

POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE

**A mystery, probably dangerous, unproved and,
in present circumstances, unprovable, causing
gross cruelty to animals, and, if widely used,
a shocking waste of public money.**

1. Parents can please themselves in the matter of polio inoculation. Why have your child inoculated when the risk of it getting polio is so small? Only 6 out of every hundred thousand of the population of Britain get paralytic polio. Last year in articles or speeches three members of the Medical Research Council, who favour all inoculations—Drs. Andrewes, Perry and Sanders—put this argument against mass inoculation. They said, in effect, that when the risk of getting polio is so minute, to organise a programme of mass inoculation of the child population is a shocking waste of money and of doctors' time and energy. One of them said that to protect one child in the U.S.A., 4,000 who did not need any protection would have to be inoculated and 16 of the inoculated would get reactions from the vaccine. A reaction may be a mild or a serious illness.

2. Remember that no one can be sure that this new vaccine protects from polio. When the English Minister of Health, Mr. Turton, recommended it at the televised Press Conference on January 19th, 1956, he said he could not guarantee that it would protect. He knew nothing at all about it in that respect as it had never been tried. Moreover, how can its presumed protective powers ever be tested since the liability to polio of any child, inoculated or uninoculated, is infinitesimal? Remember, too that the American Salk vaccine was pronounced efficient as well as safe on the strength of the tests made in 1954 although the official report on those tests shows that 71 fully inoculated children developed paralytic polio. Official figures for 1955 show that over 900 American children inoculated with the Salk vaccine developed poliomyelitis, more than 200 of the paralytic kind. Why trust official doctors when their past undertakings in respect of protective vaccines have not been kept?

3. Remember, too, that the Ministry of Health's claim that the American vaccine gave a five-fold protection does not rest on any solid foundation. *Chronicle of the World Health Organisation*, January, 1956, says in a Preliminary Review of Poliomyelitis Vaccination:

Preliminary reports up to November 1st were received from 11 States and one city. They revealed attack rates for paralytic cases from two to more than five times greater among unvaccinated children than among vaccinated children in the same age group. . . . In evaluating these preliminary reports many possible sources of error must be kept in mind, and substantial changes from the preliminary findings can be expected when final reports are completed."

The Americans from whose report the English Ministry of Health took its figures give the "many possible sources of error" as

"the accuracy and completeness of the history of vaccination, the criteria for classification of paralytic status, and the accuracy of the population estimates."

and they add

"When final reports are available many differences from these preliminary figures may be expected."

4. Why accept official assurances that the vaccine is safe? No one at the moment knows anything about the British variety in regard to this particular point. When the Minister of Health said at the Press Conference on January 19 that it is as safe as it can be, the strict tests for safety he

talked about had not at the time been performed, so he did not know whether the vaccine had passed these tests or not. Remember that the Salk vaccine was pronounced safe when it was issued in April, 1955, for mass inoculation of 8 and 9 year olds in America, but it gave hundreds of American children polio, directly or indirectly, and 12 of them died. Remember, too, that these so-called safety tests are performed on animals—monkeys, mice, rats and other animals. The cruelty to the animal does not ensure the safety of the human being. It was said that the Cutter brand of the Salk vaccine did so much harm because live virus had been left in some batches of the vaccine. At his Press Conference the Minister of Health was asked if there was any risk of live virus remaining in the new British vaccine. The question was not answered. Remember the viruses used in making the vaccine are first grown, each of them separately, on monkey kidney tissue. The Scientific Correspondent of *Financial Times*, January 21st, 1956, explaining why the two firms making the vaccine had to spend so much money on developing it—something like £600,000—stressed the importance of getting rid of any trace of the monkey kidney tissue. Is it all got rid of? No assurance on this point has been given by the Ministry of Health? Remember that the American polio vaccine that contained live virus had passed the safety tests after being tested on animals—chiefly monkeys. American experimenters have said quite openly that you cannot ensure the safety of a vaccine for human beings by testing it on animals.

5. Do you know that vital information about the new vaccine was suppressed at the Ministry of Health's televised interview on January 19th? The Medical Correspondent of *Manchester Guardian* was at that conference and he stated on January 27th that at that conference a question was put to the Minister as to whether antibiotics are used in the manufacture of the vaccine. This question was not answered, but when the *British Medical Journal* enquired of the manufacturers of the vaccine on this point, it discovered that penicillin and streptomycin are used in preliminary processes and the Ministry of Health's Public Relations Officer admitted in *Manchester Guardian* January 28th, that some of these antibiotics remain in the finished product. A child may be sensitive to penicillin. It has even been suggested by doctors that streptomycin may activate tuberculous meningitis. Surely, apart from the danger of monkey kidney tissue remaining in the vaccine, and of living virus remaining in it, it is dangerous to give every child a vaccine which contains these antibiotics, however small the amount may be. Three weeks after the Ministry of Health gave its televised interview, it issued an aide-mémoire (referred to in the medical journals of February 11th) in which it said:

"Theoretically, in view of the presence of monkey kidney protein in the vaccine, sensitisation to it and the production of Rh antibodies are possible."

They brush these theoretical possibilities aside, but will any careful parent take the risk? The Ministry officials also referred to another possibility, namely, the danger of sensitisation to penicillin and streptomycin. They say (in the aide-mémoire):

"Nevertheless, the possible effects of sensitisation and of vaccination in a sensitised person must be kept in mind."

The other point on which information was suppressed on the interview on January 19th by the Ministry of Health was the nature of the viruses used in the manufacture of the vaccine. The *British Medical Journal* complained vigorously about this. There are said to be several strains of poliomyelitis virus but three main types are used in the manufacture of the polio vaccine. Type 1 has been the Mahoney strain, and this is said to have caused the cases of polio that followed inoculation with the Salk vaccine. Dr. Salk, however, is sticking to it, but British manufacturers have discarded it as too dangerous. The two firms, Glaxo Laboratories and Burroughs Wellcome, that are making the new vaccine, have also used other viruses in place of Type 2 and Type 3. The Ministry officials did not admit this at the Press interview, but their Public Relations Officer admitted in *Manchester Guardian* January 28th, 1956, that the choice by Burroughs Wellcome of Type 2 and Type 3 in their vaccine had not yet been approved by the Medical Research Council. Fancy the Ministry of Health boosting a vaccine the viruses for the composition of which had not at the time been approved by the Medical Research Council!

The way the vaccine is manufactured is as follows:—

Three separate polio viruses are grown in monkey kidney tissue, and then separately "in-activated" by formalin. To see whether each is then harmless attempts are made to grow the

virus again and then each strain is injected into the brain or spinal cord of monkeys that have been treated with cortisone. Then the strains are mixed and again tried on monkeys and mice. When the batches of vaccine are ready, they are tested again.

6. The fact that the Ministry of Health did not disclose the composition of the vaccine raises the question: why has the Ministry been so hasty and secretive about this new polio vaccine? The *Daily Sketch* Medical Expert on January 24th, 1956, advised parents not to take the risk of letting their children be the first to have the vaccine, setting out a number of points on which the Ministry had given no information. While the Ministry of Health in a circular dated January 19th, 1956, urged local authorities, quite illegally, to collect the signatures of parents to forms asking for the inoculation of their children and to get these forms in by April 15th, the Medical Correspondent of *Manchester Guardian* (January 27th) said there was no vaccine in existence at the time that had undergone the strict safety tests which the Minister said would be performed on every batch of vaccine before it is issued, and he added that they do not know whether they will ever have a vaccine that passes these stringent safety tests.

7. If you have any regard for wise spending of public money you will oppose any expenditure at all on this totally unnecessary, probably dangerous, utterly wasteful, and most certainly cruel scheme. The Ministry of Health boasts about not charging local authorities for the vaccine, but the Ministry is buying it from the manufacturers. Have the latter already spent £600,000 without any idea of recouping themselves? Even if the Ministry pays only 10s. a dose, the 500,000 doses they anticipate disposing of in May and June this year will cost £250,000, and will cover only one in ten of the children aged 2 to 9 years. The Ministry anticipates inoculating 5 million children eventually, in which case their expenditure out of public funds will run into millions of pounds, that is, if the people are silly enough and ignorant enough to fall for all the Ministry's grossly misleading propaganda.

8. Don't think that all the doctors favour this new vaccine. The Medical Correspondents of two papers have already been mentioned as criticising the Ministry of Health in this matter. A general practitioner at Accrington, Dr. R. C. Webster, has expressed doubts in two of our medical magazines. He concludes his letter:

"I deprecate the offering to the public of this vaccine while our ignorance of poliomyelitis remains so extensive, and while the efficiency and safety of the material are still open to not unreasonable suspicion. Are we being fair to the subjects of this nation-wide experiment?"

9. And please don't overlook the gross cruelty to animals involved in the testing of the vaccine. It is injected into the brains of monkeys, mice, cotton-rats, and other animals. The monkeys used in the experiments as well as to provide the living tissue on which the vaccine is grown suffer greatly during transit from India. While it is true that the monkey is put under an anaesthetic for the extraction of the kidneys and afterwards killed with the humane killer, the test injections are made into the brain and spinal cord of the living animal. Dr. Salk owned that he had used 15,000 monkeys in his experiments.

If you have any public spirit and any regard for truth and justice, for healthy living, and for kindly treatment of animals, don't only refuse the poisonous concoction for your children, but do everything you can to defeat the plan to add to the already existing medical enslavement of the people by false ideas propagated by the Ministry of Health's minions in the Press, the B.B.C., and the Cinema.

From The Council of The National Anti-Vaccination League.

L. LOAT,

Secretary.

THE ARCHIVE COLLECTION

THIS LITERATURE WAS COLLECTED
FROM VARIOUS SOURCES
OVER THE YEARS OF MY RESEARCH
ON VACCINATION
WHICH STARTED IN SEPTEMBER 1991.

FORTUNATELY I RECEIVED
SEVERAL DOCUMENTS
AND BOOKS FROM INDIVIDUALS
WHO HAD BEEN INVOLVED IN
THE ANTI-VACCINATION LEAGUE OF GREAT BRITAIN
DURING THEIR LIFE TIME.

THE LATE DR GORDON LATTO, WHO SERVED AS THE MEDICAL
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE LEAGUE DURING THE MID 1900s.
ALSO, IAN & MONIQUE STIRLING TO NAME A FEW.

ALSO THANKS TO JOHN WANTLING, AN INDEPENDENT
RESEARCHER, FOR PATIENTLY PHOTOCOPYING
NUMEROUS ARCHIVE PUBLICATIONS & FORWARDING
COPIES TO ME BACK IN THE MID-NINETIES.

I HAVE SCANNED THESE PUBLICATIONS & LITERATURE
TO PRESERVE THE WEALTH OF INFORMATION
CONTAINED WITHIN THESE DOCUMENTS
IN THE HOPE THAT THEY WILL BE CIRCULATED
& MADE AVAILABLE TO ANYONE WHO WISHES
TO STUDY THE HISTORICAL DATA
SURROUNDING THIS SUBJECT.

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

• 2017 •