

Facts respecting cow-pox inoculation : describing the difference between the small-pox inoculation and the cow-pox - with many useful remarks, worthy the attention of parents, previously to vaccination / by R[obert] Squirrel, M.D.

Contributors

Squirrel, R.

Publication/Creation

London : The Author, 1805 (London : Printed by A. Holmes, 13 Ossulston Street, Somers Town and Fenwick Court, Holborn)

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/k3n8euu9>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.

**wellcome
collection**

Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

Vaccination

FACTS

RESPECTING

Cow-Pox Inoculation,

DESCRIBING

THE DIFFERENCE

BETWEEN THE

139615

SMALL-POX INOCULATION

AND

THE COW-POX:

WITH

MANY USEFUL REMARKS,

WORTHY THE ATTENTION OF PARENTS,

PREVIOUSLY TO

VACCINATION.

BY R. SQUIRRELL, M.D.

FORMERLY APOTHECARY TO THE SMALL-POX AND
INOCULATION HOSPITAL.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,
BY A. HOLMES, 13, OSSULSTON STREET, SOMERS TOWN,
AND
FENWICK COURT, HOLBORN,

~~~~~  
1816.

EPB 49435/P

## ADVERTISEMENT.

INOCULATION for the Small-pox, (not the Cow-pox,) from nine to twelve every morning, *gratis*, at No. 39, Chalton Street, Somers Town. The preparatory medicines, necessarily prescribed, 5s. only.

Where also may be had, the medicines which have, in numberless instances, eradicated the various diseases arising from vaccination, such as itchy eruptions, inflammations, ulcers, glandular swellings, sore eyes, and declines.

Read the following pages, and judge for your infants!

# FACTS

RESPECTING

## COW-POX INOCULATION.

---

**T**O every question put to me, respecting cow-pox inoculation, my answer has been, that there could be no necessity to forsake or alter the old practice, as children had always done extremely well under it, and no ill effects whatever had arisen in consequence of small-pox inoculation: at the same time, I recommended them to read Dr. Jenner's account of the origin of the cow-pox; viz. from the greasy heels of the horse, which would prove decisive of the subject.

The following is a correct extract from Dr. Jenner's publication, describing the surprising effects and origin of the cow-pox:

“ In this dairy country (Gloucestershire) milking is performed by men and maid-servants. One of the former having been appointed to apply dressings to the greasy heels of a horse, and also to milk the cows with some particles of the infectious matter from the horse adhering to his fingers, he communicates to the cows a disease; called the cow-pox, and from the cows to the dairy maids, which spreads

through the farm, until most of the cattle and the milkers feel its consequences.

“ This disease appears on the nipples of the cow, in the form of pustules, which degenerate into ulcers. The animals become much indisposed, and the secretion of milk is considerably lessened ; inflamed spots appear on the hands of the milkers, with tumours in each arm-pit. Shiverings, succeeded by heat, encreased pulse, great thirst, general lassitude, pains about the loins and limbs, with vomiting, come on. The head is painful, and the person is affected with delirium. These symptoms generally continue three or four days, leaving very troublesome, ulcerated sores about the hands, which heal slowly. The lips, nostrils, eyelids, and other parts of the body are sometimes affected with sores. Thus the disease makes its progress from the greasy heels of the horse to the nipple of the cow, and hence to the human subject.”

The following cases prove, that the cow-pox is not a security against the small-pox, and that it produces malignant effects on the human constitution :

CASE 1. Mr. Hodge's daughter, Fulwood's Rents, was vaccinated at the inoculating hospital, in October 1800. She caught the small-pox in August 1804.

CASE 2. The sister of the above-mentioned child was vaccinated also, at the same hospital, in May 1802. She caught the small-pox in September 1804.

CASE 3. Mr. John Meredith, shoemaker, No. 3, Richmond's Buildings, Kensington, had

his child inoculated with the cow-pox, at the Vaccine Institution, Castle Street, Leicester Fields, in October, 1803. It died of the small-pox on the 20th of July 1804.

CASE 4. Mr. Linnard, No. 2, Grafton Street, Soho, had his child inoculated, with the cow-pox, in November 1802. It caught the small-pox in 1804.

CASE 5. Mr. Joseph Briant, No. 11, Boswell Court, Queen's Square, had his child inoculated with the cow-pox, at the small-pox hospital, in the beginning of 1802. It caught the small-pox at the latter end of the same year.

CASE 6. Mr. Thorn, Upholsterer, Bear Yard, Lincoln's Inn Fields, had a child inoculated, at the hospital, in April, 1804, with the cow-pox. It caught the small-pox in November.

CASE 7. Mr. Percival, Holywell Street, Strand, had a child inoculated with the cow-pox, by Dr. Pearson, who assured the parents that it had taken proper effect; but, in the same year, the child died of the small-pox.

CASE 8. Mr. Mozoyer's child, 31, Grafton Street, Soho, was inoculated at the hospital with the cow-pox matter, 1801. It died of the small pox, 1805.

CASE 9. Mr. Marle's child, 34, Monmouth Street, St. Giles's, was inoculated with the cow-pox, in September, 1800, at the hospital. It caught the small-pox, in October, 1805.

CASE 10. Mr. Englefield, who keeps the Assembly house in Kentish Town, had his child inoculated with the cow-pox matter, in January 1805, by Mr. Sandys, of the same place. Soon

after it had been inoculated, very violent inflammation and ulceration broke out, and from the irritation, fever, and excruciating pain, it died in a most distressing and melancholy condition. Another child of this person was also vaccinated by the same surgeon, and it experienced nearly the same fate from the virulence of the disorder.

CASE 11. Mr. Bowen, Surgeon, at Harrow, inoculated his own infant with vaccine matter, in September, 1799. He inoculated it also with small-pox matter, on the 28th of October, 1804, which succeeded in producing the small-pox.

CASE 12. A daughter, about four months old, of Mr. Worsfolds, a Publican, in Havant Street, Portsea, was vaccinated by Mr. Goldson, Surgeon, on December 10, 1800. She caught the small-pox, the 6th of February.

CASE 13. Mr. Luscombe, keeper of the jail, at Portsmouth, had a child inoculated with cow-pox matter the latter end of January, 1801. She caught the small-pox, in April, 1804.

CASE 14. The child of Dr. Smyth Stuart, of Billericay, in Essex, was inoculated with vaccine matter, by Mr. Canadine, surgeon, of East Lane, Walworth, on the 8th of April, 1802. On the 14th day, from the inoculation, the inflammation on the arm extended to a very alarming degree, accompanied with hard, painful tumours and blotches, which terminated in obstinate ulcers, resisting every medicine and application. The poor suffering infant,

after being affected, without intermission, for nearly six months, with the most excruciating pain and fever, died on the 1st of October, the same year.

CASE 15. Mr. New, Don Saltero's coffee house, Chelsea, had two children inoculated on October the 12th, 1802, by Mr. Morrison, Belville Place, Chelsea; and, from the malignant effects of vaccination, one of them died, on the 18th of the same month, owing to the inflammation and pain, which affected different parts of the body.

CASE 16. A very recent one occurred in the family of Mr. Winkfield, Montague Street, Russel Square, whose five children caught the small-pox after vaccination. Some were inoculated by Dr. Jenner himself.

CASE 17. The child of Mr. Carpenter, bookseller, in Holborn, was vaccinated, also by Dr. Jenner, who positively declared, that the infant would be ever secure from the small-pox, but it has since caught the small-pox.

CASE 18. Mr. Dunning's child, of Portsea, was inoculated with vaccine matter in 1801, by Mr. Weymouth. About twelve months afterwards it was inoculated with the small-pox matter, which took proper effect.

CASE 19. On the 18th of March, 1801, Mr. Weymouth likewise vaccinated a child of Mr. Light's in the same house. He also inoculated this child with some small-pox matter, on the 4th of May, 1802; the arm took extremely well.

CASE 20. This case was communicated by



Dr. Hooper, to the Society of Physicians and Surgeons :

“ Thomas Pewsey, when in the service of Mr. Pennygar, farmer, of Cow-wick Farm, near Devizes, was seized with eruptions on different parts of his body, from which he suffered very considerably, in consequence of milking some cows affected with a pustular disease. Five years expired, at the end of which period, he was taken ill, and died of a confluent small-pox.” Here is another very strong proof, that the cow-pox renders the system insusceptible of the small-pox for a time only. I wish this particular period could be ascertained in each individual.

CASE 21. In a note of Dr. John Sims, inserted in the eighth number of the Medical and Physical Journal, he states as follows: “ I have received a letter from Mr. Cook, Surgeon, at Barking, Essex, informing me, that Martha Angel, who now lives in the capacity of cook to Mr. Downing, Hatton Garden, had the cow-pox very severely, being completely full of pustules, and exceedingly ill, at Highworth, in Wiltshire, in the year 1760. Thirty years afterwards, in the year 1790, she was inoculated, and had the small-pox in the usual manner.”

CASE 22. Dr. Woodsorde, of Castle Cary, Somersetshire, has adduced a case that militates against the permanently preventive influence of the vaccine disease. He observes, that he lately attended a Mrs. Dredge, aged fifty-five years, whom he found labouring

under small-pox of the distinct sort, which she caught from a servant-boy living in the house. She informed him, that she did not expect this disease, since she had taken, twenty-eight years before, the cow-pox, from milking cows affected with the same. The cow-pox, she remarked, was very severe; numerous pustules arising on the hands and fingers, with tumours in the arm-pits and a great degree of fever. Sixteen years afterwards, she was much exposed to small-pox in her own family, having children ill of it, both naturally and from inoculation, whom she constantly attended, but escaped the infection.

CASE 23. " Mr. Hall, in Thunderbolt Alley, Clapham, had two children inoculated for the cow-pox, by Mr. Buckland, surgeon of the above place. One of these children, eleven weeks old, was inoculated October 22, 1801, and the matter produced the desired effect, but, on the ninth day from the insertion of the matter, the inflammation in the arm increased, the child became feverish, with an affection of the head, and other symptoms of general irritation. On November 2d, the inflammation reached from the shoulders to the fingers, extending over the breast and back, proceeding downwards, and after covering the body, extended nearly as far as the knees; but before it reached these parts, the child died on the 16th of the same month.

CASE 24. Clarke, a marine, at Haslar, was vaccinated by Mr. Rickman, in 1800. He was afterwards inoculated by the same gen-

tleman, in 1802, and the subsequent disease was clearly demonstrated to be the small-pox.

Mr. Walker, a respectable practitioner, at Oxford, has lately published an account of the small-pox making its appearance in that city, in the month of May, 1815, among those who had passed through vaccination, which threw the whole inhabitants of the place and neighbourhood into consternation and alarm: it has, in consequence, received such a check, that its credit is entirely lost, at the above place.

The preceding facts afford indisputable proofs, that vaccination is a very unsafe and injurious practice; yet, notwithstanding these instances, fatal to vaccination, the cow-pox matter has been forced into the blood of innocent and helpless infants, by the impious hand of man, with a fallacious promise of its being a perfect security against the small-pox.

Is it then becoming of the vaccinators to continue a practice, which secures no human being permanently from the small-pox; is often productive of the greatest mischief; and has brought into the world several new diseases, by which many children have severely suffered? "Bad men excuse their faults, but good men leave them."

The difference between the small-pox and cow-pox inoculation will be best seen in the following lines:

1. The small-pox inoculation is a perfect security against the natural small-pox. As a proof of this assertion, all the inoculators

uniformly declared, that the natural small-pox never happened to any person who had been once inoculated; nor did they believe it ever happened in any instance whatever.

The cow-pox is not a permanent security against the small-pox, as the preceding cases, selected out of many hundreds, will abundantly testify.

The Jennerian Society have confessed, in the ninth article of their Report, that the cow-pox is not a security against the small-pox, and it is attested by Dr. Jenner himself.

2. The small-pox inoculation produces no other disease than its own.

The cow-pox inoculation, as experience has proved, vitiates the blood, and produces eruptions, inflammations, ulcers, glandular swellings, sore eyes, and other diseases of a malignant and dangerous nature, nay, even death itself.

3. The small-pox inoculation has been practised in this country nearly a hundred years to the perfect satisfaction of the public, and no ill health, nor bad effects, can, with truth, be attributed to it.

The cow-pox was introduced into this country, in the year 1798, since which time, experience has fully proved, that it has produced many bad effects.

The small-pox is a natural disease, the inoculation of which, so far lessens its violence, as to render it mild and harmless, very seldom becoming contagious.

The cow-pox is a disease, foreign and unnatural to the human constitution.

Had those gentlemen who support vaccination, taken the same pains, and resorted to the same means of rendering small-pox inoculation as popular and fashionable as they have the cow-pox, it would have operated still more satisfactorily and safely to the public, and obviated many of its unpleasant effects; in short, it would have possessed all the boasted advantages of vaccination, without any of its pernicious consequences.

On reading Dr. Jenner's account of the cow-pox, originating in the matter issuing from the greasy heels of a horse, I was stricken with horror, aversion, and disgust; and the case, 20, of Thomas Pewsey; 21, of Martha Angel; 22, of Mrs. Dredge, before my eyes at the very commencement of the practice, I could not but conclude, that vaccination would prove unsafe or insecure; for what has once happened, may happen again. If this axiom be admitted, the consequences arising from vaccination, sooner or later, must be of a very serious and melancholy nature; for, should those children, who have been vaccinated, within these few years, when grown up and settled in business, with every prospect of success, and become parents of a numerous offspring, catch the small-pox; and, as on a fair calculation, one out of five who have caught the natural small-pox have died of the disease, I imagine we have a right to expect, that the

fatality of the small-pox, subsequent to vaccination will be in the same proportion, and that many families will be reduced from a state of prosperity and happiness, to the utmost distress and wretchedness, all which might have been prevented by small-pox inoculation. What can cure the distressed mind, or relieve the aching heart of the surviving parent, should one be spared, with a numerous progeny, unprovided for and unprotected? can even one family be restored to its former prospects of success in life, or recover its domestic happiness?

With these impressions and reflections, I am constrained, from a sense of duty, not only to refuse practising vaccination, but, conscientiously to oppose it with all my might.

The natural small-pox, it must be admitted, is often a disease of the most malignant and dangerous nature, and one that produces complaints in the constitution, attended with trouble and distress, and remedied with the utmost difficulty. Sometimes they are never cured; besides, one person out of five, afflicted with that disease, dies. "I have known," says Dr. Buchan, in his *Domestic Medicine*, the "tender mother and her suckling infant laid in the same grave, both untimely victims to this dreadful malady." How often are the finest features, and the most beautiful complexion miserably disfigured by the natural small-pox; and as vaccination is a security only for a time, we may expect that these circumstances will happen again after cow-pox inoculation.

All these disastrous, distressing, and tragical effects may be prevented by small-pox inoculation, which produces a very mild disease, and is never attended with the smallest alarming circumstance, provided the operation be performed by a person of judgment, abilities, and experience.

While I was resident apothecary at the small-pox hospital, not more than one patient out of 1000 died, which was generally the number inoculated at that hospital annually; and those apparently died of other complaints, not at all connected with the inoculation. *Quære,* Would not one out of 1000, in the course of twelve months have died, without any disease whatever? For instance, admitting that three persons were indiscriminately taken into any man's house, every day, for the course of one year, and there kept for three weeks, (which is the time the patients continue in the hospital,) without being inoculated, and treated in the family way the whole time, might it not be expected, from fair calculation, that one out of that number would die, in the course of that year?

At the same place, I had an opportunity of observing the malignancy and dreadful consequences of the natural small-pox, such as ulcerated sores, boils, and inflammations in different parts of the body, which afflicted some of the patients, while others were affected with mortifications, blindness of one eye, and contraction of the limbs, other poor creatures groaning with anguish and pain in the agonies

of death. Those who die of this disease are generally sensible to the last moment.

In witnessing the dreadful and malignant effects of the above disease, and contrasting it with the mildness of that, produced by inoculation, in the same house, in which we find the patients, without any complaint, but on the contrary, cheerful and comfortable, I considered it then, and do still consider it as one of the greatest discoveries, and the most beneficial improvements in the annals of medicine,—a blessing as great as Providence ever bestowed on human beings. Immortal be the name of Lady Wortley Montague, whose philanthropy has prevented the misery and saved the lives of millions ! Let us say of her, as was said of the celebrated Washington, the American general :

“ Her fame survives, bounded only by the limits of the earth, and by the extent of the human mind. She survives in our hearts, in the growing knowledge of our children, in the affection of the good throughout the world ; and, when our monuments shall be done away, when nations now existing shall be no more, still shall the glory of Lady Montague shine unfaded, and die not, until the love of virtue cease on earth, or earth itself sink into one undistinguished chaos.”

Whenever I have objected to vaccinating a particular child, and, in my opinion, have given cogent reasons for refusing it, the person has generally put these questions to me : Do you think you know the business better than the whole college of physicians, who have



sanctioned the practice? and, do you imagined that parliament would have granted ten thousand pounds to Jenner, the discoverer, if vaccination were not perfectly safe?

The answer, I have usually made to these queries, is as follows:

Inoculation was not the province or department of physicians: they always considered it much beneath them to perform the operation. They, therefore, had not experience sufficient to furnish them with adequate knowledge of the subject. This part of the profession had always been practised by apothecaries, a few only, under the immediate attention of the surgeon, excepted.

No one ever thought of consulting a physician respecting inoculation. Families generally depended on the ability of their apothecary, consequently physicians could not be accustomed to see many instances of this kind, more especially as they did not practise it themselves. Hence, it must appear, how improper it was for them, without sufficient experience, to interfere or sanction such an unknown and undefined practice.

It has always been a maxim with me, to persevere in my mode of practice, so long as it proved successful; and this having been the case with the small-pox inoculation, which I have practised, upwards of thirty years, with the utmost success, I therefore see no reason to forsake or change it for any other; nor shall I, until convinced, by more substantial proofs

than have hitherto been adduced in support of vaccination.

The honourable house of commons very judiciously heard, and minutely examined the testimonies of those medical gentlemen, whom they imagined to be proper judges of the propriety of such an experiment.

These practitioners gave a negative character to a most virulent and active disease, for want of a proper knowledge of the small-pox inoculation, which would have enabled them to have given a more enlightened decision, on such an important occasion. It appears evident, when these gentlemen gave their testimony before the house, they kept the interest of Dr. Jenner mostly in view; and, by so doing, they obtained from Parliament ten thousand pounds, as a reward for introducing the cow-pox matter into the vital fluid of helpless infants, many of whom have suffered, and are now suffering, from its fatal and malignant effects.

The misrepresentations of the vaccinators, from the commencement of this new practice, who have been constantly reporting and presenting to the public the most dangerous and the most malignant effects, arising from small-pox inoculation, have given such an alarm, and so intimidated the people, that their fallacious statements have frightened them into vaccination.

Had they, like honest men, candidly given a comparative view of the small-pox inoculation and all its improvements, with that of

vaccination, it would have enabled the people to judge for themselves, and choose accordingly. The daily occurrence of the small-pox, subsequent to vaccination, has so much alarmed the public, that they begin to refuse both inoculations; for they very justly remark, that if the small-pox inoculation be attended with such dreadful consequences, as the vaccinators have represented, and vaccination, as experience tells us, afford no permanent security against the natural small-pox, we will trust to the will of Providence and submit to neither.

The reason why the numerous failures and malignant effects, arising from vaccination, are not universally known, is evident enough, because the public prints refuse publishing any one circumstance, however true it may be, which militates against it. Their reason for objecting to publish any circumstance, adverse to vaccination, is because, they say, it would materially diminish the sale of their paper; so that, whatever failures take place, or whatever malignant effects be the consequence, can only be known, in a circumscribed and comparatively small circle.

THE END.