part of the island was entirely free from small-pox until an energetic vaccinator, newly-appointed, vaccinated upwards of a hundred. In the course of three or four weeks small-pox then broke out. Certainly small-pox spread with amazing rapidity in the Port of Spain, after the house-to-house vaccination had been a short time in operation." I have much more, and even more striking evidence on this head. Should there be need for it, I will adduce it hereafter; though as vaccination is blood-poisoning, and in many instances is inoculation with small-pox matter, it cannot fail to increase small-pox, to say nothing at present of other diseases. In conclusion, it may be interesting to Mr. Dodgson and your other readers to learn that a great German writer and statistician, Herr G. F. Kolb, member extraordinary of the Central Statistical Commission of Bavaria, has just published a pamphlet "On the Vaccination Question," in which, after going over the whole ground scientifically and statistically, he announces the following conclusions (here translated *verbatim*), which deserve all the more weight because, as he takes care to state, he is not an anti-vaccinator:—"1. That a scientific foundation for the vaccination theory is still wanting. 2. That an empirical one may be possible, but that the high figures with which the medical and non-medical public have so long been held in awe are untenable. 3. That the vaccinated are, though not in relatively very numerous cases, exposed to the danger of syphilitic inoculation, and, on the other hand, in anything but rare instances, are exposed to the further danger that other diseases may be generated or developed in them, or at the least, that they may be made more susceptible of them. In these circumstances," Herr Kolb concludes, "it appears to us that the least which can, but which also must be demanded, is:—"1. A new thorough and impartial examination of the whole vaccination question. 2. Abolition of compulsory vaccination, at least for so long as the State shall be unable to provide full guarantees against the possibility of the co-inoculation of other dangerous and especially loathsome diseases." Having in England abundant evidence that vaccination is worthless and mischievous, we want no further official inquiry, we want absolute repeal of the Vaccination Acts, which no one who understands the functions of a State Government could for a moment countenance. To accomplish our end our cry must be, 'Out with all M.P.'s. who are in favour of the vaccination tyranny.'"

Yours truly,
WILLIAM HUME-ROTHERY.

Merton Lodge, Tivoli, Cheltenham,
Aug. 22nd, 1877.

Correspondence.

THE VACCINATION QUESTION.

Sir : I have written and argued on this subject many years ago, with an unsatisfactory result for two reasons. 1. The opponents too frequently make a trade of it, and get their living by it. 2. Those who do not, have a peculiarity of brain, not influenced by evidence. Besides, it is always unsatisfactory to reason with men who draw upon their imagination for their facts, upon their credulity for their arguments, and upon their own natural instincts for personal abuse. I subjoin an extract from the last report of the Homerton Small-pox Hospital of 915 cases last year:—"Deaths, unvaccinated, 53 per cent.; badly vaccinated, 26 per cent.; well vaccinated, 2 per cent."

What follows small-pox? The report states that out of the 915 cases 151 had boils; 18 mania followed, of which 12 cases were fatal; 7 cases partial blindness; and 24 cases inflamed windpipe, of which 8 died. Of course all this will be denied by the "unlucky" individual who is now before the authorities on this matter, and his supporters, no doubt, will call me, in their polite literature, A BIGOTED DOCTOR.

IS IT WELL TO HAVE CHILDREN VACCINATED?

Sir : I hope you will be able to afford me space for a few words in reply to Mr. Hume-Rothery's letter in your paper of August 25th. He quotes from his previous letter some statistics of the number of vaccinated persons who died in small-pox, which statistics, he says, I have taken "care not to reproduce," implying (as I understand him to mean) that I omitted them in order to make my case look better than it really was. Surely this insinuation of an unworthy motive is a little uncourteous? But whether it be so or not, let me assure him that it is at least unfounded; my only motive for not reproducing those statistics was that they were irrelevant to the subject of my letter. I limited myself to the one question whether vaccination increases or diminishes the liability to take small-pox, and I reproduced the statistics which related to that question. I thought my letter long enough as it stood; otherwise I should have taken the question whether vaccination increases or diminishes the liability to die of small-pox, and have pointed out that the statistics given by Mr. Rothery (the per centage of deaths among vaccinated patients) require to be compared with other statistics (the per centage of deaths among the non-vaccinated) and that by themselves they prove nothing.

But Mr. Rothery further says that I am in error in thinking he used the statistics for any such purpose. "I in no part of my letter attempt," he says, "by the figures he has quoted, or by those he has omitted to quote, or by both together, to prove that vaccination increases the liability to small-pox." I am sorry to have misunderstood him, and can only say that I find in his letter, at the end of the statistics, the words "To this indisputable evidence anyone who desires it may find in England and elsewhere very much of the same nature which may be added, making a mass of testimony against vaccination, &c." Clearly, then, he thinks that the statistics prove something "against vaccination," and if that something is not "liability to small-pox" I am at a loss to know what it is.

I will not attempt to follow Mr. Rothery through the medical portions of his letter; I wrote as a mathematician, not as a doctor, with the object of asserting one single proposition, which is of such vital importance in the vaccination controversy that I gladly take this opportunity of repeating it:—The statistics so constantly quoted by the opponents of vaccination, namely, the per centage of vaccinated persons among small-pox patients, prove nothing, when taken alone, as to vaccination increasing or diminishing the liability to take small-pox; in order to prove anything, they must be compared with other statistics, namely, the per centage of vaccinated persons among the whole population; and, when so compared, they prove that vaccination diminishes that liability.

Your obedient Servant,

CHARLES L. DODGSON.

7, Lushington-road, Eastbourne, August 30th 1877

EASTBOURNE CHRONICLE 8th SEPTEMBER, 1877

THE VACCINATION QUESTION.

Sir: I am not surprised that "A Bigoted Doctor" should have written and argued upon the subject with an unsatisfactory result; but the reasons he assigns for this are entirely at variance with the truth. The opponents of vaccination do not "make a trade" of their opposition, neither do they "get their living by it." On the contrary, we spend much of our time and money in exposing the delusion of vaccination and the unconstitutional tyranny of compulsory vaccination. I fully admit, and am proud to acknowledge, that anti-vaccinators have a peculiarity of brain which makes them think and see for themselves, and thus they are "not influenced by evidence" of the kind brought forward and blazed abroad by the supporters of an absurd medical dogma, a filthy, dangerous and useless practice. Anti-vaccinators do not "draw upon their imagination" for their facts, neither "upon their credulity for their arguments" nor "upon their own natural instincts for personal abuse." Vaccinators themselves produce from time to time a sufficient array of facts and figures as to the inutility and evil results of vaccination upon which (without any others) anti-vaccinators may base their belief and arguments. As to the "natural instincts for personal abuse" with which "a bigoted doctor" charges us, I may say I do not accept the compliment. I am, however, glad to know that anti-vaccinators have those natural instincts—which vaccinators seem devoid of—which constrains them to use every means in their power to protect their helpless and innocent children from the poisoned lancet, the unnatural practice which "bigoted" doctors and State paid and unpaid tyrants try to force upon them in this so-called "free country."

What does "A Bigoted Doctor" bring forward his statistics for? What to prove? I suppose to try and prove that the un-vaccinated, taking small-pox, are more liable than the vaccinated to death from that disease; if this is so, "A Bigoted Doctor" must not mislead the public thus, but must go deeper into the question and ask why so many were un-vaccinated, &c.? What age are they? And whether they were not of delicate constitution, and consequently more liable to succumb to an attack of small-pox, &c., &c. Even taking the figures as they appear, it is admitted that the vaccinated die from small-pox, whereas Jenner said "Once vaccinated, protected for life," and I have no doubt the Compulsory Vaccination Laws were passed upon the assumption that vaccination is an absolute protection, whereas doctors "bigoted" and otherwise are venturing a variety of opinions as to how many times the operation ought to be performed and how many marks, &c., a person ought to have to be "protected. Anti-vaccinators boldly assert that neither vaccination nor re-vaccination can possibly prevent or mitigate small-pox. Vaccinators leave other causes (the real causes) of immunity out of the question. Vaccinators too are always reminding us of the deaths amongst the un-vaccinated—trying to frighten us, I suppose—as though we disputed that unvaccinated persons ever die from small-pox, whereas such is not the case. As long as the causes of small-pox exist, just so long will the effect be small-pox whether a person be vaccinated or not; at any rate anti-vaccinators claim the right as Englishmen to think and act for themselves, and they must assert that right whenever the law is put into action against them, even in the face of unjust and vindictive magistrates.

Mr. Luck is a courageous man, and does not accept as gospel the cruel anti-Christian medical dogma of vaccinators which the authorities at their discretion endeavour to force upon him. I could write more but forbear.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

WILLIAM T. MARTIN.

One of the Executive of the National Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League.

10 and 17, Cliffe, Lewes,
September 12, 1877.

EASTBOURNE CHRONICLE

15th SEPT, 1877

IS IT WELL TO HAVE CHILDREN VACCINATED ?

Sir: Your paper of the 8th inst. has reached me, and in it I find another letter by Mr. Charles L. Dodgson, "Mathematical Lecturer of Christ Church, Oxford."

It is certainly comical to find our Christ Church mathematical lecturer, who in his first letter stigmatises the "Anti-Vaccination League" (his misnomer for the Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League) as a "most mischievous association," charging me with discourtesy for simply crediting him with the intention to make the best of his case.

Our lecturer says, "My only motive for not reproducing those statistics was that they were irrelevant to the subject of my letter." If so, why did he quote a portion of the statistics I gave from the *Hilfe-Ruf*, and yet omit to cite the most telling part? He says, "I limited myself to the one question whether vaccination increases or diminishes the liability to take small-pox, and I reproduced the statistics which related to that question." Let anyone consult my first letter, and he will find that the latter part of this quotation is not correct. The mathematical lecturer garbled these statistics.

Our Oxford mathematical lecturer has very much the appearance of a sophist. He passes over my reiterated argument, showing that as small-pox arises from impurity in the blood, vaccination, which does not prevent the cause of small-pox, but is blood-poisoning with corrupt matter, must not only fail to prevent small-pox, but must tend to promote it, and then twists the latter part of my letter into a *quasi* support of his original charge, viz., that I founded an argument on certain statistics to prove that vaccination increases liability to small-pox.

A thing is true or false irrespective of figures, which are artificialities, and may be applied to illustrate and confirm what is true or false. I have proved, independently of figures, that vaccination must be worthless and mischievous, and I have used official statistics as testifying to this solid conclusion. To this end I may here add that during the epidemic in Banbury all who had small-pox and of course who died of it had been vaccinated; not one of the many unvaccinated persons there had this disease. The same is true of Stockport. During the severe epidemic in the Keighley Union several thousands of unvaccinated children entirely escaped small-pox. On the other hand, Dr. Small, of Boston, Lincolnshire—a magistrate—told me of a medical neighbour who gave small-pox to children in that town by vaccination.

Our Oxford mathematical lecturer says the percentage of vaccinated persons amongst small-pox patients "must be compared with other statistics, viz., the percentage of vaccinated persons among the whole population; and when so compared, they prove that vaccination diminishes that liability," i.e., to small-pox. I do not hesitate to call this a wilful *ipse dixit*, directly at variance with the evidence adduced in my last letter from Dr. Bakewell and the French Imperial Academy of Medicine. I dare our mathematician to the proof of his *ipse dixit*.

Our Oxonian tells us that he writes as a mathematician. I hope then that he may appreciate the following evidence, which I adduced when examined by the House of Commons Committee on vaccination in 1871:—

EASTBOURNE CHRONICLE 15th SEPTEMBER, 1877

PS W H R corrects this in next edition - "I do not know anyone who makes a trade of anti-vaccination and gets his living by it"

Our Oxonian tells us that he writes as a mathematician. I hope then that he may appreciate the following evidence, which I adduced when examined by the House of Commons Committee on vaccination in 1871:— In the *Lancet* of January 21, of that year, it is acknowledged, in a leading article, that "from the early part of the century cases of small-pox after vaccination have been increasing and now amount to four-fifths of the cases." From returns made to the late Poor Law Board and the new Medical Department of the Privy Council, it was found (see Commons' Committee) that but two-thirds of the people were vaccinated. Yet these two-thirds furnished four-fifths of the small-pox cases, whilst the remaining one-third furnished but one-fifth. I am willing to leave it to the decision of your readers whether this evidence supports our mathematician's *ipse dixit*, or the contrary.

But let not your readers be drawn away from the real question at issue, which is simply this—is vaccination a protection against small-pox or not? Jenner said it was an absolute protection, Parliament said the same, and on this ground at length made vaccination compulsory. We now all know that Jenner and Parliament were wrong. We know, further, that vaccination is a means of spreading horrible disease.

I see that your guardians and magistrates are continuing to treat Mr. Luck as a criminal because he has a healthy child and will not allow that child to be diseased. I trust that all lovers of true liberty will help Mr. Luck in his battle against State-medical despotism.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM HUME-ROTHERY.

23, The Crescent, Filey,
Sept. 12th, 1877.

P.S.—The doctor who writes in your paper says, "The opponents of vaccination too frequently make a trade of it and get their living by it." Perhaps I know more anti-vaccinators than any other person in England, and I do not know of anyone who makes a trade of vaccination and gets his living by it. I only know of one person who receives any payment, and that is simply to enable him to hire an efficient superintendent of his saw mills when he is engaged in the work of the league.—W. H. R.

IS IT WELL TO HAVE CHILDREN VACCINATED?

Sir: Mr. Hume-Rothery has at last supplied the missing link in his argument. In your paper of the 15th he states that, according to recent reports, only two-thirds of the population (which we may call a percentage of 66) have been vaccinated. This differs widely from the 98 which, in the absence of statistics, I had taken as a probable percentage, and the statistics, as now completed, undoubtedly go to prove that vaccination increases the liability to take small-pox. There is no hiatus in the argument. All depends now on the correctness of the statistics themselves, a matter which I am not qualified to discuss. I do not mean, of course, that this if proved would settle the whole question. Vaccination may still be good, even if it increases the liability to take small-pox, provided it diminishes the severity of the disease, or the pain, or the disfigurement, or the bad consequences, or the risk of death. On all such questions valuable evidence may be got from statistics, if we bear in mind the simple rule that we must compare two percentages together, *e. g.*, as to the severity of the disease, we must compare the percentage of severe cases among vaccinated patients with the percentage among the un-vaccinated.

Mr. Hume-Rothery thinks it "comical" that I should see any discourtesy in the charge he made against me of suppressing evidence (with the implied dishonourable motive of wishing to make my case look better than it really was), and says he was "simply crediting me with the intention to make the best of my case." And he holds that I was equally discourteous in speaking of the League as "well-meaning, but most mischievous" (where I expressly avoided implying any dishonourable motive by introducing the word "well-meaning"). He now makes a new charge against me of "garbling statistics." Perhaps he thinks that here also he is within the bounds of courtesy, and is not implying any dishonourable motive; if so, I can only say that we do not take quite the same view, either as to what is honourable in controversy, or as to what is courteous in language. This is the last letter with which I need trouble you. I did not come forward as a champion in the controversy, but as a critic; and I concerned myself rather with the logical accuracy of the weapons than with the result of the fight. My object in addressing you is fully effected, if I have made it clear (as I hope I have) that the statistics which I quoted from Mr. Hume-Rothery's first letter were useless by themselves, and that the conclusion which he drew from them had no logical force.

Your obedient Servant,

CHARLES L. DODGSON.

7, Lushington-road,
Sept. 20, 1877.

ERRATUM.

Sir: There is a curious error in the P.S. of my last letter to you. The error lies in these words, "I do not know of any one who makes a trade of vaccination and gets his living by it," which is much more than I could venture to declare. But the truth is, I do not know of anyone who makes a trade of anti-vaccination and gets his living by it.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM HUME-ROTHERY.

EASTBOURNE
CHRONICLE

22nd
SEPTEMBER,
1877

IS IT WELL TO HAVE CHILDREN VACCINATED?

Sir: I think Mr. Charles L. Dodgson, "Mathematical Lecturer of Christ Church, Oxford," must have afforded your readers some little merriment by the figure he has made as "a critic." It is a fact, as any one may see for himself by carefully reading the correspondence, that Mr. Dodgson garbled the statistics contained in my first letter; it is a fact that he misapplied these statistics; it is a fact that he expressed his regret that he had misunderstood me; and it is a curious fact that in his last letter he persists in a wilful misapplication of these statistics, which were given simply in disproof of the leaflet that had been laid upon the table of the Eastbourne Guardians. Mr. Dodgson thinks, from my repeated challenge to him, that he would attempt to refute the argument by which I prove that vaccination must tend to promote small-pox. Mr. Dodgson evidently feels his inability to undertake the task. Mr. Dodgson does not take his punishment kindly. He can garble; he can persist in misrepresentation; he can refuse to acknowledge his mistakes; he can go out of his way as "a critic" to stigmatise our League as "that well-meaning but most mischievous association;" but when he is hit hard by facts he—certainly to the amusement of some—cries out "discourtesy!" Brave Mr. Dodgson! It is curious to find Mr. Dodgson now saying, "I did not come forward as a champion in the controversy." This must be news to some readers, though it may somewhat relieve the feelings of his neighbouring vaccinating doctors, who may well have been exclaiming, "Save us from our friend." Our good friend, the *Lancet*, of the 15th inst., presents us with the following from Dr. Hill's last quarterly sanitary report for Birmingham: "There were only 19 reported cases of variola (small-pox), all of which were described as vaccinated. Sixteen of these cases were removed to the Borough Hospital, and two proved fatal." A nice commentary on Jenner and Parliament! I am glad you have now an Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League in Eastbourne. All lovers of freedom amongst you should join it. The cry of the League should be, "Out with every M.P. in favour of the vaccination despotism."

Yours truly,

Merton Lodge, WILLIAM HUME-ROTHERY.

Tivoli, Cheltenham, Sept. 24th, 1877.

[The correspondence on this subject must now cease.

—Ed. E.C.]

EASTBOURNE
CHRONICLE

29th SEPT,
1877

KNOW HIS DUTY.—MR. DEAN AND BRYANT had each to pay £1. 16s. 6d., and Downs £1. 9s.

THE VACCINATION ACT.—*Philip Luck*, tea-dealer, of Pevensey-road, was summoned for neglecting to comply with an order of the Bench to have his child vaccinated. This was defendant's seventh appearance before the Bench.—The defendant said he had not complied with the Act, and did not intend to. If he were summoned 700 times it would not be done. He urged that having paid two or three penalties, the requirements of the law were satisfied, and proceeded to descant upon the impotence of vaccination to ward off small-pox.—The Chairman said that the vaccination officer was appointed for the express purpose of enforcing the law—it was his bounden duty to do so. If defendant were a quiet person who remained at home and kept his scruples to himself the Bench would endeavour to pass him by as long as possible; but he went about preaching his doctrines and encouraging others to evade the law. There was no escape to the officer but to summon him or give up office altogether.—Defendant: I never began to preach till he began to prosecute.—The Bench imposed a penalty of 20s. and costs.—Mr. Langham: £1. 12s. you have to pay.—Defendant: Very well, sir—I don't part with any money though.

EASTBOURNE CHRONICLE

29th SEPT, 1877