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ABSTRACT

This thesis highlights Alfred Carpenter’s contribution to the public health debate from 1852-92. New sources have been used including the Croydon newspapers and Carpenter’s correspondence with Edwin Chadwick and four Archbishops of Canterbury.

Carpenter worked as a general practitioner in Croydon from 1852-82 and then became a consulting physician. He never became a Medical Officer of Health or hospital consultant. His interests included sewage irrigation, infectious disease and temperance. Carpenter sat on the Croydon Local Board of Health and introduced many important reforms. On the national stage he belonged to, and held office with the British Medical Association, Society of Arts, National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain and the Medical Society of London. He became a friend of Edwin Chadwick. Carpenter regularly corresponded with the BMJ, Lancet, The Times and the local newspapers.

Carpenter promoted sewage irrigation as the best method of sewage disposal. In 1881 he placed Croydon on the international stage when 200 members of the International Medical Congress visited the Beddington sewage farm. Carpenter continued to advance his sanitary knowledge and was awarded the Certificate of Sanitary Science from Cambridge University by examination (later called the Diploma in Public Health). He became lecturer in Public Health at Thomas’s Hospital and published a book about his lectures. Carpenter was an examiner in public health for the Universities of London and Cambridge. He was an examiner for the Society of Apothecaries and sat on a Hospitals’ Commission for smallpox and fever hospitals.

Carpenter was medical attendant to four successive Archbishops of Canterbury. His correspondence with the Archbishops provides us with both medical and non-medical information. Carpenter had a philanthropic nature; he gave 10% of his income to the poor and held annual parties for the children from the Ragged School. He raised Testimonial funds for national and poor figures alike. Carpenter’s failures were few: he was not elected on to Croydon’s first School Board; he never became Croydon’s Mayor or a Member of Parliament. Carpenter was never far from controversy: he was involved in two high profile court cases against him; he was burnt in effigy behind Croydon Town Hall; in Reigate he was thrown into a pond by the publicans during his abortive parliamentary campaign.
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Carpenter in Bristol
INTRODUCTION

The first chapter describes Carpenter's early introduction to medicine when he was apprenticed to his father at the age of fourteen. He later became a pupil at Northampton General Infirmary, completing only three years instead of the normal five after his father became ill. He returned home to care for his father's patients in nine parishes and when he left received a testimonial from the Guardians of Kettering Union. In 1847 he travelled to London and became an assistant to John Syer Bristowe in Camberwell. He was also one of the first students to gain a scholarship to St Thomas's Hospital medical school. Carpenter qualified MRCS, LSA in 1851 and gained six prizes, including the Treasurer's prize and gold medal for general proficiency and good conduct. He held posts of resident accoucher, house surgeon and assistant medical officer at Thomas's. Carpenter moved to Croydon in 1852, armed with fourteen testimonials, where he worked for forty years until his death in 1892.

The second chapter describes how Carpenter started working as a single-handed practitioner. He later joined Edward Westall in the High Street and, as will be seen later, Westall's influence made a big impression on Carpenter. They took it in turns to visit the sick cadets of the East India Company at Addiscombe College, and Westall introduced Carpenter to the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution.

In 1853 Carpenter married Margaret Jane Jones; they had four children (three sons and a daughter) and one son went to Thomas's. Carpenter later qualified with MB in 1855 and MD in 1859 (the title of his thesis is not known although it is likely to have been in public health). Carpenter also wrote articles in the BMJ and started to give lectures.
The ‘Croydon Case’ of 1852-3 was a typhoid epidemic, which affected one in ten of Croydon’s inhabitants. This was despite Croydon being one of the first towns to adopt the 1848 Public Health Act and completing the ‘combined works’ of a constant fresh water supply, tubular drainage and sewage recycling by December 1851. Edwin Chadwick and Thomas Southwood Smith, from the General Board of Health, and the Archbishop of Canterbury attended the opening ceremony of the ‘combined works’. The ‘Case’ attracted widespread publicity and caused embarrassment to the Croydon Local Board of Health, the General Board of Health and the Government itself. What made matters worse was that William Ranger, an Inspector to the General Board of Health, had reduced the size of the sewer pipes from six-inch to four-inch on the grounds that their design was too costly. Three separate investigations took place, which are described later.

The third chapter describes Carpenter’s increasing involvement in a wide range of activities. He was elected to the Croydon Local Board of Health, became President of the SE Branch of the BMA and Justice of the Peace for East Surrey. He also became involved in a number of Clubs and Societies. In the public health field Carpenter became an authority on sewage disposal giving lectures and writing papers on sewage irrigation and sewage farming.

From 1860-72 Carpenter was a member of the Croydon Local Board of Health and introduced a number of initiatives and reforms. He was elected to the Roads Committee with Benjamin Bean, and together they produced a damning report on a run down area in the centre of Croydon called Middle Row. Carpenter was also instrumental in the establishment of public-slaughter houses and public baths in Croydon. He also became interested in a wide range of public health issues, which included ventilation of sewers, house drainage and fogs.
The fourth chapter describes how Carpenter was invited to succeed Westall, his partner, in 1860, and become medical attendant to Archbishop John Bird Sumner. Carpenter looked after four successive Archbishops at Addington Palace and closed the eyes of three. Carpenter’s letters to the Archbishops plus correspondence from the [Archbishops] Longley and Tait papers give us an idea of the health issues involved and details of how the Archbishops and their families coped with illness and bereavement.

Chapter five describes how Carpenter improved his knowledge with his appointment as lecturer in public health at Thomas’s. He also passed his diploma in sanitary science from Cambridge University, later to be called the Diploma in Public Health (D.P.H.), and published a book based on his lectures at Thomas’s. He organised the 1878 Sanitary Congress in Croydon of the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain. Carpenter also gave a number of lectures to a variety of organisations and corresponded in the local and national newspapers on public health issues. For example, from 1876-7 the Croydon newspapers had many letters both supporting and opposing vaccination and Carpenter, who supported vaccination, joined in the debate.

In church matters Carpenter regularly took part in the annual Easter Vestry meetings. He often joined in the discussions whether they were financial matters, involving County Rates, or public health. In 1877 Carpenter was treasurer to the Croydon Church Congress and also gave a paper on intemperance.

Carpenter was active in a number of Societies and became President or Chairman of some of them. At the Medical Society of London he presented a number of scientific papers and gave the 1878 Oration (described later). He spoke to national organisations such as the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, and local ones, such as the Croydon Microscopical Club.
His philanthropic activities were numerous and ranged from raising funds for an Abyssinian ship’s surgeon stranded in Croydon, to raising a Testimonial fund for William Farr.

Chapter six deals with Carpenter’s involvement in the temperance movement. Carpenter became a total abstainer in the latter part of his life. As a JP he dealt severely with cases of drunkenness whether they were men or women. However, he also supported ways of rehabilitating these drunkards and in particular the foundation of a home for inebriate women. Carpenter supported the Sunday Closing Movement, but despite his energetic campaigning, Sunday Closing never took place in England as it had in Scotland and Ireland. Carpenter’s strong views on temperance even put him on a collision course with his fellow magistrates, as will be seen later.

The Church of England responded to the views of its temperance members and in 1876 The Church of England Temperance Society held a meeting in Croydon under the Presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Carpenter was asked to give the 1878 Annual Oration to the Medical Society of London [he was also Chairman of Council of the BMA at this time]. His title was ‘Alcoholic drinks – As Diet, as Medicines and as Poisons.’ He later spoke to the Hunterian Society in 1885 on ‘The Place which Alcoholic Drinks should Occupy in the Treatment of Disease.’

Chapter seven deals with Carpenter’s retirement from general practice and his new role as a ‘consulting physician,’ whose definition was detailed in a high-profile High Court case between him and his ex partners. Carpenter passed his MRCP (London) by examination in 1883 and was examiner in public health to the Universities of London and Cambridge as well as examiner to the Society of Apothecaries, London.
Carpenter’s correspondence to Edwin Chadwick contains a number of public health issues and also demonstrates Carpenter’s affection for Chadwick including their similar interests. Both were prominent members of the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain and the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, and regularly gave addresses at the Annual conferences of both these organisations.

In 1881 Carpenter was asked to join the Hospitals’ Commission for smallpox and fever hospitals, which included a host of eminent public figures and demonstrated Carpenter’s knowledge and experience in public health. Details of the report are discussed later. The 1889 Infectious Disease (Notification) Act required prompt notification to the MOH of all cases of smallpox, Asiatic cholera, diphtheria, membranous croup, erysipelas, or any of a list of fevers: typhoid, typhus, enteric relapsing, continued, puerperal and scarlet. Prior to this Act, many people, including Carpenter, had been involved in a long debate as to the best way of notifying infectious disease.

In the field of politics Carpenter, who was a Gladstonian liberal, was defeated twice in parliamentary campaigns, in Reigate in 1885 and Bristol in 1886. Chadwick too was unsuccessful in gaining a seat in Parliament earlier in his career.

In 1888 Carpenter was elected vicar’s churchwarden at Croydon Parish Church and was also made Chairman of the Whitgift Foundation, which is discussed later. Carpenter gained his Surrey Association of Change Ringers Certificate and this is one of the few non-academic pursuits he took part in.

Carpenter continued to be active in a large number of societies and associations. In 1886 he was elected to the Parliamentary Bills Committee of the BMA and in the same year he was President of the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution. He was presented with a marble bust of himself and an illuminated address
from a hundred subscribers, as a token of appreciation for all his hard work over the years. The marble bust survives today in the post-graduate centre of Mayday Hospital, Croydon.

Carpenter was involved in another court case (Brown v Dukes and Carpenter) whereby a patient claimed damages of £2000 from Dukes and Carpenter for wrongful and careless conduct in signing certificates, by which means she was removed to Peckham House Lunatic Asylum. The plaintiff lost the case and made an unsuccessful appeal. However both Dukes and Carpenter had to pay their own legal fees, as Brown was penniless. Curiously, Carpenter’s last letter to the BMJ was on ‘On Actions in Lunacy Against Medical Men.’ It was written on 2 January 1892, shortly before he died in the Esplanade Hotel, Ventnor, Isle of Wight while recuperating from an illness. He had eighty obituaries and the funeral procession numbered thirty carriages. Carpenter is buried in Queens Road cemetery, Croydon and a Saxon cross marks his grave. In his Will he left £23,019 18s 7p to his family.

Chapter eight asks the question whether Carpenter was a typical GP. The author uses the seventeen categories listed in Anne Digby’s book *The Evolution of British General Practice 1850-1948*. Carpenter gets a score of 88%, which would indicate that he was a typical GP. However, this thesis shows that in many ways he was atypical, given his wide range of expertise and activities.
CHAPTER 1

THE EARLY YEARS

This chapter describes Alfred John Carpenter’s early start in the medical profession when he was apprenticed to his father, a surgeon-apothecary, after leaving school.¹ He later became a pupil at the Northampton General Infirmary before returning home to work for his father again. In 1847 he travelled to London to work as a surgical assistant in Camberwell, and also gained a place as a medical student at St Thomas’s Hospital Medical School. Following qualification, he worked at Thomas’s before moving to Croydon.

Alfred John Carpenter was born on 28 May 1825 in Rothwell, Northamptonshire, and baptised the following day.² He had two brothers, John and Edward³ and three sisters, Emily, Eliza and Maria.⁴ He was educated at Moulton Grammar School, Lincolnshire, and at the age of 14 was apprenticed to his father for two years.⁵ Years later, at the opening of the Mayday Infirmary, Croydon, in 1885, he gave an address and recalled working for his father:

When 15yrs of age he [Alfred] had the entire control and management and care of a very large District and Union. His father was a medical attendant upon the poor, was an invalid confined to his bed for nearly six months, and for the whole of that time the poor creatures were under his care and he

¹Carpenter’s father qualified as an apothecary, LAC in 1831. His entry read-CARPENTER John, Moulton. Oct 13 1831, List of Apothecaries (1815-1840), London: Gilbert and Rivington, 1840, p.35.
² The 1851 Rothwell Census lists John Carpenter, aged 51yrs, as a Surgeon and LAC (surgeon-apothecary which is equivalent to a general practitioner today). He had an assistant John Chapman, aged 28yrs. Ref: H0107/1744.
³ Baptisms in the Parish of Rothwell, Northamptonshire, page 72, entry number 571.
⁴ Both his brothers qualified at Thomas’s. John William in 1856 and Edward 1864.
⁵ 1841 Census in Rothwell, ref: H.O.107/809.
⁶ J. Leyland, Alfred Carpenter: A Biography, (Being a Reprint from “Contemporary Medical Men,” 13 pages), Leicester, Office of the Provincial Medical Journal, 1887, p.5. (Thereafter called Leyland) No records have survived of Carpenter’s apprenticeship with his father.
practised upon them and gained a great deal of experience by it, sometimes no
doubt through the mistakes he made, but such things were not possible now.\(^6\)

Carpenter later became a pupil at Northampton General Infirmary, which was
popular with pupils.\(^7\) He trained under William Percival, surgeon, and Archibald
Robertson, physician. Carpenter only completed three years and this may have been
due to a recurrence of his father’s poor health.\(^8\) Carpenter’s qualities were evident at
this early stage of his career in the testimonial from Robertson:

I have great pleasure in certifying that I have known Mr Alfred Carpenter for
several years, and that he is a man of high character - both professionally and
morally. While he was a pupil at Northampton General Infirmary, under my
own eye, he was a zealous student, profiting by his opportunities for acquiring
knowledge.\(^9\)

When he returned home to Rothwell to work for his father, Carpenter had the
total charge of nine parishes, and on leaving, received a testimonial from the
Guardians of Kettering Union.\(^10\) In 1847 he moved to London.

Carpenter worked as a surgical assistant to John Syer Bristowe,\(^11\) who was a
surgeon to the Anchor Life Assurance Company.\(^12\) We do not know what

\(^6\) Copy of original record of the Opening Ceremony of the Mayday Infirmary, Saturday 16 May 1885,
by His Grace Dr Edward W. Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, 22 pages, p.5. (Author has copy)
\(^7\) Three pupils were taken on at a time and each had to pay a premium of £315, which covered board
and lodgings for five years. F.F. Waddy, A History of Northampton General Hospital (1743-1948),
\(^8\) Leyland, p.5. Carpenter would have received a pupil’s certificate when he left which would say as
follows: - General Infirmary Northampton. This is to certify that Alfred Carpenter has been a Pupil in
this Infirmary and has had an opportunity of attending the Medical and Surgical Practice of the House
for the space of (three) years during the whole of which period he has conducted himself with
Diligence, Sobriety and Attention; and always complied with the Statutes of the Institution. Dated this...
day of...18... Two physicians, two surgeons and the House Surgeon and Apothecary signed it.
\(^9\) List of Testimonials for Mr Alfred Carpenter. 15 Nov 1851. (Copy in authors possession)
\(^10\) Leyland, p.5.
\(^11\) Ibid.
\(^12\) The 1847 Medical Directory lists Bristowe’s qualifications as MRCS Eng.1826 and LSA 1821, and
his address 2 North Addington Place, Camberwell, London. He was a Fellow of the Medical Society of
London and may have invited Carpenter to one of the meetings prompting Carpenter to join later.
Carpenter’s duties were or how long he worked for Bristowe. Whilst still retaining his
post with Bristowe, Carpenter gained a scholarship to St Thomas’s Hospital Medical
School, where he was a student from 1847-1850.\(^{13}\) After qualification as a surgeon
and apothecary, Carpenter held the posts of house surgeon and resident accoucheur at
Thomas’s.\(^{14}\) He also worked as an assistant medical officer.

**ST THOMAS’S HOSPITAL**

St Thomas’s was founded in Southwark near London Bridge, approximately on the
site of the Cathedral of St Saviour. The exact date of its foundation is unknown but it
appears to have originated in the infirmary of the Priory of St Mary the Virgin,
Southwark, in the early part of the twelfth century.\(^{15}\) Thomas’s was one of the oldest
charitable foundations connected with the City of London and its medical school dates
back to the early eighteenth century. Thomas’s was run by a General Court, which
met quarterly from 1827 onwards.\(^ {16}\) It consisted of an Honorary President, Treasurer
and Governors. The Court was responsible for deciding the election of such high-
ranking officials as the surgeons, physicians, apothecary and the matron. All decisions
of policy and finance were referred to the Court from the Grand Committee, which
consisted of thirty Governors who were delegated from the Court, together with the
President and the Treasurer. Each year the Grand Committee members were chosen
from amongst the Governors, who then served for three years before being relieved of

\(^{13}\) Leyland, p.5.
\(^{14}\) Ibid.
called McInnes)
(Thereafter called Parsons, vol.iii)
their positions for at least a year. By the time Carpenter attended Thomas’s, there were seventeen wards with five hundred and twenty beds plus the personnel. 17

No one, until the days of Lady Almoners, knew more of the intimate affairs of the ‘sick poor’ than the Steward and his assistants. The Steward received £200 p.a. and two gratuities of £100 each in Carpenter’s time. 18 His allowances, including his residence, were £92 15s 3d, and his assistant was paid £100 p.a. The Steward’s duties extended to the whole policing and internal management of the hospital, but no definite charge existed. A diary from the Steward’s office gives an insight into the lives of some of the patients at Thomas’s in Carpenter’s time. Many of the parish cases had no clean linen and others no linen of any kind. The Steward could provide money for clothes for destitute patients who were leaving the hospital, and sometimes paid their fares home using Randue’s legacy. 19 If a patient wanted to make a will, it was the Steward who had to help him or her, as well as to witness it afterwards. Steward’s also had to deal with such things as putting out fires in the ward chimneys and turning off bath taps, which were often left running either by accident or on purpose. Ward patients frequently stole or fought one another and the Steward had to remove them from the hospital. 20

In October 1847 the systematic registration of patients began at the suggestion of the surgeon John Simon, who had borrowed the idea from St George’s. 21 It began in a book in which the staff were to record cases of interest, and when these ended fatally the pathologist was to add the result of the post-mortem. It was not a great

17 Physicians; Assistant Physicians; Surgeons; Assistant Surgeons; House Surgeons; Surgeryman; Apothecary; Matron; Sisters; Nurses; Surveyor; Clerk; Receiver; Hospitaller; Minister of the church; Butler and Brewer; Cook; Bathman; Porters; Admission room porter; Theatre porters; Carpenters; Bricklayers; and the Steward. Parsons, vol.iii, pp.100-2.
19 Parsons, vol. iii, p.103. In 1723 a Mr Randue (given name unknown) left a legacy for the supply of clothing etc to destitute patients.
21 Parsons, vol. iii, p.113.
success at first, for in May 1848 the Treasurer wrote to the Committee of Lecturers that he had found no entries at all by the staff and the results of only three post-mortems, all by Simon. The task of registration, therefore, was handed over to the house surgeons who thus became the first registrars. Later, in 1851, Richard Baggallay, the Treasurer, wrote a long letter to the staff regretting that the registration scheme had been allowed to lapse. He reminded them of the large sums which the hospital was spending on the school, in spite of the opposition of some of the Governors. To this the staff replied that a satisfactory scheme could only be carried out by employing a large number of clerks and two paid registrars to supervise them. All that the medical staff could do was provide an accurate diagnosis.  

MEDICAL EDUCATION

In 1847 to be able to practice orthodox medicine a man required one or more of the following qualifications: LSA, MRCS, LRCP or MD. Carpenter qualified in 1851 with LSA and MRCS.

In the mid-nineteenth century a student gained admission to Thomas’s either with a scholarship (as in Carpenter's case), an examination in Arts or free admission if he were a son of a member of the staff of the hospital. An Entry Book includes Carpenter’s details: Alfred Carpenter, Rothwell, Northants. 1st Session paid

---

22 Parsons, vol. iii, p.123.
23 In 1847 the Royal College of Physicians of London consisted of 161 Fellows, 269 Licentiates and 253 Extra Licentiates. The MRCP examination was first held in 1859. The first Conjoint examination for LRCP and MRCS was held in 1885.
24 Leyland, p.5.
25 An examination in Arts was suggested by Simon and adopted by the Committee of Lecturers. In 1848 five candidates presented themselves. Parsons, vol.iii, p.115.
26 In 1849 it had been decided that the son of a member of the hospital staff had no prescriptive right to a free education, although it was customary to give him one. Parsons, vol. iii, p.120.
The book also contained the promises the student had to take and the regulations they had to adhere to:

Gentlemen entering the Medical School at St Thomas’ will be admitted to the Lectures, Practice, and all the privileges of a student for this Session. The Tickets for the Session will be withdrawn in the event of misconduct.

I hereby promise to submit to all the Regulations of the Hospital; I acknowledge the authority of the Officers under whose control I am placed, and I undertake to abide absolutely, upon all occasions, by the decision of the Treasurer of the Hospital.

Carpenter paid £20 instead of the normal £40 for the Session, as he had won a scholarship, hence the entry ‘In part as allowed.’ This was the first year that scholarships were awarded at Thomas’s and the first notice about them appeared in *The Lancet* on 2 October 1847. It advertised: “Two scholarships for first year men of the value of £20 per year, and tenable for three years, which will be awarded annually.”

Carpenter studied the following subjects: botany; forensic medicine; hospital practice (medicine and surgery); practice of medicine; materia medica; physiology and general anatomy; descriptive anatomy; surgery; chemistry; midwifery; pathological anatomy and comparative anatomy. Students learnt in a variety of ways including attending lectures and demonstrations, reading from books and lecture notes, by dissection, experimentation in the laboratory, attending outpatients, and walking the wards.

---

27 It was customary for students to sign the entry book annually for each session, e.g. 1847-8, 1848-9 and 1849-50.
28 Entry Book, No 493, p.20.
29 Ibid.
Botany was a very old subject in the medical curriculum, and Newman has suggested that because Linnaeus and his system provided the intellectual tools for precisely naming and hence classifying objects of the natural world, “the teaching of botany had great formative potentialities for the medical student in the period 1840-1900.” He remarked, “the science of botany was included in the curriculum because of its relation to the vegetable drugs and classification of plants and its application to materia medica.” James Risdon Bennett taught Carpenter materia medica on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays at a quarter to four. Materia medica is a term derived from Medieval Latin and means ‘medical matter.’ It can also be defined as the branch of medical science concerned with the study of drugs used in the treatment of disease and the history, physical and chemical properties of drugs.

Henry Leeson and Thomas Taylor taught Carpenter chemistry on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays at twelve. The importance of chemistry has been outlined by Newman who has suggested, “the reason why chemistry took so early so prominent a place in medical education was because of its application to therapy. Medicines occupied a large part of the thoughts of physicians, who had little means of investigation, but plenty of theories on which to base an active and diligent treatment.” By 1850 Thomas’s had a chemistry laboratory, which was described in The Lancet during the distribution of scholarships and prizes:

Various improvements had been made to the medical school including the temporary transformation during the summer of the dissecting room into a

---

30 Mr G Luxford (given name not known) taught botany during the summer. Lancet, 1847, ii: 359.
32 Carolus Linnaeus (1707-78), Physician and Botanist.
33 Newman, p.97.
34 Lancet, 1847, ii: 359.
36 Lancet, 1847, ii: 359.
practical chemistry laboratory. The lab was for the exclusive use of the students and each student was supplied with a case, a set of reagents, a table, a gas burner and numerous instruments and the school owed these arrangements to Dr Henry Leeson.\textsuperscript{38}

Carpenter studied forensic medicine and received lectures from James Risdon Bennett. Crawford has said:

As well as being promoted as a demonstrably useful medical science, forensic medicine was presented by the Society of Apothecaries in the early nineteenth century as a gentlemanly accoutrement for medical practitioners, a desirable accomplishment like a classical education or the knowledge of medical history. Mastery of such subjects indicated high social status, for it signified a liberal education and leisure for intellectual pursuits.\textsuperscript{39}

Risdon Bennett wrote a testimonial on Carpenter:

I have great pleasure in bearing testimony to the excellent professional and moral character of Mr Alfred Carpenter. His abilities and acquirements are such, that he must prove an efficient and most valuable Medical Officer; whilst his gentlemanly demeanour and kindness of disposition, cannot fail to commend him to those who may require his professional services.\textsuperscript{40}

ANATOMY

Carpenter studied human anatomy under George Rainey, Richard Grainger and John Syer Bristowe. Nineteenth century students learned anatomy by reading, attending

\textsuperscript{37} Newman, pp.99-100.
\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Lancet}, 1850, i: 740.
lectures, by dissection, studying exhibits in the anatomy museum, including wax models, and microscopy. All new students were required by their teachers to have a set of books and a skeleton.\textsuperscript{41}

Rainey was from the ‘old school’ of pure anatomists who had no other profession, and for many years was recognised as one of the ablest anatomy teachers in London.\textsuperscript{42} He started as a student at Thomas’s in 1824 and qualified MRCS in 1827. From 1827-37 he became a successful private teacher in anatomy and when his health broke down he moved to the South of Europe for five years. On his return to London he was appointed as an assistant in the anatomy museum at Thomas’s during the 1843-44 session, receiving a salary of £100 p.a. He continued to work at Thomas’s until his death in 1884, despite receiving a government pension for his services to science. He was employed to make preparations for the museum, and more particularly those necessary for the illustration of the lectures. Later he became a senior demonstrator in anatomy and microscopical demonstrator. His job was later modified to include the preparation of minute healthy, morbid and comparative anatomical preparations. Rainey’s job description appeared in a letter he wrote to the Thomas’s Medical School Committee of Lecturers in 1850, and it gives an idea of what the students were being taught during Carpenter’s time. It read “demonstrating in the dissecting room daily in winter; demonstrating each week in the theatre; microscopic demonstrations once a week and preparing preparations for it; contribution of some preparations to the microscopic cabinet illustrative of such

\textsuperscript{40} Bennett became Dean in 1853. Parsons, vol. iii, p.245.

\textsuperscript{41} Popular books were \textit{Ward on the Bones} and \textit{Ellis’s Demonstrations of Anatomy}. McInnes, p.97.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Dictionary of National Biography}, L. Stephen and S. Lee (eds), London, Smith, Elder and Co, (xx vols), 1909, vol. xvi, pp.621-22. (Thereafter called \textit{DNB}) Rainey’s name is commemorated in ‘Rainey’s Capsules,’ a term often quoted in German pathological works, referring to minute parasites (known as psorosperms) which he detected in muscle.
subjects as I have been especially investigating." Rainey was celebrated for his skill in the use of minute injections, and published papers in The Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science.

In 1842 Richard Grainger was appointed lecturer in general anatomy and physiology at Thomas’s (a post he held until his retirement in 1860), earning £200 p.a. and a third of the student fees. His publications included Elements of General Anatomy Containing an Outline of the Organisation of the Human Body, published in 1829, which described the anatomy of the various tissues. He had a private medical school in Webb Street, Southwark, which closed down in 1839 due to the shortage of students attending the courses as a result of the tighter regulations imposed with the LSA and MRCS examinations.

The Apothecaries regulations required all students to have dissected the whole human body at least once and this meant a regular supply of corpses was needed. In 1849 an imaginary description of Rainey working in the dissecting room is given as follows: "A dissecting room, small as we would think today, with its quiet hanging room (scarcely more than a glorified balcony) at one end, where the little, bald-headed man sat, surrounded by his microscope and complicated injecting apparatus, and added each day a little more to his store of knowledge." In 1849 complaints had been made about the quantity and quality of the demonstrating in the dissecting room where the house surgeons acted as assistant demonstrators. The house surgeons often arrived late in the afternoon after finishing their work in outpatients and, owing to a lack of skilled supervision, the demonstrating was often hastily or improperly

---

43 Minute Book of Lecturers Committee, 1849-54, St Thomas’s Hospital Archive, H1/ST/MS/A2/1. Letter from Rainey read at meeting on 1 June 1850.
45 F.G. Parsons, ‘Reminiscences of St Thomas’s Hospital – Anatomy,’ St Thomas’s Hospital Gazette, 1921, 28, pp.57-61.
done. The arrangement was good for them, but not good for the students. It was decided that Rainey, the senior demonstrator in anatomy, should have an assistant.

In 1849 John Syer Bristowe was appointed a demonstrator in anatomy and the following year he became an assistant to William Adams, curator of the museum earning £50 p.a. In 1851, when Adams resigned, Bristowe became curator at £75 p.a. Bristowe was now demonstrator of anatomy, curator of the museum, lecturer on botany, and performed medical post-mortems. Later he switched disciplines and became a physician at Thomas’s, and his popular book *Theory and Practice of Medicine*, published in 1887, went through seven editions. Bristowe also became Medical Officer of Health for Camberwell and was one of a group who worked closely with John Simon.

Studying the anatomy of the human body with the naked eye had been practised for many centuries. However, a new science, the study of the cellular structure of the various organs and tissues of the body, had recently been developed and became known as histology. The establishment of histology in the curriculum in the London medical schools in the nineteenth century had its roots in continental Europe. Xavier Bichat has been credited with creating this science, although he had no concept of cells and did not use the microscope.

By 1850 the majority of medical schools saw the virtue of a separate course of general anatomy and physiology. The teachers in surgery, medicine and midwifery also appreciated the necessity for all students to have an understanding of histology.

---

46 Parsons, vol. iii, p.120.
47 Parsons, vol. iii, p.124.
48 Bristowe was the son of John Syer Bristowe whom Carpenter worked for as an assistant. Bristowe (junior) started as a student at Thomas’s on 1 October 1845, (Entry Book, No 341). He later became Dean of Thomas’s Medical School in 1862.
49 Parsons, vol. iii, p.123.
51 Bracegirdle, p.190.
HISTOLOGY

Histology was only made possible by the use of the microscope and it was not until 1860 that the General Medical Council recommended that microscopy should be included as part of the curriculum. The increasing importance of the microscope in medical sciences is highlighted in the following quote from Bynum: “if the stethoscope was becoming the symbol of careful clinical practice, it was on the microscope that the scientific authority of medicine rested.” Bynum points out that during the middle-third of the nineteenth century, the microscope transformed the foundations of biology, and through it, of medicine. The establishment of cell theory and its application to embryology, histology, pathology, and physiology were done neither overnight nor without a great deal of controversy and debate. Owning a microscope was one thing but the skills and knowledge required in its use were another, as Bynum points out:

Nor was the mere appearance of microscopes capable of magnifying without chromatic or spherical aberration enough. For one thing, cutting, preparing, and staining tissues generated their own technical and conceptual debates. For another, as Virchow's epigram makes clear, seeing microscopically was something that had to be learned, and there was much disagreement about what was seen, to say nothing of the significance of the images the microscope revealed.

Thomas's saw the potential of the application of the microscope in anatomy following a letter from Grainger to the Committee of Lecturers in 1843. The letter noted that the running of the anatomical department in the present day required minute preparations

---

52 General Medical Council Minutes, 1869, London, 7, p.86.
54 Bynum, pp.100-1.
illustrative of structure and function, and that the museum possessed a collection of preparations, that could only be examined with the aid of a microscope. In 1845 an achromatic microscope costing £52.10s, together with a microscope lens, drawing paper and preparations, was purchased from the College of Surgeons. Access to this single microscope was restricted, and, in January 1847, Rainey put in a request that he should be furnished with a key to the microscope and also the microscope cabinet. Rainey was at this time referred to as the microscopical demonstrator. In 1849 the use of the microscope was still carefully monitored: "The microscopical preparations and microscope...under the supervision of Grainger and Simon (who was an enthusiastic microscopist); and in the immediate charge of Mr Rainey...the microscope room be used only by those using the microscope or writing the catalogue and when so engaged." Lawrence highlights Simon's anatomical approach arguing:

Simon's comparative anatomical skills reveal an approach with Hunterian and transcendentalist lineages. Simon was a highly skilled anatomist and a great enthusiast for microscopical study and a proponent of the cell theory, which had been elaborated in Germany in the 1840s. The Hunterian strain in Simon's approach is seen in his conviction that comparative anatomy was a major route to the discovery of function. More generally, it should be noted, Simon regarded arriving at ideas about function as the subject of "philosophical generalisation," and in this regard he presented himself as an enquirer interested in the "philosophy of secretion." 

---

55 Bracegirdle, p.159.
56 St Thomas's Hospital Archive, H1/ST/M6/A2/1, Medical School Committee Report, 6 March 1845, read at meeting of 3 March 1845.
57 Minute Book of Lecturers' Committee, 1836-48, vol. i, 16 January 1847, St Thomas's Archive.
58 Minute Book of Lecturers' Committee, 1849-54, vol. ii, 12 December 1849, St Thomas's Archive.
59 C. Lawrence, 'Sir John Simon as Surgeon and Man of Science.' One of three lectures commemorating the 150th anniversary of the appointment of Sir John Simon as Medical Officer of Health of the City of London, Gresham College, 9 November 1998, pp.1-10.
Teaching the students anatomy, pathology and clinical subjects (surgery, medicine and midwifery) required a large number of anatomical specimens, which were housed in Thomas’s anatomy museum. The need for an anatomy museum had been discussed by the Grand Committee and Bracegirdle notes that, “The Grand Committee had been reminded that the museum was not “a mere receptacle of unmeaning curiosities but is pre-eminently calculated to subserve the interests of the patients themselves, and should therefore be supported by hospital funds.”

The specimens were grouped under three headings: (1) Normal human anatomy, (2) Comparative anatomy and (3) Pathological anatomy, and would have been used for demonstration purposes.

PHYSIOLOGY

Carpenter studied physiology with general anatomy daily under Grainger at 10.30 am except Saturdays. Mazumdar has shown that physiology teaching in London during the early nineteenth century fell into two distinct schools of thought. The physiology taught by the hospital surgeons was part of the courses on clinical surgery, whereas the surgeon-anatomists who taught in the private schools used physiology as a means of explaining and justifying the anatomy they were demonstrating. Mazumdar argues that in both cases the physiology taught was an outgrowth of its institutional setting and the work experience of the teachers. In the hospital it explained the condition of the patient; in the school, the anatomy of the cadaver. Mazumdar also maintains that in the private schools ‘anatomical physiology’ flourished where the students were in contact with French ideas such as those of Bichat.

---

60 Bracegirdle, p.159.
Earlier, in 1837, Grainger had published a paper on ‘Observations on the Structure and Functions of the Spinal Cord’ that supported Marshall Hall’s views on reflex action. Grainger based his views on his own anatomical studies on the course of nerve fibres in the nervous system and, like Hall, lacked faith in the capacity of the microscope to reveal structural connections between the fibres of the nerves and the grey matter of the cord, but believed that his macroscopic examination of preserved tissue did reveal such a connection. In 1845 he became a Fellow of the Royal Society and was elected a member of the Council of the Royal College of Surgeons. Later, in 1848, he delivered the Hunterian Oration on ‘The Cultivation of Organic Science.’

The period from 1826 to 1836 saw the introduction of pathological anatomy into the curriculum in London medical schools at a time of great change in the institutions offering medical education. The role of the teachers, in both the hospital schools and the anatomy schools, was instrumental in that process. Maulitz has suggested that:

The introduction of pathological anatomy into medical education and medical practice must be viewed against the backdrop of professional changes that were being sought by the young medical men of the early nineteenth century. The new structures, institutions and societies plus the advent of new medical journals, promoted in different ways, the understanding and appreciation of

---

63 *Marshall Hall (1790-1857)* was an eminent physiologist who graduated with MD from Edinburgh University in 1812. He was never appointed as a physician in any London Hospital although he lectured on nervous diseases at Thomas’s from 1842-6 and worked with Grainger. Hall gave a paper on ‘The Reflex Function of the Medula Spinalis’ to the Royal Society in 1833 and thereafter laid the foundation of the theory of reflex action. He rationalised the treatment of epilepsy, and introduced the ready method in asphyxia. *Concise DNB*, 1948, p.556.
65 *Concise DNB*, 1948, p.522.
the importance of pathological anatomy, and hence of general anatomy, upon which the new discipline was founded. 67

In 1847 John Simon was appointed lecturer of pathology in relation to surgery at Thomas’s (a post he held until 1870) and was paid £200 pa. Simon’s lectureship was also connected with his clinical duties in the hospital and was the first of its kind ever established in a hospital school in Britain. He was allocated a ward with forty beds, which, a Steward’s diary says, was called Naples. 68 By 1850 it is said that Simon’s lectures provided a thorough grounding in the process and nature of disease, and concentrated on the role of blood in disease, on tumours, scrofula, nervous disorders and therapeutics. His lectures paid more attention to processes than to causes in pathology but he never disguised from his students the huge gaps he saw in exact knowledge. He encouraged further research, and stressed that in treatment they should “be content with doing nothing when ignorant how to do good.” 69 In June 1853, when Joseph Henry Green retired, Simon was appointed to a full surgeonship. 70

SURGERY

Students studied surgery from books, lectures, watching and assisting at operations, attending outpatients and by ‘walking the wards.’ Susan Lawrence describes the benefits of walking the wards: “Walking the wards enabled the students to learn by watching a skilled practitioner practice. Perhaps the physician, surgeon or apothecary

---

68 Parsons, vol. ii, p.60. In 1848 Simon was appointed the first Medical Officer of Health for the City of London.
69 J. Simon, General Pathology, Philadelphia, Blanchard and Lea, 1852, p.19. His lectures were also reported in The Lancet.
70 Parsons, vol. iii, p.128, Parsons says Simon held no office in the hospital, but was Professor of pathology in the medical school and had forty beds under his control. When Green retired Solly, Le Gros Clark and Simon were all appointed full Surgeons at £100 p.a. although Clark and Simon were still to attend outpatients.
offered verbal accounts of what he observed, and why and how he decided to act; perhaps not. Perhaps the student asked questions or volunteered comments; perhaps not.”  

Flint South describes a surgical ward round:

The visit commenced. The surgeon, accompanied by his dressers, each carrying their plaister-boxes, which they considered a mark of distinction as showing their official position, visited both the male and female wards. The pupils accompanied them in shoals, if the surgeon was a favourite, and pushed and jostled, and ran and crowded round the beds, quite regardless of the patients feelings or condition. The whole business was generally concluded in an hour and a half. Certainly not much was to be learned at these ‘goings round’; they were mostly occupied with chattering and playing, and making extra-hospital arrangements.

South continued, “But the working pupils might be seen at other times in the wards, care-taking or watching, and assisting the dressers in carrying out the orders given by the surgeons.”

Carpenter was a dresser to Samuel Solly who writes:

Having known Mr Alfred Carpenter for more than five years, I can speak advisedly of his professional attainments and moral character. The honours, which he has received in every department of his studies, speak more for him than the testimony of any single individual; but as Mr Carpenter was my Dresser, I should be denying myself a great pleasure if I did not express, on this occasion, the very high opinion I entertain of his moral and mental character. I have never known a better Dresser, and scarcely ever his equal.

---

73 Ibid, p.27.
74 Carpenter’s Testimonials, p.2.
The term ‘dresser’ has a specific meaning compared to a walking pupil, house pupil, house surgeon or an apprentice. Susan Lawrence defines the duties of a dresser as “the bandaging of wounds, performing bleeding, minor operations and assisting at capital operations.” Dressers ‘took the box’ known as the plaister box, which contained dressings. They were usually young men who, having served three or four years as apprentices in the country, had come up to London to walk the hospitals and study for two years, becoming dressers at the beginning of their second year. They were ordinarily competent to dress common wounds and treat fractures, although they lacked experience. A man of less than six months’ training might theoretically have found himself acting as a dresser of the week with all the responsibility of that office, a very considerable burden.

Dressers had to provide, and carry on their rounds, a pocket case [we are not told what they contained] as well as a case of lancets, catheters, and tooth instruments. They also had to take notes of the cases under their care, and occasionally submitted case reports [on behalf of the surgeons], of unusual or interesting cases to journals such as *The Lancet*. In 1846 it was decided that dresserships should be given, without payment, to the most deserving students, and that £100 p.a. be paid to the surgeon, and £50 to each assistant surgeon, for the loss of the dresser’s fees. It was also settled that the dresser in residence should receive commons during his week of office, instead of having to find his own board as hitherto he had done. In 1847 a new set of rules was drawn up following misconduct amongst the students and, in particular, the dressers. Failure to observe the new rules meant the loss of the dressership. Among the new rules, there was one, which allowed

---

75 The term dresser was still used when I was a medical student at the Middlesex Hospital in 1974.
76 *Charitable Knowledge*, p.109.
77 Parsons, vol.iii, p.111.
78 Ibid and E.M Mclnnes, p.98.
no dresser or pupil to be in the wards after 2 p.m. without an order from the physician or surgeon.

In 1847 house surgeons were appointed at Thomas’s for the first time and candidates were to hold the dual qualifications of MRCS and LSA, and former Thomas’s students were preferred. Two house surgeons were to replace the resident assistant surgeon, who now ceased to be resident. In 1851 the Treasurer complained of the inadequate treatment of the surgical outpatients; to this the staff retorted that the surgery and outpatient rooms were neither large enough nor sufficiently equipped for the work, which had to be performed. At this time the assistant surgeons, Solly and Dixon, saw the cases in the outpatients, decided on what treatment was needed and then left the house surgeons to carry out the work. The end result was that the surgery was reorganised and the house surgeons were freed from their work in the dissecting room. From his testimonials it is known that Carpenter received surgical training from John Simon, Gilbert Macmurdo, Joseph Henry Green, Samuel Solly and Frederick Le Gros Clark.

Simon’s testimonial says that Carpenter worked as a physician’s clinical clerk, which “offered great opportunities for practical study” although it is not clear what his duties were. Susan Lawrence writes that the physicians’ walking pupil attended the rounds with the physicians, had access to the physicians’ books and that the house pupil wrote cases into the books. Patients were admitted to the wards from medical outpatients on two days per week. Three assistant physicians were allowed to admit up to ten patients each into the hospital at each attendance. As well as learning from

---

79 Parsons, vol. iii, p.112.
81 Macmurdo was Dean in 1850 and 1860, Solly in 1854 and Le Gros Clark in 1856.
82 Carpenter’s Testimonials, p.3.
83 Charitable Knowledge, p.109.
84 Parsons, vol.iii, p.109.
the physicians, the students also attended a weekly clinical lecture given by one
member of staff. Carpenter received medical training from Thomas Barker, 85 who
wrote, “No pupil of St Thomas’s Hospital, since the period when I first became
connected with that Institution, has been more distinguished than yourself by talent,
zeal, industry, and good conduct.” 86 William Munk wrote, “It gives me great pleasure
to state that I have known Mr Alfred Carpenter for many years, and have had frequent
opportunities of observing his untiring industry in the acquisition of Professional
Knowledge.” 87

Carpenter studied midwifery under Charles Waller, who was made lecturer for
diseases of women in 1847. 88 Parsons said that Waller “gradually obtained beds, until
he had all the standing of a physician to the hospital without the Governor’s Court
having any voice in his election.” 89 We do not know if there was a separate ward for
diseases for women although it is very likely. Later, in August 1848, when the Grand
Committee drew up the prospectus of the medical school, the post of resident
accoucheur was created and Charles O’ Callaghan was appointed. 90 Parsons says:

It seems that practical instruction was to be given at some lying-in institution
near the hospital, but a minute of the Committee of Lecturers tells us that the
new officer was resident because he had to supervise the students in the
district. It is likely that this is the period when students first attended
confinements of women in their own homes. 91

85 Parsons, vol. iii, p.115. Thomas A Barker, MD FRCP, Senior Physician, was made Dean following
the sudden death of Henry Burton during the cholera epidemic of 1849.
86 Carpenter’s Testimonials, p.1.
87 Ibid, p.3. Munk was Physician at the Royal Infirmary for Diseases of the Chest, City Road, London.
88 Charles Waller, MRCS Eng. 1820, MRCP 1843, MD Erlangen 1831, Obstetric Physician to and
Lecturer on Midwifery to St Thomas’s. Listed in the 1855 Medical Directory.
89 Parsons, vol iii, p.112.
90 Parsons, vol. iii, p.114.
It is notable that in 1849, while Carpenter was at Thomas’s, there was a cholera epidemic. This had been anticipated and Clinical ward had been prepared for cholera cases. As the summer wore on the Treasurer wrote to Sir George Grey, the Home Secretary, pointing out the shortage of beds and the delays in admitting the cholera cases. As a result thirty extra cholera beds were provided. On 10 August the Dean of the medical school, Henry Burton, died from cholera. He had only been appointed some three weeks earlier. Even when the patients were dead, it was not always easy to get their relatives or parishes to bury them. Their bodies lay in the dead house in the back yard, close to the living, for day after day in the blazing, cholera summer of 1849. Meanwhile, the Steward’s clerk wrote to one person after another about them, usually unsuccessfully, until in September the nuisance became so unbearable that the Treasurer removed the dead house and the post-mortem room to the north-east corner of the hospital grounds, far away from any of the wards. Grainger, who taught Carpenter physiology, was appointed an inspector under Chadwick’s Board of Health to inquire into the origin and spread of cholera, and furnished a report in 1850.

PRIZE GIVING
The Prize Giving at Thomas’s on the 7 June 1850 was described in The Lancet as a ‘grand occasion’ and Carpenter received six prizes, in the following subjects: physiology, descriptive anatomy, botany, medicine, surgery, treasurers prize and gold medal for general proficiency and good conduct. It was reported:

---

92 Ibid, p.115. This is the only mention of Clinical Ward and its location remains unknown.
93 Henry Burton, MD Camb, FRCP, was born in 1799 and joined the hospital as assistant physician in 1828. He became Censor at the Royal College of Physicians in 1838 and councillor in 1843. He is remembered for the blue line found on the gums in lead poisoning, which was known as ‘Burton’s blue line.’ Parsons, vol. iii, pp.115-6.
94 Ibid, p.117.
The distribution took place with great solemnity on the 7th inst., in the great hall of the hospital. The visitors were very numerous and a great many ladies attended on this occasion. The Lord Mayor was in the chair, and Sir Robert H. Inglis, Bart; MP presented the prizes to the successful candidates. The proceedings were opened by the Dean, Dr Barker, who read the report on the state of the school during the past session: from this document it appears that the pupils were on the increase, in spite of the cholera, which was hardly abating at the beginning of the session. The Physicians and Surgeons of the hospital, and the lecturers, then severally presented the prizemen to the Lord Mayor and Sir Robert Inglis, the latter of whom delivered an impressive address to the company, and a short, kind, and appropriate allocution to each successful pupil, on handing him the prize. Dr Barker announced in his report, that Mr Bristowe, who had carried off a great number of prizes last year, and who had filled the house-surgeoncy in a distinguished manner, had been appointed assistant demonstrator in anatomy, and assistant curator of the museum. Such appointments come very near the spirit of the “Concours,” and are highly creditable to the school and to Mr Bristowe.96

The Committee of Lecturers minute book for 6 April 1850 contains the following entry: “Mr J L Jardine and Mr Alfred Carpenter were selected as the two students who were recommended to the Treasurer for the privilege of attending Dr John Conolly’s lectures at the Hanwell Asylum but in the event of Mr Carpenter not

95 *DNB*, vol. viii, pp.370-1.
96 *Lancet*, 1850, ii: An idea of what the Prize-giving would have looked like can be seen in an engraved drawing by WH Kearney, which depicts the Prize-giving on 26 June 1845, when the Prince Consort attended. The drawing hangs in the medical school and an illustration of the prize-giving appears in Parsons, vol. iii, facing p.106.
being able to attend, the Dean was to offer the appointment to Mr G F A Drew."  
Parsons tells us that from 1850 onwards Hanwell had followed the example of the Bethlem in allowing two students to attend there for instruction in mental diseases. 
Formal training on mental disease was not introduced until the late nineteenth century (although London medical schools did run courses on phrenology) and Asylum doctors gained their knowledge from the patients they treated. 

In 1851 Carpenter qualified with MRCS and LSA. He also won a prize in ophthalmic surgery. Although the MRCS students had to attend lectures on many subjects, the examination was confined to anatomy, physiology, surgery and surgical pathology. Hunting gives an idea of what it was like to be a student sitting for the LSA examination:

The Examiners regularly adjusted the course of study, meeting weekly for that purpose and to conduct the examinations in the afternoon. To begin with the nervous candidate faced the whole Court who were entitled to question him in turn, although the certificate named only the principal Examiner. As the numbers to be examined increased the Court divided into four tables of three examiners, each table examining one candidate under the direction of the chief Examiner. If the three Examiners found the candidate unsatisfactory he was referred to a majority of the Court and those who failed that test could re-take after six months.

---

98 Committee of Lecturers Minute Book, (1849-54), 6 May 1850.
99 Parsons, vol.iii, p.121.
102 Carpenter's Testimonials, p.2. G. Macmurdie, Royal Ophthalmic Hospital and Thomas's.
Carpenter held the posts of resident accoucheur and house surgeon at Thomas’s. He also was assistant medical officer during the absence of Mr Whitfield. In 1851 Carpenter was resident accoucheur to Waller, who wrote:

For six months he held the very responsible office of Resident Accoucheur, wherein he had the superintendence of a large branch of the St Thomas’ Lying-in Institution. The kindness manifested towards the patients and the skill and attention evinced in their treatment, entitle him to my warmest commendation. I conscientiously avow my belief that few leave our hospital, so entirely fitted to perform the arduous duties devolving upon the Accoucheur, as he has done; and I cannot express a better wish on his behalf than that his success may be equal to his merits.

Whilst working as a house surgeon in 1852, Carpenter was mentioned in the *Lancet* when he spoke at a public meeting of the students at Thomas’s. The report read:

A public meeting of the students was held on Friday May 21 1852 at 1 o’clock in the large theatre for the purpose of presenting Mr Rainey, the able and talented senior Demonstrator of Anatomy, with a testimonial indicative of their regard for his great private worth, and the zeal at all times displayed by him in imparting instruction to his students.

Mr Simon kindly took the chair, and Mr Carpenter, the senior house surgeon, who has throughout his whole career been one of the most distinguished students, in a most eloquent and effective speech, presented Mr Rainey, on behalf of the subscribers, with one of Ross’s finest microscopes, complete. Mr

---

105 Leyland, p.5.
107 Carpenter’s Testimonials, p.3. Charles Waller, MD, Obstetric Physician at Thomas’s.
Carpenter in the course of his speech, referred to Mr Rainey’s contributions to science, and his peculiar fitness as a teacher, lamenting at the same time that such men were not more generally valued.

Rainey replied, thanking them for the honour they had done him by the presentation of such a valuable testimonial. He also thanked Carpenter for the kind words saying he hoped that the testimonial would be a great incentive to him for arduous study, and trusted that he should see all his pupils, wherever they may be, enjoying prosperity and happiness. A vote of thanks to Mr Lankester, a senior prizeman of the third year, for originating the idea of the testimonial, and one to Mr Simon, for his kindness in taking the chair, was carried by acclamation. The Lancet commented, “thus concluded one of the most interesting meetings that has for some time taken place.”

Carpenter also worked for Le Gros Clark, who wrote, “As I was brought more directly into contact with Mr Carpenter when he was acting as House Surgeon in this Hospital, I may add that I entertain a high opinion of his attainments as a practical Surgeon.” However, Simon’s observations leave us in no doubt as to Carpenter’s qualities:

To a very complete professional education - complete both in principles and in practice - Mr Carpenter adds a personal character worthy of unqualified esteem and confidence; and I believe that in private practice, whether with rich or poor, he will be highly esteemed for conscientious conduct, integrity, discretion and kindness.

Shortly afterwards, Carpenter, complete with his Testimonials, left Thomas’s to work in Croydon.

108 Lancet, 1852, i: 575.
109 Carpenter’s Testimonials, p.2, 1 Nov 1852.
110 Ibid, p.2.
111 Ibid, p.3. Written from Lancaster Place, 28 October 1852.
CHAPTER 2
LIFE AS A GP AND THE CROYDON CASE

The bulk of this chapter will examine the typhoid epidemic in Croydon from 1852-53, which became known as the ‘Croydon Case.’ But first Carpenter’s activities during his early years in Croydon after he arrived from Thomas’s in 1852 are described.

In 1852 Croydon was a parish with a population of 21,387; in that year there were 206 marriages, 641 births and 483 deaths giving a death rate per thousand of 22.6. Croydon’s public buildings included the parish church of St John the Baptist, where Carpenter was an active member up until his death in 1892. Whitgift’s Hospital was described as a ‘memorable and charitable’ structure; and was founded in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I in 1596 by John Whitgift, the then Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1853 the inhabitants were William Coppin, warden; George Coles, schoolmaster; Henry Risbridger, claviger; plus eighteen brothers and eighteen sisters. The Elys David Almshouses supported seven poor people (men and women), including the tutor master, William Washford. The Little Almshouses afforded habitations for twenty-four poor persons. The Town Hall, described as ‘a handsome stone building,’ was erected in 1809 and contained commodious courts for holding the summer assizes for the county of Surrey. It also held the corn market; the magistrates sitting in petty sessions met every Saturday and local or County Courts were held regularly. It also

2 The church was regarded as one of finest examples of ecclesiastical architecture in the country.
3 One who carries a key or a club.
5 Ibid, p. xiv.
1885 Map of Croydon
furnished offices for the Local Board of Health and rooms for the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution, and functioned as a meeting place for churchwardens holding public meetings for charitable or religious reasons. The ratepayers of the parish elected the members of the Local Board of Health (four of whom went out of office annually). Its members in 1851 included Cuthbert William Johnson Esq., Chairman; Edward Westall, Surgeon; Thomas S. Wykes Esq., Clerk; Thomas Cox Esq., Engineer and Surveyor; James Langley, Assistant Surveyor and Inspector of Nuisances; Thomas Goodwin, Collector of Rates; and ten other members.6 The Croydon Union consisted of a Board of Guardians,7 Board officials and ex officio Guardians who were magistrates that resided within the limits of the Union.

In 1727 Croydon opened a Workhouse on Duppas Hill. Later, in 1832, it was agreed to erect a detached building in the grounds of the Workhouse “for the reception of cholera patients and other poor persons attacked with dangerous or contagious diseases.” 8 In 1832 cholera was not considered to be a serious disease judging by the joint statement of the Medical Gentlemen from the Board of Health in the Parish, whose opinion was that, “the disease called cholera is not of that contagious or infectious character as to endanger the inmates of the workhouse.” 9 The eleven signatories included W.D. Thomas,10 Edward Westall and George Bottomley.

In 1851, in addition to the Union doctors there were eighteen surgeons working in Croydon but no apothecaries or physicians.11 The majority of surgeons were practising in the High Street, Croydon, including Westall. The population at this
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6 Gray 1853, xxii.
7 The Guardians were made up of gentlemen, farmers, watchmakers, manufacturers and smiths.
8 Meeting of the Select Vestry held at the Town Hall in Croydon on the 17 July 1832.
9 Ibid. The Pest House, which stood in Lambert’s Place, near Croydon Common, was sold in 1829 for £100, and this money together with £200 from the Select Vestry funds was used to build the Infirmary at the northeast corner of the Workhouse.
time was 20,548, which gave a ratio of 1141 people per surgeon. This figure is similar to Digby’s for the whole of England. She gives a ratio of 1028 per doctor in 1851 from the Census in England and Wales.  

We do not know the reasons why Carpenter picked Croydon to work or why he joined Westall, who must have been impressed with Carpenter’s fourteen testimonials. In 1852 they started in partnership, as Westall and Carpenter, from rooms at 53 High Street, Croydon. Later, in 1861, Henry Whitling joined the Practice. When Westall retired in 1869, Henry Lanchester became a Partner.

EDWARD WESTALL

Westall made a big impression on Carpenter who even named one of his sons, Edward Westall, after him. Westall assisted in the formation of the Croydon Local Board of Health and sat on the Board from 1849 until he resigned in 1859. He was regarded as the Board’s Honorary Medical Officer since there was no Medical Officer of Health in Croydon at this time. He prepared Croydon’s quarterly returns for mortality from 1848 until 1872. In 1865 he published a paper ‘On the Advantages to be derived from the Adoption of the Local Government Act as Exemplified in Croydon’. He was Surgeon to the Cadets of the East India Company, at Addiscombe College, until it closed in 1861. Westall also assisted in the formation of the Literary
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10 Given name not known.
11 Wards Croydon Directory, 1851. (Thereafter called Ward)
13 Richard Baggally, Thomas’s Treasurer; John Syer Bristowe Esq. Surgeon; Dr Robertson, Physician, Northampton Infirmary; Dr James Risdon Bennett, Physician, Thomas’s; Joseph Henry Green, Senior Surgeon, Thomas’s; G. Macmurdo, Surgeon, Thomas’s and Royal Ophthalmic Hospital, Moorfields; Samuel Solly, Surgeon, Thomas’s; F. Le Gros Clark, Surgeon, Thomas’s; R.D. Grainger, Medical Inspector to the General Board of Health; John Simon, Officer of Health, City of London, Charles Waller, Obstetric Physician, Thomas’s; William Munk, Physician, Royal Infirmary, Diseases of the Chest; R.G. Whitfield, Resident Medical Officer, Thomas’s.
14 Gray 1853, p.144.
15 Baptism records of Croydon Parish Church, 1855.
16 Croydon Advertiser, 15 June 1878.
and Scientific Institution in Croydon. Westall had a large practice, which included several local celebrities. One of his patients was Hablot Browne, known as "Phiz", who illustrated novels by Dickens, Lever and Ainsworth.

Westall was described as a tall, good-looking man, with a healthy pink complexion, white hair, and a cheerful expression. He always dressed in black, with a white choker wound two or three times round his neck, and was invariably spick and span even if he had been up all night.  

**DR ALFRED CARPENTER**

On 22 June 1853 Carpenter married Margaret Jane Jones, the eldest daughter of Evan Jones Esq., Marshall of the Admiralty. We do not know how the couple met although we know that Margaret Jones came from Camberwell. It is possible that they may have met at a social occasion, or through the church when Carpenter was working for Syer Bristowe or during his time at Thomas’s. The Carpenters first lived in Dingwall Road (which was close to East Croydon station) up until 1859. They had four children (three sons and a daughter). Arthur Bristowe went to New College, Oxford, and Thomas’s and was appointed House Physician to St Thomas’s in March 1882. He later worked in Croydon as a GP and became medical attendant to Archbishop Benson following Carpenter’s death. Edward went to Caius College, Cambridge, and became vicar at Bobbing, near Sittingbourne. Evan George became a

---

18 *Times Supplement*, 23 June 1853.
19 *Wards Directory*, 1855, p.90.
20 *Croydon Chronicle*, 4 March 1882, p.5.
1854
Alfred and Margaret Carpenter, age 29
partner in a firm of auctioneers, known as Blake, Haddock and Carpenter, in 1882. Evan also played rugby for the Croydon 2nd team. Margaret Aimee became known for her work in embroidery and was mentioned in the Notae Memorabiles, of Croydon Parish Church, for making a new altar cloth in 1884. Aimee was quoted in an address given by Sir Spencer Wells at the Croydon School of Art annual prize giving in 1891:

The clever benevolent lady who distributed the prizes here two years ago (Mrs Ernest Hart) referred to the loving labour which Miss Aimee Carpenter, the loving daughter of your President, had devoted to the development of the art embroidery industry, from which peasantry in the North of Ireland have already gained so many and such great advantages.

In 1891 Aimee was awarded a diploma of honourable mention by the Donegal Industrial Fund, for work exhibited at the Paris exhibition in 1889 in connection with the Fund.

Little is known about Carpenter’s work in general practice or his patients. It is known that he gained additional qualifications; an MB in 1855 and an MD in 1859, from the University of London. The title of his MD thesis is not known, although it is likely to have been in public health. This was a subject in which he became actively involved throughout the rest of his life. Carpenter also started to write letters to the BMJ and gave lectures. For example, he wrote to the BMJ three times in 1854. The first was in the ‘Original Communication’ section. Carpenter’s article was entitled ‘Impure Water as a Cause of Disease.’ In his opening paragraph Carpenter wrote

---

21 Croydon Chronicle, 11 March 1882, p.5.
22 Notae Memorabiles of the Parish Church of St John the Baptist, July 1884.
24 Croydon Chronicle, 4 April 1891.
"Some observations made by Dr Snow, upon the influence of water in the production of disease, bring to recollection facts observed by myself, and bear out what I have for some time maintained, that water is most frequently the vehicle by which the poison of continued fever and cholera gain entrance into the human body."

Carpenter was referring to Snow's observations during a cholera epidemic. In 1854 there were fifty people dying each day from cholera in Broad Street, Soho, London, which was supplied with water from the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company. Snow suspected that cause of the cholera was due to infected water and by persuading the authorities to lock the handle of the pump in Broad Street the deaths came to a sudden halt. However it was not until 1883 that Koch isolated the cholera bacillus.

Carpenter concluded his communication and wrote "I have presumed to publish the foregoing observations, in hopes that they may stir up others to trace out the origin of disease - be it fever or cholera: for I cannot lose sight of the fact, that it is far more honourable to prevent disease than to cure it."

His letter on the 'Vaccination Question against the [Croydon] Board of Guardians' was headed 'The Medical Profession of Croydon, The Poor Law Board, and the General Board of Health.' It concerned the refusal of the Board of Guardians to pay the Croydon doctors 2s 6d for vaccinations under the terms of the Vaccination Act. Instead, the Board of Guardians employed a stranger, who
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25 John Snow (1813-1858), anaesthetist; MD London, 1844; discovered that cholera was communicated by contaminated water, and introduced scientific use of ether (first adopted in America) into English surgery practice, 1846-7; published 'Chloroform and other Anaesthetics,' 1858. Concise DNB, p.1220. Snow wrote a text on Cholera: On the Mode of the Communication of Cholera (1855).

26 Houses supplied by the Lambeth Water Company were unaffected and this was because they drew their water from the safe reaches above Teddington Lock. A.S. Wohl, Endangered Lives, Public Health in Victorian Britain, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1983, p.125. (Thereafter called Wohl)


subsequently resigned after only six weeks. George Bottomley, Medical Superintendent of the Croydon Union, then allowed his assistant to act as public vaccinator charging 1s 6d per case. The second point of disagreement concerned payment for diarrhoea and cholera cases. In 1854 the fear of an epidemic prompted the Board of Guardians to appoint a ‘cholera staff’ and offered 3s 6d for diarrhoea cases and 7s 6d for cholera cases. This was considerably less than in 1849 when each case of diarrhoea or cholera attracted a fee of 10s 6d. It is not surprising therefore that all the medical men of Croydon, except Bottomley, rejected these terms.

Carpenter’s third communication was a letter entitled ‘Mr Bottomley and the Medical Men of Croydon.’ In his letter Carpenter made the following reference to Bottomley “In conclusion, I would observe, that a young man, with plenty of work upon his hands, is not likely to be jealous of any one old enough to be his grandfather, and who fills up his assistants’ time with such ill-paid offices as public vaccinator and union medical officer.”

In 1856, Carpenter wrote on ‘Remarks Upon that Portion of Dr Routh’s paper, “On Faecal Fermentation as a Source of Disease,” which refers to Croydon.” In Carpenter’s opening paragraph he wrote “Dr Routh, in his paper read before the Medical Society of London, and published in the present volume of the Association Medical Journal, has, at p.763, fallen into considerable errors, where he speaks of the typhoid fever which prevailed at Croydon in the winter of 1852-53.” Carpenter then went on to quote the sections of Routh’s paper which he considered incorrect:

---

29 BMJ, 1854, ii: 1157.
31 BMJ, 1856, ii: 868-70.
The Croydon typhoid fever, which proved so fatal, was due to water impregnated with drains of a very foetid character... Croydon, like most other country places, abounds with cesspools... Towards the end of 1852, the water supply, which was obtained by steam power from the chalk, was interfered with in the formation of the new drainage works established by the Board of Health... The result was a virulent epidemic of typhoid fever.

Carpenter then went on to say “Now, fortunately for Croydon, and fortunately for Dr Routh’s conclusions, they are all erroneous; and were such assertions a sample of the whole paper, that which is really valuable would be worse than worthless.”

In his reply Routh felt that Carpenter’s response was overcritical and this prompted Carpenter to write a further letter to the *BMJ*. In his letter Carpenter wrote, “Dr Routh has quite mistaken the object of my paper. It was to set forth the advantages of sanitary reform as evidenced in the satisfactory results which have followed the operations of the Board of Health in Croydon; and not intended in the least as an attack upon the learned doctor.”"32 As will be seen later Carpenter fiercely defended his views and principles and was often on a collision course with many learned members of the medical profession.

Carpenter’s first public lecture was given in the Lecture Hall, Croydon, on 27 March 1855. The subject was ‘The Evil Effects of Shop Labour Upon the Human Body, Under the Late Closing System.’ At the suggestion of the Chairman, Rev. J.G. Hodgson,33 he had the lecture printed into a pamphlet of forty pages, a tradition that he continued with future lectures. Carpenter promoted early closing in order to allow the shop assistants sufficient evening relaxation.34
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32 *BMJ*, 1856, ii: 1004.
33 Given name not known.
Carpenter's second lecture was on 'The History of the Sanitary Progress in Croydon;' it was delivered on Wednesday 6 April 1859 to the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution, and printed as a thirty-one-page pamphlet. Carpenter charted the sanitary progress in Croydon from the years before the 1848 Public Health Act up until 1859.35

EAST INDIA COMPANY

In 1843 Westall was appointed Surgeon to the East India Company's military seminary at Addiscombe, which was founded in 1809.36 When Carpenter started in partnership with Westall they took it in turns to visit the cadets up until 1861, when the Seminary closed.37 Prior to 1809 the building was a private residence called Addiscombe Place. Shortly after 1700 Addiscombe Place was rebuilt by William Draper. The walls and ceilings were decorated with paintings of mythical subjects, some of which were supposed to have been the work of Sir James Thornhill. 38 There was an impressive list of previous owners including John Evelyn's daughter and Lord Liverpool. 39

The College consisted of a mansion house with 58 acres of land, and years later 30 more acres were acquired including a meadow and a coldstream. Additional buildings including a hospital, brewery and bakery were later provided. The parents or

38 C.G. Paget, Croydon Homes of the Past, Croydon, HR Grub, 1937, Chapter vi, p.43. (Thereafter called Paget)
39 Paget, pp.42-3. It is recorded that George III, Pitt the Prime Minister and friends frequently visited Lord Liverpool at Addiscombe Place. On one occasion after visiting Lord Liverpool, Pitt and his friends left in the early hours of the morning and galloped through a turnpike without paying a toll and were shot at by the turnpikemen. This incident was commemorated in a six-line stanza.
guardians of the cadets were required to pay £50 per term [there were four terms],
defraying the expenses of their board, lodging and education.

According to Vibart, the cadets’ health was excellent and it was very rare for
any serious illness to occur at the College. He attributed the cadets’ good health to the
wholesome food, regular hours and to athletic sports, including football. The
doctors’ work was generally easy and Westall and Carpenter were only required to
visit the cadets if Mother Dodd, the hospital nurse, was unable to cope with sick
cadets. At that time some of the cadets had numerous devices for deceiving the
doctors, such as putting chalk on their tongues. At other times, just before going to
see the doctor, they would knock their elbows sharply against the wall so as to make
the pulse beat more rapidly. The cadets went to the hospital if they wanted an idle
day, or if they were backward in a subject and wanted specially to work it up, rather
than on account of illness. Curiously enough, Mother Dodd used to complain that she
could manage the cadets very well when they were really ill, but that they were quite
beyond her control when they had come into hospital without due cause. This
happened generally at the outbreak of what was called the ‘Hindustani’ fever; the
scare when Professor Wilson was coming down to examine them in that language.
When they were malingering in hospital they used to make poor old Mother Dodd’s
life a burden to her, climbing over the roof and playing other games scarcely in
accordance with what was expected from invalids. The General would then come
down in wrath and ‘blow up’ Mother Dodd for not keeping them in better order. In 1858, after the Indian rebellion, the affairs of India were taken over from the East
India Company by her Majesty’s Government, and in 1861, the Royal and Indian
Services were amalgamated. Woolwich and Sandhurst were considered sufficient for

---

40 Vibart, p.218.
41 Vibart, pp.148-50.
Cadets outside Addiscombe College
all requirements in connection with the training of officers, and on 30 August 1861, the College was sold to the British Land Company. On 8 March 1862, Carpenter wrote to the Treasurer of Thomas’s suggesting that the disused College be used as an extra urban hospital. However, the idea was never taken up and the site was developed with housing and five roads.  

THE CROYDON CASE

The ‘Croydon Case’ of 1852-53 was a typhoid epidemic, which affected one in ten of Croydon’s inhabitants. This was despite Croydon being one of the first towns to adopt the 1848 Public Health Act and completing the ‘combined works’ of a constant fresh water supply, tubular drainage and sewage recycling by December 1851. Those attending the opening ceremony of the ‘combined works’ included Edwin Chadwick and Thomas Southwood Smith, the two Commissioners from the General Board of Health. The ‘Case’ attracted widespread publicity and embarrassed Croydon’s Local Board of Health, the General Board of Health and the Government. Three separate investigations took place to find out the cause(s) of the epidemic, and these are discussed later. In the investigations William Ranger, an inspector to the General Board of Health, came in for particular criticism. He had been the engineer in charge of Croydon’s ‘combined works’ and had reduced the size of Croydon’s sewer pipes.
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42 Canning, Outram, Clyde, Elgin and Havelock.
East India Cadets
from six-inch to four-inch on the grounds that their design was too costly. The sanitary state of Croydon before the 1848 Public Health Act is now discussed.

In 1848 Croydon had been described as “the worst district in the county from a sanitary point of view, with no sewers at all.” Cesspools generally prevailed, and the house sullage was thrown into the streets. Foul ditches, open drains and stagnant ponds abounded, including Scarbrook and Lauds’ ponds, which received much of the town’s drainage. These ponds were especially offensive and injurious to health and their exhalations, it was said, gave rise to epidemics. In 1848 a Health of Towns report had examined the water supply, town drainage, burials and roads. It was noted that the water supply was abundant but “the springs are nearly all contaminated, the water tainted, privies erected close to the wells in which the ‘soil’ percolates and with the water rendered impure, the sufferer has no remedy.” Despite all the filth and risk of disease, the effort to bring some elementary measure of sanitary reform in nineteenth-century Britain was resisted both in the House of Commons and by the Local Authorities. This was an issue that touched private property in every city in the country, and the vast body of affected interests stood firm against the handful of reformers. However, when news came that a fresh wave of cholera was sweeping into Europe from the East, this provided Edwin Chadwick with a cruel and uncompromising ally. In 1848 the Public Health Act was finally passed and a Central Commission established, called the General Board of Health, which consisted of a

---

44 Report of the Sub-Committee of Towns (Health of Towns Association), 1848, p.6. (Thereafter called Health of Towns, 1848)
45 Statement of the Preliminary Inquiry by T Southwood Smith and John Sutherland on the Epidemic at Croydon; together with Reports by RD Grainger and Henry Austin, London, G. Eyre and W. Spottiswoode, 1853, p.36. (Thereafter called Statement).
46 Health of Towns 1848, p.6.
48 Cholera had first appeared in Britain in 1832-3.
49 Edwin Chadwick, (1800-1890). In 1847 Chadwick was appointed to the Royal Commission on London Sanitation and a Metropolitan Commissioner of Sewers.
Chairman and two Commissioners. The Chairman, Lord Ashley, was already Chairman of the Health of Towns Association and the two Commissioners were Southwood Smith and Chadwick. The Board had the power to require the formation of Local Boards of Health (which reported to the GBH) if petitioned by 10% of the local ratepayers or if the locality’s death rate exceeded 23 per 1,000 (the national average was 21 per thousand). Lawrence has noted that:

The significance of this Act scarcely lies in its content. It was for the most part permissive, empowering local authorities if they wished, to initiate local reforms by removing nuisances, laying down sewers and so forth. But as a government intervention into the conditions perceived to be connected with the production of disease, it was monumental.

Fee and Porter point out that, “the power of the Act, however, was seriously undermined by being adoptive rather than compulsory, and it thus resulted in uneven standards of public health regulation throughout the kingdom.” Croydon’s response to the Act is now discussed.

Edward Westall and Cuthbert William Johnson together sought to apply the Public Health Act to Croydon and petitioned the General Board of Health, having secured a petition signed by one-tenth or more of the Croydon ratepayers. Westall had
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51 Thomas Southwood Smith (1788-1861); sanitary reformer; MD Edinburgh 1816; founded the Health of Towns Association; wrote valuable works on epidemics and sanitary improvements; Jeremy Bentham left his body by Will to Smith for dissection in 1832; Concise DNB 1948, p.1217.
52 Bynum, p.77.
55 Cuthbert William Johnson (1799-1878); agricultural writer; barrister, Grays Inn 1836; FRS 1842; published The Farmer’s Encyclopaedia, 1842; Farmers Medical Dictionary, 1845; The Life of Sir Edward Coke, 1837; translated Thaer’s Principles of Agriculture, 1844; collaborated with W. Shaw and his brother, George William Johnson. Concise DNB, p.695.
been a Croydon resident since 1831 and Johnson since 1847/48. Johnson was a barrister and an active member of the Metropolitan Commission of Sewers, and together with Chadwick, materially advanced the cause of sanitary reform in London.\textsuperscript{56} The \textit{Croydon Advertiser} pictured him virtually as Croydon’s Mayor, “seated in his canopied chair, with his velvet cap, faultless necktie and expanse of shirt, a character not unlike Chadwick’s, formidable and intolerant of fools.”\textsuperscript{57}

Croydon’s Local Board of Health was formed in August 1849 \textsuperscript{58} and on 27 November 1849 Thomas Cox, Croydon’s Surveyor, prepared a fourteen page report entitled \textit{Report to the Local Board of Health of Croydon Relative to Drainage and Water Supply}. It contained details of land and surface drainage, sewerage and water supply; suggestions as to the abolition of cesspools, privies, ponds, and ditches containing foul matter; a description of the principal main drains for conveying the sewage from houses; and estimates of the probable cost of the execution and maintenance for five years, of the principal works recommended. The new works were approved and work commenced in November 1850. By December 1851 Croydon had completed ‘the combined works’ of a constant fresh water supply, tubular drainage and sewage recycling.\textsuperscript{59} The Croydon Local Board, under its vigorous chairman, Johnson, was now regarded as one of the most progressive and successful of the General Board’s satellite authorities. Edwin Chadwick and Thomas Southwood Smith had attended a pleasant and heartening ceremony at the opening of the ‘combined works.’ They had looked on benevolently as the Archbishop of

\textsuperscript{56} ‘The History of Sanitary Progress in Croydon,’ p.4.
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Croydon Advertiser}, 2 May 1873.
\textsuperscript{58} Croydon was the fifth Local Board to be set up in August 1849 after Uxbridge (April), Coventry (June), Chatham and Durham (July). By 1856 there were 185 Local Boards. CF Brockington, \textit{Public Health in the Nineteenth Century}, Edinburgh and London, E & S Livingstone Ltd, 1965, p.185.
\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Illustrated London News}, 20 December 1851, pp.725-6.
Canterbury, John Bird Sumner, lifted the valve of the great steam engine that pumped water to the high level reservoir. This vast tank was capable of holding 900,000 gallons, which, as Johnson explained, would supply all the houses in Croydon ‘on the constant service principle.’ Chadwick observed that Croydon was “honourably in advance of the 130 towns now placed under the Public Health Act,” and Southwood Smith predicted that, “the time was not long distant...when fever would never occur in such a town as Croydon, or that if a single case of fever did occur, it would then attract so much surprise and immediate investigation, as the breaking out of an epidemic in a prison.” 60 As it turned out Southwood Smith’s words were all too accurate.

THE EPIDEMIC

Despite all the improvements in Croydon, isolated cases of fever began to appear by July and August 1852, reaching epidemic proportions by November 1852. On 11 January 1853 the following entry appeared in the Minute Book of the Croydon Local Board of Health:

An epidemic of very serious and distressing character is prevailing in Croydon notwithstanding the extensive works of the Board for improving the sewage, drainage and water supply to the Town and neighbourhood and that it is advisable to solicit the immediate investigation by medical officers of the General Board of Health into the nature and cause of the disease. 61

On 20 January 1853, George Bottomley, a Croydon surgeon, wrote to the Surrey Standard attributing the fever to local causes, saying he thought the illness was

60 Ibid.
61 Full Minutes of the Croydon Local Board of Health. (Thereafter called CLBH Minutes). The date given in the Statement, p.1 is given as 17 Jan 1853, which is incorrect.
ordinary gastric fever. Carpenter wrote a reply to the *Surrey Standard*, saying that he and Westall had attended 370 cases and felt that the fever in Croydon was different to common fever. Only seven of these cases had proved fatal, giving a mortality rate of less than two per cent. Carpenter also listed the symptoms which were “the frequency of glandular complications, the frequent presence of an irregular rash, and in severe cases the universal presence of rose coloured or else livid spots on the abdomen.”

Carpenter also claimed that the disease was not infectious or contagious. *The Times* reported on the ‘Fatal Epidemic at Croydon’ on 25 January 1853, and said that “the town and neighbourhood of Croydon are suffering from a fever of a very fatal character, which during the last fortnight, has been most fatal in its results, the victims being not, as is usually the case, among the poorer classes, but among the gentry and principal tradesmen in the town.” The article referred to a mortality of 17 per 1000. Other critical letters followed, prompting the Local Board to gather all the doctors in Croydon to a meeting of the Board on 27 January 1853. Thirteen out of Croydon’s fifteen surgeons attended and four resolutions were agreed. On 29 January 1853 these resolutions were published in the *Times* as follows:

1. That the disease exists extensively in other places besides Croydon.
2. That the rate of mortality in the cases of the epidemic in Croydon is unusually low.
3. That the public reports relating to the fatality of the disease in Croydon, which have appeared in the newspapers, are very much exaggerated.

---

62 B. Lancaster, ‘The “Croydon Case”: Dirty Old Town to Model Town: The Making of the Croydon Local Board of Health and the Croydon Typhoid Epidemic of 1852-3,’ Croydon, Croydon Natural History and Scientific Society, 18 (7) 2001, pp145-206, see p.183. (Thereafter called Lancaster). In typhoid fever “rose coloured spots” appear during the second week of the disease. Although Carpenter described these spots in his letter to the *Surrey Standard* he went on to say that the disease was not infectious or contagious.

63 CLBH minutes.

64 *The Times*, 29 January 1853, p.7.

65 Baldwin Latham states a death rate of 27 per 1000.
4) That the new cases within these few days have materially diminished in numbers.

The resolutions were also printed on handbills and distributed in Croydon.

However, by February 1853, eighteen hundred people had been affected, with sixty deaths amongst Croydon’s population of sixteen thousand. At approximately the same time, about one hundred cases of breakages and blockages - from flannel, hay, shavings, paper, hair, sticks, kittens, a night cap, a cat, pig’s entrails, a bullock’s heart- began to be discovered in the pipe sewers. It was also reported that several inches of raw sewage covered some cellar floors and sewage saturated the ground outside the houses. As a result of the deepening crisis, three investigations took place. First an independent report by Simon at the request of Croydon’s Local Board of Health, second a report from the General Board of Health by Southwood Smith, John Sutherland, Richard Grainger and Henry Austin, and third a Home Office Commission conducted by Neil Arnott and Thomas Page.

Simon’s Report

In 1853 there was no general agreement as to the causes of febrile disease and theories focused mainly on miasma, water propagation or a combination of both. Simon’s report is now discussed.
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66 The number of deaths varies: R.D. Grainger with 41; Neil Arnott with 60; Thomas Page with 70.
67 Reports, by Neil Arnott and Thomas Page on An Inquiry by the Secretary of State, Relative to the Prevalence of Disease in Croydon, and to the Plan of Sewerage, together with an Abstract of Evidence Accompanying the Reports, London, G.E. Eyre and W. Spottiswoode, 1853, p.3. (Thereafter called Reports). Croydon’s population is quoted as about 16,000, which is incorrect. According to Baldwin Latham, Croydon had a population over 16,000 as early as 1840, and in 1853 the population was 22,261.
68 Croydon Local Board of Health to Home Office, 23 December 1853, PRO HO 45/5105.
69 J. Simon, Report to the Local Board of Health, Croydon, with Regard to the Causes of Illness Recently Prevailing in that Town, Croydon, J.S. Wright, 1853, p.19. (Thereafter called Simon).
70 Statement.
71 Reports.
Simon was asked by Johnson to ascertain if the new works, either by their failure or otherwise, had been instrumental in the production of disease. Simon’s *Report to the Local Board of Health, Croydon, with Regard to the Causes of Illness recently Prevailing in that Town* acknowledged that during the previous fifteen months there had been progress with the Croydon water supply and house drainage, when it was hoped that it would improve the health of the population. However, as these sanitary works approached their completion, there arose in the town an unusual prevalence of fever and diarrhoea, which reached an unprecedented and epidemic severity. Simon’s report listed a number of presumed relevant factors and causes of disease. These included fever prevailing elsewhere, unusual rainfall, impurity of water, great influx of day labourers, the absence of paving, defects in house drainage, remains of the former drainage system and failure of the new sewerage system.72 Paradoxically, Simon felt that Croydon was far better off at that present time (1853) than it had been eighteen months previously.

Simon looked at the distribution of house filth and pointed out that the cesspools of eighteen hundred houses had been emptied. With reference to sewerage he noted that the greater portion of the daily sewage passed to an open building called the Filter House, where it entered a large tank measuring 3000 square feet. The sewage was partially strained of its solid ingredients and peat charcoal was spread on the surface. Intercepted solids were conveyed at night through the town for agricultural purposes, and the residual fluid passed from the filter house over a short distance to the river Wandle. Some of the sewage from four hundred houses at the North End of the town passed off by two pipes unconnected with the Filter House and was discharged without any interception or delay on to a field of about seventeen

72 Simon, pp.5-7.
acres, where it collected in shallow pits and was then diffused in trenches. Large quantities of ordure were transported by carts from the cesspools and the Filter House and then taken to a farm. The field was saturated with animal manure beyond its power of digestion and had become a giant cesspool. Simon pointed out that “faecal evaporation and decomposition were a sufficient cause of disease and the main object of the Board was to remove cesspools from the immediate vicinity of houses.”

Simon noted that the overflow of sewage began in December...and that the general disturbance of impure earth, necessary during your works, contributed continuously to the “fog of faecal evaporation” and led him to believe that miasma was the cause of the recent illnesses. Simon made seven observations and suggestions at the end of his report, which are summarised as follows. All domestic drain-works should be inspected by a designated person; the utmost vigilance would be necessary to guard against renewed arrest of drainage either by obstruction of the sewers or their breakage; cesspools should all to be filled up; the old drainage in the High Street should be scrupulously examined in order to perfect its cleanliness; the general paving and street cleansing of the town required considerable improvement; the sewage outfall required re-consideration, and steps should be taken to reduce, within as narrow limits as possible, the present evils. The discharge of sewage into the river Wandle, he said, rendered the water unfit for human consumption. Simon admitted in his report, “this pollution cannot have affected the population of Croydon, I do not consider their discussion to lie within the scope of your Chairman’s reference.” In conclusion, Simon felt that the causes of the epidemic “all appear to be removable; that some of them have belonged almost of necessity to your period of transition; that

---

73 Simon, p.11.
74 The term miasmatic is one of the most ambiguous terms in the history of nineteenth-century medicine according to M.Worboys, Spreading Germs, Disease Theories and Medical Practice in Britain, 1865-1900, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p.38. (Thereafter called Worboys)
none of them can be accounted essential to the improved system (of sanitary reform in Croydon).” In a post-script, Simon analysed the Surveyor’s list of thirty-eight accidents (obstructions) that affected the sewers between 27 March and 10 November 1852. He also commented on the optimum size of the sewers and felt that this had not been generally agreed upon. Five hundred copies of Simon’s report were printed by order of the Local Board, and he was paid a fee of 25 guineas, a fee he considered inadequate compared to the £220 paid to Thomas Wicksteed, the civil engineer.

Statement of the Preliminary Enquiry

The second report, Statement of the Preliminary Enquiry, by Southwood Smith, Sutherland, Grainger and Austin was completed on 21 April 1853. Carpenter gave the first piece of evidence:

Mr Carpenter, surgeon, who informed us, that the earliest recognised case of the disease had occurred in September last, in a person who came from Oxted, where a similar form of the disease was stated to have been prevalent. This case presented the same peculiar symptoms as the cases, which subsequently occurred in the town. It was also stated, that fever of the same character had existed in other places distant from Croydon.

Southwood Smith and Sutherland blamed the fever on a mix of general constitution of the atmosphere (fever had been widespread that autumn), contagious transmission (the epidemic had been imported from a nearby village), and, as local causes, the excessive and long continued prevalence of rainy weather. Hamlin points out that Southwood Smith had been claiming for almost three decades that bad fever

---

75 Simon, p.13.
76 CLBH Minutes, 28 March 1853 and 5 April 1853.
77 Ibid, 23 November 1853.
78 Statement, p.1.
meant bad sewerage. The elements atmosphere, contagion, and dampness were all legitimate parts of an explanation of a disease outbreak. Hamlin argues that, as with the destitution years earlier, it was what was missing from the explanation that was significant.  

Hamlin also points out that Grainger's report took the same general strategy. He represented Croydon as intrinsically unhealthy. There were miasms, which arose in cleaning old sewers, emptying old cesspools, and spreading night soil, all in contravention of the General Board of Health instructions. And with over crowding (seven people in two hundred square feet in some dwellings), it was no wonder that there was fever.

Austin's report focused on the breakages and the blockages in the sewage pipes. The chief problem was the bad connections between house drains and public sewers, and these were the responsibility of Croydon's surveyor, Cox. Also, things had been put into the pipe sewers that should not have been and, grudgingly, he admitted that Ranger's downsizing had been unwarranted. Worse, it had slipped past the Board's scrutiny, a fact that Austin's excuse - "It would not be supported that you [the GBH] would direct an examination of every minute portion of the many plans for which your sanction is demanded " - could not disguise. 

Southwood Smith and Sutherland's report contained the fullest description of the disease, which was noticeably absent from Simon's report. Grainger noted that "the type of the disease was what is professionally termed typhoid, not true typhus." He later said that "in adults the fever was essentially of the continued form, whereas in children was remittent and of importance with reference to the cause of the

---

80 Hamlin, pp.325-6.
81 *Statement*, p.18.
outbreak.” The report said that all the practitioners who were questioned on the fever agreed that the present epidemic was different to that which had occurred in Croydon in former years. Later he went on to say that in “the great majority of cases the excretions contained bile; but in several instances the attack exhibited the leading marks of true cholera.” For example, a Mr Hubbert observed, “it has attracted my attention that this diarrhoea was in many cases decidedly choleric, there being rice-water dejection’s, the sunken eye, cold breath, great prostration, intolerance of heat, a sense of burning, heat on swallowing cold water, and in two cases complete suppression of urine.” Grainger wrote, “it is not, therefore, suprising that with such a large number of diarrhoeal attacks at Croydon, some of them should have presented the choleric type.” Grainger recorded 1526 cases of fever and 41 deaths in the period from July 1852 to January 1853. He also highlighted the fact that Croydon did not have a Medical Officer of Health at this time and commented:

In the Circular addressed to Local Boards of Health ‘On Cleansing of Towns,’ among other instructions the following appears: ‘The clearance of cesspools, particularly during epidemic periods, is an operation of much danger in the manner in which it is ordinarily done. It should be done with copious dilution of the contents in water, with a pump and hose, and with the use of deodorisers.’ So great is the importance attached by the General Board to the proper performance of this class of works, that they deem it essential they should be supervised by a medical officer of health.  

Grainger arrived at eleven conclusions, which are summarised below:

82 Statement, pp.18-9.
1. In former times Croydon suffered with epidemic disease, which in some years exceeded London and therefore indicated serious local causes of unhealthiness.

2. The unprecedented character of the season from July 1852 - January 1853 inclusive in Croydon, as elsewhere, operated unfavourably on the public health in Croydon and predisposed the inhabitants to epidemic fever.

3. The accidental occurrence of the Bourne rivulet had operated very unfavourably.

4. Some cases had the characteristics of cholera.

5. The large number of fever cases and the enormous amount of diarrhoea had depended on a general epidemic influence and local conditions.

6. Local causes were effluvia arising in the interior of the houses or in their immediate proximity, owing to the defects and obstructions in their new drains, and the existence of old house-drains, and the overcrowded and unventilated condition of many dwellings of the poor.

7. The Filter House should be moved further from the town due the accumulation of a large amount of cesspool matter and precautions should be to prevent the escape of effluvia.

8. The practice of irrigating the meadows at Brimston Farm...generates effluvia in certain states of the weather, and should be discontinued.

9. That the spreading of night soil in large quantities in solid form and without proper precautions, in the immediate vicinity of the town, is objectionable and should not be carried on in future.

10. That in houses unconnected with the new works, and often distant from the town, fever and other zymotic diseases had prevailed to a large amount.
11. In connection of the new works with the epidemic, it is evident that they have not, under the circumstances recited in Mr Austin’s Report, accomplished the great ends of sanitary improvements, though to some extent they may have mitigated the predisposing causes of epidemic disease.\textsuperscript{84}

Grainger concluded by saying:

There are in Croydon a large number of miserable dwellings, entirely unventilated and often densely crowded. Many of these I examined; and as overcrowding is, according to my experience, the most deleterious of all sources of preventable disease, I beg to state my conviction, that until these unwholesome dwellings, some totally unfit for human habitation, are placed in a more satisfactory condition, they will, notwithstanding the provision of efficient external works, continue to be in future, as they have been in former years, a constant source of zymotic disease, and of expense to the ratepayers of Croydon.\textsuperscript{85}

Austin’s report highlighted the entire absence of ventilation in every part of the system.\textsuperscript{86} He also pointed out the Local Board’s lack of supervision:

Regulations were issued by the Local Board, ‘to be observed by persons proposing to connect their premises with the sewers or water pipes of the Board,’ to secure the fulfilment of which it was very properly stipulated that ‘no drains or water pipe is to be covered up until it shall have been inspected by an officer appointed by the Board for that purpose...Beyond the small number of houses first drained under the immediate direction of the officers of the Local Board, no such inspection has taken place, and builders and owners

\textsuperscript{84} Statement, pp.33-5.
\textsuperscript{85} Statement, p.34.
\textsuperscript{86} Statement, p.43.
have apparently been allowed to proceed with this important branch of the work in any mode they pleased.\textsuperscript{87}

\textit{Home Office Commission}

The appointment of a Home Office Commission reflected the government’s general suspicion of the competency of the General Board of Health, and Chadwick realised at once that the Board and its works were in the dock.\textsuperscript{88} Neil Arnott and Thomas Page conducted the independent Commission and their report, \textit{The Prevalence of Disease in Croydon}, did not confirm the findings of the previous two reports. The report is dated 14 February 1853 although their \textit{General Report} was not completed until 21 April 1853 (the date it was submitted to Lord Palmerston). The Commission had held open court in Croydon on 25 February, and 5 and 10 March 1853. Of the two reports, Page’s thirty-four-page engineering report was more comprehensive and critical than Arnott’s seventeen page medical report. As well as the above reports, two house-to-house surveys were conducted with questions concerning stoppages in the sewers, and illness. The first survey was by a Mr Baker for Grainger and Austin and the second by a Colonel Thompson for Arnott and Page. Finer writes, “their joint report came as a terrible shock. It confirmed all that the population of Croydon had been saying: the plan for sewerage had caused the epidemic, and the chief reason was the use of pipe drains and pipe sewers!”\textsuperscript{89}

Page’s report contained a chapter headed ‘Of the absence of Ventilation in the Pipe Sewers’ and remarked that “this important element of health and comfort, which has been generally neglected in dwellings, and almost totally neglected in sewers,

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Statement}, p.41.
\textsuperscript{88} Lewis, p.316.
\textsuperscript{89} S.E. Finer, \textit{The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick}, London, Methuen, 1952, p.447. (Thereafter called Finer.)
which must soon be introduced into every plan of sewerage present or to come, has been entirely overlooked at Croydon.” 90 Arnott, on the other hand, felt that because the promised downward ventilation was not occurring, the new sewers became a network for distributing deadly poison throughout the town, with gas rising through the network and out through drains.

The pollution of the river Wandle came in for criticism. Page’s report pointed out that it was most unjustifiable to throw the filth from 10,000 people in Croydon into a stream from which at least as many hundreds had to drink, and recommended a better disposal of sewage. 91 Because there was no effective surface drainage, groundwater had seeped into the pipe sewers (intended only for household drainage), overtaxing the filtering plant and also contributing to the contamination of the nearby river Wandle.

Page found a correlation between fever and the new sewers, a matter on which the Board’s doctors had been silent. He felt that Ranger had been arbitrary in his downsizing of the sewer pipes, and that Cox had not supervised the house connections carefully and had accepted poor quality pipe. 92 Inspection of the sewers had proved difficult, because there were only five manholes in seventeen miles of sewer. 93 Page took up broader issues of the Board’s philosophy of technology. He recognised that one could only judge success or responsibility within a framework of assessment. Ranger’s design was acceptable in terms of GBH doctrine, although the actual work was not; nor was the Board’s oversight. However, from the perspective of the state of the art in pipe sewerage, Ranger’s sewers were too small, long and thin. But judged in terms of health and cleanliness, the entire project was wanting. The main blame fell

90 Reports, pp.33-4.
91 Reports, p.52. One of the processes put forward was by Thomas Wicksteed, engineer to the patent solid sewage manure company.
92 Hamlin, p.326.
on neither Cox nor Ranger, but on the author or promoter of the mischievous system [Chadwick] who was sitting in self-gratification far away from the scene of strife.

Finer writes, “Chadwick was beside himself with vexation when the Report [by Arnott and Page] reached him. He ascribed the failures at Croydon to the bad workmanship of the jobbing builders and lack of superintendence.” With regard to the downsizing of the sewer pipes and the blockages, Chadwick felt a smaller pipe would increase velocity [of the water] and prevent deposition and he therefore supported Ranger. Chadwick conceded that the pipes were thinner than the Board had specified. However, despite these problems only 150 yards of sewer had been broken, in a very deep cutting, whereas no less than sixteen miles of sewers were working successfully. Chadwick also questioned why the epidemic could be ascribed to the new works when its first visitation was at Oxted, three quarters of a mile away? He also pointed out that the epidemic [number of cases] was three times worse at Oxted and six times worse at Sheriff Hutton. Chadwick sat down to write a reply and exonerate himself and the GBH, and it was all that Shaftsbury could do to persuade him that his letter was too controversial for publication. Instead Shaftsbury recommended that Chadwick should hand the matter over to Henry Austin. In his letter to Chadwick, Shaftsbury wrote, “if sent forth as I have before me in MS, it would be absolutely the ruin of the Board [GBH]. You, I, and the Doctor, [Southwood Smith] we three, should by our own act and deed, be cast down, bound hand and foot, into the burning fiery furnace.”

92 Reports, p.49.
93 Finer, p.447.
94 Hamlin, p.324.
95 Oxted is approximately ten miles from Croydon and not three quarters, as quoted in Finer, p.448.
96 Finer, p.448.
97 Finer, p.448.
98 Previously known as Lord Ashley. He succeeded to the Earldom in 1851.
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100 Cited in Lewis, p.318. Letter from Shaftsbury to Chadwick, 15 October 1853.
A battle of reports and counter reports began and continued into the summer of 1854. The civil engineers publicly attacked the GBH while giving evidence before the Select Committee on the Great London Drainage Bill, thus damaging their reputation. Other reports followed. As a result, the confidence in the Croydon Local Board of Health was badly shaken and Johnson, the Chairman, lost his seat in the 1853 Local Board elections. Chadwick's reputation was also severely damaged, and in 1854 he was pensioned off after a bout of illness. Despite this setback Chadwick continued to be active in the Society of Arts, Social Sciences Association and the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain, and became a friend of Carpenter.
CHAPTER 3
LOCAL BOARD OF HEALTH, SEWAGE DISPOSAL
AND PUBLIC SERVICE

This chapter describes how Carpenter was elected to the Croydon Local Board of Health and how he became involved in the public health debate, taking a special interest in sewage disposal. He also became a friend of Edwin Chadwick and corresponded with him. Carpenter’s other activities included becoming President of the SE Branch of the BMA, a Justice of the Peace for East Surrey and membership, both locally and nationally, of a number clubs and societies.

The 1861 Census\(^1\) shows that Carpenter was living in Scarbrook House, 113 High Street, Croydon, on the corner of Whitgift Street. His stables were located at the rear of his property and a gateway opened into Whitgift Street.\(^2\) His neighbours were Alfred Roper, general practitioner, at 112 and George Price, wine merchant, at 114. Carpenter’s house was near his practice (at 53 High Street) and the Local Board of Health and the Town Hall (at 127). The ten residents in Scarbrook House were Carpenter aged 35, Margaret (his wife) aged 34; sons Arthur Bristowe aged 4, Edward Westall \(^3\) aged 5, and George \(^4\) aged 3; a daughter, Margaret Aimee, aged 1; plus four staff: Esther Hicks aged 31, cook; Helen Hutchurson aged 28, housemaid; and two nurses, Mary Bunt aged 27 and Ann Harris aged 19. Carpenter’s activities with the Local Board of Health are now discussed.

---
\(^1\) 1861 Census, Croydon, High Street, p.91.
\(^2\) CLBH minutes, 8 April 1862.
\(^3\) The ages of Arthur and Edward are wrong. Arthur was born in 1854 and Edward Westall (named after his GP Partner) in 1855, Baptism Records of Croydon Parish Church. Arthur should he 5yrs and Edward 4yrs.
\(^4\) George was Baptised Evan George on 20 March 1858 in the Croydon Parish Church.
LOCAL BOARD OF HEALTH

In 1860 Carpenter was elected to the Croydon Local Board of Health, which consisted of twelve members from Croydon ward and one from Norwood ward. Every year a third of the members from Croydon ward came off the Board and these four outgoing members were often put up for re-election. The member for Norwood was put up for re-election every three years. The poll from the ratepayers of Croydon and Norwood wards took place every April in the Croydon Town Hall, and in 1860 Carpenter came fourth and was elected. Later, in 1863, he improved his position by coming second and in the years 1866 and 1869 he topped the polls. However, in the 1872 elections Carpenter came fifth and lost his seat. Before looking at the reasons why he polled so badly in 1872 Carpenter’s activities on the Board during these twelve years from 1860 are described.

Prior to 1870 the Board met in the Town Hall weekly on Tuesdays at 7pm, and the ratepayers and Press were allowed in as observers only. However, due to the increasing number of committee meetings during the 1860s the Board decided to meet every fortnight from 1870 onwards, despite Carpenter’s preference for the weekly meetings. The Board’s clerk recorded all the important information in the minute books including the agenda, the items discussed and any action taken. However, the Board’s clerk often missed out significant amounts of discussion, especially during lengthy debates. Fortunately the weekly local newspapers published reports of these meetings, which were more comprehensive and caught the mood of the occasion with extra words in brackets such as ‘humorously,’ ‘laughter’ and ‘no, no.’ There were

---

5 Old and New Croydon Illustrated, Croydon, printed and published by J. Ward, 1979, (no page numbers in the book).
6 Croydon Chronicle, 7 April 1866.
7 Croydon Chronicle, 3 April 1869.
8 Croydon Advertiser, 28 May 1870. Carpenter tried to persuade the Board to revert to weekly meetings but was unsuccessful.
times, however, when the reporter had to leave early and only a partial report was published. For example, in 1871 a footnote read: "We regret that our report is unusually brief, owing to the serious illness of one of our reporters, who had taken copious notes of the Board’s proceedings, but who has since been too unwell to transcribe them."  

In the build up to the 1860 Board elections a highly personal and critical letter appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle*, which was signed anonymously by ‘Vigilans.’ The author wrote about the two outgoing members seeking re-election: “two of them especially - who are candidates for re-election, are singularly incompetent for the functions they have to perform, I do hope my brother ratepayers will supplant them by men of common sense, of common honesty, and with a capacity for business.” The Chairman of the Board  also came under attack and Vigilans wrote, “There is no blinking the question that the Chairman is the Board. His will is law; the majority of the members are so many automata who obey his bidding.” By way of contrast the letter spoke in more pleasant terms of Carpenter and in the final paragraph said, “Nor will there be any difficulty in supplying their places with men of intelligence, of honesty, and of business habits. Dr Carpenter and Mr Wilson, I would hope, are too well known to need any advocacy of their claims.”  Vigilans letter provoked an outcry with a leader and nine letters in the following week’s *Croydon Chronicle*, including one from Carpenter who wrote:

> Certain interested parties are busy charging me with being cognisant of the letter of “Vigilans.” A denial is quite unnecessary to those who know me; but as the matter is now being used for the purpose of influencing the forthcoming
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9 *Croydon Advertiser*, 6 May 1871.
10 In 1853 Johnson lost his seat following the ‘Croydon Case’ and William Drummond, a solicitor, became Chairman.
11 *Croydon Chronicle*, 31 March 1860.
election, I beg to state, for the information of those who do not know me, that I am no party to anything containing personalities, and I treat those who use them with the contempt they deserve. My own impression is that an enemy has done this.\textsuperscript{12}

In response to the adverse correspondence he had created, Vigilans wrote a reply in the following weeks \textit{Croydon Chronicle}. He started with a heading, ‘Open to all parties - influenced by none.’ The correspondent was clearly delighted with the response to his letter and wrote, “I think it was Shakespeare who said, ‘some men were born to greatness, some aspired to greatness, and some had greatness thrust upon them.’ The latter has been my lot.” Later in the letter Vigilans made a reference to Carpenter and wrote, “I am sorry that my friend Dr Carpenter should have thought proper to disown my advocacy and attribute it to an enemy.”\textsuperscript{13} Vigilans attributed this to Carpenter’s inexperience in newspaper controversy. However, despite the publicity, Carpenter was elected to the Board on Saturday 14 April 1860, coming fourth with 915 votes. William J. Wilson, whose name appeared alongside Carpenter in the first letter by Vigilans, came sixth with 814 votes and was not elected.

Carpenter became an active member of the Board for twelve consecutive years and usually gave at least one week’s notice if he was going to introduce a new item on to the agenda.\textsuperscript{14} He later introduced a new format to the Board’s agenda, so that important items were dealt with first.\textsuperscript{15} However, despite his contributions to the Board during these twelve years, he was never asked to deputise if the Chairman was away. This may have been because he was relatively young (35yrs when he was first

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Croydon Chronicle}, 7 April 1860.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Croydon Chronicle}, 14 April 1860.
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Croydon Chronicle}, 18 July 1863.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Croydon Chronicle}, 4 May 1867.
elected) but more likely due to his strong points of view, he being outspoken and of strong character.

Carpenter’s first meeting with the Board was on Tuesday 17 April 1860 when all new members had to show their ‘Declaration of Qualification.’ William Drummond, a solicitor, was elected Chairman, and members were proposed and seconded for the various committees. Carpenter was selected for the Roads Committee together with Benjamin Bean, and they soon got to work and produced a damning report on a run-down area in the centre of Croydon called Middle Row. The area had many buildings of great antiquity and should have been a great asset to the town. However, there was an average of eleven people in each house and twenty-four in the common lodging houses, which also contained prostitutes. The following appeared in the Croydon Chronicle: “Mr Sutherland said the report seemed a very important one and called the attention of the Board to a state of things which they could scarcely have believed to exist in the heart of the town. He moved that the report be received and the recommendations therein carried out.” The report also revealed the terrible state of the sewers and offensive smells prevailing: “four untrapped sewers containing surface water of an offensive character in the gully-holes in Middle Street.” The filth and excrement was not far from the Board’s offices and the report noted: “At the upper end of this street, and within sight of the windows of this Board-room, a very small corner exists, fenced in, and forming a receptacle for every abomination. Several parties claim a right of use, but the whole is unfit to exist close to human dwellings.” The shortage of public conveniences was also highlighted as follows:

16 J.B. Gent, Croydon - A Pictorial History, Chichester, Phillimore & Co Ltd, 1991. (no page numbers)
We found the urinal at the corner of the Town Hall in a very dirty condition, and we think it highly requisite that more conveniences should be provided at this spot, and that in addition to a larger urinal, public water closets should be erected on the plan suggested by Mr Langley [assistant surveyor and inspector of nuisances] as, in the course of our inspection we observed human excrement in a recent state in very many places, showing a great want of public conveniences in this thickly populated district.

The report also highlighted the plight of unfortunate animals:

Our inspection revealed the existence of many animals in the part inspected, and we consider that it would be a legitimate source of enquiry how many horses, donkeys, cows, and other animals exist in the district between High Street and Surrey Street. We saw several such, some in cellars, some almost upstairs, with dwellings and sleeping apartments on all sides, in such confined and ill-ventilated situations as must be cruel and unsafe to the animals themselves, and highly detrimental to those living around. 17

An early example of Carpenter’s efforts to make the Board and its various Committees more accountable and open took place on 19 June 1860, when Carpenter criticised the Board’s procedures. It was recorded that “Dr Carpenter stated that he had applied to the Board’s accountant for the particulars of the Expenses charged upon the WaterRate for one year and complained that the information had been withheld from him when after some discussion it was determined that the information should be given to Dr Carpenter.” 18 The *Croydon Chronicle* published a more

---

17 *Croydon Chronicle*, 19 May 1860.
18 CLBH Minutes, 1858-61, vol. 4.
comprehensive account of the whole debate in which Carpenter held his ground despite antagonism from various Board members.\textsuperscript{19}

In 1861 Carpenter was elected Chairman of the Gas Committee, and the cost of supplying gas to the Board’s public lamps was a hotly debated topic. He recommended that the Board negotiate a reduced price with the Croydon Gas Company for the supply of gas at of 4s 1/2d per thousand [cubic] feet.\textsuperscript{20} However, the Gas Company refused, and stated that they were only prepared to supply gas at 4s 6d. Carpenter tried to get an amendment so that the Gas Committee could discuss the matter further at a later date. However, the Board’s Chairman refused and felt that the matter had to be resolved, and eventually the Board agreed to the gas company’s offer. Carpenter was clearly upset by this decision and it was reported that:

Dr Carpenter later expressed his wish to resign his post as chairman of the gas committee, as his motives had been misrepresented. He thought, after what had taken place, that he should not be doing right in acting upon that committee, as an opportunity would be given for saying that he had acted from personal motives, although he defied any one to prove that he had ever done so.\textsuperscript{21}

At the next Board meeting a lengthy discussion took place and the members voted for Carpenter to be re-elected as Chairman of the Gas Committee for a further three years, which he accepted. Carpenter was also brought into active antagonism with the Croydon Gas Company when he was living in Scarbrook House, High Street. The Gas Company headquarters were situated in Surrey Street (behind the High St) and it was reported in the \textit{Croydon Review} that the Croydon Gas Company “used to poison the whole neighbourhood with the manufacture of sulphate of ammonia from gas refuse.”

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Croydon Chronicle}, 23 June 1860.
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Croydon Chronicle}, 6 April 1861.
The Croydon Review observed that, "he [Carpenter] declared that he was absolutely poisoned in his back premises by the exhalations from the works, and when the Gas Company applied to Parliament for an extension, Carpenter offered a strenuous opposition to the Bill. The result of this opposition was a considerable alteration in the clauses proposed to be enacted." Carpenter recommended that the Gas Company be moved to the suburbs, and although the directors refused to listen to his suggestion at the time, they eventually went to the identical spot in Waddon Marsh Lane that he had suggested.\textsuperscript{22}

As will be seen later Carpenter developed a broad interest in other public health issues including public slaughter houses, public baths, house drainage, ventilation of sewers, waste of water, widening of the High Street, slum clearance, the need to appoint a medical officer of health and sewerage disposal. Slaughterhouses are now discussed.

PUBLIC SLAUGHTERHOUSES

On 22 July 1862 Carpenter successfully put forward a motion to the Board to establish public slaughterhouses in Croydon, which were paid for by the Board. He felt that most private slaughterhouses were filthy nuisances, a risk to public health, and he was concerned that some of the animals waiting for slaughter were kept in poor conditions. In his carefully researched presentation he showed that Paris had built five magnificent public abattoirs as early as 1810. Public slaughterhouses had already been built in London, Liverpool, Newcastle and Aberdeen and it was not compulsory to use them. The butchers who killed the best animals and had the largest sales of meat usually used these public slaughterhouses. In other towns such as

\textsuperscript{21} Croydon Chronicle, 20 April 1861.
\textsuperscript{22} Croydon Review, 30 Jan 1892.
Carlisle, Newport, Aberdeen, Darlington and Carmarthen, public slaughterhouses had been established under the various local Acts of Parliament, and were sources of local revenue. Carpenter was also sensitive to the butchers’ welfare, and it was reported in the *Croydon Chronicle* that Carpenter said that, “the Board ought not to ride roughshod over the butchers by compelling them to get rid of their old-established slaughter houses, but that they should combat the difficulties of ancient custom with persuasion and gradual adoption.” He pointed out that in 1862 Croydon had a population of 32,000 with thirty-eight private slaughterhouses and fifty-seven butchers. Carpenter proposed the following resolutions to the Board:

1. That, as slaughter houses in the crowded thoroughfares of the town are nuisances, and at times likely to be prejudicial to health, it is resolved that this Board refuse to grant its sanction to any more applicants for licences in the special district (according to the 45th section of the Local Government Act).

2. That this Board undertake to provide public slaughter houses for butchers who desire to have them (according to the 62nd section of the Public Health Act).

3. That the slaughter houses already licensed shall not be interfered with by this Board, so long as the same be duly cared for according to the bye-laws of the Board; but that each license shall be opposed at the next licensing day after the death of the original licensee, or the transfer of the slaughter house to other hands, or as soon as the slaughter house has been complained of by the neighbours, and proved to be a nuisance.

4. That after the erection of the public slaughter houses; those (slaughter houses) at present licensed shall only be used by the licensees.

5. That the proposed shambles shall be erected on a site as near to the town as may be conveniently obtained; that the plan shall embrace accommodation for
at least 60 butchers, but that, at present only one fourth of the plan shall be carried out, the remainder to be finished as soon as such accommodation shall be required.

6 That the plan shall consist of single houses, which shall be let to individual butchers at a fair rental, and also of a much larger slaughter house, where cattle & c, may be slaughtered at so much per head.

7 That instructions be given to the surveyor of the Board, to prepare a plan according to the above resolutions, and submit it, as soon as convenient, to the Board. 23

Carpenter also submitted a plan in outline prepared by one of the principal builders in the town, based upon one of the abattoirs of Monmartre, and which, he said, could be carried out for £2,600. Later that year, on 2 December 1862, it was reported that:

Mr Fenton produced a plan of the proposed slaughter houses to be erected at the old filter works and reported that the cost would be about £950 - there would be one public and six private slaughter houses and a cottage for the person in charge of them and it was resolved that the plan be carried out and the expense charged on general District Rate No 1 and that Mr Fenton do prepare a detailed plan of the building and advertise for tenders for their erection. 24

The slaughterhouses were completed by 18 October 1864 and Carpenter proposed a gratuity of £10 to Mr Dart, Inspector of Nuisances, for the great assistance rendered in the completion of the slaughterhouses. This was unanimously agreed to and a cheque drawn accordingly. Dart’s salary was also increased to £40 per year on the motion of Carpenter at the next Board Meeting and demonstrating Carpenter’s

23 Croydon Chronicle, 12 July 1862.
24 CLBH minutes, 2 December 1862.
appreciation for Dart’s hard work and support of the project. In December 1899 (seven years after Carpenter’s death, and thirty five years after Croydon’s public slaughter houses were opened) the poor condition of some private slaughterhouses was highlighted in an article on ‘Municipal Slaughterhouses.’ The article said, “Many of our private slaughterhouses are in so insanitary a condition that the meat is exposed to foul emanations from drains, decomposing blood, offal, etc.”

PUBLIC BATHS

With reference to public baths, an anonymous letter from a writer named ‘Amphibious’ appeared in the Croydon Chronicle on 25 July 1863 highlighting the need for public-baths in Croydon. The letter noted that, “the inhabitants generally have thrown cold water on the subject by expressing their opinion that, as a dividend-paying commercial speculation, public baths will never answer, and they have consequently never been practically tried.” The article referred to Carpenter:

I think, however, that there is “looming in the distance” a hope for the “great unwashed” of Croydon. I do not wish to flatter, but I must confess to an opinion that if Dr Carpenter is pledged to, or means to bring a Public Baths Company, Limited (to philanthropy), to a successful issue, it will, in time, be done. A glance at his successes for the past five or six years, will bear me out in pointing to him as the “coming man” for all the lovers of the external use of aqua pura.

The article highlighted Carpenter’s other successes and said:

Has he not placed the Institution [Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution] on its present firm footing; built the Public Hall; solved the great gas question

---
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and given the Norwegians three members? And now, having obtained a tenant for the slaughter houses, and then got them off his hands, why should he not give the working classes a bath? I look around in vain for a more pressing necessity for the exercise of his talents and energy. Baths must now be built, and I fancy I have named the “right man” if he should choose or be kind enough to step into the “right place.” Why, sir, there isn’t such a Carpenter for miles around; and if he is well supported, as there is little doubt he will be, the public may hold their peace and enjoy their ablutions for evermore “at the lowest possible price.”  

The letter was written on 23 July 1863 two days after the Board met and may have been from one of the ratepayers who had been an observer at the Board meeting. The Croydon Chronicle included an article with the heading: ‘A prospect at last of having public baths in Croydon.’ It was reported that Carpenter submitted the following resolution to the Board with regard to supplying water for public baths:

That this board will supply water for use of swimming and warm baths, free of charge, subject to such restrictions as may be recommended by the surveyor of the Board; provided a swimming bath be constructed for the use of the poor, at a charge not exceeding 2d each; and provided no dividends are paid by the association establishing them.

Carpenter said that various attempts in other towns to establish public baths on the commercial principle had failed, including the use of donations. He also pointed out that the Croydon Local Board had previously intended to establish public baths. This did not happen because a resolution had never been formally submitted to them and because the baths were to be erected at the expense of the ratepayers. It was reported

---
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that the Chairman intervened and pointed out that “the Board had no power to establish public baths. However, the parish, could submit the question in vestry, and afterwards leave it to the Board to carry out.” The *Croydon Chronicle* quoted Carpenter as saying:

He believed that under the Public Heath Act, the Board were empowered to supply water for such purposes; and he had been urged by many persons to take up this matter, and endeavour to bring it to a successful issue. (Hear, hear) It had been proposed that an association should be formed for this purpose, in connection with a contemplated incorporation of the Literary and Scientific Institution, and that they should raise subscriptions for erecting a building by which the poor might be provided with swimming and warm baths at a nominal charge; and as cleanliness was one of the means of preventing diseases in this parish, he felt sure there would be no opposition on the part of the Board to this project; neither would they, he believed, object to supply the water under such restrictions as their surveyor might recommend.

One of the speakers supporting Carpenter was Thomas Farley who pointed to the shortage of rivers and flowing water in Croydon for bathing:

There was no water for poor people to bathe in. The streams in this neighbourhood were private property, with the exception, perhaps, of one or two ponds, or gravel pits, and several deaths had occurred by bathing in them. He found, daily, the advantages arising from a bath, but his poorer neighbours were deprived of this inestimable boon; and he should therefore, as a private individual, and a member of the Board, do everything in his power to forward Dr Carpenter’s views on this matter. (Hear, hear) 

---
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After further discussion the matter was adjourned for future consideration, and following a series of meetings and delays, the swimming bath was finally opened on 27 June 1866 and the warm baths on 21 August 1866. *Ward’s Directory* noted, “After a long and weary delay, which well-nigh exhausted the patience of the expectant public, these useful accessories to the sanitary perfection of the ‘model town of England’ were opened.”

In summary, the baths were financed by forming an association and incorporation with the Literary and Scientific Institution, who in turn raised subscriptions. The Local Board of Health provided the water for the baths free of charge and the poor paid a maximum of 2d per visit.

HOUSE DRAINAGE

House drainage became an interest of Carpenter’s, and on 6 December 1865 he proposed a number of resolutions on the subject to the Croydon Local Board of Health, which were approved. Shortly afterwards, on 16 December 1865, a letter appeared in *The Times* from a civil engineer (the letter was signed C.E.), misquoting Carpenter’s resolutions to the Board. Carpenter predictably wrote a distinct and emphatic denial to *The Times* correcting CE’s statements. This letter, together with others, induced Carpenter to write a pamphlet entitled ‘Hints on House Drainage,’ which was first published in 1865. Carpenter wrote:

> The numerous enquiries that came to me in the course of the week following the publication of that letter from all parts of the country, requesting information upon the subject of house drainage, proved to me that a great

---
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amount of general ignorance existed, and that the difficulties I had tried to remedy, were not limited to Croydon in particular.\textsuperscript{32}

The pamphlet became popular and was quoted in many journals, reprinted in foreign languages and reached a third edition by 1868.\textsuperscript{33} Years later, in 1878, a book entitled \textit{Dangers to Health: A Pictorial Guide to Domestic Sanitary Defects} \textsuperscript{34} was published and reached a fourth edition by 1883. The book demonstrated the growing interest in domestic sanitary arrangements and the importance of properly installed and maintained domestic drainage. It also shows Carpenter’s early involvement twelve years earlier (in 1865) in the debate on house drainage.

In 1866 Carpenter gave a lecture on House Drainage at a meeting of SE Branch of the British Medical Association, held at the Crystal Palace.\textsuperscript{35} In the opening paragraph Carpenter wrote:

> The great injury likely to arise from the ignorance of the public upon the subject of House Drainage, and, especially, the ignorance of those employed in repairing or carrying out works in private houses has induced me to throw together the result of my own observations, and also to explain in more detail the resolutions, which were approved by the Local Board. \textsuperscript{36}

These resolutions were:

1. After the date of approval, no new house should be passed as fit for occupation that did not have a cistern fitted to the WC on self-flushing principles. That water from such cistern should not be used for dietetic purposes.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Hints on House Drainage}, p.5.
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2. That every branch of drain going into the public sewer should be properly ventilated, by an extension of the soil pipe of the WC upwards and outwards.

3. If the drain is not intended for a WC, then by a ventilating pipe inserted between the trap and the sewer, and as close to the trap as possible.

4. That all rainwater pipes be untrapped.

5. That all overflow pipes from cisterns, baths, and wastewater sinks or closets, be cut off from direct communication with the sewer.

6. That no communication with the public sewer, or any sewer pipe, be covered up, until it has been inspected by the proper officer of the Local Board. 

Carpenter also wanted all communications with the public sewer to be laid upon concrete, but this was rejected by the Local Board on the grounds of cost.

In the autumn of 1865 Carpenter noted that a large number of cases of fever had occurred in Croydon. This was despite a general system of drainage, pure water supply and the abatement of all public nuisances. He pointed out “that the fatal cases occurred nearly all together in point of time - appeared simultaneously in many parts of the parish, but principally in new houses, and at the ends of long lines of sewers rather than at their lower parts.” 

He also noted that a very heavy rainfall, high temperature and absence of ozone preceded all the earlier fatal cases. Carpenter then asked three questions: “To what cause could those isolated cases of fever be attributed? How had the rainfall acted? And why should it act injuriously upon a perfectly well drained town? ” Carpenter wrote, “Unfortunately for myself, an experiment was performed before my eyes, which enabled me distinctly to point to cause and effect.” Carpenter described how he was woken up in his house:

---
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by a loud noise proceeding from the closet; it continued at intervals throughout the next day. Unable at first to account for it, I eventually found that it was caused by the ventilating pipe, doing duty as a waste pipe to the overflowing cistern. There was no room for exit of foul air from the sewer, and it was therefore forced through the trap of the water closet, with at times the force of steam through the safety valve of a steam engine.

Carpenter discovered that the previous summer, without his knowledge, the mistake of making the ventilating pipe do duty for a waste pipe had been made. A few days later two members of his household [we are not told if they were members of his family or his servants] fell ill with symptoms of typhoid fever. Carpenter observed that, "into the room occupied by these two persons, the foul air from the closet, as proved by experiment, naturally ascended." Carpenter also found that in every case of enteric or typhoid fever in his practice there was some defective housework. He pointed out that:

An old rule of the Local Board of Health was that the rain-water pipes had been allowed to be ventilators to the sewers: on ordinary occasions, therefore, the sewers had been fairly ventilated, but whenever there has been an excessive rainfall, the escape of air has been impeded by the fall of water, which has been poured in abundance in a comparatively warm state into the impermeable pipes, at the very time that gas in large quantities has been evolved. It is well known to country people, that the drains smell most before and during rain, by reason of this evolution. 39

---
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VENTILATION OF SEWERS

Foul sewer air was thought to be one of the causes of disease, and Carpenter promoted the ventilation of sewers to reduce the risk of disease. Ventilation of sewers had been carried out sporadically in Croydon from 1860, and by 1865 its use became more widespread. In 1872 Carpenter wrote, "There had not been a single case of typhoid fever, or even general epidemic illness, in good houses, which could not be distinctly traced to a neglect of the principle." He also added that, "It is also now an acknowledged fact, that such cases do not occur in houses which are so protected, and at the same time have a pure water supply." Carpenter advocated the use of charcoal baskets placed at the opening of the sewer entrance to neutralise the foul sewer air and thus reduce any danger to the inhabitants in the neighbourhood. In a footnote Carpenter wrote, "I observe that enquiries are now being made by the Metropolitan authorities upon the effect of these charcoal ventilators, as if they were new discoveries. They have been used in Croydon for a long time, and the effect in our town might have been learnt long since." Carpenter continued:

It happens that Croydon is something like a lady in a pure white dress - a splash of dirt is distinctly visible. Whenever a case of fever does occur, it is immediately reported at one of the several railway stations in the town, and in forty-eight hours is magnified into something serious.

In 1869 Carpenter attended a lecture at the Society of Arts on sewage, and was able to discuss his own observations on the ventilation of drains. He felt that in order to minimise the cases of fever it was important for the physician to investigate every
case and to follow up and remove the cause as soon as it was discovered.\textsuperscript{44} He believed that sewer gases produced disease and said, “Not only may enteric fever be produced by sewer gases, but a long list of other maladies may be distinctly traced to the same cause.” \textsuperscript{45}

With reference to typhoid, Hardy has said, “In December 1871, exactly ten years after his father's death, Edward, Prince of Wales, contracted typhoid while staying at Londereborough Lodge, Scarborough.” Hardy goes on to say that the events at Londereborough Lodge constituted a significant episode [which is discussed later] in the history of typhoid, the Royal Family and of the English country house. Not only was the Prince of Wales affected, but also Lord Chesterfield and a groom died. At this time, in common with general popular beliefs, sewer gas was assumed to be to blame. However, William Henry Corfield, Professor of Hygiene at University College London, was invited by Lord Londereborough for his expert opinion and wrote in The Times on 22 January 1872 that he felt sewer air was not the cause. Initially Corfield felt that the vehicle of infection was contaminated food eaten on a shooting party. However, later in 1872, the location of one defective closet provided a generally acceptable explanation of the outbreak. Corfield later established a flourishing practice as a specialist on the sanitary facilities of country houses. \textsuperscript{46} He also became an authority on typhoid and in 1902 was invited by the Royal College of Physicians, London to give the Milroy Lectures (three lectures, which took place on 20, 25 and 27 February) on ‘The Etiology of Typhoid Fever.’ \textsuperscript{47}
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WATER

The provision of a constant fresh water supply was an important feature of the 1848 Public Health Act. However, the loss of a substantial quantity of fresh water through faulty pipes could in turn increase demand and raise the Water Rate. Ways to identify the causes of the water leakage and methods to minimise the loss are discussed later.

In 1869 Carpenter wrote his first letter to Chadwick about Croydon’s water supply. Before the contents of this letter are discussed, details about Carpenter’s correspondence to Chadwick and Chadwick’s career are described.

CHADWICK

Carpenter wrote to Chadwick from 1869 until his death in 1890. At least fourteen of Carpenter’s letters to Chadwick survive (nine were written between 1883-89) and cover a variety of topics including public health issues and parliamentary elections. Although no letters from Chadwick to Carpenter seem to have survived, the exchanges can be pieced together using other available sources. The letters give an insight into the public health issues of the day, the two men’s similar views and also provide evidence of their growing friendship. First Chadwick’s activities after he left the General Board of Health are discussed.

In 1854 Chadwick left public life following severe criticism in Parliament of the way the General Board of Health was run. A contributory cause were the events surrounding the Croydon Case. Later Chadwick suffered a period of illness and was induced by Palmerston to resign, and was then pensioned off. His later life has been described as one of continuing influence but without power. Chadwick exerted his influence by writing pamphlets, corresponding with learned journals and periodicals.

and belonging to various societies. From 1854 Gladstone has identified three themes that emerge from Chadwick’s writings. First Chadwick’s continued willingness to engage in the politics of public health and administration: not least in London. Second his commitment to comparative and statistical study; for example, his knowledge ranged from his discussion of the sanitary state of the army in the Crimea and India in the 1860s to the comparative position of Manchester’s death rate in the 1880s. Third, despite having added nothing of significance to his earlier views on public health, Chadwick was re-discovered, feted and hailed as the father of the sanitary idea in later life. He has also been criticised for holding on to the miasmatic theory of disease even when new scientific discoveries were suggesting alternative aetiologies. 48

Waste of water

I now return to Carpenter’s letter to Chadwick, written on 27 September 1869, about the waste of water:

We have much difficulty with our own water supply. The normal consumption is 50 gals per head per day but much of this we have reason to believe is lost in the gravel when the water works were first laid down in 1850. Iron service pipes were used. These are now giving way in all directions and we are about to have them renewed in lead, ours is hard water and we believe that it will not touch the lead. The quantity, which reaches the farm, averages about 30 gals per head per day. We hope to reduce this in time to 20 gals and when this is brought about we shall have much less difficulty in stormy weather and we

have every reason to believe that the continuous rain does not injuriously affect the fields themselves at all.49

On 19 October 1869 a resolution regarding the waste of water put forward to the Croydon Local Board by Carpenter and two others (one of whom was his next door neighbour, Price). The following appeared in the Croydon Advertiser: “The Chairman said they were that night to discuss one of the most important questions that had occupied the attention of the Board, which was to take into consideration the resolutions (a copy which they had before them) proposed by Dr Carpenter, Mr Price and Mr Morland, in reference to the waste of water.” Baldwin Latham, the engineer, had been asked to prepare an approximate return of the gallons of water lately used for various legitimate purposes. They were for the public baths; flushing the sewers; watering the roads; for public urinals; and for various other purposes. The Chairman said this information was needed in order to find out how much water was used per head in Croydon by private individuals. The results would show that the supply of water was higher than in any other town in England. During the discussions it was pointed out that the amount of water supplied in London was only 30 gallons per head, compared to Croydon’s 50. Sutherland argued that London had an intermittent supply and that it was quite out of the question to compare us (Croydon with a constant supply) with those towns where there is an intermittent supply. Latham’s idea, which was supported by Carpenter, was to “spare no expense in valves, and cocks, and water meters, and whatever might be required, until at least they found the locality of the leakage. He thought it would be a great benefit to divide the town into sections, so that only a quarter to half the town might be supplied at once.” 50

49 Chadwick papers, box 444, 27 September 1869.
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Carpenter proposed that the High Street, which was the principal area of trade in the town, be widened for both commercial and sanitary reasons. On 19 July 1864 Carpenter submitted the following motion to the Board: “That an application be made to Parliament in the next Session for powers to enable the Board to widen the High Street, and otherwise improve the town of Croydon.” His reasons were fully reported in the *Croydon Chronicle*. Carpenter’s long and detailed presentation, and the discussion afterwards, meant that business did not finish until 10.30pm. Carpenter started by saying that they lived in an age of progress, and that it was the duty of individuals to keep pace with the times in which they lived. He pointed out that those towns where railways had been introduced the value of land had increased enormously, and he need only refer to Croydon as an example. Focusing on the High Street, the *Croydon Chronicle* reported Carpenter as saying:

They knew that accidents were continually arising in that street, and that, commercially speaking, it acted injuriously to trade. He knew numbers of people who would not go into the High Street to transact their business, as, on account of its narrowness, they were unwilling to have their carriages scratched, or run the risk of receiving contusions from collisions with other vehicles.

The *Croydon Chronicle* pointed out another reason why Carpenter wanted to widen the High Street [which was perhaps in his eyes more important]:

The High Street could not be widened without doing away with a number of buildings, which were a pest to the town. There was a place in the centre of the town, which was a kind of cancer - a malignant sore - and it acted as a check upon the Board’s sanitary measures. They knew that these places, or some of
them, were occupied by persons who did not belong to Croydon, and were not connected with the town in any way. They came here from London and Brighton, knowing that they could find a home here.

The *Croydon Chronicle* pointed another group, mentioned by Carpenter:

There was also a class of mendicants who were of no use to anyone. This class existed in enormous numbers in London, and feeling a little poorly; they came out of such places as Kent-street or the Borough, thinking, perhaps, that a change of air would do them good. They brought with them, perhaps some malignant disease, and when they found that their health had not been improved by the change, they would be removed to the Union, and there some of them died.

The financial implications to the town were also highlighted and the *Croydon Chronicle* reported Carpenter as saying: “These persons caused a charge on the poor rates, and his impression was that a considerable number of diseased persons were removed to the workhouse, by which the ratepayers had to bear an increased burden of taxation.” Carpenter then went on to focus on disease and the *Croydon Chronicle* quoted Carpenter as saying:

This matter was worthy of attentive consideration, for it was only with reference to the amount of disease, which was conveyed to our workhouse, but an incalculable amount of disease was introduced to the town. People came here with fever, small-pox, and other infectious diseases - they brought the virus with them - the diseases were spread in the town, and people had to bear the serious effects of illness, without knowing from what source it emanated.

In conclusion the *Croydon Chronicle* reported Carpenter as saying:
The parties who frequented these lodging-houses were parties whom the parishioners could very well do without; they did not improve the trade of the place, neither did they help increase the value of property; they brought diseases nameable and unnameable, amongst us, and if they could be kept away, it would be an advantage to the town. (Hear, hear) 

However, despite Carpenter’s careful plans it was not until 1893 (the year after his death) that work on the widening of the High Street began.

MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH

Carpenter has frequently been quoted as having been a Medical Officer of Health (MOH) for Croydon, although this is incorrect. Croydon, like many other towns, did not appoint a MOH until many years after the 1848 Public Health Act. The appointment was not mandatory and was left up to the discretion of the Local Board. This was despite Chadwick’s most cherished wish, that the appointment should be compulsory. Chadwick was supported by the Lancet, which said, “We regret that the appointment is not compulsory, instead of being left to the discretion of the Board. It strikes us as an absurd anomaly, that the local boards of health should be obliged to elect the inspector of nuisances, but an officer of health is optional; they may elect such an officer, or they may decline to do so.”

The need to appoint a MOH for Croydon was debated on 22 August 1865 by the Local Board of Health. The minutes record that “The subject of appointing a Medical Officer of Health to the Board was discussed and the Clerk was directed to

---
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communicate with each of the Medical Officers of the Board of Guardians for this Parish and request him to undertake the duties of Officer of Health for the District in which he acts as Medical Officer." The Croydon Chronicle included the various points of view from the Board members, including Carpenter, why a MOH was necessary:

The Chairman [Cuthbert Johnson] said – Perhaps you will allow me to suggest to the Board that at a time like this - when cholera is said to advancing with rapid strides to our shores - we should consider whether there is anything to do in the way of setting our houses in order; because I am instructed that what has to be done should be done at once, and not deferred until the onslaught is made upon us. To remove obnoxious matter, when cholera comes amongst us will be attended with danger; and I have thought that an inspection should immediately be made in certain districts, where the inhabitants have not the most cleanly habits - such as Middle Row, and other places with which I am not acquainted and that steps should at once be taken to remove all accumulations of matter which will be likely to engender disease; and also to compel the residents in unclean houses to have them thoroughly whitewashed.

The Croydon Chronicle also included Carpenter’s views and it was reported that:

Dr Carpenter said the presence of two medical men on the Board had certainly been attended with some advantages, and it had also been attended with some disadvantage - it had, perhaps, prevented the Board from having what was necessary for the proper performance of its functions - a Medical Officer of Health for enquiring into the various causes of death, which only a properly qualified medical man was authorised to do.
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During the discussion the Rev. J. G. Hodgson, Vicar of Croydon Parish Church entered the room and asked the Chairman if he could speak. The Chairman agreed and the Croydon Chronicle reported the following:

He [Rev Hodgson] had canvassed the opinions of people of all classes and denominations in the parish, and he only conveyed their sentiments when he said, ‘Pray appoint a medical officer.’ If this visitation came upon them they would not find the clergy backward in doing all in their power to arrest the progress of the disease. (Hear, hear)  

Despite this strong support for a MOH, no decision was taken and the subject was deferred to the following week’s meeting on the 5 September 1865. Mr Close moved that a permanent Medical Officer of Health be appointed at a salary of £100 per year, which was seconded by Mr Crowley. However, due to lack of support by the majority of Board members Mr Close withdrew his motion and the matter was left in abeyance.  

It was a further nine years before Croydon appointed Charles William Philpott as its first MOH, on 24 February 1874. The Town Crier magazine published a cartoon of Philpott sitting on a chair next to a patient’s bed with the caption, “‘I care not if I do become your physician.’ Shakespeare.” The magazine commented, “His skill in his profession is evidenced by his extensive and increasing private practice, which his recent ‘alliance’ will doubtless tend to still more improve and consolidate.”
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"I care not if I do be your physician." — Shakespeare.

Town Crier Cartoon of Charles William Philpott
SEWAGE DISPOSAL

During the second half on the nineteenth century the urbanisation of towns like Croydon, and the expanding population meant an increasing accumulation of human as well as animal excrement. In the early nineteenth century, sewage was deposited in ponds and cesspools and was removed by night soil workers to the town boundary. In some cases the sewage passed into sewers and was transported to the outskirts of the town or discharged into the river or sea. During Carpenter’s lifetime sewage disposal became an important public health issue due to the risks of disease, the costs of disposal and the nuisance value, including the smell. There were differing views on the best ways to dispose of the sewage. On the one hand Chadwick, Carpenter and others promoted surface irrigation, whilst others found it easier to dispose of the sewage into the rivers or sea. Other methods included turning the sewage into manure; deodorising of the sewage by the addition of lime; Captain Liernur’s Pneumatic Sewerage System; and electrical treatment.

In 1857 Henry Austin, Chief Superintending Inspector of the Board, wrote a comprehensive report to the President of the General Board of Health entitled Report on Means of Deodorizing and Utilising Sewage of Towns. It contained sections on difficulties with sewage, deodorization of sewage, manufacture into solid manure, chemical processes for separating the solid matter from sewage, mechanical processes for separating the solid matter of sewage, deposition of the solid matter of cesspools and the separate system of drainage. The Report also looked into the utilisation of open irrigation and the system of underground pipes, distribution of liquid manure and agricultural results for the use of sewage manure. The Report concluded there was no

---
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method that was head and shoulders above the rest. Later in 1865 Simon gave
evidence to the Royal Commission on the Third Report of the Royal Commission on
the Distribution of the Sewage of Towns.62

Sewage treatment and disposal

The various methods of sewage disposal available during Carpenter’s time are now
discussed. On 7 March 1855 a meeting took place at the Society of Arts, London and
a paper was given by J.B. Lawes on ‘On the Sewage of London.’ 63 Lawes highlighted
the economic factors of sewage disposal and reported that, “ Of late years much
money has been uselessly expended in patents and inventions for converting the
sewage into portable manure, which might have been saved by a better knowledge of
the true principles of manuring, and the wants of agriculture.” 64 One of these patents
was ‘Wicksteed’s Process’ named after its originator, Thomas Wicksteed, who was
not convinced that sewage irrigation would work and included calculations to show
the impossibility of employing such a large amount of liquid by irrigation.65 His
process consisted of adding lime to the sewage, and the liquid mud was then put into a
centrifugal machine to throw off the water. The resulting manure was dried off in
sheds with a current of air and the manure sold off from £2 to £2.13s per ton. Lawes
argued that Wicksteed’s plans were too expensive costing a capital of one million to
apply to the metropolitan sewage. Lawes argued that:

... those who advocate the employment of sewage by irrigation, must
therefore seek for an extensive tract of land at no great distance from London

---
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published into a 34-page pamphlet. (Thereafter called Lawes)
64 Lawes, p.263
on which to deposit this fluid; whilst those who propose to separate from it a solid manure, must produce a substance of sufficient productive value to bear the cost of carriage to all parts of Great Britain.

Lawes believed that grass was the most suitable crop for the application of liquid sewage (solid faecal matter which was partially dispersed in water and strained of any residual solid matter by a filter), and that experience alone could decide what was the minimum area of land that would yield the maximum produce and rental from the sewage of London. “And grass being the produce grown, so milk and cream should be the chief products obtained in return.” In conclusion Lawes said, “Whilst, therefore, they must be justly charged for the removal of the sewage on sanitary grounds, they might surely demand, that the cost should be lessened by a proper application of sewage; and it appears to me, that a liberal distribution of it on grass, is the most promising means of attaining this result.” 66 Chadwick joined in the discussion afterwards, and the JSA reported the following:

The only instance in which there had been any observations of which he [Chadwick] was aware of value in respect to sewerage in the new conditions as to drainage, were those of Mr Cuthbert Johnson 67, who for several years had observed the application of the sewerage on his own house to a plot of land, and had analysed the soil water, and noted the products on grass carefully. On his scale 33 acres of land would be required to apply the sewerage of 1000 persons on grassland. 68

Another method of sewage disposal was the Pneumatic System, which was popular on the continent and invented by a Dutch engineer called Captain Liernur.

---
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The process consisted of a locomobile steam engine working an air pump, which extracted all the air out of the interconnected sewage pipes and in turn created a vacuum. The hermetically-closed house valves, were then, one after the other, opened and shut, thus discharging the privy contents, including all gases, into a street reservoir. These reservoirs were emptied at regular intervals by horse drawn pneumatic tenders and transported the sewage to decanting stations situated near a railway station, steamboat landing or canal.

Electricity was also used to treat sewage. For example at the Annual Meeting of the BMA in Birmingham held in July 1890, James MacLintock, MOH for Bradford, gave a paper to the Section of Public Medicine on ‘A Discussion on the Electrical Treatment of Sewage.’ He highlighted the difficulties with the Bradford sewage, which included a large proportion of manufacturing refuse. The BMJ reported MacLintock as saying that “A large quantity of grease and other organic matter from wool washing gets into the sewage and materially enhances the difficulty of treatment, as well as in itself being of an offensive and dangerous character.” The second difficulty with Bradford was the absence of available land for irrigation or filtration works in the immediate neighbourhood. The BMJ reported the following:

Bradford is situated in the midst of a large number of manufacturing districts. It is entirely surrounded by busy and populous communities, which are ever on the watch to resist the establishment of any sewage or other works, which might prove detrimental to their interests. From the conformation of the land no site is available for irrigation or filtration works within the boundaries of the borough. The corporation has therefore been forced to adopt the system of precipitation, lime being the material employed.

The electrical treatment required an ‘electrical plant’ consisting of the following equipment: an electrolytic shoot \(^6^9\) or channel; electric generator; motive power for the generator; necessary conductors for conveying the current to the shoot from the generator. The cost of the equipment was not mentioned and the BMJ quoted MacLintock as saying: “As to the question of cost, I am sorry that I have no definite information to lay before you. There can be no doubt, however, that a large initial expenditure is necessary on account of the immense quantity of iron employed, and the large amount of tank room necessary.” The sewage passed between the vertical plates of the shoot, which were connected to the electrical supply. Some of sewage was also treated in a second shoot. The effluent then flowed into a channel, were it was further aerated and flowed into the Bradford Beck, a tributary of the river Aire.

During the discussions which followed, the BMJ reported the following: “The President [Alfred Hill, MOH from Birmingham] said he did not think the effluent from the electrical treatment was sufficiently pure to go into the stream to be used lower down for drinking purposes.” The BMJ also quoted Carpenter and reported the following: “Dr Carpenter advocated sewage farming as the only useful method of utilising sewage. He referred to the Birmingham Sewage Farm [sewage irrigation] as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty as regards Birmingham. The electrical treatment could not remove much of the dissolved organic matter of sewage.” \(^7^0\)

SEWAGE IRRIGATION

Before we look at Carpenter’s involvement with Croydon’s sewage at the Beddington Farm and the use of sewage irrigation (the application of liquid sewage to fields of rye

\(^6^9\) The ‘shoot’ was constructed of brickwork and was 25 ft in length, 24ins wide, 4ft in depth. It was divided into eighteen cells each containing twenty iron plates, measuring 3ft x 1ft 2ins x ½ ins and each plate weighed 70lbs.

\(^7^0\) BMJ, 1890, ii: 498-9
grass) it is necessary to look at the broader picture of sewage irrigation. I now discuss
the sewage arrangements of Cuthbert Johnson and Alfred Crowley, both members of
the Croydon Local Board of Health, who provoked adverse comments from the local
residents and the press.

Criticism of Croydon Board members

Cuthbert Johnson (Chairman) and Alfred Crowley came in for criticism from local
Croydon residents for irrigating their gardens with their own sewage. In his defence,
the Croydon Chronicle reported Johnson as saying, “I knew that his sewage could
not be a source of annoyance to anyone, because it was not allowed to decompose,
and he was certain that no one could smell it, because no smell existed.” Crowley was
reported in the same article as saying, “the gentlemen who had signed the letter in
question appeared to be fighting upon an idea and not upon a fact.” 71 In the
discussions that followed at the Local Board of Health, reports from Philpott (the
MOH) and Thomas Walker (the engineer) were read. Latham informed the Board that
under the Public Health Act it was for the surveyor to report if a house was not
properly drained, and in that case it must be connected with the sewer. The following
appeared in the Croydon Chronicle:

My [Johnson] operation has gone on for 27yrs, and I have never had any
complaint. I believe that Mr Powell, who has agitated my waters, has admitted
to a member of the Board that there is no smell. If we have created an
offensive smell, we should have had the first enjoyment of it - (laughter) - but
my neighbours, on both sides of me declare they have never smelt anything. 72

71 Croydon Chronicle, 19 June 1875.
72 Croydon Chronicle, 3 July 1875. Johnson must have started with sewage irrigation in his garden in
1848.
The Board decided that following favourable reports from the officers, they were not prepared to take any action on the matter. The *Croydon Chronicle* editorial was highly critical of the Board and wrote, “The complaint lodged with them against two of their members, who had chosen to do what no other inhabitant dare accomplish without incurring heavy penalties, has been shelved in a very unsatisfactory manner.”

The following year the sewage arrangements of Johnson and Crowley caused a further stink and the *Croydon Chronicle* remarked:

Mr Johnson’s unique argument that no nuisance can possibly arise, as the sewage is turned on to his garden every morning at seven o’clock, is a shady compliment to his neighbours. It happens to be the hour when many open their bed-room window to “sniff the pure air from the Atlantic,” as Sir Francis Head designated it, and it is simply abominable that it should be tainted by operations, which the Board would be the first to stop were they carried out by any one other than the Chairman.

**Beddington Sewage Farm**

Carpenter thought the utilisation of sewage by irrigation was the most economical way of sewage disposal. The sewage farms produced grass, which could be fed to cattle, which produced both milk and meat. Produce could also be grown in the meadows and sold. Carpenter was proud of the Beddington sewage farm [see below] and, as will be seen later, he often entertained scientists, Thomas’s students and other

---

73 *Croydon Chronicle*, 17 July 1875.
74 Sir Francis Bond Head (1793-1875) wrote an essay about the Poor Law when he was briefly Assistant Poor Law Commissioner in East Kent, when Edwin Chadwick was Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners. Probably it was because of this connection that he was persuaded to write *The Air We Breathe*, a review of Chadwick’s *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*. He was fond of pure air and chose to live at Duppas Hill, Croydon because of the Atlantic breezes. Also near the site of the Duppas Hill Workhouse Infirmary.
75 *Croydon Chronicle*, 17 June 1876.
guests at the farm. There are also many issues regarding the management of sewage farms that need to be addressed. These include the economic factors, health risks, the quality of the produce grown and the health of the animals that grazed on the land.

First I discuss a letter written by Carpenter, in December 1883, to every member of the Croydon Council on the experiences he had gained at Beddington Sewage Farm. The letter was addressed “To The Mayor and Corporation Of Croydon.” Carpenter wrote, “Gentlemen, The utilization of sewage has had my most careful study for nearly thirty years. It is one of the most important questions of the day, and one of the most difficult to determine.” In the final paragraph Carpenter said:

The duty of the Corporation is to purify the sewage at all cost. This can only be done by rye grass. The grass must be consumed. It ought to be consumed on the spot, because by that means there is the least waste of power. It should be turned into milk and meat as rapidly as possible, and until there is capital sufficient on the land to effect this object, the Council are not likely to find a responsible tenant to take the farm, but when it is well stocked, when it is in good working order, and the produce consumed as fast as it is grown, there will, in my opinion, will be no difficulty in finding a tenant ready to take it off the hands of the committee, who would put such a stake into that for his own sake he must and would succeed. 76

Croydon’s sewage farm had been described many years earlier at a meeting of the Society of Arts on 3 February 1865, when John. C. Morton Esq. spoke on ‘London Sewage from the Agricultural Point of View’ 77 and Chadwick was also present. 78 Morton’s description of Croydon’s sewage farm was as follows:

76 Croydon Chronicle, 29 December 1883, p.5.
near Croydon (Beddington) Mr Marriage deals with the sewage of 20,000 people, in a stream of 1,000,000 gallons per day, over an extent of about 250 acres. He uses the water a second and a third time. His fields vary from 300-500 yards long. Italian rye grass is sown in the autumn, and keeps down two or three years, and is then broken up for mangel-wurzel and followed by potatoes, and is then sown down again.

Morton pointed out that the land that Mr Marriage rented cost £5 per acre, whereas the land in the neighbourhood was only worth £2 per acre. However, because the yield from the produce was £15 per acre, it was therefore a profitable concern.

The produce from the Farm was sold following advertisements in the newspapers such as the Croydon Advertiser. For example in 1870, Mr RW Fuller, auctioneer, announced that he had sold the growing potatoes on Beddington irrigation farm for £19 per acre. In 1871 the following appeared in the Croydon Advertiser, “The Croydon Irrigation and Farming Company are prepared to receive Tenders for the purchase of a quantity of Mangel Wurzel, to be removed from the Farm by the Buyers - Application to be made to the Manager, Beddington Lane, Beddington.” Later in 1874 Carpenter took some of the farm produce to a meeting of the Local Board of Health, in response to letters that had appeared in the daily press stating that the farm produce was spreading all kinds of diseases. He announced that the three gigantic mangel-wurzels (weighing 18, 17 and 16 lbs) on the table before them were specimens of the produce of the Beddington farm, which showed what could be done by sewage. He also displayed a specimen of wheat.

---

79 This equates to 12.5 acres per 1000 population. Cuthbert Johnson thought 33 acres were needed.
80 Ibid, p.188.
81 Croydon Advertiser, 2 September 1870.
82 Croydon Advertiser, 4 March 1871.
83 Croydon Advertiser, 24 October 1874.
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incorporating rye grass
Later that year it was reported that the Croydon Advertiser “had an opportunity of inspecting an unusually fine crop of celery grown on the Local Board’s sewage farm. Each root is a marvel in point of size and weight, while the taste is fully equal, if not better than that of the plants grown in the ordinary market gardens.”

_Croydon the Pioneer of Sanitary Science_

Carpenter’s commitment to the farm paid off, and in 1866 the Croydon Chronicle reported on a meeting of the Local Board of Health with a heading ‘Croydon the Pioneer of Sanitary Science.’ The Chairman, Mr Drummond, reported that an important meeting had been held at Leamington [Sewage Congress, 26 October 1866] and thanked Carpenter and Baldwin Latham for “their kindness in attending that meeting, and for the very satisfactory, skilful, and successful manner in which they dealt with details respecting the sewage operations of the Parish of Croydon.” Later it was reported that Drummond said, “there were no papers that would bear comparison with those read by Dr Carpenter and Mr Latham.” Carpenter’s paper was entitled ‘The success and failures of the Croydon Local Board’ and included a chapter on how to deal with sewage. Carpenter described Croydon’s attempts to deal with the sewage in the earlier years and the Croydon Chronicle quoted Carpenter who said, “The most serious errors, commercially speaking, were the attempts to deodorize the sewage.” Sewage irrigation had been considered, but as the law stood then the Local Board was unable to provide land for irrigation purposes. However, when the law was altered, in 1860 the Local Board was able to take land out of the district [Beddington] for irrigation purposes. Carpenter later wrote, “In the hands of our engineer, Mr Baldwin

---

*Croydon Advertiser*, 21 November 1874.
Latham, it has been made a triumphant success, and presently will tell you what results have attended his efforts."^85

Criticism

Conversely, there were many critics of sewage farming, although Carpenter was always ready to defend the Beddington Farm with his wealth of experience and knowledge. In Carpenter’s presentation in 1859 to the Bristol Congress of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science he pointed out that, “the objections which had been made of sewage farms were mainly three.” These were:

First, that sewage irrigation destroys vegetation, and turns the ground into a pestilential swamp, from which unhealthy miasms must arise, causing fever, ague, dysentery, and general unhealthiness to those living near to the land so used, even affecting population miles away from it. Second was that the wells in the neighbourhood would be contaminated with sewage elements by percolation, and thus also disease be engendered; and third, that the cattle fed upon such farms will be unhealthy, their flesh unwholesome, and their milk and butter unsafe for people to consume, and that the farms will be foci, from which disease will be spread to any of the cattle in the neighbourhood.

Carpenter reassured his audience and it was reported in the Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science that he said, “nothing, however, could be further from the intentions of those who worked sewage farms than to have a swamp. Their great object was, by means of vegetation, to carry off the whole of the decomposing matter. This had been done very successfully at Beddington farm.” Carpenter showed that the young vegetation not only absorbed

---

^85 Croydon Chronicle, 3 November 1865.
many of the elements of the sewage, but the growing plants gave off a great quantity of ozone which could be recognised in many ways. The consequence was that there was really no evidence to show that sewage farms had been productive of evil results to health. In the case of Norwood, Carpenter pointed out that the death rate had fallen very considerably since the establishment of the sewage farm. He agreed that it was possible that some wells could become contaminated and said that earthy materials would usually act upon sewage as filters. Twenty feet of earth of any kind will purify sewage. Experiments, however, had shown that very little percolation takes place, even upon gravel. Finally, with reference to unhealthy cows, Carpenter felt the best answer was derived from experience: “The personal appearance and health of the cows at Beddington was admirable.” More significantly, Carpenter showed that, “the mortality among the cows fed upon sewage grass in Croydon was much less during the cattle plague than in other parts in and near the metropolis. On the farm itself there had not been a single case of foot and mouth disease.”

Carpenter produced a pamphlet from his Bristol talk and appended a paper on ‘The Influence of Sewer Gas on the Public Health.’ The first edition was advertised in the Croydon Advertiser and sold for one shilling. A second edition, was also advertised on the front page of the Croydon Advertiser, and had a section entitled ‘With Notes upon Recent Evidence Adduced Against Irrigation in the Houses of Parliament.’ Following the success of the second booklet, the Croydon Advertiser contained a long article entitled ‘Dr Carpenter On Sewage Irrigation.’ It concluded with the following paragraph:

We do not feel ourselves very competent to decide upon the truly medical aspect of the paper, but our contemporary, The Lancet, says, after a more than

---

86 Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (later called TNAPSS), 1869, vol.xiii, p.488. Conferences were held annually and Carpenter and Chadwick often took part.

87 Croydon Advertiser, 12 February 1870.

88 Croydon Advertiser, 29 October 1870.
copious review, “We recommend Dr Carpenter’s pamphlet to the earnest attention of those who are practically interested in this important public question; ” and we cannot do better than follow the lead of our distinguished medical contemporary.\textsuperscript{89}

Criticism of sewage irrigation continued and on 4 January 1868 an article entitled ‘The Health Officers and the Sewage Question’ appeared in \textit{The Lancet}, prompting Carpenter to write a swift response:

I am not about to contrast the merits of irrigation as against the earth-closet system, but having some practical acquaintance with the subject, I wish to make a few corrections of errors advanced at that meeting. It was fully proved, at the Leamington Sewage Congress, that neither method was fitted for every case, and it will be experience alone, not by theory, that we shall eventually be able to weigh the merits of one against those of the other.

In his letter Carpenter corrected no less than five of the speakers, including the President of the Health Officers Association. He rounded on the first speaker by trusting his own practical experience rather than unworkable theory and said: “If Dr Hawksley [given name not known] had had any practical acquaintance with the working of parish matters, he would have known that his theory is impracticable, and his calculations erroneous.”\textsuperscript{90} The second speaker criticised the waste of water with irrigation, and Carpenter wrote, “I am not prepared to agree with Dr Letheby\textsuperscript{91} that the excessive dilution of sewage is both wasteful and mischievous. The true key to the safe and profitable disposal of sewage is its immediate removal and rapid application to the land in a fresh state. This can only be done by much dilution, or by the general

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Croydon Advertiser}, 17 November 1870.
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Lancet}, 1868, i: 65-6.
\textsuperscript{91} Henry Letheby (1816-1876), analytical chemist; M.B. London, 1842; lecturer on chemistry at the London Hospital; for some years he was MOH and analyst of foods for the City of London.
adoption of the earth-closet system." 92 The third speaker questioned whether the rye grass was wholesome or not, which prompted Carpenter to write:

I now come to Dr Tripe's idea, that it is questionable whether sewage grass is perfectly wholesome. We have had extensive experience in this neighbourhood for some years, and I can safely say that there is not a particle of evidence in support of Dr Tripe's view. The consumption of the grass is so general, that if it were unsafe we must have discovered it long since.

The fourth speaker questioned the successful application of faeces on soils other than sandy ones, and Carpenter wrote:

Dr Thudichum93 is in error when he states that faeces are of no value whatever, except on sandy soil. We have most pointed evidence to the contrary. Our farm at South Norwood is a clay soil, and is even more successful than the gravel soil at Beddington; the length of the grass grown is greater, and the water passes off as perfectly freed from sewage ingredients.

The fifth speaker questioned whether the rye grass could be made into hay or not, and Carpenter replied, "Mr Girdlestone [given name not known] is also in error in stating that rye grass cannot be made into hay: it is so made, and there is a plan of making it by artificial means which, even in wet seasons, may render the farmer independent of sunshine; and where the supply is so abundant and constant, the drying process may be constantly at work."

The President criticised the principle of irrigation in winter, and Carpenter wrote:

---

93 Johann Ludvig Wilhem Thudichum (1829-1901), MRCS 1854, MRCP 1860, FRCP 1878. Simon was influential in getting Thudichum appointed in 1865 as Lecturer in Pathological Chemistry at Thomas's. Thudichum was one of a number of medical men who worked for Simon, some part time, during the period 1858-71. Simon said that Thudichum was 'the greatest chemist between Justus von Liebig and Emil Fischer and one of the truly original minds in biochemistry.' R. Lambert, Sir John Simon, 1816-1904, and English Social Administration, London, Macgibbon and Kee, 1963, p.402. (Thereafter called Lambert)
The President’s observations also require a correction. If he will visit the meadows during the prevalence of frost and snow, he will see that there is no check to the action of irrigation. It is a curious and instructive fact that the meadows do not freeze; the sewage is delivered upon them comparatively warm, and a moderate amount of vegetation is always found. Hence frost and snow, unless excessive and long continued, do not interfere with the principle of irrigation.

Carpenter concluded his letter with the following statement to the Medical Officers of Health: “I have to apologise for presuming to offer opinions to medical officers of health; but as we are all anxious for truth, I hope you will allow me, as a member of the Croydon Local Board of Health, to say what our experience has been.” 94

Spread of disease

The fear of the spread of disease associated with sewage irrigation was a constant source of worry, particularly to families living near the sewage farm. For example on 20 November 1871 Carpenter wrote a letter to the Editor of the BMJ, entitled ‘Sewage and Entozoa,’ correcting comments made by Thomas Spencer Cobbold 95 at a meeting of the Royal Microscopical Society. Cobbold had used terms somewhat to the effect that “while on swampy ground, as about Croydon and other low lying districts, where the mode of irrigation was practised.” Carpenter rounded on Cobbold by saying,

94 Lancet, 1868, i: 65-6
95 Thomas Spencer Cobbold (1828-86), helminthologist; surgeon’s apprentice in Norwich; studied medicine at Edinburgh, 1847; M.D., 1851; curator of Edinburgh anatomical museum, 1851-6; lectured on botany and zoology in London, 1857-84; studied parasitic worms; wrote treatises on parasites from 1864.
“Surely Dr Cobbold has never visited Croydon, or he would be aware that it is neither ‘low-lying’ nor ‘swampy.’ There is nothing like a swamp in any part of the parish.” The reason for the error becomes apparent when Carpenter says:

Dr Cobbold has probably been misled by the biased evidence of Mr Hope [given name not known], who, curiously enough (though Croydon had won its successes in sewage-irrigation before Mr Hope was heard of, except as the type of a courageous Englishman), never reads a paper without asserting something to the detriment of Croydon. We are quite aware that our plans are not perfect, for perfection does not belong to human works; but I wish again to give publicity to two facts. First, I have carefully watched for evidence to bear out Dr Cobbold’s theory. If I had found it I would have published it at once. There is no more evidence now than there was two years ago, when I contradicted Dr Letheby’s deductions at a meeting of the Association of Medical Officers of Health.

Carpenter tried to reassure the readers of the *BMJ* and wrote:

The five hundred acres of irrigated land under our direct supervision (not in the parish of Croydon) continue to be entirely free from the least particle of evidence that they promote either the distribution of entozoa or the production of enthetic disease. We have frequent returns of the state of health in that district; and during the past year the deaths have been at the rate of ten to twenty seven births; and, with the exception of a case of scarlatina which occurred on a hill more than a mile away from the fields, there is not a single death which can be referred to ordinary removable causes.⁹⁶

⁹⁶ *BMJ*, 1871, ii: 627.
Cobbold wrote a response to Carpenter’s letter and Carpenter replied. Carpenter wrote, “In answer to Dr Cobbold, I wish to state that I have nothing to do with angry feelings, and that abuse is not argument.” Carpenter reiterated the three main points that he put in his earlier letter and then went on to say that:

Dr Cobbold could not dispute any of these three points, but adduces the theoretical and fanciful evidence, which was given before committees of the House of Commons. The evidence was totally disproved at the time, and shown to be either unnecessary or improbable. The evidence then adduced had no weight with the judges, and their verdict proves the opinion of six distinct committees in the Lords and Commons to be against Dr Cobbold’s witnesses. Dr Cobbold puts forward their evidence as if it had not been completely disproved. Dr Letheby’s idea that “irrigated land is always a fetid, swampy morass” is an offspring of his imagination.

Carpenter then offered to invite Dr Cobbold to the fields “(unsatisfactory though they be), I shall be glad to show him that there are two sides to a question - a fanciful one and a real one - and that those most engaged in the work will be the best judges, unless they are determined to be deceived, which I am not.”

In 1873 a short article by Carpenter on ‘The Supposed Dangers of Sewage Farms’ appeared in the *BMJ*. In the article Carpenter wrote about the possible effects upon human beings of the ova of entozoa on sewage farms, which had been raised by the Croydon Microscopical Club (of which Carpenter was a member). He felt, however, that the possible dangers did not arise and noted that cases of *taenia soleum* [pig tapeworm] were unknown in Croydon inhabitants. However, if cases did occur, they usually occurred in someone from central Europe or Africa. Carpenter admitted.

---

97 *BMJ*, 1871, ii: 711.
however, that contamination could occur, and recommended that meat be cooked
properly and that sewage farms were properly managed. In the article Carpenter noted
that some critics enquired about what happened to the millions of entozoan, which
found their way down to the sewage farm. His reply was that he had often searched
for them, at the outfall, but had never found them. 

In 1873 the possible links between typhoid and sewage farming, and the
occurrence of typhoid fever and the use of milk were raised when Alfred Smee
wrote to the Editor of The Times. Smee pointed out that the cows liked the sewage
glass and that the quality of the milk was increased slightly. However, the milk had a
slightly rancid odour and the butter became offensive after a few days. In his reply
Carpenter began by saying that Smee’s letter was unlikely to influence the
distinguished sanitary authority to whom it is addressed, but it may influence others
who may be led to believe that the outbreak of typhoid fever in Marylebone was due
to milk from a sewage farm. Carpenter commented that he had repeatedly exposed the
hollowness of Smee’s arguments, and pointed out that both his household and those of
his patients consumed milk from the sewage farm and had not been able to associate
evil with its use.

On 23 September 1874 Sir Philip Rose wrote letter to the Editor of The Times
under the title ‘Water Storage and Water Waste.’ His long letter contained the
following paragraph:

In almost every town the subject of drainage and water supply is now the
prominent question of the day. It is occupying the attention of the thinking

---

98 BMJ, 1873, i: 382.
99 Alfred Smee, (1818-77), surgeon and metallurgist; FRCS, appointed surgeon to the Bank of England
in 1841; to Aldersgate Street Dispensary, London 1842; and to Central London Ophthalmic Institution;
awarded Iris medal of Society of Arts for his battery; FRS 1841; initiated educational lectures of the
London Institution. CONSE DNB
100 Times, 16 August 1873.
man beyond all other questions. The gravest doubts exist whether the plan of carrying off the excreta by water carriage through the sewers is not as radically unsound in theory as it is proved to be wasteful in practice and dangerous in its effects on health, and the distrust in this system is increasing day by day. Each of us can appreciate the danger of having within a few feet beneath us a subtle deadly poison, which at any moment may find a vent into our houses, and to inhale which, if not fatal, as it too often proves, is destructive of health.

However, most of the letter contained facts and figures relating to 'the Pneumatic System of sewage disposal (discussed earlier). Carpenter wrote a reply, confining his comments to the utilisation of sewage by irrigation and said, “Sir Philip writes that water carriage of human excreta is wasteful in practice, dangerous in its effects on health, and that the distrust of the system is increasing day by day.” Carpenter contended that Rose had no evidence to prove the truth of his statements and, far from being wasteful; the cultivation of the land with sewage was profitable.\footnote{Times, 26 September 1874.}

Farm management

There was frequent criticism about the way Beddington farm was managed. For example in 1876 a letter from Carpenter, highly critical of Latham, appeared in the \textit{Journal of the Society of Arts}. This contrasted sharply with the successful meeting held at the Leamington Sewage Congress in October 1866 in which Carpenter and Latham took part. In 1866 Carpenter had made reference to sewage irrigation and said, “In the hands of our engineer, Mr Baldwin Latham, it [sewage irrigation] has been made a triumphant success.”\footnote{Croydon Chronicle, 3 November 1866.} One of the reasons of their dislike for each other
is likely to be due to the events surrounding the Croydon typhoid epidemic, in 1875, which are described later.

In Carpenter’s letter to the *JSA* he was upset at Latham’s highly offensive remarks made about him at the Society of Arts, claiming that he [Carpenter] had adopted a ruinous policy since becoming Chairman of the Sewage Farm Committee, Beddington. Carpenter concluded his letter and said, “we have unfortunately discovered in Croydon that Mr Latham is not a safe guide to follow in sanitary work. Whilst he followed the road which was pointed out to him by the Local Board he kept right, but as soon as he attempted to lead, and we trusted him, we fell into evils as bad as those from which we were trying to escape.” 103

In December 1877 the *Croydon Chronicle* reported that a highly critical article, on the Beddington Sewage Farm had appeared in the *Globe*. The article prompted three replies to the *Croydon Chronicle*, from Latham, Price and Carpenter. Latham said, “... you draw conclusions as to the management of the above farm which might lead your readers to suppose that it is not only unprofitable by reason of its bad management, but that it is prejudicial to the health of the district in which it is located.” Latham pointed out the large increase in the rent from £996 in 1867 to £4,612 in 1877 was the main cause of the deficit. Price argued that the poor balance sheet was down to bad management and highlighted the high rental of £112 per acre. He also pointed out that the committee of management of the farm were continually quarrelling and changing the farm manager every three years. Even when the last manager had asked for an increase in his salary, from £100 to £200 per annum, the committee refused and the manager left. However, the committee must have had a change of heart, as an advertisement in the papers later appeared for a new manager at
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103 *JSA*, vol.24, 1876, p.760.
£200 per annum. With reference to the farm being the cause of the outbreak of fever, Price wrote, “I think you may dismiss this from your mind at once. The folks in the neighbourhood of the farm are ‘extremely’ healthy.” In his letter Carpenter pointed out that although the sewage farm utilised the secretions of more than a thousand fever patients, not a single case of fever had occurred in the surrounding district of the farm. The *Globe* reported that the cost of utilisation of sewage in Croydon was one and three quarter pence per head of population, which Carpenter regarded as cheaper than in any other place of the same size in the kingdom.  

On 7 January 1887 Carpenter wrote to Chadwick and said, “I have a complaint against the Society of Arts. I wanted an opportunity to answer Dr Tidy in detail. [regarding the treatment of sewage] They would not give it and it is impossible in a single short speech to deal with the fallacies contained in his paper.” Either because of Carpenter’s request to the Society of Arts and/or Chadwick’s help, Carpenter was granted his wish. In February 1887 Carpenter gave a paper at the Society of Arts on the ‘Utilisation of Town Sewage by Irrigation.’ In his opening remarks Carpenter said:

> Allow me to thank the Council for having given me this opportunity of stating the case of sewage irrigation, in accordance with my request. I made that request immediately after I read Dr Tidy’s paper upon the treatment of sewage. Having read the abstract, I considered it a veiled attack upon the principle of sewage irrigation, which required a specific reply.

---

104 *Croydon Chronicle*, 15 December 1877, p.3.
105 Charles Meymott Tidy (1843-92), sanitary chemist; MB Aberdeen, 1866; professor of chemistry at the London Hospital, 1876; reader of medical jurisprudence to the Inns of Court; public analyst and deputy medical officer of health for London; invented new method of analysing water, 1879, and published numerous works on sanitary and chemical science and legal medicine. *Concise DNB*, p.1300.
106 Chadwick papers, box 444, 7 January 1887.
The following was reported in the *JSA* “I [Carpenter] will now return to Dr Tidy’s paper, and taking his framework as my skeleton, I will deal with the fallacies contained in it in my remarks upon the general subject.” The four headings that Tidy used were as follows: 1) The method of applying sewage to the land; 2) The soil best suited for irrigation; 3) The crops most suitable for a sewage farm; 4) The value of crops so grown. Robert Rawlinson was called upon by the President to give a vote of thanks and it was reported in the *JSA* that Rawlinson said, “he had listened to the paper with the greatest interest and pleasure.”

The financial viability of the sewage farm was a constant worry, particularly to the ratepayers. Earlier on 9 and 10 May 1876, the Society of Arts held a conference on the ‘Health and Sewage of Towns.’ The General Committee included Chadwick, who was Vice President, and Latham and Carpenter who were on the committee. Carpenter’s paper dealt with the ‘Financial Account of the Beddington Sewage Farm.’ He demonstrated that the over ten years period from 1867-76 the total receipts and payments showed a loss to the Parish of Croydon of £5441 16s 6d. Carpenter was asked questions from the audience including Chadwick who asked if the sewage delivered on the farm was in a state of putridity, or whether it was distributed fresh. Carpenter replied that in theory it was delivered fresh, but unfortunately they had many badly constructed sewers. The result was that the sewage was not always as fresh as it should be. Chadwick suggested that it could be corrected by the re-adoption of a new system of self-cleansing sewers. Chadwick also enquired if there had lately been any cases of typhoid in Croydon and what had been the condition of the drainage

---

107 Rawlinson, Sir Robert (1810-1898), civil engineer; entered employ of Jesse Hartley [q.v.], 1836; chief engineer under the Bridgewater trust, 1843-7; inspector under the Public Health Act, 1848; chief engineering inspector to local government board, 1848-88; head of sanitary commission, and sent by the government to seat of war in Crimea, 1855; knighted, 1894; published technical works and reports. *Concise DNB*, p.1089. Rawlinson was a supporter of Chadwick’s views.

108 *JSA*, vol.35, 1887, pp.221-42.
at those points especially. Carpenter replied that an epidemic of typhoid, which arose the previous year, was most likely caused by the interference with the water supply. The water had been delivered containing typhoid matter, and a number of cases of fever had occurred. The excreta of the patients found its way into some of the badly constructed sewers, and the gases arising unfortunately found their way into some of the houses, which were built by speculative builders and not constructed as they ought to be. Wherever typhoid cases were found there was some defect in the sewer arrangement, by which gases found their way into houses or into the water supply or both.\textsuperscript{110}

Later, on 14 November 1876, Carpenter wrote a letter to the Society of Arts about the previous year's financial statement of the Beddington sewage farm. The statement highlighted a deficit of £1,505 between receipts and payments. By deducting the valuation of the farm, this deficit could be reduced to £1,039. Carpenter pointed that an enormous rental was paid for more than 400 acres out of the 466 acres, and that £500 was charged against the farm on account of the freehold land, which belonged to the parish.\textsuperscript{111}

\textit{Chadwick}

Carpenter and Chadwick both attended the Annual Congresses of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, the Society of Arts and, later, the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain. In his letter to Chadwick, dated 27 September 1869, Carpenter thanked Chadwick for his kind and encouraging note and said, "I wish you could have taken part in the proceedings, as something will be wanting if

\textsuperscript{109} Up to this time Carpenter had only written one letter to Chadwick, on 27 Sept 1869, concerning the Beddington Sewage Farm.
\textsuperscript{110} JSA, vol.24, 1876, pp.614-7.
\textsuperscript{111} JSA, vol.25, 1876, p.48.
you are not there." We are not told where these proceedings were or any details about the paper. However, we do know that Carpenter gave his first paper on 2 October 1869 to the National Association of Social Science Congress at Bristol, which was entitled: ‘On the Physiological and Medical aspect of Sewage Irrigation.’ It is highly likely that Carpenter was referring to this Congress, as Chadwick and Carpenter were both members of Council of the Health Section of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science and were both interested in sewage irrigation. Carpenter’s letter discussed three issues, namely water supplies, the Beddington Sewage Works and Westall’s quarterly mortality tables. With reference to the Beddington sewage works Carpenter wrote:

The Beddington Farm is not carried on at all to our satisfaction and next March it will be decided upon by the Board by lapse of time the lease expiring and I believe it will not be renewed to Mr Marriage but retained in the hands of a manager whose object will be to work it with entire reference to its sanitary state on the principles enunciated in my paper as necessary for the proper sanitary state of a sewage farm without reference to the pecuniary return. I believe the latter will be secured by it more effectively than is at present. Our great point is to avoid the formation of marshy spots upon the ground otherwise as you pertinently surmise we should get disease."

At the 1871 annual conference of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, the subject of removal and utilisation of sewage was on the agenda. Chadwick joined in the discussion afterwards, and said the cheapest mode of removal

---

112 Chadwick papers, box 444, 27 September 1869.
114 Chadwick papers, box 444, 27 September 1869.
was by water, which arrested decomposition and carried the sewage away most completely. With reference to health Chadwick went on to say:

In England we had a good test of the water closet system, as water closets were brought into prison cells. As a rule, no class of persons, have so high a degree of health as prisoners. The death rate was reduced to about three to four per 1000. It was lamentable at this time that the distinction should not be understood between a self-cleansing sewer, and one, which allows the deposit to accumulate. And there was a further distinction between sewage fresh and sewage putrid. Nothing could be more important than this distinction. If anybody going to a water closet perceives a foul smell he may be satisfied that the sewage is bad.  

Sewage Farm competition

In 1880 a Sewage Farm Competition took place and the Mansion House Committee, in connection with the London International Exhibition of the Royal Agricultural Society, offered two prizes, each to the value of £100, to the best-managed farms in England and Wales. There were three judges, and unfortunately for Croydon, one was Latham. Class I was for the best managed sewage farm utilizing the sewage of less than 20,000 people, and Class II for sewage farms for over 20,000 people. Croydon was entered in the Class II category together with Birmingham, Doncaster, Reading and Leamington. Bearing in mind the management problems at Beddington and Latham’s highly critical comments in 1876 to the Society of Arts about the farm, it is not surprising that Croydon failed miserably. Leamington won in Class II and the judges recommended a second prize to Doncaster, with Birmingham highly

\[^{115} TNAPSS, 1871, vol. xv, p.414, Annual Conference, Leeds.\]  
\[^{116} Ibid.\]
commended. The *Croydon Chronicle* summed up the mood and wrote, “If there had been a prize for the farm in the worst condition it would have had a much better chance.” 118 Carpenter must have been dismayed by these events, and yet despite all these setbacks he would later put the Farm on to the International stage.

**Visits to the Farm**

By November 1871 it had been announced at the Local Board of Health that the Rivers' Pollution Commissioners were to visit Beddington Farm. The *Croydon Advertiser* reported, “The Chairman observed that the Royal Commissioners had made many elaborate reports on the subject, and were almost unanimous in their commendation of the system for the disposition of sewage by means of irrigation. (Hear, hear)” 119

Other visits to Beddington Farm took place, and on 12 June 1875 Carpenter entertained 200 scientists when it was recorded that the weather was exceedingly stormy and the luncheon tent was wrecked. The *Croydon Chronicle* remarked:

Dr Carpenter who, we might say, has to an extent inherited the kingdom of Beddington, or rather its farm, gave a sumptuously prepared feast to a number of guests, invited for the express purpose of proving to the best of his ability that irrigation was the cheapest system and best for the disposal of town sewage; that sewage-grown crops are not injurious to cattle; that adjacent property is not deteriorated in value by the presence of the irrigation farm, and that the health of the neighbouring district bears favourable comparison with others far removed.

---

117 *Croydon Chronicle*, 7 February 1880.
118 *Croydon Chronicle*, 19 June 1880. The delay was due to full reports being compiled on all the farms.
119 *Croydon Advertiser*, 4 November 1871.
The guests included many influential members of the Houses of Parliament, and representatives of Local Boards who were learning the secret of sewage farming. The *Croydon Chronicle* then went on to say, “We in Croydon have paid very dearly for the materials out of which the experiments have been made and which Dr Carpenter’s guests are to profit from. But having paid the bill we are permitted to gaze with admiration on the purchase and bid others admire our enterprise.”

Carpenter later wrote to the *BMJ* about the Croydon Sewage Farm, and said “I have to thank you for your impartial review of the inspection of Beddington Sewage Farm and may refer to the visit by the scientists already mentioned.” Carpenter pointed out that the annual accounts only showed receipts and expenditure, and did not show any of the items termed ‘un-exhausted improvements’ such as making fences, roads and building cow houses. He said that until a seven-years account could be published together it was not possible to show a balance on the right side. Later, on 20 June 1877, Carpenter showed a class of students from Thomas’s around Beddington Farm, as he was Lecturer in Public Health at Thomas's at this time.

In 1877 Carpenter wrote to Chadwick, inviting him and a friend to lunch, with a chance to visit the Beddington sewage farm. In a P.S. Carpenter pointed out to Chadwick the farm balance sheet he had delivered at the Society of Arts Sewage Conference the previous week. He wrote another letter to Chadwick on 4 September 1877 and included a reply to a question about the sewage farm:

In answer to your question regarding the sludge it is simply strained out by a strainer and the crude sewage allowed to go on the land at once. The faecal balls and coprolotics and other rubbish, which is collected at the filter house is mixed with the dustbin refuse and left to putrefy at the filter works. It is a

---

120 *Croydon Chronicle*, 19 June 1875.

121 *BMJ*, 1875, i: 873.
nuisance with its removal. It is sold at 2s 6d a load, which is quite as much as it is worth. The load being a cartload, as much as one can take away.  

1881 International Medical Congress

1881 was the year of the International Medical Congress, held in London which Sakula has said, "was arguably the greatest and most historic medical congress ever held." Carpenter appears in a large group portrait. He predictably read a paper to the Congress on 'The Utilisation of Town Sewage by Surface Irrigation: being the experiences gained at Beddington Sewage Farm.' He also invited 200 members of the International Medical Congress to visit the Beddington Farm. The Croydon Chronicle reported: "They consisted of representatives of every nation and language." The Croydon Guardian wrote, "It was important because it afforded the only opportunity of furnishing for discussion a subject with practical illustration." The article continued, "A special train had conveyed the members from Victoria Station to Beddington, where carriages awaited them, and in these the company rode over the farm, alighting at the various points of interest, and journeying on, watching the process of irrigation to the outfall into the Wandle, where the water, in effluent state, is discharged, and flows to regions unknown." In the discussions that followed, one gentleman from Buenos Aires had come to gain what information he could about the disposal of sewage in a city of 300,000 persons. Others came from the United States,

122 Chadwick papers, box 444, 10 May 1877.
123 Chadwick papers, box 444, 4 Sept 1877. In this letter Carpenter told Chadwick that he had given a short course of lectures on public health to the students at Thomas’s and that they were to be published in a book by Simpkin and Marshall. Carpenter promised Chadwick a copy when the book was printed.
124 A. Sakula, 'Baroness Burdett-Coutts' Garden Party: The International Medical Congress, London 1881,' Medical History, 1982, 26: 183-90. Forty-three medically qualified ladies from different countries were excluded from the meetings of the Congress because they were women.
125 Ibid, fig 4 facing page 185.
127 Croydon Chronicle, 13 August 1881, p.4
South Australia and European towns. Carpenter provided lunch for the guests in the large hall of the Beddington Asylum nearby. The *Croydon Chronicle* noted, “The *piece de resistance* was a noble baron of beef weighing 110 lbs, the animal who had been butchered to make a medical holiday having passed its uneventful life in eating rye grass on the farm.” At the end of the proceedings Carpenter proposed the health of the Visitors, associating with the toast the names of Bishop Tufnell and Chadwick.

The following then appeared in *Croydon Chronicle*:

> Mr Chadwick, in replying said he wished to have the opportunity of exhibiting the progress that had been made in this place in Croydon. It was nearly the first place the Local Government Board, of which he was chief medical officer, had to deal with, and at that time the death rate of the parish was something like twenty-eight in the thousand. But what had sanitary science done in Croydon? It had reduced the death rate from twenty-eight as low as fourteen in the thousand. This was an example of what sanitary science had achieved by rudimentary means, which were further improvable.

The article continued and reported Chadwick as saying:

> The elements of sanitary science were so very certain that sanitary scientists could undertake to achieve grand results. At present the death rate in London was twenty-two in the thousand, but he (Mr Chadwick) believed it was possible to reduce it to seventeen in the thousand or less. Those present had seen an example of what could be done and they might, by applying the same simple principles, in time achieve results. They might reduce the mortality by one half. (Cheers)  

---

128 *Croydon Guardian*, 13 August 1881.
129 *Croydon Chronicle*, 13 August 1881, p.3.
The *Croydon Chronicle* summed the day up when it wrote in its Editorial, "The fame of the Croydon sewage farm, and of Dr Carpenter, will be spread in almost every corner of the civilized world. Before the visitors left nearly all of them shook hands with the Doctor, whose liberality in defraying the cost of a special train, and providing carriages and lunch, was thoroughly appreciated." 

On 27 August 1881 Carpenter wrote to Chadwick and enclosed a paper with a list of those present at the luncheon. Carpenter noted, "that several Frenchmen were present." Carpenter continued, "we are much as when you visited us, our mortality could easily be reduced to 10. We ought to have a MOH who could continually inspect our lower class of house." 

The feasibility of Carpenter buying the farm was raised in June 1887, when the following heading appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle*: ‘Dr Carpenter Proposes to take over the Beddington Sewage Farm.’ This came about following a letter Carpenter had written to the Town Clerk, which had been read publicly at a meeting of the Croydon Town Council and without Carpenter’s consent. The following week Carpenter wrote a letter to the *Croydon Chronicle* and asked if they could publish a reply that he had written to the Town Clerk. The letter said, “I am much obliged to your courtesy in sending me a copy of a part of the report of the Farm Committee. I protest against the publication by the committee without my consent of a private letter written to a member of the Corporation.” Carpenter continued, “However, I shall not complain of its publication, as it will show the Corporation that I am not afraid to put £20,000 of my own capital into the farm, as I feel certain that I should gain a good £5,000 a year by the investment.” However, Carpenter's offer was never taken up.

---

130 Ibid, p.4.  
131 Chadwick papers, box 444, 27 August 1881. Carpenter was unhappy with Philpott.  
133 Ibid, p.3.
Visits to the farm continued, and in July 1888 Carpenter invited two hundred members of the Association of Sanitary Inspectors of Great Britain, a body whose duties were described as “onerous and very unpleasant.” The party included William Corfield and Louis Parkes. As well as the Beddington Farm they also visited the large dairy farm and public baths. A luncheon provided by Carpenter was held in the Small Public Hall. Later, in 1889, an important visitor to Croydon and the Beddington Sewage Farm was Dr de Pietra Santa, President of the Societe Francaise de Hygiene. Carpenter introduced Dr de Pietra Santa to the Borough Council at a meeting, saying that he was one of the most eminent sanitary engineers on the continent and thought it a great privilege for the Corporation to have his presence on this occasion. In reply the Croydon Chronicle wrote, “Dr de Pietra Santa said he had great admiration towards Croydon, and he hoped the town would go on to prosper. The Council were the Croydon police in a sanitary sense, and he and others on the continent fully appreciated the work being done here in Croydon. (Applause)”

In 1891 the Seventh International Congress on Hygiene took place in London, which was opened by the Prince of Wales. Carpenter gave a paper on Sewage Farming. The Croydon Chronicle concluded its report by saying “We congratulate Dr Carpenter upon his views being so largely reflected at such an important gathering as that now being held in London.” This was Carpenter’s last talk on sewage farming before he died in 1892.

---

134 Croydon Chronicle, 14 July 1888, p.3.
135 Croydon Chronicle, 11 May 1889, p.2.
137 Croydon Chronicle, 15 August 1891, p.4.
PUBLIC SERVICE

In 1855 the Committee of the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution were concerned about the falling attendance at its meetings, which was due to not having an adequate premises. Later, in 1857, it was resolved to form a company under the Limited Liability Act for the erection of New Public Lecture Halls since the Institution was its main tenant. Other reasons put forward were, "a public room was needed for concerts or entertainment that men of first class talent could be brought to, or that the gentry of the neighbourhood would attend." Carpenter had been Honorary Secretary of the Institution since 1857 and he also gave a piece of land for the building of the Halls. On 3 September 1859 Carpenter wrote a letter to Lord Brougham, inviting him to lay the foundation stone of the new public halls. It is unclear whether Lord Brougham accepted the offer, as no other correspondence has survived and there is no mention of the laying of the foundation stone in the minutes of the Institution. When the New Public Halls opened, in 1860, a Bazaar and exhibition of works of art and natural history collections was held for three consecutive days. Carpenter's wife, Margaret, and Westall's daughters helped with one of the stalls at the bazaar. A week later, on 16 June 1861, a public dinner was held and tickets were sold for one guinea each. The dinner was attended by a variety of prominent gentlemen and there were numerous after-dinner speeches. The following appeared in the Croydon Chronicle:

Edward Westall, Esq., then rose, but the applause with which he was received was so great that it was some time before he could speak. When silence was

---

138 Croydon Chronicle, 9 June 1860.
139 Brougham papers, letter from Carpenter to Lord Brougham, 3 September 1859, University College London.
140 5, 6 and 7 June 1860. Season ticket was half a crown.
obtained, he said he was a poor speaker at the best, and he was afraid they had taken away the little power, which he had.

The *Croydon Chronicle* went on to say:

He [Westall] came into Croydon 30 years ago, and there was no such thing as a literary institution. Some few years passed away, and then a few friends met together, and they agreed to establish a literary institution. He believed that the majority of those whom he considered his best friends thought that he was beside himself. Indeed they said as much. However, he joined a few friends, and they established a literary institution.

Carpenter responded to one of the toasts and the *Croydon Chronicle* reported the following:

Dr Carpenter. In responding, said that Lord Brougham, in an address upon education a few months ago, said that no man should speak in public, unless he had prepared his speech beforehand. He was sorry to say that he had not carried out Lord Brougham’s advice, for what with the calls of his profession, his assistance to the late Bazaar, and other advocations, he had not had a single moment to spare to prepare a speech for that evening. (Loud applause) They would therefore forgive any lapsus linguæ that he might make.

The *Croydon Chronicle* continued when it was reported that Carpenter said:

Their excellent Chairman in his address had alluded more particularly to his (Dr Carpenter’s) services in the Hall. It had indeed been his hobby. But he should have been powerless to accomplish his favourite object if it had not been for the active and zealous colleagues combined with him to accomplish success. What with the difficulty of obtaining the site. What with the difficulties of obtaining an architect, and a proper design, within the means
and yet desirable, and what with the difficulties of obtaining the needful money, the project had often been looked upon with apprehension, and almost despair, and he could say that if it had not been for the encouraging perseverance of Mr Westall, his heart would have failed him. But the meeting now saw the result, and what he believed to be a glorious result.¹⁴¹

Later, a committee of the New Public Halls, Croydon, presented Carpenter with a gold watch and chain for all his hard work. The note from the Rev JG Hodgson, Chairman of the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution, which accompanied the gift, plus Carpenter’s reply both appeared in the Croydon Chronicle.¹⁴²

Later, in 1861, Carpenter’s reputation was given a further boost when his professional skills were extolled at the annual Vestry Easter Dinner. This was held at the Greyhound Hotel, Croydon and provided by Benjamin Bean, the hotel owner. A large party of gentlemen sat down to an excellent dinner and “the bill of fare was on a most liberal scale, and the wines, dessert, and general arrangements gave complete satisfaction.” The Croydon Chronicle reported that the Rev John Hodgson (father of Rev J G Hodgson, the vicar of Croydon parish church) gave a toast and said he wanted to mention one name:

I have therefore most affectionately and gratefully to thank Dr Carpenter for his assiduity, his diligence and his persevering attention to my son [during his illness]. (Hear, hear) The skill, kindness, and great attention he has rendered on this occasion, does him (and I say it before you all) the highest honour. And, gentlemen, I rejoice, not only on my son’s account, but I rejoice on his (Dr Carpenter’s) account, for he is just now inaugurated into the place of Dr Westall; and he told me himself that under the last circumstance he was now

¹⁴¹ Croydon Chronicle, 16 June 1860.
¹⁴² Croydon Chronicle, 30 June 1860.
placed in a situation of great responsibility, for he knew that the eyes of all Croydon were upon him, and that the greatest anxiety was manifested by the parishioners on my son’s account. Therefore he wished me to call in other professional assistance. But, gentlemen, I would do no such thing. I saw there was a skill and ability in Dr Carpenter, and I left the case in his hands. I have now the pleasure of congratulating him upon his success. (Loud cheers) And thus it is that Dr Carpenter has inaugurated himself amongst you under what, I consider the most favourable circumstances.

The Rev John Hodgson then proceeded to say a few words about Westall, Carpenter’s senior partner. The *Croydon Chronicle* wrote, “I [Rev John Hodgson] cannot omit saying a few words respecting Dr Westall, whom I have to thank for his kindly and friendly visits to my son, and I hope and trust he will be surrounded with happiness in his partial retirement, and that one of his pleasures may be to see his successor succeed to his popularity and usefulness. (applause)”

**HOSPITALS**

In April 1866 the lack of hospital accommodation in Croydon was highlighted in the *Croydon Chronicle*. At this time the town only had the workhouse and infirmary on Duppas Hill, and the *Croydon Chronicle* reported the following, “the want of adequate hospital accommodation in this rapidly increasing town has long been felt, and we are glad to say that a movement has been set on foot for supplying this much desired desideratum.” On 6 April 1866 a meeting of friends favourable to the cause of starting a new hospital in Croydon, supported by voluntary contributions, was held in the Town Hall, Croydon. At this meeting the sum of £149 2s 0d was

---

143 *Croydon Chronicle*, 6 April 1861.
144 *Croydon Chronicle*, 7 April 1866.
collected. The invitation to attend was signed by T.W. Sutherland, JP; T.R. Edridge, JP; R.A. Heath; A. Carpenter, MD; Thomas Farley; H.J. Close; A.G. Roper, FRCS; G. Price Esq.\(^{145}\) and the Rev J.G. Hodgson was in the Chair. The following resolution was moved by Admiral Williams and carried unanimously, “It is expedient that a Hospital be established in Croydon for the reception of persons, during illness, whose position in life unfits them for the Workhouse Infirmary, but who require that care and attention, which they cannot obtain at their own Homes.”\(^{146}\) The catalyst for this move was that a new Workhouse was nearing completion at Queens Road, Croydon, and there would be empty wards left behind when the workhouse moved. However, before the voluntary hospital could accept patients these empty wards would need fitting out. It was estimated that the cost of fitting out two wards, containing 17 beds in total would be £250 and the annual cost of caring for 17 patients £544 7s 6d. The new workhouse was completed on 25 September 1866, and shortly afterwards a voluntary hospital [later to be called Croydon General] was opened. The *Croydon Chronicle* reported the following:

> It is almost unnecessary to state that the hospital will have to be supported by voluntary contributions, as all similar institutions are; but it is computed that the class of persons to be admitted will be in a position to contribute towards their support whilst they are inmates - say, 5s per week, which from 17 patients will amount, in a year, to £221, thus reducing the annual cost to £323 7s 6d.\(^{147}\)

\(^{145}\) Price appears in the *Croydon Chronicle* but not in Paine’s book. G.A. Paines, ‘Croydon General Hospital,’ extracts from the Minutes of Meetings of the Committee and Board of Management, 1866-1947, unpublished, Croydon Local Studies Library, pp.60. (Thereafter called Paines).

\(^{146}\) Paines, p.3.

\(^{147}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, 7 April 1866.
In October 1866, amongst the Rules and Regulations drawn up and approved were the following:

That this Institution be called the Croydon General Hospital and be designed for the benefit of those persons engaged in the Industrial occupations of life, including Domestic Servants, who when over-taken by sickness or accident are unable to obtain that accommodation, care and attention which the affluent can command and the destitute have by law provided for them.\textsuperscript{148}

The hospital relied on voluntary contributions; a person donating ten guineas or more became a Life Governor, and a yearly subscription of one guinea and upwards constituted an annual Governor.\textsuperscript{149} At a time when mortality from disease was high, it was essential for the hospital to have some form of monetary security from the in-patients. Hence one of the Rules stated that, “no person shall be admitted as an in-patient without security from some substantial person for payment of expenses of burial or removal.” Not all patients could gain admission to hospital, for example persons disqualified for admission were “Lunatics and persons disordered in their intellect; children under seven years of age; persons having habitual ulcers or consumption in its last stage or having small pox or itch.” Even having gained entry into hospital, patients were still liable to face expulsion if they were found swearing, cursing, using abusive language, guilty of improper conduct or playing at cards or dice, smoking within doors or using spirituous liquors.\textsuperscript{150}

By 1873 there was an increasing demand for beds at Croydon General. Oakfield Lodge was purchased and Croydon General moved to its new site. Archbishop and Lady Tait attended the opening ceremony, which included many local

\textsuperscript{148} Paines, p.3
\textsuperscript{149} Ward’s Directory, 1868, p.xlvii
\textsuperscript{150} Paines, p.4.
1873
Official Opening of the New Croydon General Hospital
(Formerly Oakfield Lodge)
dignitaries including Carpenter. As the demand for extra beds continued over the years, extra wings were subsequently added on to the hospital. For example, on 13 November 1883 the Duke of Edinburgh came to the Borough to lay a foundation stone in the new wing of Croydon General Hospital. This was the first Royal visit since the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. Three hundred guests attended the luncheon in the Great Hall and the *Croydon Chronicle* reported the following: “These rose as the Prince entered, and the band of the Grenadiers, under the able leadership of Mr Dan Godfrey, played the National Anthem. His Royal Highness sat on the Mayor’s right hand, and Lord Monson to the left.” Carpenter responded to a toast to the Governor’s of the Whitgift Hospital and the following was reported in the *Croydon Chronicle*:

Dr Carpenter, in responding expressed his deep gratification for the words, which had fallen from Mr Grantham and His Royal Highness on this occasion, with regard to the Whitgift Governors. He was in somewhat of a peculiar position, feeling something like the Head Master at Eton, who, when King George visited the school, expressed a wish to keep his hat on lest if he removed his hat the others should think meanly of him. (Laughter).

In the evening the Mayor provided fireworks on Duppas Hill, which attracted many thousands of people.

**SOCIETIES**

As well as his professional commitments, Carpenter was an active member in a number of Societies. Apart from the BMA, Society of Arts and the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution, which have already been mentioned, these included the

---

151 *Croydon Chronicle*, 17 November 1883, p.2.
152 Ibid, p.3
Croydon General Hospital (with the new "Royal Alfred" wing).

Croydon General Hospital in later years
Croydon Medical Reading Society, Croydon Microscopical Club, the New Sydenham Society and the Medical Society of London.

**Croydon Medical Reading Society**

The Croydon Medical Reading Society was founded in 1832, although only the records from 1867 onwards survive. The records show that Carpenter attended the first meeting listed in the Minutes Book, on 9 January 1867. It is highly likely, however, that he became a member much earlier in the 1850s as this is the period when he was active with other societies. Croydon’s Medical Reading Society was founded in the same year as the Cambridge Medical Book Club. However, whereas Cambridge voted itself out of existence on 14 July 1865 Croydon’s Medical Reading Society survives to this day. The society is now called the Croydon Medical Society and there are three meetings and an annual dinner annually. Speakers have now replaced books and the meetings are held at a local private hospital instead of in members’ homes. Bishop has said that these medical book societies were quite distinct from the ordinary medical societies:

... they rarely had a settled home and their membership was made up of a few - rarely more than twenty-medical men who subscribed to buy a book each month and then exchanged the books among themselves. These book clubs represent a remarkable instance of enterprise and self-help on the part of country practitioners who were almost entirely cut off from all other forms of library service.

---

153 Croydon Medical Reading Society Minutes Book, (9 January 1867 - 21 October 1891).
154 W.J. Bishop, ‘Medical Book Societies in England in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,’ *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, vol. 45, no 3, July 1957, p.347. The reason for the Cambridge Medical Book Club’s demise is likely to be due to many books going missing.
In Croydon from 1867-1891, there were sixteen members who paid an annual subscription of 10s and met quarterly in each other’s houses. They also had an annual dinner at the Crystal Palace (10s 6d per head), which was paid for out of the Society’s funds. On 14 October 1868 the possibility of forming a medical library for the books belonging to the Society was suggested and defeated. At each meeting, following the formalities, books recommended for purchase by the Society were put forward and required both a proposer and seconder. Every six months, a selection of medical books, which had been in circulation for more than one year, were sold to the members. Fines of 2s 6d were charged to members who were absent for more than one hour on ordinary nights, and 5s on nights of book sales.

Carpenter was also a member of the New Sydenham Society, which published works from leading authors. The Croydon Medical Reading Society paid his annual subscription of one guinea, from 1867-84 (when he resigned). Later, in 1889, Carpenter donated 500 of his books to Croydon General Hospital.

Medical Society of London

In 1870 Carpenter became a Fellow of the Medical Society of London and was a councillor on three occasions, a steward and conversazione steward. In 1871 he read two papers to the Fellows. The first, on 16 January, was entitled ‘The Causation of Scarlatina.’ Carpenter informed the audience that his enquiries into scarlet fever extended over a period of ten years, and during that time he had attended 268 cases (we are not told the age range) without one fatal result. Hardy has shown that scarlatina mainly affected children between the ages of 1-5yrs. What is unusual,

---

157 The whereabouts of these books is unknown and Croydon General closed in the 1990s.
159 Hardy, p.57.
however, is that in London between 1861-70 the average death rate in the under-5s from scarlet fever was 5.80 per 1,000 living, and yet Carpenter reported no fatalities. As to the aetiology, Carpenter believed that “scarlatina might arise de novo, having an apparently spontaneous origin, in any position in which the elements required for its development were brought together and then exposed to the proper physical influences necessary for its growth.” He gave instances whereby putrid and decomposing animal matter, blood and offal, etc. could cause scarlatina. To reinforce his arguments Carpenter gave three examples. The first was three separate families who developed scarlatina living on a healthy hill. Carpenter believed that the disease was caused by miasma blowing from some fields not far distant, which had been manured with slaughterhouse refuse. A second case occurred at a boys’ school, which had a cesspool under the playground and was fed by some refuse from a slaughter yard. Carpenter remarked that when this refuse was directed elsewhere the outbreaks of scarlatina ceased. His third case occurred where all the children sleeping over a fowl house developed scarlatina. Carpenter pointed out that the fowls were regularly killed, and their blood poured on to the floor. After some discussion the *BMJ* reported Carpenter as saying that, “he believed the disease to be common in the families of slaughter-men and butchers; and in districts where large quantities of blood passed into the sewers and then became putrid.”

Carpenter’s second paper was read on 13 November 1871, and was entitled ‘Cases of Muscular Anaesthesia.’ In his talk he presented the case histories of two sisters, whom he described as “two intelligent young ladies of a city gentleman,” who suffered “a gradual but decided decrease in muscular power.” The case provoked such interest, that a committee consisting of Drs Benjamin Ward Richardson, John

---

160 Carpenter repackaged Pettenkofer’s ideas in terms of x, y, z variables, which are discussed later.  
161 *BMJ*, 1871, i: 121.
Hughlings-Jackson, Lockhart Clarke [given name not known] and Carpenter examined the cases further and reported back to the Society the following week. On 20 November 1871 it was reported that the committee had found that, “the muscular contractility was greatly impaired, but not so the muscular sensibility.” Lockhart Clarke recommended they continue with galvanic current, phosphates and stimulants. Hughlings-Jackson remarked that he had never seen any similar cases.\textsuperscript{163}

Carpenter later had a pamphlet printed which included the talk on ‘Muscular Anaesthesia’ (1871) and ‘Malignant Pustule’ (1873) [a paper he later presented]. It also included a paper on Acute Farcy or Glanders.\textsuperscript{164}

SUCCESS AND FAILURE

Up until 1870 Carpenter’s career appeared to be one of increasing success. However, the cracks started to appear in 1871 when he failed to get elected to the Croydon School Board, and in 1872 when he was not re-elected to the Local Board of Health. The School Board Elections are now discussed.

1872 School Board Elections

The Boards were set up in response to the Education Act of 1870, and designed by William Forster to provide schools for all children. The School Boards were elected by the ratepayers, and had the power to require local authorities to raise a rate to help pay for the schools and to enforce attendance. A contemporary cartoon in \textit{Punch} shows Forster telling a group of children that they will have an education, with a

\textsuperscript{162} \textit{Lancet}, 1871, ii: 779-80.
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid, 780.
\textsuperscript{164} Pamphlet containing papers on ‘Malignant Pustule,’ ‘Acute Farcy of Glanders,’ ‘Muscular Anaesthesia,’ 1873, Croydon, F. Warren.
Croydon's first School Board election took place on 1 March 1871 and there were sixteen candidates. Every householder, whether male or female, was entitled to eleven votes each, which could either be given to one single candidate or distributed amongst the candidates. Prior to the elections, advertisements appeared in the newspapers and Carpenter was one of eight candidates nominated by the Church of England. The advert read: "To all Members of the Church of England and all who are anxious to promote Religious Education."

Carpenter was an active member of the Croydon Parish Church and following the destruction of the Church by fire in 1867, was invited to sit on the Restoration Committee. The Church should have been officially opened on 8 December 1869, but "due to the dangerous illness of his Grace" (Archbishop Tait) this had to be postponed. The consecration was carried out on 5 January 1870, by the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of London (Dr Jackson), and exactly three years after the destruction by fire.

A letter addressed by Carpenter "To the Ratepayers of the Parish of Croydon" appeared in *Croydon Advertiser*, with a heading "Croydon School Board." In the opening paragraph Carpenter wrote:

If you elect me as one of your representatives on the School Board, I will endeavour to do my duty to the best of my ability, and conscientiously support the principle which I have always studiously promoted-viz, that sanitary science and mental education are parts of the same whole-that it is impossible

---

166 *Croydon Advertiser*, 25 February 1871.
for the people to have healthy bodies if their minds are untrained and left in a
diseased or imperfectly developed state.

It is clear from Carpenter’s letter that he was uncertain about becoming a member of the Board, as later he wrote, “I am not personally anxious for a seat at the Board, but I consider it a duty not to shrink from advocating the opinions I held. I have therefore allowed myself to be put forward as one of the candidates for your suffrages at the approaching election.” Carpenter was against personal canvassing and said, “I shall follow my usual course of not soliciting a single vote, for I consider personal canvassing to be one of the main causes of unsoundness in the present condition of local self government.” Carpenter’s opinions about the wider aspects of children’s education, namely hygiene, physical training and religion, were also put forward when he wrote: “If returned as a member of the new Board, I shall advocate the cultivation of cleanly habits and proper physical training, accompanied by a teaching based upon revealed as well as natural religion in the simplest possible form.”

Carpenter promoted gradual change and also the same choices for the rich and poor alike. He wrote, “I should advocate the gradual and gentle adoption of the compulsory clauses of the Education Act, on the principle that every man is bound to educate his child up to a certain standard. I would, however, give the poor man the same liberty in his choice of teachers as is now enjoyed by the rich.” Despite his support for the poor, Carpenter drew the line when he said:

I should, however, as soon think of clothing and feeding all the people at the public expense as of providing a free education for all. It would to my mind be the first step towards Communism and the adoption of the principles of

---

168 *Croydon Advertiser*, 25 February 1871.
169 Frederick Engels, aged 27, wrote ‘The Principles of Communism’ in 1847 just prior to the 1848-9 Europe wide revolutions. This was to be the Communist manifesto. The final manifesto, worked on by Marx, differs considerably from the first draft of Engels ‘The Principles of Communism.’
Prud'homme - that “all property is robbery.” At the same time, I think that the development of mental power should be encouraged wherever it is to be met with, and that it should be perfectly competent for a boy to win his way from any rate-aided school to a University degree if he has the ability to do so.

In conclusion Carpenter said, “I would therefore invite the religious sections to select representatives, but I do not think the election ought to be made a platform for the dissemination of either political or sectarian opinions.”

Two days before the election, a large meeting took place at the Public Halls to hear the addresses of some of the candidates. The following appeared in the Croydon Advertiser, “Dr Carpenter who, on rising to address the meeting, was received with loud cheers and hisses.” This was likely to be due to a number of factors, including the voters being unhappy that six candidates were selected from the Church of England with only five Non-Conformists, Carpenter’s involvement in the closing down of the Workmen’s Club and his outspoken views on public health issues. Carpenter began his talk with his favourite subject namely sanitary science and the Croydon Advertiser reported the following, “He [Carpenter] had always asserted his conviction during the twenty years he had lived in Croydon that prevention was better than cure, both in regard to the health of the mind as well as of the body, and he, with other gentlemen had succeeded in effecting a vast improvement in the sanitary condition of Croydon as far as bodily health was concerned.” The article continued, “They might rest assured that he [Carpenter] would do all he possibly could to carry out the provisions of the Act of Parliament in such a manner as would tend to elevate the sanitary condition of the mind of the people, if he were unfortunate [sic. i.e. fortunate] enough to be returned as a member of the Croydon School Board.” Carpenter pointed out that another reason why ratepayers said that they would not
vote for him was because he would not have the time “to attend the onerous duties which would have to be performed by the School Board.” Carpenter countered this criticism and the following appeared in the *Croydon Advertiser*:

Now, he [Carpenter] believed he was the best judge of that. His time was his own, and he was fully determined to use it as he pleased. Who were the persons who thought he had not sufficient time? They were gentlemen who were very fond of going to the theatre, dining out, and such like amusements. He had no objection to their taking their pleasure in any manner they thought proper, but he certainly entertained a very great objection to their interfering with his amusement.

Later, he caused uproar by saying that a great many of his friends had been asked to vote for outsiders, as they were told they need not vote for Carpenter as he was sure to be returned. On the other hand Carpenter’s support for the Liberal party meant that many of his Tory friends did not vote for him. In addition his Nonconformist friends did not vote for him because he was a churchman. The report in the *Croydon Advertiser* also quoted Carpenter as saying:

> It had been his fortune during the time he had been in the profession of which he was a very humble member - A voice ("A very humble member") it had been his lot to be often at the side of the death-bed of all classes - in all ranks of society, both rich and poor, both high and low - and on such occasions he had noticed that it was perfectly immaterial whether they were churchmen or Nonconformists, Liberals or Conservatives. Creeds were then of no use. A man might be a Churchman or a Roman Catholic, a Wesleyan or a Congregationalist - it matters not at his last day what he has been if he had not a belief in his own unworthiness, and trust in some one else. He believed he
had lost some votes in consequence of stating this belief, but he maintained that those who refused their votes on these grounds were bigots, and he did not want their support. (Hear, hear)  

It was clear that Carpenter had many critics in the audience, as there was further uproar when he was accused of being a half-liberal because he had something to do with closing down the Workmen’s Club. Carpenter explained that, as Treasurer, the Club was in debt to him by more than £100. The *Croydon Advertiser* wrote “He [Carpenter] contended that he was himself a working man, and he asked for the help of the steady hard working man, but not for the help of the drunkard, the lazy, or the man who left his wife and family to the care of the Parish.” Following Carpenter’s talk a number of other speakers addressed the audience, and the meeting ended, it was reported, in uproar and great confusion.  

When the election took place, there were eleven seats available from the sixteen candidates in the poll. Carpenter came twelfth, with only 670 votes, and was not elected. The *Croydon Advertiser* wrote:

> Croydon has muddled through its first School Board election, and proved beyond all doubt the vagaries of the cumulative voting system, and the danger of coalitions being entered into while sectarian ‘outsiders’ have the option to enter into competition and spoil well-intentioned ‘compromises’ by energetic action and well organised canvassing.

*Local Board of Health*

Carpenter’s second, bigger, disappointment was not to be re-elected to the Local Board of Health in 1872, and missing out by a mere 16 votes. His letter to the
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170 *Croydon Advertiser*, 4 March 1871.
171 *Croydon Advertiser*, 4 March 1871.
172 T.R. Frewer came eleventh and polled 1,532 votes.
173 *Croydon Advertiser*, 4 March 1871.
Ratepayers of Croydon Ward after the Poll provides us with some clues as to why he was not re-elected. Carpenter wrote:

Ladies and Gentlemen, Twelve years’ service in fighting the battle of truth against error, health against disease, and purity of food against adulteration, has met with the usual reward. I have nevertheless the pleasing duty of thanking those who have shewn their appreciation of my efforts by wishing me to continue a Member of the Local Board of Health, and at the same time to assure them that the falsehoods which have been propagated with the view of influencing Votes against me, when it was too late for me to reply to them, will not deter me from continuing the contest which at present appears to be very unequal.

Carpenter also included a paragraph thanking the Board members: “I have also publicly to thank the Members and Officers of the Local Board for the uniform kindness and courtesy I have experienced from them, notwithstanding the disagreeable duty which often devolved upon me of criticising their actions, and their work.”

Carpenter’s obituaries give further clues as to the reasons why he was not re-elected to the Local Board. A few months before the Board elections, he gave a lecture to the Croydon Microscopical Club on ‘Adulteration of Food, Detected by the Microscope,’ which was later published. Carpenter’s paper raised the wrath of the grocers and milkmen, and it was reported in the *Croydon Advertiser* that, “some clever and unscrupulous fellow hinted in large posters that the doctor was guilty of the dreadful crime of having dealt with those reprobates at the Civil Service Stores. The anonymous logician asked his ‘brother tradesmen’ if they were aware of this fact, and

---

174 *Croydon Chronicle*, 7 April 1872.
175 ‘On Adulteration of Food,’ *Proceedings of the Croydon Microscopical Club*, 21 February 1872, p.12. (Thereafter called PCMC)
whether, therefore, the doctor was fit to be a member of the Local Board.” The Croydon Advertiser continued:

... this was non sequitur, but then logic must not be looked for at election times in the average tradesmen, whose intellect is bounded by the walls of his shop. As a matter of right, Dr Carpenter or any other man may deal where he chooses. Whether he had or had not tried the London Stores, is not now of any importance. The shopkeepers were touched in a vital point - the breeches pocket; and the plumbers, whom he accused of a want of sanitary knowledge in the construction of their house fittings, joined in the general cry, which lost him many votes. The cry answered its purpose; the little tradesmen put out the great light, and the doctor fell for the first time in his life into the minority.  

Carpenter was still able to exert his influence to the Local Board of Health. For example, he wrote a letter, entitled “The Smoke Nuisance,” to the Local Board, which appeared in the Croydon Chronicle. Carpenter wrote, “I wish to bring to your notice the flagrant manner in which the Smoke Nuisance Act is set at nought by the many persons in Croydon, notwithstanding the warnings which have been issued by the Board.” More embarrassingly, the Waterworks, owned by the Board, were also implicated. Carpenter continued: “This is not to be wondered at, considering the fact that the chimney of the Waterworks engine house puffs out dense volumes of the blackest smoke at occasional periods.” Carpenter was either an insomniac or, more likely, was called out to one of his patients in the middle of the night, for he wrote, “At three o'clock this morning a splendid cloud overhung the town, which presented a magnificent contrast to the otherwise pure morning air. I do not think it was so conducive to health as if the contrast had not existed.” Carpenter then put pressure on

176 Croydon Advertiser, 30 January 1892.
the Board by saying, “I have observed the same thing at other times, and as it may be hard for the Local Board to have to prosecute themselves, it is my intention to apply to other sources for protection from a serious evil if it is continued.”

On 13 April 1872 the Croydon Chronicle announced that Carpenter had been appointed a Justice of the Peace for the Eastern Division of the County, a post he held until his death in 1892. In effect, Carpenter had transferred his valuable services from the Board to the Bench. The Cases were heard on Saturdays and the Proceedings were regularly published in the Croydon Newspapers. As will be seen later, as a JP for Surrey he also sat on committees which were involved in the planning, building and running of Cane Hill Lunatic Asylum until 1889, when the Surrey Justices involvement ceased following the formation of the London County Council.

BMA

Carpenter achieved further success when he was elected President of the South-Eastern Branch of the BMA, a post his previous partner and mentor, Westall, had held in 1864. The meeting was held in the Crystal Palace in July 1872. Prior to the meeting, some members had lunch provided by Dr Cresswell [given name not known] of South Norwood, and afterwards visited the Croydon Sewage Farm. In Carpenter’s Presidential Address he touched on a variety of topics. The first was “the practice of securing elections to medical appointments by the purchase of votes.” Carpenter condemned this practice and said that the proper method was to appoint a committee. Carpenter then spoke about the role of medical witnesses in courts of law and said that skilled assessors should be appointed, occupying a position analogous to that of the
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Trinity Masters in the High Court of Admiralty. Regarding small-pox and vaccination the *BMJ* reported the following: “Dr Carpenter said that the fee for each case of successful vaccination at the public expense should be five shillings, together with half a crown for a certificate; and he recommended that the children should not be brought to stations, but should be vaccinated at their parents’ homes.” Referring to the prevention of disease, the *BMJ* article reported that, “he [Carpenter] said that this was the most glorious part of the profession. Such successes as those obtained in the recovery of the Prince of Wales [the Prince contracted typhoid in December 1871] must not turn the profession from the duty of impeding the establishment of disease in any preventable shape.” Carpenter felt that the State should be urged to make proper provision for such services and that some officials should be appointed in every district, “who shall compel obedience to sanitary law.” As to the means of carrying out the prevention of endemic diseases, the *BMJ* reported on Carpenter as saying:

> It is preposterous to suppose that medical men who have to live by the practice of their profession are to be the only class of men who are to practice their profession, and at the same time destroy their own income without any recompense. The same parsimony which now impedes the working of the Vaccination Acts will prevent the possibility of carrying into effect proper sanitary laws, unless those who have to make them effective are independent of the local authorities.

The subject of a medical officer of health was raised and the *BMJ* reported the following:

> The appointment of a medical officer of health for every drainage area should be made imperative upon every district; and he ought not to be paid out of the local rates, but from the imperial exchequer. To ask the local bodies, whose
own election depends upon the amount of local rates which are levied, should themselves fix the salary to be paid to the health officer, is about as sensible as to ask the inmates of Wandsworth gaol to appoint and pay the warders of the prison."

Carpenter felt that the local officer must be completely independent of the local authority, as is the policeman of the pickpocket or disorderly characters of this district. The article continued and quoted Carpenter as saying:

We ought to insist upon the appointment of officers of health, of high standing, and of special training. They ought to be paid according to their position and their ability and as so long as they do their duty they ought to be independent of any local authority. This is a noble work, and one worthy of prosecution by such an Association as ours.

After the business of the meeting, the members and friends of the Association assembled for dinner. Carpenter knew many of the influential people who were seated on the top table and the BMJ reported: "Dr Carpenter presided, supported on the right by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, J. Watney, Esq., MP, the Rev. J.G. Hodgson, vicar of Croydon, and Rev. William Benham, vicar of Addington; and on the left by Sir William Gull, M.D., Bart. Dr. John Syer Bristowe, and Cuthbert Johnson, Esq." 179 It is likely during a period of reflection during the dinner Carpenter had overcome his disappointments and was perhaps looking towards the future?

CHAPTER 4
ARCHBISHOPS

This chapter describes how Carpenter was invited to succeed his partner, Westall, as medical attendant to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and how he looked after four successive Archbishops during his lifetime. Nobody has fully studied the medical advisers of the Archbishops of Canterbury, mainly because the sources are few, scattered and hard to find. In the case of Archbishop Sumner neither personal nor official papers have survived. However, Carpenter’s correspondence to the Archbishops provides us with an insight into the medical and non-medical issues affecting the lives of the Archbishops and their families. They also demonstrate Carpenter’s qualities as a caring doctor. Firstly how Carpenter became medical attendant to Archbishop John Bird Sumner is now described.

One of Carpenter’s obituaries states:

Dr Carpenter has enjoyed a unique position in regard to the Archbishops of Canterbury. It was over thirty years ago that he was first called to see Archbishop Sumner, and he afterwards attended Drs Longley and Tait, as well as the present Primate, Dr Benson. He has had the unexampled experience of closing the eyes of three Archbishops, a circumstance, which he used to refer to with pardonable pride to those who enjoyed any intimacy with him. ¹

ARCHBISHOP SUMNER

In 1860 Carpenter was invited by Archbishop Sumner to succeed Westall, his senior partner, who was retiring. Archbishop Sumner presented Westall with a Lambeth

¹ Croydon Advertiser, 30 January 1892
Addington Palace
degree of Doctor of Medicine (honoris causa) on 17 January 1861, as a mark of appreciation for his medical advice and care over the preceding years.²

Carpenter consulted with the Archbishops at Addington Palace, Croydon, which had been their summer residence since 1807. Previously, Croydon Palace had been the favourite home of the Archbishops of Canterbury, a manor they owned before Lambeth.³ Fifty-one consecutive Archbishops, starting with Archbishop Lanfranc ⁴ in 1079, had been in residence in Croydon Palace up until 1757. The decline in popularity of the Palace followed from the town becoming more industrial and unhealthy in the eighteenth century. This was possibly due to nuisances from smoke from the charcoal burners, and the smells from the cesspools and polluted ponds nearby. The Palace was eventually sold in 1780 ⁵ and a new home for the Archbishops was sought. In 1807 Addington Place was purchased and renamed Addington Palace, and became the summer residence for the Archbishops up until the death of Archbishop Benson in 1896.

Archbishop Sumner (1780-1862) was eighty years old when Carpenter became medical attendant. He died aged 82 on 6 September 1862. ⁶ The death certificate recorded epileptiform convulsions and albuminuria for seven weeks, pericardial effusion for ten days and uraemic coma for fourteen hours.⁷
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² F1/HH, pp.157-8, Lambeth Palace Library.
⁴ Give name not known.
⁵ In 1780 an Act of Parliament permitted Cornwallis to put the Old Palace up for sale. In 1781 Abraham Pitches purchased the Palace for £2,500 and it became a washhouse. Today it is a successful independent all-girls school called Old Palace.
⁶ Illustrated London News, 20 September 1862. Sumner died at Addington Palace on 6 September 1862. The funeral took place at Addington Church and he was buried in the church graveyard.
⁷ Certified Copy of an Entry of Death, General Register Office, DXZ 093335.
ARCHBISHOP LONGLEY

Charles Thomas Longley (1794-1868) succeeded Sumner and is remembered for calling the first Lambeth Conference in 1867. Carpenter looked after Longley and also members of his family. For example on 3 April 1864 Carpenter attended Longley’s daughter, Fanny, who was suffering with measles. This was regarded as a “much dreaded disease,” which entailed “more evils on the health of childhood than any other.” Measles was a common infectious disease where 3 out of every 1000 children under the age of 5 died from complications, in England and Wales during the period 1861-70. Longley’s anxiety about his daughter’s health is revealed in a letter to his son, Henry, when the Primate was away in Ospringe. Longley wrote, “Your letter of this morning naturally made me anxious, whilst your assurance from Dr Carpenter that there was no cause for alarm on dear Fanny's account has kept me up.” Longley later wrote:

I long to be at home again and with her. I was quite prepared for her having the measles severely whenever they did come; and I am willing to hope that with the blessing of God, the worst is over this time; as Dr Carpenter foretold two bad nights-delirium is I believe not at all uncommon in measles.

Longley trusted Carpenter’s abilities, judging by the concluding remarks in the letter: “Dr Carpenter seems to have been very attentive; and I believe him to be very clever. This is a very favourable time of year to have measles. I should think that Fanny had better remain in country air for the present - but we can talk over our plans when we meet.” Carpenter’s other skills were appreciated when Longley wrote to his son, Henry, from Addington Palace on 23 September 1864:

---

9 Hardy, p.30.
10 Longley papers, MS 1838, pp. 92-3.
Archbishop Charles Longley and the First Lambeth Conference
Carpenter syringed my ear well, and the deafness is quite gone, I am happy to say - a solid plug having come out - I am taking Wilson’s prescription diligently and hope to conquer my internal energy - but it will take a while to alter the habit - I have got sick of the night waking - and yesterday there was less of the pain than I have ever had - I find I must be very careful as to my diet at present. 11

Although Carpenter was medical attendant to the Archbishops, opinions from specialists were also sought. In the previous letter ‘Wilson’s prescription’ is mentioned, although we are not told who Wilson was or what the prescription was for. However, in a letter dated 17 January 1866 Longley had a double consultation with William and Erasmus Wilson. 12

I am to meet the two Wilson’s, the Dr & Erasmus at 3 o’clock tomorrow at 28 Dover St.

I.... Ride up in the carriage tomorrow to London..... you shall hear, before we return, what the doctors say - Wilson liked the appearance of the affected parts better than the last time - but the disorder is grumbling on.

Your afft Papa

E. L. Cantaur. 13

It is likely that Longley had a skin disorder, although, we are given no clues as to its aetiology.

---

11 Longley papers, MS 1838, pp.109-10.
12 Longley papers, MS 1839. The consultation is likely to have been with Dr James Arthur Wilson (1795-1882), physician, and Sir William James Erasmus Wilson (1809-84), physician. 28 Dover St, London, was the address of James Arthur Wilson, MD Oxon, 1823; FRCP Lon 1825 (St Georges), late senior physician St George’s. 1866 Medical Directory.
13 Sir William James Erasmus Wilson was a dermatologist and wrote a book entitled Treatise on Diseases of the Skin in 1842. He founded and held the Chair of Dermatology at the Royal College of Physicians, London from 1869-77 becoming President in 1881. It is unclear what skin disorder Longley was suffering from.
By 1868 Longley’s health was slowly deteriorating. It is probable that, acting on the advice of Carpenter, John Syer Bristowe consulted Longley at Addington Palace three days before he died.\(^{14}\) Bristowe became physician to Thomas’s in 1860 and Carpenter had worked as an assistant to his father in 1847. Although we are given no clinical details in the letter, it is likely that Bristowe was asked for an opinion on Longley’s pneumonia, from which he had been suffering for a total of ten days before his death. Carpenter would have spent many hours at the Archbishop’s bedside, but despite Carpenter’s efforts Longley died on 27 October 1868, aged 78yrs.\(^ {15}\) Carpenter certified the cause of death as emphysema for ten weeks, bronchitis for six weeks and pneumonia for ten days.\(^ {16}\) There is no reference to a skin disorder.

On 14 November 1868 Carpenter wrote to Longley’s son, Henry Longley, and said, “I hope I shall never forget the privilege which was accorded to me in seeing so much of his grace during his last illness and the lesson which was there caught is worthy of memory for all time.”\(^ {17}\) The manner of Longley’s death and the way in which the family had conducted themselves made a big impression on Carpenter for he wrote, “not only in teaching one how to die but also how to be bereaved. The beautiful and touching behaviour of your sisters I shall never forget and I am indeed very grateful to Mrs Longley for showing me your father’s last words.” Carpenter referred to the sisters again and said, “The calm and angel-like conduct of all your sisters was indeed very beautiful.”\(^ {18}\)

\(^ {14}\) Tait papers, vol. 85, p.49. The reference to Bristowe is contained in a letter from Henry Longley to Tait. “My dear Lord, Very many thanks from all of us for your most kind expression of sympathy. Dr Bristowe saw my father today with his usual medical man [Carpenter] and they report favourably of him.” Bristowe was also Medical Officer for Health for Camberwell and wrote a popular text entitled *Theory and Practice of Medicine.*

\(^ {15}\) Longley papers, vol. 8, pp. 232-3.

\(^ {16}\) Certified copy of an entry of death given at the General Register Office, DXZ 093346.

\(^ {17}\) Longley papers, vol. 8, pp. 232-3.

\(^ {18}\) Ibid.
ARCHBISHOP TAIT

Archibald Campbell Tait (1812-1882) was Bishop of London at the time of Longley’s death. He was offered the See [the diocese of a bishop] of Canterbury by the Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli, and accepted. Tait was enthroned as Archbishop in February 1869 and the following year on 18 November 1870, suffered a stroke. 19

Tait had previously suffered with poor health in 1848 20 and 1866. 21 On 28 October 1866 John Hassard wrote a letter to Catharine Tait (Tait’s wife) and recounted the advice given to Mrs Tait, regarding Bishop Tait’s recent illness, by Dr James Begbie, a physician from Edinburgh. 22 Begbie offered advice on preventing a recurrence [we are not told what the illness was, although diabetes mellitus is a possibility]. Tait was told to avoid sugar in his tea, as it is “ruination - it simply adds fuel to the fire.” With regard to meals, Tait was advised that he “should take his meals at the stated times, with the greatest care (eating slowly) and regularly.” Regarding drinks, “dry pale sherry should be drunk instead of full bodied sherries.” Hassard continued, “try giving up all other wines but the very best claret taking his pint or some of it throughout the day. In fact live on sound claret. He thinks it might entirely alter the blood.” Finally Hassard recommended that potash water should be drunk instead of soda water.

Despite all this advice from Hassard Tait suffered a stroke whilst staying at Stone House, which he had purchased in 1868 with a bequest from a distant relative. 23

---

20 Tait Correspondence, vol.78, pp.58-60. Letter to Tait from W.C. Lake who wrote, “You are my oldest friend.”
21 Tait Correspondence, vol.103, pp.256-8. This letter is indecipherable, and therefore the letter from John Hassard has to be referred to.
22 Tait papers, vol. 103, p.259.
23 Stone House, St Peter’s, Broadstairs was a small estate in the Isle of Thanet.
Archbishop Archibald Campbell Tait
Tait regarded Stone House as a refuge from the almost overwhelming work and anxieties of the diocese of London. Davidson described Tait's recollection of the event:

I had not finished dressing when I fell prostrate and senseless on the floor. It was a convulsive seizure of the most alarming kind, and on the recurrence of a second attack a few hours later, it was thought right to telegraph Craufurd Tait [his beloved son] from Oxford. There was partial paralysis of face and arm and side, and Mrs Tait wrote that evening to his sister that they were 'simply waiting for the end.' But though the attacks recurred at intervals, he lost no ground.

Three days later, Archdeacon Parry, who was acting as domestic chaplain, wrote,

Gull and Haden were here yesterday. I begin to be a little hopeful. Last night he felt faint again, and wished for Holy Communion, so Mrs Tait woke Craufurd [his son] and me at half past three, and we had the solemn service in the stillness of the night. No more convulsions, but he is drowsy, and the numbness on the left side is, I believe, the worse symptom. But, as I say, I hope - for life, that is; - for I see no prospect, in any case, of further work.

The report continued, “The medical reports, however, of the next ten days gave little hope for recovery, and an official intimation in The Lancet, more than a fortnight after the original seizure, emphatically warned his [Tait’s] friends against adopting an over-sanguine view.” Despite the pessimism, Tait made a gradual recovery and on 17 November 1870 he wrote to Queen Victoria, and enclosed a letter from Gull who

---

24 Life of Archbishop Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury, p.49.
25 Sir William Gull (1816-90). Gull attended the Prince of Wales during his severe illness from typhoid fever, and was then brought into public notice. In 1872 he was created Baronet and physician extraordinary to the Queen. Haden was Mr S. Haden (given name not known). Tait also attended by Walter [given name not known] and Thomas Raven, his local medical advisers in Broadstairs.
26 Life of Archbishop Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury, p.49.
recommended that Tait should have a complete rest. Queen Victoria agreed to this request. After his six months break Tait wrote back to Her Majesty, from Stone House, on 22 May 1871, and said:

The Archbishop of Canterbury presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and desires on his return home to express his thanks for your Majesty’s kindness in having approved the course recommended by his medical advisers. The Archbishop is glad to be able to report to your Majesty that by God’s goodness, he has now reached home in tolerable health and ready he trusts for such work as lies before him in these anxious times.

Tait went back to work and all was well for a while.

Carpenter corresponded with Tait on a variety of issues, both medical and non-medical. For example, on 3 May 1874 Carpenter wrote to Mr H. Max Spooner, one of Tait’s Chaplain’s, to warn him of a troublesome family headed by a Mr James Watney, who had upset the congregation in most of Croydons’ churches that the Watney family had attended. Carpenter said of Watney, “He is exceptionally Tow church’ and has attended most of the churches in Croydon. He quarrelled with the incumbents one after the other and eventually took the whole family in a cavalcade of three or four conveyances every Sunday to Streatham.” Carpenter pointed out that because Watney’s son was now a candidate for the parliamentary elections for East Surrey, the family had moved back to St Matthew’s church. Carpenter continued, “he will do nothing for our vicar at all ” and wrote, “I give you this information so that the Archbishop may know the kind of man and sound him out accordingly.”

---

28 Tait papers, vol. 89, p.207.
29 ‘Tait’s left arm long remained quite helpless, nor did it ever again, during the thirteen years of his life, regain its full vigour.’ Life of Archibald Campbell Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury, p.49.
CRAUFURD TAIT

Craufurd Tait was the only son of Archbishop Tait and his wife Catharine. On 2 December 1877 Tait wrote in his journal about Craufurd’s illness, although at this time the diagnosis was not given. Tait wrote, “Dear Craufurd is not very strong and we are very anxious about his future.” 31 Later, on 31 March 1878, Tait wrote, “Thank God the doctors speak more hopefully of dear Craufurd.” 32 On 14 April (Palm Sunday) another entry read, “Dear Craufurd very weak has been sitting at the open window. His progress 33 is slow indeed of late. His mother and I feel at times much ... down. Thank God for his good nights and great and equal spirits. He bears his illness like a real Christian. May God bless him.” 34 On 23 April Carpenter wrote a letter to Catharine Tait about his concerns with Craufurd’s illness. 35 Carpenter began, “I do not like to let you remain any longer in ignorance of the great anxiety I feel on Craufurd’s account ever since he visited Sir James Paget.” 36 Carpenter tried to be optimistic and went on to say, “I have had my suspicions as to the nature of his disease and although I have refused to look at it in the same light that others do, it is because I have the abiding hope that his case may prove the exception to the rule.” Craufurd’s illness had been discussed on a previous occasion as Carpenter writes, “The question you put to me in the drawing room tells me that I must not keep you any longer in ignorance as to my fears. The disease under which he is suffering has been generally fatal sooner or later.” Carpenter later says, “but I cannot find the

31 Tait papers, vol.62, p.43 verso
32 Ibid, p.67 verso.
33 The use of sf instead of ss was still used at his time.
34 Tait papers, vol. 62, p.70.
36 Sir James Paget (1814-99), surgeon, St Bartholomew’s Hospital, London, sergeant-surgeon to Queen Victoria, vice chancellor of London University (1883-95).
Craufurd and Catharine Tait
history of a case which has been cured but then no case that I can find has had the advantages which Craufurd has.” Carpenter’s religious conviction was also demonstrated when he writes, “I dare not trust myself to tell you all that I have thought but I write this first trusting that we may together ask for guidance from one above as to the best course to be followed.” Carpenter was also worried about how this terrible news would affect Tait:

I dread the effect of this knowledge upon the Archbishop. I was anxious to keep it from him until after the Synod but I dare not keep it any longer from you and I shall consider that he [Craufurd] is to get well again, despite of all I read and all I am told about. He has youth; he has a good heart and a resigned spirit. Surely we shall have a favourable answer to our prayers?

Carpenter ends his letter with the following comment: “I cannot say that there is any more serious symptoms now than there was a month ago but he is not any better. Believe me with the greatest sympathy.” 37 Later, on 19 May, Tait wrote from Addington Park “Dear Craufurd was able to come to Chapel today to receive the Holy Communion. Thank God for it. We have again here Sir William Gull and I am most hopeful.” 38

On Sunday 26 May Tait moved Craufurd to Stone House, Broadstairs, and Carpenter travelled with them. Carpenter’s care and attention is evident when Tait writes:

Yesterday we came down here with our precious son. Dr Carpenter most kindly accompanied us and remains here for a few days to watch over his patient. Craufurd bore the journey well. We pray earnestly that this wonderful

---

37 Tait papers, vol.103, pp.314-5.
air may work for his restoration and the renovating of his blood. He is very
patient and cheerful thank God.\textsuperscript{39}

Craufurd was initially well enough to get out along the lighthouse road by means of a
portable chair. However, things soon changed for the worse, as revealed in Tait’s next
diary entry at Stone House on Ascension Day, Thursday 30 May. He wrote, “I now sit
down to read the events of the last three days with that sad, sad determination.
Monday dear Craufurd was as usual laid out on the lawn. I think in the morning I
drove to Ramsgate, where Carpenter and I examined the Baths. He [Carpenter] asked
me afterwards if I thought the baths might be of use to him? ” On the Tuesday 28 May
Tait wrote, “He [Craufurd] brought up some blood and Carpenter was so uneasy that
he advised me not to go to Maidstone, where I was expected to dinner. Thank God I
did not go.”\textsuperscript{40} Carpenter went along to Margate to purchase a galvanic battery and on
his return applied it “vigorously to the spleen [of Craufurd].”\textsuperscript{41} It was reported that
Craufurd seemed in good spirits though complaining of sickness. After dinner
Craufurd went to bed much as usual. On Wednesday 29 May 1878 “Carpenter
reported that [Craufurd’s] his pulse was abnormal at 100 and was very uneasy at
having to go away for some other patients, but he gave full instructions to Walter and
Raven [Tait’s local medical adviser’s] and promised to return at night.” Later that day
Craufurd took a turn for the worse and died, “a blow from which Mrs Tait never
recovered.”\textsuperscript{42} The death certificate, signed by Thomas F. Raven, recorded the cause
of death as splenic leucocythaemia for two years and haematemesis and melaena for
twenty-four hours.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{39} Tait papers, vol.62, p.80
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid, p.85.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, p.86.
\textsuperscript{42} G.K.A. Bell, \textit{Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury}, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1938,
p.42.
\textsuperscript{43} Certified copy of an entry of death, General Register Office, DXZ 952912.
Craufurd’s funeral took place on Tuesday 4 June 1878 in Addington Churchyard. Tait was accompanied by Catharine his wife and their three daughters. The *Croydon Chronicle* reported the following: “the churchyard was crowded by dignitaries and clergy of the Church; by relatives, dependants, parishioners; and by a strikingly large number of old college friends.” Rev William F. Erskine Knollys, rector of Saltwood, West Hythe, in Kent, to whose curacy the deceased had been ordained, took the service at the grave. Craufurd was interred next to the graves of Archbishop Longley and his daughter (Mrs Levitt). 44

Later on 9 April 1879 Carpenter presented a case of leucocythaemia to the Metropolitan Counties Branch (South London District) of the BMA and Bristowe was in the chair. He referred to the patient as a male C.T. aged 28 who had recently returned from the United States and who first consulted him on the 1 December 1877. The patient presented with troublesome priapism, which caused him to wake on the morning of every third day at two or three o’clock. Later his abdomen started to enlarge, he lost weight and developed epistaxis. At this stage leucocythaemia was suspected and he later developed a continuous fever. The patient subsequently died on the 29 May 1878 and a post mortem was performed. His spleen and liver were enlarged and his death certificate recorded leucocythaemia. This patient must have been Craufurd Tait as the patient’s initials, age, clinical history, date and cause of death all correspond. 45

CATHARINE TAIT

On 12 November 1878 Tait’s daughter Edith married Randall T. Davidson, Tait’s Chaplain (who later became Archbishop of Canterbury). However, Tait’s happiness

44 *Croydon Chronicle*, 8 June 1878, p.5.
45 *BMJ*, 1879, i: 821.
was to be short lived, as he was to suffer another tragedy. Within three weeks of their wedding day the couple were called home from their honeymoon in Florence. Catharine Tait had been suddenly taken ill with a bilious attack, on Sunday 24 November, whilst on holiday at Garsecule, near Glasgow. Tait recalled that on the Monday Catharine seemed better, and had walked with her daughters in the morning and had driven to Lady Campbell’s cottage in the afternoon. Tait recalls, “She did not however feel strong enough to go with all of us to see the new University and College at Glasgow where we spent the afternoon, but by dinner time she [Catharine] seemed completely herself.” On Wednesday 27 November Tait was concerned that the biliousness was not going and was ignorant of what remedies it was safe to use. He therefore telegraphed Dr Moir, who was a local GP, to visit Catharine. Moir advised her to stay in bed and not to travel to Durham on the Friday on account of her violent sickness. On the Friday night Tait became alarmed when Catharine told him that she felt her hand go rigid and feared an attack like she had had in 1874. Moir also became uneasy because her pulse and temperature were very high. Tait therefore telegraphed all the symptoms to Carpenter. By Saturday morning her condition had not improved. “Carpenter, greatly alarmed, had telegraphed throughout the night, both to Tait and Dr Moir that he would come up at 7 [pm].” Catharine was now becoming very weak, and Tait wrote:

Dear Mother now evidently felt alarmed about herself and spoke to Lucy as if she might die. When I told her Carpenter was coming she said she was glad and added, ‘How nice it would be if he thought I could be moved [to Stone

---

46 Tait’s visits to Scotland were frequent, because he was a Scotsman and brought up a Presbyterian by his devoted nurse after the death of his mother.
47 Tait papers, vol.63, p.92 verso.
48 Ibid, p.95
49 Ibid, p.97.
House] for the rest and air’ for which she was yearning. I was much alarmed by her speech becoming ‘indistinct’ through the difficulty in breathing.  

When Carpenter arrived, “it was satisfaction to her; he and Moir quite agreed as to the treatment, but perceived now too clearly that some congestion of the lungs had supervened.” Tait later wrote, “How thankful we were that Carpenter, who at first had seemed averse for fear of disturbing her, allowed her to receive her communion from me. Carpenter and my two girls communicated with her, Annie Pittie kneeling behind the door all the time. Nothing could exceed Carpenter’s and Annie Pittie’s sympathy.” Tait continued, “I said texts and little prayers which she followed; till Carpenter who nursed her all the time said it was better that she should rest.” Tait described her final hours and wrote:

Her breathing about 1/2 past 8 became more laboured and plainly a state of coma now came on. We said the commentary prayer by her bedside. At 10 exactly the laboured breathing ceased and with three or four gentle sighs she fell asleep for Jesus; looking more sweet than ever. Her dear eyes have closed.

Carpenter kindly closed them and this intercourse of six and thirty years was at an end.  

Catharine died aged fifty-nine years on Advent Sunday, 1 December 1878 and her body was transported back to Croydon. On Saturday 7 December 1878 her funeral took place at Addington Church; the service was described as “of the simplest character.” The Dean of Windsor threw four wreaths of flowers into the grave (from Queen Victoria, Princess Christian, Princess Beatrice and Prince Leopold). The most touching part of the proceedings, as reported by the Croydon Chronicle, was when the  

50 Ibid, p.97 verso.
52 Probably a servant or family friend.
Archbishop of Canterbury himself pronounced the benediction after the Gloria Patri had been sung by the choir. The *Croydon Chronicle* also reminded its readers that, “the grave of Mrs Tait was by the side of the one which her son had been laid only six months before.” The following year, in September 1879, a book entitled *Catharine and Craufurd Tait, Wife and Son of Archibald Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury* was published, and Carpenter is cited.

Tait had suffered many losses during his lifetime including his mother when he was a child; five children from scarlet fever between 6 March and 8 April 1856 (when he was Dean of Carlisle); his son Craufurd and now his beloved wife Catherine. Edward Carpenter (no relation of Alfred Carpenter) said of Tait, “the mortality that crept around him continued as one of the most formative influences during his seventy years of his life.” He continued, “It was out of such traumatic experiences that he was able to testify to others.” He later wrote, “in hours of sickness and approaching death and when friends are taken from them….their consciences awake and their hearts open, ready to return to the faith of their childhood and believe in the great Redeemer.”

CASE OF DIPHTHERIA

Carpenter continued to correspond with Tait on important matters. For example, in 1878 Carpenter, who was an ex-officio member of the Croydon Board of Guardians, attended a meeting of the Rural Sanitary Authority. He highlighted the case of a child who had died of diphtheria at Addington Village in the Archbishop’s manor. A woman living in the house had also developed diphtheria, and a child next door was

---

54 *Croydon Chronicle*, 14 December 1879, p.2.
55 *Croydon Chronicle*, 27 September 1879, p.5. The book was written by Rev William Benham (Vicar of Margate, who was present at Stone House during Craufurd Tait’s final illness) and published by Macmillan and Co.
also suffering with the disease. Of greater concern to Carpenter was that other children in the neighbourhood had been allowed to see the body after death. He pointed out that diphtheria was highly infectious and that there was room for better management with regard to these matters. An inspector was called for, who stated that the people living in the cottages, where diphtheria had broken out, were of the very lowest class, and it was rather owing to the way in which they lived than to any fault in the houses. It was decided by the Rural Sanitary Authority Committee that a letter should be written to Mr Walker, the owner of the cottages, asking him to put them into a proper state. It also included Carpenter’s suggestion on how the regulations should be carried out.

On 17 December 1878 Carpenter wrote another letter to Tait about the child who died from diphtheria, including details on the nature of diphtheria. Carpenter also thanked Tait for his letter, commenting that it was “of service to me at the meeting of the Board of Guardians this afternoon.” Carpenter’s letter highlighted his concerns for the poor when he wrote, “I read a portion of it to the members and had an opportunity of speaking to them upon the point. I hope with some advantage to the Addington poor.” Carpenter continued, “I will keep the matter open until all is done that the law will allow.” Carpenter felt that the inspector had not done all that he could to minimise the spread of the disease. In his letter to Tait, Carpenter also gave his views on how diphtheria and scarlet fever were spread. He also posed the question, “if the disease [diphtheria] could not be kept out of a Palace how could it be kept out of the Irish Cottage?” Carpenter observed “that unsanitary conditions existed

---

57 Croydon Chronicle, 14 December 1878, p.3.
58 The inspector was a Mr Chart (given name unknown) who was a sanitary officer for the Board of Guardians.
60 Minutes of the meeting were printed in the Croydon Chronicle, 21 December 1878, p.5.
at the Darmstadt which affected the Royal Family alone in the private apartments and which was undiscovered.” Carpenter continued, “The germ of living matter which produces the disease we call diphtheria will not produce a fatal result if implanted in tissues of a person living in pure air and drinking pure water. Like scarlatina, it will be mild in its action and will not destroy life.” Carpenter went on to give his management for diphtheria:

The best remedy against its affects when the disease does arise is a solution of sulphurous acid as a local applicant [to the throat in the hope of destroying the fungus of the diphtheritic membrane] and air loaded with creasotum [antiseptic]. I mention these points because other remedies are used empirically which do not affect the object which is required viz the destruction of parasitic life. Dry rot, potent disease, vine disease ‘enid genus orme’ are allied to diphtheria and are all arrested by the remedies I have named and I have not yet met with a case of diphtheria, which has resisted these remedies when they have been used early in its treatment.

Carpenter also gave Tait practical advice on treating diphtheria cases, if the need arose:

I have taken the liberty of mentioning this to your Grace so that should the disease appear in any of your Grace’s establishments it may be once met by a scientific opposition of sulphurous acid is not disagreeable and is not painful in its application, such as lunar caustic. Children do not mind it and if creasole is sprinkled around the room, the child kept warm whilst fresh air is freely admitted and ice used in the mouth. I do not think the disease need have been a fatal result.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{61} The exact spelling is unclear.

\textsuperscript{62} Tait papers, vol.235, pp.7-10.
The combined effect of Tait’s letter, which was read at the Croydon Board of Guardians, and Carpenter’s dogged determination, produced a result. On 26 December 1878 Carpenter wrote a letter to Davidson and said:

I have stirred up the mud pretty well and all has been done at Addington, which can be done whilst the weather remains so severe. I attended the Board last Tuesday. Mr Walker was there and had been I understand very wroth of me. I have promised to meet him at the cottages in question after the frost is over and point out to him any further work that should be done and he has promised to do it.  

Three days later Carpenter wrote to Davidson again and said:

... the sanitary officer of the Board [of Guardians] has met the charge I made against him for neglect of duty in a most improper manner. I was not at the Board at the time of his report was made but I shall attend next Tuesday and make the enclosed report which conveys the evidence which I obtained from a personal inspection of the place. It is my intention to send a copy to the Local Government Board and ask them to take the matter in hand as between the Rural Sanitary Authority and the Inspector. I will not now leave this matter until the crying evils of the place have been remedied.  

On 1 January 1879 Carpenter wrote a further letter to Davidson and said “I attended the Board of Guardians yesterday and read the report, a copy of which I sent you. Mr Walker apologised for his conduct at the Board on the preceding week and has promised to do all that is required, provided Col. Leonard will do his part. I have written to Col Leonard.” On 18 January the Croydon Chronicle reported on the meeting of the Board of Guardians held on the previous Tuesday, under the heading  

‘The Cottages at Addington.’ A report by George Simons and Thomas Allen who were both members on the Board of Guardians was read. Simons “found the cottages inside pretty good, but the ground around was in a wretched state.” Allen, on the other hand, “… could not endorse all that Mr Simons had said about the filthy condition of the place, because he had never seen any dirt at all.” According to Simons “they were making the matter worse than Dr Carpenter had done. They could not smell anything. The place was as fresh as it could possibly be. He was surprised at what Mr Simons had said.” 66 Carpenter then read out a letter he had received from Col. Leonard, who said that he had not had any complaints about the cottages and he concluded that they were all right. The Report was adopted.

These cases of diphtheria may have prompted Carpenter to write a short article in the BMJ on ‘A possible predisposing cause of diphtheria.’ Carpenter’s hypothesis was that “diphtheria is dependant upon a germ of living matter which is capable of reproducing itself when it meets with a congenial soil.” 67

TAIT’S FINAL ILLNESS

In September 1882 Tait’s deteriorating health was causing concern, and the Croydon Chronicle reported:

Our readers will hear with profound regret of the serious illness of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who has been suffering with an attack of congestion of the lungs, and is now at his residence in Addington Park. Indeed his illness assumed so dangerous a form - fever having supervened – that the case is considered by many to be hopeless.

Carpenter is also mentioned and the Croydon Chronicle reported the following:

66 Croydon Chronicle, 18 January 1879, p.2.
Dr Carpenter, his Grace’s medical adviser, has been in constant attendance during the week, and in consequence of the numerous enquiries as to his Grace’s condition, it was considered advisable to issue daily bulletins. The latest of which informs us that that the Archbishop is in a very critical condition.

Opinions were often sought from specialists and the following was reported in the *Croydon Chronicle*:

Yesterday (Friday) afternoon Sir William Jenner visited him [Tait], and after a consultation with Dr Carpenter, the following statement was issued:

The condition of the Archbishop continues to cause grave anxiety, for whilst the pulmonary symptoms have diminished in intensity, and the pulse is stronger and less frequent, there is greater drowsiness.

The bulletin has been communicated to the Queen at Balmoral.

Sir William Jenner expresses his entire approval of Dr Carpenter’s treatment.

A week later the *Croydon Chronicle* published the following, “Croydon shares with the rest of England in anxiety concerning the Archbishop. The daily bulletins are watched with intense eagerness in the town, for they relate not only to an accomplished scholar and an eminent and popular divine, but also to a highly respected neighbour.” The report continued: “A few days ago all hope of his Grace’s recovery seemed gone, but during the present week Dr Carpenter has been able to report much more favourably.” Despite this optimism Tait’s health deteriorated, and on 2 December 1882 the *Croydon Chronicle* announced that: “After his long and severe illness the Archbishop of Canterbury is sinking rapidly, and all hopes of his

---

67 BMJ, 1879, i: 8.
68 Sir William Jenner (1815- 98); LSA, MRCS, MA London, FRCP, FRS, Hon DCL Oxford, Hon LLD Cambridge; physician to University College Hospital, London; physician extraordinary to Queen Victoria; established the distinct identities o f typhus and typhoid fevers.
recovery are abandoned. In fact he may have expired before these lines are read.”

Carpenter slept at Addington Palace during Tait’s final illness, and it was reported that Tait’s last connected sentence showed his thoughtfulness for others, and in particular, for Carpenter. The report said: “He thanked Dr Carpenter for his care and kindness, and added, ‘I am sorry not to have put your old coachman into the Whitgift College [Whitgift Hospital]. I did hope to put him there.’ - this being an institution founded by Archbishop Whitgift, partly for his servants and partly for some of the inhabitants of Croydon.” Tait died on Sunday 3 December 1882 and Carpenter certified the cause of death as disease of the heart and lungs, disease of kidney and spinal convulsions. The funeral took place on 8 December 1882 at Addington church, as his daughters had declined the offer of a public funeral at Westminster Abbey, on the orders of the deceased.

ARCHBISHOP BENSON

Edward White Benson became the next Archbishop and outlived Carpenter by four years. Carpenter attended to Benson during his illness [we are not told what the complaint was or the date]. It was not long before the events surrounding Archbishop Tait’s death and Archbishop Benson’s illness appeared in the *Lancet* on 27 October 1883 in a letter under the title ‘Medical Bulletins.’ The writer who only gave the initials of his name as A.R.G., wrote, “There was I think, a general feeling that too

---

69 *Croydon Chronicle*, 9 September 1882, p.5.
70 *Croydon Chronicle*, 2 December 1882, p.4.
71 *Croydon Chronicle*, 9 December 1882, p.5.
72 Certified Copy of an Entry of Death, Column 58, 3 Dec 1882, Croydon in the County of Surrey, No: DXZ 093409. Death registered 11 December 1882. Informant, Edith Davidson, daughter.
73 *Croydon Chronicle*, 9 December 1882, p.5.
Archbishop Edward White Benson
much was said about the illness of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and I hoped that such like bulletins would have ceased to appear, but I have noticed lately a repetition of these objectionable reports.”  

Carpenter, clearly unhappy about this letter, wrote a swift reply to the *Lancet* on 3 November 1883. Carpenter pointed out that no medical bulletin was ever issued during the last illness of the Archbishop. The medical attendants upon his Grace never signed a single bulletin or communicated a single written observation upon the case to the daily journals. However, Carpenter did concede that members of Tait’s family were responsible for all the published communications. These were in answer to inquiries, which were incessant from all parts of the kingdom, from the Queen down to the smallest parish in the diocese of Canterbury. When the names of the medical attendants were published in the notices regarding the Archbishop’s illness, such publication was made without their action in the matter. In conclusion, Carpenter said that he disapproved of misleading or dubious statements, which were capable of being twisted in various ways.  

Carpenter also wrote a letter to the *BMJ* and remarked, “Sir, Several abusive letters from anonymous assassins and dynamite-distributors have recently reached me by post. They are similar in kind to the mass that I have from anti-vaccinators; and among other things, accuse me of unprofessional misconduct in connection with the illnesses of distinguished personages.” Carpenter then went on to explain the events surrounding Tait’s final illness: “During the last illness of Archbishop Tait, an army of reporters appeared at his Grace’s residence: it was impossible for me to make secret visits to Addington; and if those visits, together with those of eminent men who saw the patient with me, were chronicled in the daily journals, they were not published by me.

---

74 *Lancet*, 1883, ii: 750.
or with my sanction.” Carpenter accepted, however, that he had provided information to medical editors on request and said:

I plead guilty to having answered the requests of yourself and other medical editors that I should furnish particulars of his Grace’s case for the information of your readers; but I beg most emphatically to contradict the statement that any bulletin was ever issued or signed by us. The information furnished to you was copied by the daily journals in some cases without acknowledgement as to its source; but I am in no way responsible for that fact.

Carpenter then referred to the case of Archbishop Benson:

The particulars of the nature of Archbishop Benson’s illness, was published in direct opposition to my advice. Several very important engagements of a public character had to be broken, and public announcements had to be made as to the cause. It was requisite for special reasons that the cause should not be misunderstood or misrepresented. Those most interested wished that the whole truth should be known, and that there should be no secrecy in the matter. 76

On 28 November 1883 Carpenter wrote a letter to the Editor of the BMJ, saying he was going to submit a resolution for the approval of the Journal and Finance Committee [BMA] at its next meeting. It read: “That it be an instruction to the editor not to insert details of the cases of illustrious individuals who happen to be suffering from the effects of serious illness, and that the publication of bulletins be discouraged.” 77

77 BMJ, 1883, ii: 1095.
CHAPTER 5
PUBLIC HEALTH
DIPLOMA, LECTURER AND EXAMINER

This chapter describes how Carpenter strengthened his claim as an authority in the public health debate. He achieved this in various ways, including his appointment as a lecturer in public health at Thomas’s and the subsequent publication of a book based on his lectures. Carpenter was one of the first to be awarded a sanitary science diploma by examination from Cambridge University, and was instrumental in staging the third Congress of the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain in Croydon. Carpenter held numerous offices in many diverse societies and organisations, and continued with his philanthropic activities and work with the church. His activities in public health are now described.

PUBLIC HEALTH

By 1880 Carpenter had established himself in the public-health arena and was chosen as the first person to appear in a new publication, The Town Crier and Surrey Cartoonist. Carpenter is shown standing behind a bench with a variety of sewage pipes laid out. In his right hand he is holding a carrot. The background shows drawings of drainage, a sewage farm and ventilation. The cartoon was headed “Sanitas” and the caption reads: “Pondering much and contriving, how the tribes of men might prosper.” A short article about Carpenter accompanies the cartoon and remarks:

---

1 The Town Crier and Surrey Cartoonist, 16 December 1879, pp.6-7.
"SANITAS."

Town Crier Cartoon of Carpenter – "Sanitas"
An unventilated drain is his especial horror, and to what he has effected in this and matters affecting the sanitation of Croydon, though laying him open to the opprobrium of some, the satisfactory position Croydon holds in the mortality bills of large towns, is largely owing."

In order to understand the significance of this cartoon and the comments about him, it is necessary to look back at Carpenter’s public health activities and the various issues involved.

LEGISLATION

The Royal Sanitary Commission (1868-71) made recommendations, which had a profound affect on sanitary legislation over the next ten years and came about by men both within\(^2\) and outside the government who were unhappy with the sanitary conditions in England.\(^3\) The final report of the Commission was not issued until 1871. The Commission recommended a consolidation of the fragmentary sanitary legislation, the centralizing of sanitary powers in towns and counties in one fully responsible authority, and the setting up of a central authority of ministerial rank to direct the nation’s sanitary reform. The central authority was also to be responsible for the relief of the poor. Each local authority was to have a minimum of one medical officer of health.\(^4\)

The following year the Public Health Act of 1872 created the basic local organisation of the new era of sanitary administration, just as the measure of the previous year had established the central machinery.\(^5\) The Bill proposed to divide

---

\(^2\) Within government circles Simon, Medical Officer of the Privy Council, was the most influential spokesman during this period.


\(^4\) Brand, p.13.

\(^5\) Lambert, p.516.
England into urban and rural sanitary districts, with an additional provision of port sanitary authorities. However, there were weaknesses in the Act, particularly regarding the appointment of basic sanitary staff for each locality. For example, details regarding the medical officers (how they were chosen, remunerated and controlled, and whether they were to be appointed by the Boards acting singly or in combination) were not given.⁶

During the planning stages of the Act, a joint committee from the BMA and the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science had met James Stansfield, President of the Local Government Board, who was regarded as being obstinate and weak.⁷ The deputation urged the necessity of consolidating the existing law (The Local Government Act of 1871), a large extension of area (the Bill proposed to divide England into urban and rural sanitary districts/authorities) and the establishment of a registration of sickness (disease notification). ⁸ The Act subsequently became law in August 1872. Later, in November 1872, a BMA deputation including Carpenter had a meeting with Stansfield. At this time Carpenter was President of the South Eastern Branch of the BMA and also a member of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (although he had not been a member of the Joint Committee previously mentioned). Stansfield conceded that his Bill had created only the barest framework of a system - a framework that he intended to fill in later on by administrative and not legislative means.⁹ Reports in The Times about this meeting proved to be inaccurate, prompting both Ernest Hart, Editor of the BMJ, and Carpenter to write to the Editor of The Times to clarify the situation. Both

---
⁶ Lambert, p.517.
⁷ Sir James Stansfield (1820-98), politician; BA, 1840; LLB, 1844, barrister Middle Temple; liberal MP for Halifax, 1859-95; privy councillor, 1869; President of Poor Law Board, 1871; President of Local Government Board, 1871-4 and April-July, 1886; GCB, 1895. Concise DNB, p.1237.
⁸ TNAPSS, 1873, p.xl.
⁹ Lambert, p.517.
letters appeared under the heading “Mr Stansfield and the Public Health Act”. Hart remarked that the article wrongly stated that the deputation that met with Stansfield was from the executive council of the BMA, when in fact it was made up from 335 members from Kent, Surrey and Sussex. He also pointed out that they included men whose capacity and character were known far beyond local limits; and in treating with great respect the representations of “such men as Carpenter of Croydon; Holman of Reigate; and Napper of Cranley, the author of the now widely-spread system of Cottage Hospitals.” Hart noted that:

Mr Stansfield was paying a wise deference to the opinions of men who represent the cream of country practitioners, who have been foremost in promoting in your columns, in their own sphere, and by all their influence the cause of public health, and who have an intimate and practical acquaintance with the questions to be solved and the work to be done.

He continued, “If the Public Health Act is to succeed in its mission, this is the class of men whose support must be enlisted, and their opinions as to its machinery are worth having.” In his letter Carpenter wrote:

I took the liberty of representing to the Minister (as President of the Branch) that lawyers, however necessary to advise as to the legal status of the local authority, were not the persons to advise as to the necessities of sanitary work; that if medical officers attached to Boards of Guardians were generally to be appointed the new medical officers of health, and that if they were to be kept up to the proper mark of efficiency by legal inspectors, then the Medical Act of the last Session would be a dead letter, and be another piece of useless legislation encumbering the statute book.
Carpenter pointed out that sanitary science was partially taught in medical schools, and was studied by men having a particular interest in that field. He felt that to appoint a Union Medical Officer, who was generally a young inexperienced doctor, to be a Medical Officer of Health would destroy his future chances of promotion, the reason being that the senior and experienced medical men in the district would be called to serve under the youngest and least experienced man when a district were invaded by epidemic disease. This, in Carpenter’s view, would be strategically wrong and a fatal blow to future sanitary progress.  

As previously described, the National Association for the Promotion Social Science and the BMA formed a joint committee, which met Stansfield during the planning stages of the 1872 Public Health Act. In 1873 the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science held their annual meeting at Norwich, from 1-8 October, and Carpenter was chosen by the Health Department of the Social Science Association to open a discussion on ‘the most convenient and efficient areas for sanitary purposes.’ The BMJ later published an article on Carpenter’s paper under the title ‘Dr Alfred Carpenter On Areas Of Sanitary Administration.’ It was noted of Carpenter: “with great experience in public health administration and in public business generally, and known for his originality of research, he was unconnected with most of the previous associated efforts in this direction.” He had not given evidence before the Royal Sanitary Commission and he was not on the Joint Committee previously mentioned. The BMJ remarked, “he might fairly be considered as independent of any party movement, un-pledged by previous statements, and unbiased by combinations.” Later, the BMJ gave Carpenter’s views

---

10 *The Times*, 26 November 1872.
11 *BMJ*, 1873, ii: 761-3.
on the foundation of any scientific organisation as a guide to the definition of areas
and said:

> It may fairly be expected that the health-officer shall be able to get on the trail of preventable disease - that he should put his foot down upon it as soon as it becomes manifest, and before it has the power to produce a general epidemic of either disease or panic. This is the theoretical design of the Act of 1872, and in many places it is thought to be working to that end. But in most instances there is a missing link in the chain [vital piece of evidence], which prevents the working out of the theory in the manner indicated.  

The *BMJ* summed up Carpenter’s paper and said “We congratulate Dr Carpenter on having handled this subject more reasonably and practically than some recent writers and speakers, and we recommend his paper to the consideration of the Joint Committee of the two Associations.”

Porter has commented that during the second half of the nineteenth century public health was repoliticised, away from the mainly liberal agenda of rights, responsibilities and the ‘Condition of England,’ to the politics of expertise and the duties of the state to maintain health of the nation or British race.

CROYDON LOCAL BOARD OF HEALTH

Having lost his seat in the 1872 Local Board of Health elections, a large number of ratepayers urged Carpenter to enter the 1874 elections. He took their advice and came second in the Croydon Ward. On 10 April 1874 Carpenter wrote to the ratepayers of

---

13 Ibid, p.763.
Croydon Ward, thanking them for returning him for the fifth time as one of their representatives on the Local Board. The Croydon Advertiser wrote:

Everyone, however, unless absolutely blinded by prejudice, must rejoice at the return of Dr Carpenter, who is reinstated by no fewer than 2,248 votes in the position, which he held for so many years with signal honour to himself and advantage to the parish. It is customary with a certain clique to laugh to scorn Dr Carpenter’s special knowledge, decrying him as a mere theorist; but he can afford to disregard all such snarling and hypercriticism in the pursuit of an object which he has made specially his own.

In the 1878 Local Board elections Carpenter was so convinced he was going to lose, as he did in 1872, that he gave a long farewell speech to the Board. He highlighted his contributions and the changes that had occurred in the public health of Croydon during the eighteen years he had been involved with the Board, from 1860 to 1878. To Carpenter’s surprise, but not to many of the ratepayers, he was elected again, coming third in the poll. However, on 30 September 1878 Carpenter resigned from the Board following his election as President of the Council of the British Medical Association. Carpenter’s letter of resignation to the Board was read out at the Local Board of Health meeting on 1 October 1878:

Gentlemen, Having been elected to the responsible position of President of the Council of the British Medical Association, I am impelled to place in your hands my resignation as a member of your Board.

As I am devoting myself in great measure to consultation practice, and have also occasional duties at St Thomas’s Hospital, my time is much occupied outside the parish of Croydon, and I am unable to give the attention

---

15 *Croydon Advertiser*, 11 April 1874.
16 *Croydon Advertiser*, 18 April 1874.
to the duties of the office that is naturally required from those that occupy a seat at your Board, and I am obliged to neglect your interests in a way which is not consonant to my own feelings.

Carpenter continued, "I have less hesitation in resigning my seat now, because the great principles of sanitary science for which I have pertinaciously contended at your Board for so many years are so well understood, that no amount of outside ignorance or hidden self-interest is likely to cause you to depart from them." Carpenter then went on to refer to these principles, which were:

1. A constant water supply so arranged that the necessity for a daily intermission is not again likely to arise.
2. The entire separation of all water services, so that no direct communication shall exist between them and the sewers.
3. The perfect ventilation of every part of the sewer system, including every branch of every house drain.
4. The exclusion of surface or land drainage from the sewers in every part of the parish, except the streets and courts of the town, and those parts of the districts in which houses are in continuous rows.
5. The utilization of our sewage by irrigation upon land, which should be the freehold property of the parish.
6. Together with those ordinary works which are regularly followed up by your medical officer.

In the discussions that followed the following appeared in the Croydon Chronicle, "Mr Morland said it was unfortunate that a gentleman who knew so much about

---

17 Croydon Chronicle, 5 October 1878.
sanitary matters should no longer give the Board the benefit of his knowledge; and he would move a resolution that the Board regrettet the resignation of Dr Carpenter.”  

ACADEMIC

Carpenter improved his knowledge in public health in three ways. First, he became lecturer in public health at St Thomas’s in 1875. Second, he published a book entitled "Preventive Medicine in Relation to Public Health." Third, he was one of the first to obtain the public health diploma from Cambridge University by examination and also became involved in the debate on state qualification in public health.

Thomas’s

The Thomas’s lectureship was a prestigious one. In 1856, Simon had forced the authorities at Thomas’s to set up the first lectureship in public health ever established in this country, and promptly secured the post for that “intimate home-associate and friend,” Edward Headlam Greenhow. Years later Sir Arthur Newsholme recalled attending Carpenter’s course of twelve lectures on hygiene during the summer term when he was a student at Thomas’s. He also remembered Carpenter’s pleasant manner as a lecturer, the social event held for the students at Carpenter’s home and a field trip to see the sewage treatment farm at Beddington.

Carpenter’s book "Preventive Medicine in Relation to the Public Health" was published in 1877, and was mainly based on his lectures he gave to Thomas’s students in 1876. Before the book was published, Carpenter wrote to Chadwick and said:

18 Croydon Chronicle, 5 October 1878, p.2
20 Lambert, p.261
I have given for the past two years a short course of lectures at St Thomas’s Hospital upon Public Health and I have been asked to publish them, which I am about to do through Simpkin and Marshall. I do not quite know how the paragraph about publications has been published. The work is not yet out but I have finished all that I have to do with it. You as a matter of course shall have a copy as soon as it is out. As regards sewage farms it is simply a reprint of what I have published already. ²²

In his next letter to Chadwick Carpenter wrote, “I have just received my book. I send you a copy.” ²³ Carpenter paid tribute to Simon in this book and wrote, “glory in the name of the great apostle of preventative medicine, John Simon, a worthy representative of a noble line of health preservers.” ²⁴ The Croydon Chronicle wrote the following about Carpenter’s book:

Altogether, therefore, it is a valuable and seasonable publication; and Dr Carpenter well deserves the best thanks of the community for contributing so intelligible and so practical a handbook of sanitary matters - for such it is - at a moment like the present, when the subject of health has, we repeat, become one of the most interesting and popular subjects of the day. ²⁵

The BMJ commented that the book was the product of his lectures and addresses, which he had delivered at Thomas’s, the Society of Medical Officers of Health and the British Medical Association. The review continued:

The subjects treated range over the whole field of preventive medicine, and are treated with great vigour and ability. Dr Carpenter is a warm advocate of sewage farms; he has a very poor opinion of disinfection as at present

²² Chadwick papers, box 444, 4 September 1877.
²³ Ibid, 21 September 1877.
²⁴ Preventive Medicine in Relation to the Public Health, p.2.
²⁵ Croydon Chronicle, 6 October 1877, p.6.
practised; and on these and many other subjects of fundamental importance in preventive medicine his lectures will be read with interest and profit. 26

*State Medicine*

The debate on whether or not there should be a certificate in State Medicine took place in June 1868. A Committee on State Medicine was appointed by the General Medical Council to report “on the steps proper to grant Diplomas or Certificates of Proficiency in State Medicine, and for recording the same in the Medical Register.” 27

The committee was chaired by Henry Acland and included eight eminent names from the medical profession including Henry Rumsey, Robert Christison, George Paget, Edmund A. Parks and William Stokes. A questionnaire was sent to twenty-nine British and six Continental authorities and the answers together with correspondence allowed the committee to decide whether or not State Certification in Public Medicine should be recommended. The questionnaire contained five questions in relation to the character, timing and sequence of a recommended course. Macleod has pointed out that “From the respondents, including Guy, Farr, Lankester, Letheby and Maudsley, it was clear that State Medicine, academically speaking, was still in a very primitive state.” 28

The Committee looked at the evidence and recommended that a special certificate should be awarded for State Medicine. Courses that were later known as ‘Public Health and Hygiene’ held the characteristic qualification DPH, 29 and this diploma, rather than the certificate in State Medicine, became the educational hallmark of British, and later American and Commonwealth, public medicine.

In 1870 William Stokes established the first Diploma course in State Medicine or Public Health in Dublin. Stokes course comprised papers on sanitary law, engineering, vital statistics, meteorology, pathology, chemistry and medical jurisprudence.  

Later in 1875 Carpenter was involved in designing a diploma course in public health with Alexander Stewart. They hoped that, within five years, qualified men in sufficient numbers would be available for official appointments. They proposed a course, which required “an adequate knowledge of legal medicine and medical jurisprudence, and of preventive medicine, or public medicine, comprehending medical police and the management of medical institutions supported by national or local taxation.”

In October 1875 Carpenter and twenty-five other candidates, sat the first examination for the Diploma of Sanitary Science at Cambridge (CSS Camb.). In his paper: ‘The Anatomy of State Medicine: Concept and Application,’ Roy M. Macleod writes, “The first graduates included names which have become classic in the field of Public Health practice, including Alfred Carpenter, G.S. Fosbroke, and A.S. Underhill.” Carpenter could have chosen to sit the London University Diploma in

---

31 Alexander Patrick Stewart (1813-1883), MD Glasgow, 1838; practised privately in London, 1839-83; lectured on materia medica, Middlesex Hospital; retired 1866; author of Sanitary Economics, or, Our Medical Charities as They Are and as They Ought to Be, (London, 1849). In 1871 a permanent section of the BMA was established for ‘Public Medicine’ and Stewart was its first President.
33 Report of the Committee of Council upon the subject of State Medicine Qualification, BMJ, 1875, ii: 244-5.
34 Carpenter did not always use the letters CSS. He later used DPH (Diploma in Public health) or PHD (Public Health Diploma).
State Medicine, particularly as this was his own University. However, he chose Cambridge because “its syllabus was framed upon the most liberal principle, viz., that it did not matter where a man obtained his knowledge, provided he possessed it, the examination being practical and thorough.”

The remainder of the nineteenth century saw the Sanitary Inspectors receiving specialist instruction, and saw the development of specialized professional institutions and professional registration. In 1886 State Medicine was introduced into the new Medical Act, through the exertions of the new Public Health Society and, in particular, Lyon Playfair. Macleod writes:

The new discipline of public health was by no means uniform (some health officers were full time, others were part time; some held posts with several Local Authorities, others with only one. But all had in common the experience of moving away from clinical medical practice and establishing themselves in a new scientific discipline.

Later, in 1888, the Society of Medical Officers of Health was established and the College of State Medicine inaugurated. The College was to train men through lectures and in laboratories, and “to guard the public health or to fill any of those offices which require sanitary knowledge.” In 1891, the Congress of International Hygiene was held in London, during which the Public Health Society, meeting in the State Medicine Department at Kings College, London, reconstituted itself as the British Institute of Public Health.

---

36 In 1875 the London diploma was put on an equal footing with medicine and surgery in the University syllabus, through the efforts of George Buchanan and Edmund Alexander Parkes. Lancet, 1875, i: 131.
37 Leyland, p.11.
VACCINATION

Vaccination generated much public debate in Carpenter’s lifetime. For example, numerous letters concerning vaccination appeared in the Croydon local newspapers over a five months period from October 1876 to March 1877. Headings included: ‘Vaccination Alias Blood Poisoning;’ 39 ‘Efficacy of Re-Vaccination;’ 40 ‘Unreliability of Vaccination Statistics;’ 41 and ‘Tyranny and Fraud under the Vaccination Acts.’ 42

As a magistrate, Carpenter had to deal with people who refused to have their children vaccinated. For example, Francis Potter was summoned to the Bench, by Edwin Bailey, the vaccination officer appointed by the Croydon Board of Guardians. The charge was for neglecting to comply with an order made to vaccinate his child, Alice Ann, within fourteen days of the date of such order. The defendant admitted in court that he had disobeyed the order: “God said he, has promised me that no evil shall befall me, nor shall any plague come into my dwelling. I take God at his word, and until it can be shown that God’s word is not to be depended on, I shall refuse to have my child vaccinated.” The bench was not impressed; and the Chairman remarked that it was there to administer the law, and despite stubborn resistance Potter was ordered to pay a fine of 5s and costs of 10s. Carpenter remarked, “I hope the time will not be long before the legislature will appoint a public vaccinator, and take it out of the hands of the Guardians. What will you do then?” Potter replied, “When that takes place I will be like the wild beasts, and protect myself and my children. That law, sir, never will - never can be.” The next case involved Charles Bennett, who was charged with a similar offence. Bennett asked the bench, “If vaccination is a preventative of small-pox, how is it that people have it and die with it

39 Croydon Chronicle, 28 October 1876.
40 Croydon Chronicle, 4 November 1876.
41 Croydon Chronicle, 20 January 1877.
42 Croydon Chronicle, 3 February 1877.
after vaccination? ” The Croydon Chronicle reported the following: “Dr Carpenter said that vaccination was not got up as a preventative of small-pox, but a palliative, for it had been proved beyond doubt that those who have been vaccinated had small-pox in a much milder form than those who were unvaccinated.” Bennett, like Potter, was also fined. Later, in December, advertisements from the Croydon Union appeared in the local newspapers under the title ‘Small Pox Re-Vaccination’ owing to the prevalence of smallpox in the parish. People, who had not been vaccinated since infancy, were encouraged to be re-vaccinated.

FOUL AIR

Foul air as a cause of disease was a public health issue, which aroused much interest. In 1873 Carpenter wrote a long letter on this subject to the Times. The letter commenced: “Sir, - Two events had recently come to the notice of the public and which have not obtained the attention they require so that the proper lesson may be learnt by those whom it may interest and concern.” The first was an outbreak of typhoid fever at Cambridge, which some believed was due to the filthy state of the river Cam, with the miasma exhaled from the deposits of sewage in the river being the cause of the fever. Carpenter felt that the miasma, which caused the typhoid outbreak in Cambridge, was not a direct cause but could have been an indirect one, because the fever was limited to only one or two colleges and was situated in an isolated portion of the town itself. He felt that all the evidence pointed to a want of ventilation in the soil pipes of the water closets as the real defect. Carpenter felt that a slow flowing river contaminated with sewage was unlikely to produce typhoid, unless the water of

43 Croydon Chronicle, 4 November 1876.
44 Croydon Chronicle, 9 and 16 December 1876.
45 The Times, 22 December 1873.
the river was used for dietetic purposes. However, he believed that sewer gases caused typhoid fever and that every house required proper ventilation of the soil pipe from the closet. The second matter Carpenter described was the effect of foul air on cattle, which caused them to die rapidly if the cattle were overfed and suffering from fatty degeneration.

FOOD ADULTERATION

Food adulteration was a serious public health issue, and Carpenter frequently saw cases in the magistrates’ court. He had previously lectured on the adulteration of food to the Croydon Microscopical Club in Feb 1872. The *Croydon Observer* reported, under the heading ‘Police Intelligence’ on 16 January 1874, that a grocer named Ashby was summoned before the Bench for selling mustard, coffee, and cocoa adulterated, but not injurious to health. The mustard, according to Dr Stevenson, the public analyst, was mixed with wheaten flour and turmeric, there was chicory mixed with the coffee, and the cocoa contained starchy farinas and cane sugar. However, the butter, arrowroot, and cayenne pepper purchased were all pure. The defendant pleaded that he did not know that the articles were adulterated. Despite his plea of innocence, Ashby paid 19s 6d costs and was fined 10s. The *Croydon Observer* quoted Carpenter’s remarks from the Bench and wrote, “Dr Carpenter - You have your remedy against those who supply these articles. It should be known to those who drink chicory in their coffee, that they may just as well drink roasted sawdust. It would be just as nutritious to them.”

46 *Croydon Observer, 16 January 1874.*
TYPHOID

The 1875 Croydon typhoid epidemic claimed the lives of ninety people out of the 1,200 cases reported. By 1875 there were many theories on the causes of typhoid. There were sanitarians that believed typhoid fever was linked to sanitary defects, and others, including William Budd, who believed that typhoid was caused by a specific poison that passed from person to person, usually via drinking water. Wohl has said, "typhoid continued to serve as a barometer of inadequate water supplies and sewerage down to the end of the century [19C]." Sanitary reformers like Carpenter believed that the 1875 epidemic should not have broken out in the first place, because they should have gained sufficient experience from the typhoid epidemic of 1852-3 (Croydon Case). Worboys has argued that:

... the social pressures that came from epidemic crises, and the uncertainties around the best methods of prevention and control, meant that there was no lack of interest in new theories of disease and methods of prevention. Indeed, the audience for new ideas and practices in public health was not only medical, as officials and lay people on boards of health had an interest and say in policy.

During the 1870s, Simon's Medical Department conducted numerous investigations into the cause of typhoid fever. Simon's influence attracted a number of followers including Carpenter, Edmund Parkes, William Budd, Max von Pettenkofer, Edward Klein and in India, Timothy Lewis and D.D. Cunningham. At a local level, theories about the origin of the 1875 Croydon epidemic circulated in the press.

---

47 Croydon Chronicle, 20 May 1876.
49 Worboys, p.108.
50 Ibid.
In August 1875 Carpenter wrote three letters to *The Times* about the possible causes of the typhoid epidemic. His first letter referred to the statement by *The Times* reporter that “an outbreak of typhoid fever in Croydon itself was most conclusively proved to have arisen from an intermittent supply of drinking water.” Carpenter’s correspondence to *The Times* annoyed many people, particularly the members of the Croydon Local Board of Health of which Carpenter was still a member. For example, it was reported in the *Croydon Chronicle* that Latham, the Board’s engineer, drew the Board’s attention to Carpenter’s first letter “which was calculated to do immense injury to Croydon.” He continued, “In that letter Dr Carpenter makes an attack upon the Local Board, and he does not explain that he is a member of the Board.” Later Carpenter wrote an article to the *BMJ*, which appeared on 20 November 1875. It was entitled: ‘The Fever at Croydon; and Intermittent Water-Supply as a Cause of Typhoid.’ In the opening paragraph Carpenter wrote:

The occurrence of an epidemic of typhoid fever in the district of Croydon, after the cessation of any tendency to that disease for a period of ten years, is worthy of something more than a passing notice, both as to causation and to removal. I propose, therefore, to place the whole of the facts, which have come to light with reference to the outbreak before our associates, feeling sure that it contains a lesson worth remembering.

Years later in 1879, at the BMA Annual Meeting, held in Cork, Carpenter gave a paper entitled, ‘The Dual Requirements which are Necessary for the Production of Enteric Fever, and a Consideration of Some of the Fallacies which are Based Upon a Narrow View of the Germ Theory.’ With reference to the causes of
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51 *The Times*, 13, 17 and 18 August 1875.
52 *The Times*, 13 August 1875.
53 *Croydon Chronicle*, 11 September 1875.
54 *BMJ*, 1875, ii: 632-5.
typhoid fever, Carpenter identified what he saw were two fallacies. The first was that “there is no limit to the distance to which contagia of disease can be transmitted by underground streams, and that no amount of filtration will remove or alter particles upon which the contagium depends for its specific power.” The second fallacy was that “neither microscopical nor chemical analysis is able to prove the absence of such particles, and that the conclusions based upon those analyses are likely to lead to disastrous results.”

On 22 October 1879 Croydon hosted the Congress of the Sanitary Institute and Carpenter was President of the Sanitary Science and Preventive Medicine Section. He gave a talk on: ‘Remarks on the First Principles of Sanitary Work.’ During his address Carpenter made reference to the causes of disease. He used an algebraic equation $xyz$ to explain zymotic disease, where $x$ is the human body, $y$ the waste products of human metabolism and $z$ the germ or ‘matter from without’. Carpenter explained that $y$ represented the different pabula and wastes (‘filth’) where different germs ($z$) could develop and become pathogenic before spreading to humans ($x$). Worboys found that “He [Carpenter] concluded that there are two duties of sanitary authorities: ‘First, to remove [and alter] the pabulum\(^58\) $y$, upon which $z$ is able to increase and multiply….and second, to prevent the importation of $z$, or if it be in our midst alter its nature that it cannot fructify [bear fruit].’” Worboys also argues, “Carpenter repackaged Pettenkofer’s ideas and was quite happy to play with analogies and said little on the materiality of any of his factors.”

\(^55\) Ibid, p.632.

\(^56\) *BMJ*, 1879, ii: 336.


\(^58\) Pabula is Latin for alimental

\(^59\) Max von Pettenkofer (1818-1901), German sanitarian.

\(^60\) Worboys, pp.142-3
With reference to the typhoid epidemic, by November 1875 a petition from two hundred and fifty three Croydon ratepayers called for a Government enquiry into the epidemic, although the Local Board of Health, and Carpenter, voted against it. It was recorded in the *Croydon Chronicle* at the end of the Local Board Meeting that "The motion [to have a Government enquiry] was therefore lost by three votes, and this brought to a termination one of the most protracted meetings ever held."  

The petitioners achieved their aim and on 15 December 1875 a government inquiry, under the chairmanship of George Buchanan, took place in the Croydon Town Hall and evidence was taken over two days. The *Croydon Chronicle* reported that:

Dr Carpenter said the Board would be glad to have any information, which Mr Morgan [he gave evidence about the construction of a sewer in the Brighton Road] could give them, and if anything was found to be wrong, they would take immediate steps to remedying it. He also reminded Mr Elborough [a solicitor, who was one of the memorialists] that his [Elborough’s] theory as to the cause of the epidemic was not exclusively confined to the screw down taps. There were other faults besides, and he believed the Board thoroughly understood that it was so, if the outside public did not.  

Buchanan's report was published in May 1876. The *Croydon Chronicle* summed up his report and said, “that his theory is sewer gas, and he takes great pains to show how this may enter into the houses of Croydon, but he is unable to prove that it does. But wherever there has been fever in houses in which the sanitary arrangements admit the gas entering, he attributes to it the cause of disease.” The editorial continued, “He has, however, dealt a death-blow to the water theorists, and
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61 *Croydon Chronicle*, 13 November 1875  
62 *Croydon Chronicle*, 18 December 1875.
as this is the point which really affects the interests of all, it is gratifying to have the disputed question set at rest on the authority of an official inspector.” 63

The 1875 Croydon typhoid epidemic was highlighted in a letter, dated 21 September 1877, from Carpenter to Chadwick. Carpenter felt that the defective sewers were the main cause of this epidemic. The letter was particularly critical of the Board Surveyor, Baldwin Latham, who had supervised the laying down of the sewers. Carpenter wrote, “defective sewers exist throughout the district but the major portion of the cases of typhoid (not typhus, we have not had a case of typhus amongst us) occurred more often on higher ground to which the sewers had a greater fall.” With reference to Latham, Carpenter wrote, “All the cases arose in houses connected with sewers in some part of their course which were badly laid and all of which had for many years been under Mr Latham’s supervision.” The defects in the houses were highlighted when Carpenter noted, “In 99 out of 100 cases defects existed within the house either in badly laid house drains or in want of ventilation or in the arrangements for water supply being so placed as to necessarily contaminate water by sewage.” He continued, “Many of these houses had been built and the drains carried out whilst Latham was surveyor to the Board. One house in North Park had the whole of the inmates, 10 in number, down with fever and two died.” Carpenter continued, “The drain in that case discharged under the floor into the soil of the house and some of the regulations of the Board had been entirely omitted to be put into force as to ventilation and mapping.” Carpenter continued:

Yet Mr Latham gave a certificate that it was built in conformity to the regulations of the board although the sewer was passed under the floor of the house whilst the plans deposited showed it to be outside. The sewer into which

---

63 Croydon Chronicle, 20 May 1876
that house discharged was at its point a good sewer but very little sewage reached it from the house in question. W. Latham will remember the house, which was inhabited by a Mr Backley in North Park and is typical of the minor evils, which existed in nearly all the houses in which typhoid prevailed. Carpenter reported that the individual sewers which were condemned as bad were the ones in the lower parts of the town, and from them gases ascended and were conveyed into the houses. Carpenter later said that that Latham’s views were not to be depended upon. In the final sentence Carpenter wrote:

I wish I was with you on Monday night [most likely a meeting of the Society of Arts] that I might have the opportunity of answering his statements. I should show most conclusively that they are erroneous. P.S I have just received my book. [Preventative Medicine in Relation to Public Health]. I send you a copy. PPS You can use this information contained in this letter as you please. 64

SANITARY INSTITUTE OF GREAT BRITAIN

In 1876 the increasing importance attached to sanitary science provided the impetus for the formation of a national society, owing to the unsatisfactory condition of the health of the country and the need for collecting and imparting public health information. Following a meeting in St James's Hall, London, the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain was founded on 13 July 1876. The Duke of Northumberland was elected President and Chadwick and William Farr were elected vice presidents.

The third annual Congress of the Sanitary Institute was held in Croydon.65 It is likely that Croydon was chosen because of Carpenter’s national reputation in public

64 Chadwick papers, box 444, 21 September 1877.
65 The first Congress was held in Leamington in 1877 and the second in Stafford in 1878.
health, his enthusiasm for meetings and his friendship with Chadwick. Benjamin Ward Richardson was Chairman of Council. The Croydon Congress was held from 21 October to 8 November 1879. A preliminary meeting of the Congress was held earlier, in June 1879, in the School of Art Room, Croydon. Carpenter explained to those present the work of the Sanitary Institute, and suggested that the gentlemen present form themselves into a committee. In addition, a guarantor fund had to be set up with a large number of small payments rather than a few larger ones. Before the meeting finished, the setting up of an ambulance class in connection with the Congress was also agreed.

On 27 September a large advertisement about the Croydon Sanitary Congress appeared in the Croydon Chronicle, and it was clear from the long list of vice presidents and guarantors that there was widespread support from the gentry, clergy, gentlemen and tradesmen of the town. The Congress opened on Tuesday 21 October with a public luncheon followed by an opening ceremony. Altogether there were four general meetings. The second general meeting on ‘Sanitary Science and Preventive Medicine,’ took place on 22 October. Carpenter was President of the Section and he gave his talk on ‘The First Principles of Sanitary Work.’ In addition to the meetings there was also an Exhibition held in the central Croydon station, with an annexe in the skating rink. There were 189 stands and 710 classes of articles. At first sight Carpenter had every reason to be pleased with the Congress. However, criticism was

---

66 Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson (1828-96), physician, MA MD St Andrews, 1854 and Hon LLD 1877; MRCS Lond., 1856; FRCS, 1865; FRS, 1867; Physician to the Royal Infirmary for Diseases of the Chest, City Road, 1856 and to London Temperance hospital, 1892; president of the Medical Society of London, 1868; FSA, 1877; knighted 1893; originated and edited Journal of Public Health and Sanitary Review (1855). Carpenter would have known Richardson, as they were both Fellows of the Medical Society of London. Concise DNB, p.1103.

67 Croydon Advertiser, 28 June 1879, p.2.


not far away, particularly in the local press. For example, the editorial in the *Croydon Chronicle* had the following caption: “Blessed are they who expect nothing for they shall not be disappointed.” The article continued, “If any of our readers anticipated that great business and much instruction would come out of the Sanitary Congress they have had another instance of the vanity of human wishes and of human prophecy.” The editorial ridiculed the doctors involved, including Carpenter. The article went on, “Two or three talkative doctors have had what may be called ‘a day out’, have ridden their hobbies, or held up their theories to the public, but beyond this professional amusement there has been but little done.” The following week a letter appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle* under the title “Richardson’s Show.” The correspondent wrote “The windy verbiage and inane rhapsodies, of Drs Richardson and Carpenter are by no means new. There have been founders of Utopias in all ages.” The correspondent finished the letter with the following sentence, “A devotee to science, but one who gives a very wide berth to windbags and congresses.” A week later a letter from a workingman appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle*. The correspondent complained that the cost of the tickets for the course of speeches (10s 6d) was prohibitive to the workingman, and suggested that a reduced rate or even free admission would have boosted attendance.

**RELIGION**

**VESTRY**

In 1875 the Easter Vestry was held in the Nisi Prius court, where the Local Board of Health also held their meetings, and it was reported that a “goodly number of...
ratepayers were present.” The purpose of the meeting was to transact certain parish business; to appoint churchwardens and their sidesmen; to make out a list of persons qualified and liable to serve as overseers; and to appoint a sexton for the ensuing year. Carpenter was appointed sidesman to a Mr G. Anson Whealler.

The Easter Dinner took place in the Greyhound Hotel and it was reported that a Mr Phear, a lawyer, gave a toast to the Archbishop of Canterbury but missed out the clergy. However, the imbalance was redressed when Carpenter, “amidst considerable merriment, rose to propose the clergy separately.”

During the 1876 Vestry meeting a debate took place about the county Rate. The following appeared in the Croydon Chronicle: “The Chairman [Rev. Canon Hodgson] frankly admitted that he was about to tread on new ground, and that he did not understand the matter which the Vestry were now called upon to consider. He asked whether any gentleman present was ready to start a conversation on the matter?” The Vestry clerk explained that it was the duty of the quarter sessions to periodically reassess the county rate of the various parishes. For example, in 1871 the Rate was £361,360 and it was now proposed to raise it to £406,710. Because great improvements had occurred in the value of property in Croydon, they need not be astonished that the assessment had been raised. However, Carpenter did not share the same feelings of satisfaction with the Vestry clerk, and pointed out that it would only be a fair if the Rate in the neighbouring Unions were treated similarly. The Croydon Chronicle quoted Carpenter who said:

73 Croydon Chronicle, 3 April 1875.
74 A man employed to act as caretaker of a church and its contents and graveyard and often as bell-ringer, gravedigger etc.
75 Carpenter was also elected sidesman in 1876 and 1877.
76 Given name not known.
77 Croydon Chronicle, 3 April 1875.
Whilst Croydon had been raised nearly £100,000 a year [county rate], he found that parishes in other Unions had been reduced. Epsom for instance was lower than it was five years ago and it would hardly be supposed that property in Epsom had depreciated in value. Godstone had also been considerably reduced, and some of the parishes in the Reigate Union compared with their assessments five years ago.

After further debate it was agreed that Carpenter should inquire at the court of quarter sessions as to the inequality of the rating of Croydon in relation to the other parishes that had been mentioned, with a view to obtaining a more uniform and equitable rating.

The 1876 Easter Dinner took place again in the Greyhound Hotel, and the Croydon Chronicle described it as “the annual dinner at which the clergy, gentry, and tradesmen of the town, meet for mutual congratulations, and in support of the churchwardens elect.” Cuthbert Johnson, in responding to William Drummond's toast to the Croydon Local Board of Health, made a reference to the typhoid epidemic which had occurred in Croydon the previous year and the Croydon Chronicle reported him [Johnson] as saying: “there were at least a hundred towns in England which had suffered more than Croydon, but they had the good sense to keep it quiet. (A voice – ‘They have no Dr Carpenter living among them.’).” The Croydon Chronicle later reported the following:

Mr G.F King then proposed the health of the sidesmen – Dr Carpenter and Mr W.D. Chester. One of these gentlemen (Dr Carpenter) had left the room. It had been suggested that he had heard that a typhoid germ had been found in the parish, and that he had gone to look for it. (Loud laughter.) Under these
circumstances it became his duty and his pleasure to associate with the toast
the name of Mr W. D. Chester. (Applause.) 78

We do not know if Carpenter left the dinner because he had been ridiculed in public,
or called away to one of his patients or had other business to attend to.

At the 1880 Vestry meeting, the appointment of the churchwardens, sidesmen
and a sexton took place as normal. However, the main item on the agenda was:
‘Croydon a Borough.’ The resolution put to the Vestry was “That we, the inhabitants
of the Parish of Croydon Easter Vestry assembled, approve of the movement for
obtaining a Charter of Incorporation for the parish, and authorise the vestry clerk to
signify such approval to the Commissioners if an inquiry be held by order of the Privy
Council.” A general discussion followed and Carpenter, together with a number of
other speakers, felt unsure whether the vestry was the right body to decide on the
formation of a Borough. The meeting eventually decided in favour of the motion, and
how the debate progressed is described later. 79

CROYDON CHURCH CONGRESS

A notice concerning the 1877 Croydon Church Congress first appeared in the
Croydon Chronicle on 23 September 1876. The article informed its readers that
Croydon was to host the Church Congress, and included an invitation containing the
names of 61 persons, including Carpenter, who wanted the Congress to be held in
Croydon, plus a guarantor list providing financial support. Carpenter’s sum of £20
was the second largest amount (Archbishop Tait gave £25). 80 Later, on 9 June 1877, it
was reported that the guarantee fund had reached £24,000. 81

78 Croydon Chronicle, 22 April 1876.
79 Croydon Chronicle, 23 April 1881, p.3.
80 Croydon Chronicle, 23 September 1876.
81 Croydon Chronicle, 9 June 1877, p.5.
The Congress took place from 9 to 12 October 1877, under the Presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The meetings were held in Congress Hall, "a commodious edifice of timber, erected especially for the occasion on a piece of land known as Fairfield, conveniently contiguous to the East Croydon railway station." Congress Hall was capable of accommodating five thousand people, and adjoining the Hall were "several temporary erections, appropriated to refreshment purposes, cloakrooms, and private offices." It was also reported that, "the union jack floated gaily on the roof of the hall during the week." The Congress debated a wide variety of subjects which included: Mahometanism in relation to Christianity and the prospects of missionary enterprise towards it; Christian faith and sceptical culture in their relative bearings on practical life; the position of voluntary schools under the Education Acts of 1870 and 1879, and the duty of the church with reference to state schools and charity organisation in its Christian aspect, with reference to almsgiving and medical provident institutions - their use and abuse. There was also an evening meeting on 'intemperance' at which Carpenter spoke. The following year Carpenter, who was Treasurer of the Congress, presented a cheque for £32 to Croydon General Hospital, being the balance from the Congress fund.

SHIRLEY VICARAGE

Carpenter's advice on public health matters was often sought. For instance, in 1879 the Rev. W. Wilks consulted Carpenter about the purity of the water supply of the Shirley vicarage, following his new appointment to Shirley. Wilks had been vicar of the Parish church for thirteen years. Carpenter, well known to Wilks as he was a

---

82 Croydon Chronicle, 13 October 1877, p.2.
83 Croydon Chronicle, 23 November 1878, p.5.
84 Given name not known.
85 Tait papers, vol.251, pp.393- 4. A copy of the letter was sent to Archbishop Tait.
regular member of the Parish church and had been a sidesman. Before Wilks took up his post, Carpenter wrote a letter to him voicing his concerns:

... the day will come sooner or later when your well must be contaminated by organic matters from the most dangerous sources. It is probably suffering now from the close proximity of the cesspool, which is only twenty feet from it, and if a case of typhoid should be imported into your house, there will be a certainty of most of those taking water from that well of becoming affected by the disease.

Carpenter argued that it was the duty of the owners of the property to supply water from a safe source within a reasonable distance, and that Wilks should get that water laid on before he moved into the residence. Carpenter offered him an analogy: “It appears to me very unwise to shut the stable door after the steed is stolen if you know that there are thieves about and it is better to guard it. We know that sooner or later the thief of health will find its way into the well at Shirley and I advise you to take your supply from another source.”

CHURCH OF ENGLAND YOUNG MENS SOCIETY

Carpenter was involved in encouraging younger people to join the church. For example, a conversazione by the Church of England Young Men’s Society was held in the Croydon Public Halls on 26 October 1880. The *Croydon Chronicle* noted, “The attractions were music, speeches and an exhibition of microscopes. From some cause or other the majority of those present were ladies, and the words of wisdom which came from the lips of the various speakers who gave advice to young men fell upon

---

*Croydon Chronicle*, 22 November 1879, p.4. A Testimonial fund was raised.

ears unable to act upon them." The speakers included Archbishop Tait, Carpenter and Mr Jas Watney, MP (the son of the man about whom Carpenter had written to Tait about, voicing his concerns about the family being of ‘low church’).

On 2 July 1881 the Croydon Chronicle reported that Carpenter occupied the Chair at the public meeting for the opening of the new premises of the Young Men’s Christian Association (previously called Church of England Young Men’s Society), at 21b, North End, Croydon. The Croydon Chronicle reported Carpenter as saying that “… he [Carpenter] himself entertained that prayer to God was likely to be answered satisfactorily. He could safely say that he never yet engaged in an enterprise, which had not turned out to his satisfaction without finding, when he looked back, that he had failed to ask for power from above to guide him aright.” Later towards the end of his speech Carpenter spoke specifically about Christianity and the Croydon Chronicle reported the following:

If Christianity were the rule in this country there would be much less work for the lawyers, and they would find that they did not want anything like police or persons, and he might also say that they would not want anything like lunatic asylums, while pauperism would also disappear, for no Christian would so degrade himself as to become a drunkard.  

LONDON CITY MISSION

Carpenter’s wide interest in Church matters was highlighted on 25 April 1881 when he occupied the Chair at the annual meeting of the Croydon Branch of the London City Mission. Following a prayer, the secretary read the thirty-first annual report and reminded the audience that the object of the mission was to extend the knowledge of

---

88 Croydon Chronicle, 30 October 1880, p.3.
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the Gospel among the inhabitants of London and its vicinity (especially the poor),
without any reference to denominational distinction or the peculiarities of church
government. The Society, which was catholic and unsectarian in its character, invited
all sincere Christians to assist in its work. Croydon had six missionaries from the
Association working five hours per day, visiting people in the district for the purpose
of bringing them to, ‘a knowledge’ of, the way of salvation. In Carpenter’s address
the Croydon Chronicle wrote: “that unless a remedy was provided, the disease [of the
mind] would extend, which would show itself in that state of infidelity which was
growing in their midst, and which, unless checked, would come in a flood, and would
change the institutions of the country in a way that would be most deplorable.”
Carpenter’s wish was that all true Christians would assist the London City Mission.
The Croydon Chronicle later reported Carpenter as saying:

The missionaries belonging to the society had done a great deal of work for a
very little money, and if better supported than they had been he thought there
would be the less work for himself and his colleagues to do, and less call for
the ratepayer to provide those institutions which were now required - police
stations, workhouses, lunatic asylums, and many other places. 90

SOCIETIES, ORGANISATIONS AND PUBLIC SERVICE

Carpenter belonged to many societies, and became President or Chairman of many of
them. Morris has noted that, “his [Carpenter] presence in some representative or
official capacity can be traced through at least twenty four different movements in
Croydon – political, religious, philanthropic and social.” 91 By 1876 Carpenter’s
professional commitments had increased so much that he had to reluctantly withdraw

90 Croydon Chronicle, 30 April 1881, p.2.
from some of the committees with which he was associated. For example, at the annual meeting of the governors of Croydon General Hospital, Carpenter said that it was his wish to withdraw from the committee. The *Croydon Chronicle* reported Carpenter as saying: “During 25 years he had attended upwards of 3,000 committee and other meetings connected with various institutions in this town; he therefore thought he had done his fair share of public work, and should be wrong in accepting duties which he could not fulfil.” 92 However, this was a very different attitude to the one shown when he had responded to a question from the audience during the first School Board elections five years previously and which has been quoted earlier.

Little is known about Carpenter’s patients, as none of his casebooks or patient records has survived. However, we can get some idea of the types of illness he had to deal with from other sources. These include cases that he presented at the Medical Society of London, the records of four successive Archbishops of Canterbury (including some members of the Archbishops’ family), and the case histories, which he described in the *BMJ, Lancet* and other medical journals.

Carpenter was invited to give lectures to various organisations, demonstrating his growing popularity. For example, in 1874 he gave a talk to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science on: ‘Sanitary Education in Elementary Schools.’ 93 He was also an active member of the Croydon Microscopical Club (he became President in 1877) and often gave talks and also provided objects of general interest to exhibit at the meetings. In 1874 Carpenter became a member of the Surrey Archaeological Society 94 and was elected on to the Council in 1880. In 1883 he gave a talk to the Association at a meeting in the ancient chapel of the

92 *Croydon Chronicle*, 18 November 1876.
93 TNAPSS, 1875, p.518-23, Glasgow Meeting, 1874.
Archiepiscopal Palace, Croydon. His talk was entitled ‘Suggestions as to the Derivation of the Name of Croydon.’

Carpenter continued to support the Croydon Medical Reading Society, who continued to pay his subscription to the New Sydenham Society. In 1877 Carpenter also sat on a local committee for Croydon High School for Girls. Also in 1877 he was elected as one of the three co-optive governors to the Whitgift Hospital and Schools Charity. In 1874 he became Chairman at the Croydon and Clarence Cricket Club, also known as the CCCC. In one of his obituaries, though, it was observed, ‘though he never plays.’ He was a surgeon to the Second Surrey Rifle Volunteers, “although he never attended his drill.” He continued to be an active member of the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution, and became Hon Treasurer in 1874.

MEDICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON

In November 1873, Carpenter gave a paper to the Medical Society of London on: ‘Some Cases of Malignant Pustule,’ which he had seen in his private practice.

Malignant pustule, or cutaneous anthrax, was primarily a disease of wool sorters, generally fatal and one many of industrial diseases that were accepted as part of working life. Wohl has said, “Simon and the Medical Department of the Local Government Board could do little more than to report outbreaks, and to urge a close examination of wool and hair from abroad. Anthrax remained a much-feared and bewildering scourge of wool-sorters and wool and hair workers into the present century [20C].”

---

94 Trans Surrey Archaeological Society, vol.6, 1874. List of members. (Thereafter called TSAS)
95 Croydon Chronicle, 5 May 1883, p.2.
96 Croydon Advertiser, 30 January 1892.
97 Ibid.
98 Transactions of the Medical Society of London, 1873, p.72. (Thereafter called TMSL).
99 Wohl p.265.
Carpenter described five cases of malignant pustule, of which four died within six days. The fifth was a woman who remained under his observation, whose disease had commenced on 4 February 1873 with an itch in the lower lip. By the 13 February the patient had developed swelling of the face, neck, left clavicle and sternum and she was unable to swallow or talk. She was kept alive by enemata of beef tea, eggs and brandy. By the 14 February the swellings had improved and she was able to swallow. The patient made a slight improvement - on 4 March she was able to sit up, and by the following day walk from her bed to the sofa. However, on 12 March there was a relapse, with symptoms of liver obstruction [obstructive jaundice]. Later, on 24 March, she had a slight convulsive seizure which lasted twenty minutes, but without loss of consciousness. She developed acute abdominal pain and seemed to be sinking. However, the patient rallied and the last report found her feeling much better. A discussion then followed amongst the Fellows.100 Later, in 1875, Carpenter read another paper to the Fellows: ‘On the rational treatment of some forms of hemiplegia.’ 101

CROYDON SCHOOL OF ART
Carpenter was Chairman of the Committee of Management, of the Croydon School of Art. An annual exhibition of works in connection with the science and art department, South Kensington, took place in the Public Halls, Croydon.102 An annual prize giving also took place and a distinguished guest (either a cabinet minister, senior doctor or a member of the gentry) was invited along to distribute the prizes. In 1882 Sir Henry Thompson was invited and the Croydon Chronicle reported the following: “he [Sir Henry Thompson] was an old Croydon inhabitant, having commenced his study in the

100 TMSL, 1873, p.72.
High Street of Croydon in the year 1846.” Later in 1891 Sir Spencer Wells distributed the prizes.

In 1879 controversy erupted when Montague Wigzell, Headmaster, was removed from the staff of the Croydon School of Art. The Croydon Chronicle editorial reported the following: “When he returned thanks, [at the School of Art Prize giving] however, he [Wigzell] said it had been announced to him that evening that his place was to be filled by another; and he had been told by Dr Carpenter that the desire for his removal came from the students themselves.” Wigzell had been popular with the students and a letter signed by a large number of them appeared in the Croydon Chronicle on 15 February 1878. The letter said: “We do not consider that the Chairman [Carpenter] had any authority to state that Mr Wigzell’s removal was desired by the students, and should think it a most ungrateful return to make all the care he has bestowed upon us during eleven years of patient teaching.” A long letter from Wigzell, explaining the events surrounding his dismissal, appeared in the Croydon Chronicle on 22 February 1879. It included details of his conversation with Carpenter on the day of the Prize giving. It was reported that Carpenter said, “I will not allow this evening to pass over without insisting upon your being removed from your post as headmaster.” The decision to remove Wigzell stood and later that year Wigzell set up a rival school, called ‘The Croydon and Surrey School of Art.’

---
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JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

In 1876, after four years as a magistrate, Carpenter would act as Chairman if Thomas Edridge were away. As a JP, Carpenter attended meetings of the Croydon Board of Guardians as an ex-officio member, and his broad knowledge of public health issues proved to be beneficial to the Board.

The Justices of the Peace for Surrey were also responsible for running the lunatic asylums in the county up until 1889, when the London County Council took over. Carpenter’s involvement in the asylums began on 25 May 1875, when he was invited to attend a committee meeting at the Sessions House, Newington, to “consider the question of providing further accommodation for the pauper lunatics of this county [Surrey], and other matters relating to the lunatics.” In 1875 there were two asylums in Surrey, namely Wandsworth and Brookwood, and it was resolved that the third asylum be of the same character as the existing asylums and capable of accommodating 1000 patients. Carpenter sat on the building committee of Cane Hill Lunatic Asylum, which eventually opened in January 1884, nearly nine years after the first meeting in Sessions House.

Reporters from the Croydon Chronicle had the opportunity of visiting Cane Hill, which was built at a cost of £196,640. The asylum was described as “perhaps the most wonderful building or set of buildings in the county.” Later the reporters wrote, “At Cane Hill, the air is purity itself, and we should imagine that the building will be almost as valuable as a refrigerator. Three spacious larders also face the yard.” The prevention of accidental scalding of patients in the bath was also highlighted and it was reported that:

---
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Dr Moody’s ingenuity is manifest in a contrivance simple in its working, but most important in its results. We have all heard of cases of scalding in consequence of boiling water being turned on to the bather. This cannot possibly occur at Cane Hill; for each of the taps is now fitted that cold water must be turned on before the hot water valve can be opened. The cost of fitting the contrivance to any bath could hardly exceed a shilling, and we should think its use would soon be universal.

PHILANTHROPY

Carpenter’s philanthropic activities were numerous and varied. For example, in 1874 he attended the anniversary dinner of the Ancient Order of Foresters, which was a friendly society. These friendly societies were built up by workingmen to provide themselves with some security against the poverty and destitution resulting from sickness and death. By 1875 there were four million members belonging to these friendly societies of which half a million were Foresters. Carpenter, who was an honorary member of the Forester’s, gave a toast: “Success to the Amalgamated Friendly Societies of Croydon.”

---

112 James M Moody was the Medical Superintendent on a salary of £700 per annum. The other staff plus their salaries are as follows: - David G. Thomson, Senior Assistant Medical Officer, £159; Hugh G. Hill, Junior Assistant Medical Officer; £109; John C Craufurd, Chaplain, £250; Frederick Hooper, Clerk to the Visitors, £100; James L Ralph, Clerk, £156; George G Thomson, Steward, £100; Eliza Powell, Housekeeper, £66; Daniel Green, Head Male Attendant, £71; Lydia Woodward, Head Female Attendant, £71; William Davis, Dispenser, £71; Wingate Hills, Assistant Steward, £46; William Howe, Assistant Clerk, £46.
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BOILER EXPLOSION

Another example of Carpenter’s philanthropy took place in 1875. A boiler exploded in the Croydon Town Hall, killing Henry Cahill, the hall keeper. An inquest was held at the Three Tuns Inn, Surrey Street and Carpenter gave evidence. The *Croydon Advertiser* reported the following:

Dr Alfred Carpenter, sworn, said: I am a doctor of Medicine residing in Croydon. On the 1st inst [January 1875] I was called to see the deceased. I found him lying on the floor, unconscious, and nearly pulseless. I found compound fractures of both legs, and muscles a good deal torn, as from some violence, a compound fracture of the right arm, which was also much bruised and torn, contusions about the head, and cuts about the face. The man was dying, and he died about ten minutes after I arrived, and whilst I was present, I saw the state of the boiler room, and I have no doubt that he received his injuries through the explosion. The boiler had just been lifted off him, and portions of the material had struck him. The injuries he received were quite sufficient to cause death, and I have no doubt that he died from them.

The *Croydon Advertiser* continued:

The Coroner having handed to Dr Carpenter the usual fee, that gentleman said he did not know what steps were going to be taken with regard to the widow of the deceased, but for his own part he should be happy to give up his fee. The deceased having been one of the officers of the Board of Health they would like to do all they could. He then handed the guinea to the foreman of the jury to start a subscription for the deceased’s widow.

---

115 *Croydon Advertiser*, 4 July 1874.
The jury returned a verdict of accidental death and relinquished their fees in favour of the widow of the deceased. A subscription was started in the room, and before the jurymen left, it was announced that £33 10s had been collected.\footnote{Croydon Advertiser, 9 January 1875.}

At the meeting of the Croydon Local Board of Health the \textit{Croydon Advertiser} reported the following:

\begin{quote}
Dr Carpenter thought the Board ought not to let it go forth that the man [Cahill] lost his own life entirely through his own “fault.” It was his misfortune. He was extremely wishful that no complaint should be made against him, and he (Dr Carpenter) believed that the accident entirely arose from his fear that unless the Nisi Prius Court could be got warm on Saturday [when the magistrates court took place] he would get a ‘wigging’ - he would not say from whom. It was the fear of this, and the nervous anxiety that arose in consequence that made the man get up a larger fire than it was right for him to do.
\end{quote}

Carpenter’s concerns for Cahill’s widow were evident when the \textit{Croydon Advertiser} reported the following:

\begin{quote}
He did not know what steps would be taken with reference to the widow, but he hoped something would be done to place her in a comfortable position, that but the anxiety of a man doing his duty to the Board, and which caused him to lose his life, might not plunge her into poverty. He hoped some steps would be taken by which sufficient money might be raised to purchase her an annuity equal to the pension, which her husband had received.\footnote{Croydon Advertiser, 16 January 1875.}
\end{quote}
ALIMANI SAIDOO

Carpenter’s kindness was also demonstrated on 23 April 1879, when he wrote a letter to the Croydon Chronicle encouraging the public to attend a meeting in the Public Halls. The purpose of the meeting was to help raise funds for Alimani Saidoo, an Abyssinian ship’s surgeon who had worked on ships trading between Sierra Leone and the West Indies and who was stranded in this country. Carpenter said that because of his colour it was impossible for him to obtain employment in his profession here.

The Croydon Chronicle informed its readers that during the entertainment “He will relate his experiences in England, will speak of what to him appeared the peculiarities of this country, and in the second part, will read selections from English authors. A song will bring the entertainment to a close.” On 3 May 1879 a letter from Saidoo appeared in the Croydon Chronicle:

Will you kindly allow me a short space in your valuable columns to publicly thank my patron, Dr Carpenter, for the receipt of the generous offer of a Bank of England note for £5.

I am sure you will not grudge me this opportunity of thanking him, for the unremitting attention and kindness I have received from this gentleman during my stay here is more than mere words can express.

Carpenter’s popularity continued, and on 12 September 1879 he opened the Castle Coffee Tavern in the High Street. In the same year Carpenter, his wife and lady helpers entertained the children of Croydon Ragged School. The Croydon Chronicle wrote, “For some years past the children attending the school, have had an excellent treat provided for them through the kindness of Dr Carpenter.” The following year, Carpenter entertained 173 children from the Croydon Ragged School in the grounds

---
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of his residence, Duppas House. It was reported that Carpenter and his family did all in their power to promote the enjoyment of the children. Additional help was provided by the Sunday school teachers and many ladies and gentlemen who took an interest in the school.\textsuperscript{121}

In 1880 Carpenter was invited to join the Croydon Nurses Institute Committee\textsuperscript{122} and later in that year distributed the Prizes at the Annual Speech day of the Grammar School in Lansdowne Road.\textsuperscript{123}

WILLIAM FARR

In 1880 Carpenter was instrumental in ensuring that William Farr's \textsuperscript{124} important contributions to science was recognised. Carpenter was also involved in raising a Testimonial Fund for Farr who had been Superintendent of Statistics at the Registrar General's Office from 1838-79.

In 1880 Carpenter was Chairman of the Council of the BMA and past President of the SE Branch. He was influential in the passing of a resolution from the executive council of the SE Branch to Lord Beaconsfield, for Farr's efforts to be recognised by conferring upon him some distinguished mark of honour and approval.\textsuperscript{125} Carpenter's influence worked, and a notice soon appeared in the \textit{BMJ} informing its readers: "The Queen has been graciously pleased to confer the honour of

\textsuperscript{120} Croydon Chronicle, 27 September 1879.
\textsuperscript{121} Croydon Chronicle, 31 July 1880, p.4.
\textsuperscript{122} Croydon Chronicle, 12 June 1880, p.5.
\textsuperscript{123} Croydon Chronicle, 18 December 1880, p.4
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{BMJ}, 1880, i: 262.
Companion of the Civil Division of the Most Honourable Order of Bath on Dr William Farr.  

It was generally felt that Farr’s retirement pension of £800 per annum was too small compared to the £1100 per annum he received when he was Superintendent of Statistics. For this reason many of Farr’s friends and admirers expressed a wish to mark his retirement by some substantial mark of their appreciation of the value of his forty-two years labour in the interest of public health and statistical science. For this reason a Testimonial Fund for Farr was raised. Apart from a few other large donations, Carpenter’s £25 donation was one of the largest and is another example of his generosity.

Later in the year the Annual Meeting of the BMA was held in Cambridge and the following was read out:

That the Gold Medal of the Association be awarded by the Committee of Council of the British Medical Association to W. Farr, CB, MD, FRS, etc, as an expression of their high appreciation of his long, unwearied, and successful labours, on behalf of statistical and sanitary science, and as recognition of the light he has thrown upon many physiological and pathological problems, and on account of the extraordinary services his work has rendered to the advancement of the health of the nation.

The BMJ reported that the Senate House was then the scene of an interesting ceremony, namely the presentation of the gold medal of the Association, as voted, to Dr William Farr. Unfortunately, Farr was unable to attend the ceremony and Farr’s

---

126 BMJ, 1880, i: 527.
127 BMJ, 1880, i: 344.
128 BMJ, 1880, i: 378. During Farr’s lifetime it was his wish that the fund be invested and allowed to accumulate and support his three daughters after his death. When he died, in 1883, the fund received two large donations, from the government and the Florence Nightingale Fund, and then totalled £1724. Victorian Social Medicine, The Ideas and Methods of William Farr, p.190.
daughter asked Professor Henry Acland, from Oxford, to receive the medal on his behalf. Acland replied:

Dr Farr will receive this medal, as it was offered, as a token of sympathy with his unwearied scientific work - a work which was ill recognised and scarcely paid; and it also betokened that Dr Farr's professional brethren in this great Association had only made an acknowledgement which would be shared by the whole civilised world.

An engrossed scroll on vellum, bearing a copy of the resolution accompanied, the gold medal. Unfortunately Farr had to wait for the medal, as the following letter from Carpenter to Noel A. Humphrys testifies. The letter dated 17 October 1880 read:

My dear Mr Humphrys

I am surprised to hear that Dr Farr has not yet received his medal. It was returned for the purpose of burnishing and was then to have been delivered to the dear old Doctor at once. I will enquire about it tomorrow or Tuesday when I will be at 161 Strand [headquarters of the BMA] and will see that it is delivered as soon as possible.

METROPOLITAN PROVIDENT MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

On 17 April 1880 Carpenter, together with a Mr H.H. Collins and Francis Neison, represented the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science at a meeting of delegates at the Cannon Street Hotel. They were to consider the subject of Provident Dispensaries for the wage-earning classes, which numbered about 500,000

129 BMJ, 1880, ii: 299.
130 Sir Henry Wentworth Acland (1815-1900), physician, regius Professor of Medicine (1858-94), lifelong friend of John Ruskin, KCB 1884, President of the GMC (1874-1887), published writings dealing with sanitation and medical education. Concise DNB, p.4.
131 BMJ, 1880, ii: 299.
men. Following the meeting an Association was formed with James Stansfield, MP as Chairman.\footnote{TNAPSS, 1881, pp.868-9.}

The following year a meeting took place in the Croydon Town Hall in which Carpenter chaired a meeting of delegates representing the various Friendly Societies, “for the purpose of taking into consideration the question of the formation of a branch in Croydon of the Provident Medical Association.”\footnote{Croydon Chronicle, 5 March 1881, p.5.} The meeting was favourable to the formation of a Croydon Branch. On 18 March 1881 a meeting took place in the large Public Hall and it was reported that a large number of workingmen attended. Carpenter, who was in the chair, informed the meeting that the Association was formed the previous year and its aim was “to consider the best means to be adopted to dispose of the difficulties, which at present existed with regard to the question of medical aid to the working classes, and the mischief resulting from the present outpatient system adopted at the great hospitals and dispensaries in London.” He also pointed out the benefits that had already accrued to the working classes of the metropolis from the formation of this Association. Stansfield also addressed the meeting and explained the objects of the movement. He pointed out that by the payment of a very small weekly sum, prompt and efficient medical treatment would be available for a workingman and his family, and the scheme would be carried out upon the principles of hospital outpatient relief. Later, it was decided that members of sick-benefit societies would be admitted to the Association on payment of 4d per month (or for their families upon payment of 1s per month), whilst other persons would be enrolled for 6d per month (or their families for 1s per month).\footnote{Croydon Chronicle, 26 March 1881, p.2.}

\footnote{Farr Collection, British Library of Political and Economic Science, MF 279, 30. Humphrys was based at the General Registrar's Office, Somerset House, London, W.C.}
\footnote{Given name unknown. He was listed as an ordinary member of the Association in 1881.}
\footnote{TNAPSS, 1881, pp.868-9.}
CHAPTER 6

TEMPERANCE

The temperance movement was a major source of social reform in Victorian Britain. During the eighteenth century, the middle and upper classes served wine with their meals whilst the working classes drank beer and cider. However, during the nineteenth century temperance reformers regarded the consumption of alcohol by the working-class men as wasteful - an illicit form of entertainment that served no purpose and caused many problems, both socially and with health. However, the reformers did not want to outlaw drink altogether, but rather to control its consumption. The temperance reformers (mainly middle-class men) concentrated on the drinking habits of working-class men, as those of women were largely unknown.

The Temperance movement encouraged the working class to remain sober, and to enable them to establish self-respectability and to achieve both higher economic and social status. Although the teetotal and prohibitionist movements were not successful the temperance movement altered England’s view on alcohol and influenced change for the future.

Carpenter became an active member of the temperance movement both at a local and national level. He was involved in temperance organisations, societies and congresses, giving lectures and addresses. As a magistrate he dealt severely with cases of drunkenness, although, as will be seen later, he was also keen to rehabilitate these drunkards. Carpenter’s strong views on alcohol sometimes upset people and also provoked comment in the press. He irritated the publicans with his strong temperance views, both in Croydon and Reigate, and as will be seen later, was dealt with severely by them. First the East India Company cadets are discussed.
In the 1850s Carpenter and Westall looked after the cadets, and Vibart recalls the following episode:

On one occasion one of the orderly officers being unwell, asked Dr Westall for his advice. After enquiring into his symptoms, he said, ‘Well, you certainly must be most abstemious and avoid all stimulants.’ Next day Dr Carpenter came up, so he [the orderly officer] asked him to prescribe for him. He, having heard what was wrong, said, ‘I should strongly recommend you to live generously and take an extra glass of port wine.’

Later in his career Carpenter changed his views on alcohol, both in the treatment of illness and in its social context and in 1880 he became a total abstainer. The problems associated with alcohol excess amongst the population were numerous. Alcoholism could affect both the work and family environment and the also the health of the individual. Alcoholism caused absenteeism and instability among the working classes, decreased efficiency and this in turn affected the economy of the country as a whole.

When Carpenter was a magistrate, he frequently saw cases of drunkenness although the Victorians often failed to distinguish between alcoholism, drinking and drunkenness. Carpenter did not always agree with his fellow magistrates when dealing with cases of drunkenness. For example, on one occasion a prisoner before the bench was told by the Chairman to “take a little less beer” prompting Carpenter to say, “don’t take any.” Some of the defendants charged with drunkenness became verbally abusive, both when they were arrested and whilst in the magistrates court. For example, in 1874 Carpenter spoke to a husband and wife who appeared before

---

2 Temperance Record, 1892.
him and the following was reported in the *Croydon Advertiser*: “Dr Carpenter - And you, too, Mrs Hollyman, keep away from drink and keep a quiet tongue in your head.” In another case, Carpenter bluntly put the undesirable effects of alcohol to a prisoner and the *Croydon Advertiser* reported the following: “Dr Carpenter (to the prisoner) - When you get drunk you are no longer a human being.”

In 1881 an article appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle* under the title: ‘The Degradation of Drink.’ Josiah Thomas was charged with being drunk and disorderly, and a witness said that at times persons gave him [the defendant] drink. This prompted Carpenter to say, “They are more to blame than their victims.” The prisoner was unable to pay the fine of 1s 6d and 3s 6d costs, and was sent to a house of correction for seven days. Carpenter offered him advice and the following appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle*: “Dr Carpenter: Then you will have to go to the house of correction for seven days. If you are wise, you will keep from drink after you come out. It is possible to retrieve your character if you give up drink; but otherwise it will be impossible for you to be anything but an outcast.” In another case appearing before the bench it was reported that three females were brought before him, charged with having been drunk on leaving the theatre, and their language was stated to have been most obscene. In sending them to prison the *Croydon Chronicle* reported the following: “the Doctor [Carpenter] remarked that respectable people were deterred from going to the theatre by the bad company they were likely to find in some parts of the house.” The medical profession were not immune to drunkenness. For example

---

3 *Croydon Observer*, 26 July 1872.
6 *Croydon Advertiser*, 15 August 1874.
7 *Croydon Chronicle*, 3 October 1874.
8 *Croydon Chronicle*, 3 September 1881, p.3.
9 *Croydon Chronicle*, 26 August 1882, p.5.
John Foster Williams, a surgeon, was charged with being drunk and incapable and fined 2s 6d with 2s 6d costs.¹⁰

Carpenter’s charitable attitude towards some drunkards is apparent in many ways. For example, an article appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle*, which read, ‘An Appeal on Behalf of Intemperance.’ Carpenter had written to the Croydon Local Board of Health, in his capacity as a magistrate, on behalf of those poor drunkards who came before the magistrates charged with intemperance. The *Croydon Chronicle* reported Carpenter as saying, “He thought his services might be more usefully employed if he could obtain the use of a room in the Town Hall on Monday evenings from eight till half past nine, in order that he might have the opportunity of reclaiming these poor people, and leading them into a right mind.”¹¹ It is unclear whether or not Carpenter was able to put his plan into practice.

Carpenter was invited by the Law Amendment Committee to give a paper to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. His paper entitled ‘Legislation for the Habitual Drunkard’ was published in the *BMJ*. In his talk Carpenter put forward three questions. First, is further legislation required? Second, are present powers capable of being used for the reformation of the drunkard? Third, the direction any legislation would take. It was reported in the *BMJ* that, “Dr Carpenter answered the first and second questions by showing that he felt that the present powers were comparatively inoperative for prevention, and had not the least pretence for being considered curative.”¹² His personal knowledge gained as a Surrey magistrate and from having read the ‘Select committee upon habitual drunkards,’ showed that “small fines and short imprisonments were useless.” Carpenter said he fully endorsed the opinion of the Committee, “that fresh legislation upon the subject

---

¹⁰ *Croydon Chronicle*, 26 August 1882, p.3.
¹¹ *Croydon Chronicle*, 14 August 1875. Carpenter was also a member of the Board at this time.
was necessary, and that the law should be made more simple, uniform, and stringent.”
Carpenter then dealt with Mr Dalrymple’s Bill, and whilst approving of it, expressed his view that public opinion was not yet ripe for it, and suggesting that it would be good policy to take the first clause of Dalrymple’s definition and ask for a permissive measure only. The BMJ quoted Carpenter as saying, “They only ask for a measure that should give permissive power to deal with ‘intemperance the disease,’ as distinct from ‘intemperance the vice;’ they wanted power to prevent the establishment of the disease; but they would at present be content with power to cure it after it is established.” Later, on 29 October 1877, Carpenter attended a meeting with the Lord Mayor (Sir Thomas White) and others at The Mansion House, in which he also addressed the delegates. Resolutions were adopted in favour of founding an Industrial Home for Inebriate Women.

There were various ways for encouraging people to either reduce or completely stop their alcohol consumption. For example, the Croydon Board of Guardians resolved on 11 July 1876 that all the medical officers should be supplied with cod liver oil and quinine with a view to diminishing the consumption of wines and spirits amongst the residents of Croydon. Adverts for non-alcoholic beverages appeared in the local press, with testimonials for purity from Carpenter and others. One advert read:

The makers of really delicious Non-intoxicant Beverages are genuine workers in the great temperance movement. Rhetorical exaggeration will not win half so many men and women from indulgence in alcoholic stimulants as will be

---

12 BMJ, 1876, i: 426.
13 Donald Dalrymple (1814-73), physician and liberal MP. On 4 March 1870 his motion to create reformatories for forcibly confining habitual drunkards was rejected by the Commons.
14 BMJ, i: 426.
the substitution of Non-intoxicant Beverages, some thing more than barely palatable. Messrs Packham and Co’s Manufactures are simply delicious. ¹⁶

The Sunday Closing Movement was an important part of the anti-drink agitation. A heading: ‘The Closing of Public Houses on Sundays’ appeared in the Croydon Chronicle on 15 May 1880. A Public Meeting had taken place earlier on 7 May 1880 and the Vicar was in the Chair. It was reported that amongst those present were Carpenter and a large number of ladies. In his resolution Carpenter pointed out that Scotland had for a quarter of a century been enjoying the blessings of total Sunday closing, and that the Act of 1878 closing the public houses in Ireland (with the exception of five towns) during the whole of the Lord’s day had been productive of great and undoubted good. Carpenter argued that Sunday drunkenness was reduced by more than two thirds, and said he wished that the members of Parliament for this division of the county would give their earnest and persistent support to a measure which would bestow a similar boon on the whole of England and Wales. ¹⁷ The resolution however was never taken up.

Carpenter did not always get the full support of his fellow magistrates in cases involving licences for the sale of alcohol. For example, in 1883 a headline appeared in the Croydon Chronicle: ‘The Sale of Intoxicants at Balls.’ It related to an application to the magistrates for a licence to sell intoxicating liquors at a private ball in the Public Halls. Carpenter refused to grant the application, “ alleging that he would not be a party to allowing young persons to drink until three o clock in the morning. It was most ruinous, and had an injurious effect, especially on young women. As other applications of a similar nature had been declined, he did not see why an exception

¹⁶ Croydon Chronicle, 14 January 1882, p.4. In 1884 the Company went into liquidation.
¹⁷ Croydon Chronicle, 15 May 1880, p.6
should be made in this case.” However, Jabez Spencer Balfour the other magistrate, said:

He did not concur with the observations of his colleague, who he thought was going too far. He had only a short time previously been to a ball at the Public Hall, and had drunk at three o’clock in the morning, and was quite certain that he had not been ruined by it. If people had their ball at home they were allowed to drink as long as they wished, and as this was so he saw no reason why they should be deprived of it simply because they engaged the Public Hall.

Mr Balfour then signed the application, much to the annoyance of Carpenter.

Later in February a heading appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle,* ‘Decrease of Drunkenness in Croydon.’ The article began:

Dr A. Carpenter, presiding at the Croydon Bench of Magistrates on Monday, in dealing with a charge of drunkenness, said he had hoped that the week during which his colleague and himself had attended at the court would have passed without having a single charge arising out of taking intoxicants before them, but such was not the case. There was no doubt that there was something good in the town at the present time in suppressing some of the drunkenness, which had been present in Croydon of late.

---

18 *Croydon Chronicle,* 10 February 1883, p.5
19 Jabez Spencer Balfour was the most popular man in Croydon for many years up to 1892, after which he was reviled. Taking an interest in practically every movement in the town, he was the natural choice for Charter Mayor in 1883. He was at that time Liberal MP for Tamworth and later became MP for Burnley. As a young man he had shown a genius for speculation and became associated with a group of companies of which the Liberator Building Company was the principal one. In September 1892, this society failed and Balfour fled to South America. Eventually he was arrested there, extradited and sentenced to 14 years hard labour. Many thousands of small savers had lost their life savings in the collapse of the various companies with which Balfour was involved. His name was removed from the plaque dated 1883, which is to be found on the wall of the long corridor of Mayday Hospital. The plaque contains the names of the then Board of Guardians and Justices of the Peace, who were ex-officio. Carpenter was an ex-officio.
20 *Croydon Chronicle,* 17 February 1883, p.5
Carpenter still had his critics, and a letter to the Croydon Chronicle said, “Dr Carpenter, for instance may be wise in council, able in debate, but there are perhaps many important facts which he has not assimilated to his understanding.” The article continued, “He [Carpenter] gave some very good reasons why he thought the people of Croydon should become abstainers, stating that they [the public] did not hear one tithe part of the lamentable cases of drunkenness that every week was brought under their (‘the magistrates’) notice.” The article continued:

Carpenter said it was painful to stand at the London Bridge Terminus, and see the numbers of young men, who travelled by the early workmen’s trains, rush into the refreshment bar, and have what they called a pick me up of dogs nose (gin and beer) to keep their hands steady. This unsteadiness, says the doctor was not caused by the excessive labour of the previous day, but by the excessive drinking!

C.K. Graves, the author of the letter, offered Carpenter some advice and in the letter he said:

I have travelled a good deal by the Croydon and London trains during the past fifteen years, and can count the number of times I have been at London Bridge terminus by scores, when these early trains from Croydon have arrived there, and I can emphatically assert that not five per cent of the working-men referred to in the doctor’s disparaging remarks enter into these refreshment bars, nor is it reasonable to suppose they can afford “what Dr Carpenter designates a ‘dogs nose’ ”at these places, the cost of which would be fourpence or sixpence each time.

The article continued:
I [C.K. Graves] have seen some thirty or forty men at one time standing round the coffee stalls at Broad Street and Liverpool Street stations, and if Dr Carpenter could, by using his influence in the matter, be instrumental in causing a really good coffee stand to be placed at London Bridge station at the time of departure and arrival of the early trains, I feel sure he would gain the hearty thanks of a considerable number of the working-men of Croydon and elsewhere.  

TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES

The Church of England was the first of the major churches to respond to the calls of its temperance members. For example, on 21 January 1876 it was reported that the Church of England Temperance Society had a “large and influential meeting in the Public Halls, Croydon, under the presidency of his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.” The purpose of the meeting was to form a branch of the above association. The primary objects were: “the promotion of the habits of temperance, the reformation of the intemperate and the removal of the causes which lead to intemperance.” The special objects aimed at by the Society were firstly moral, educational and social, and secondly legislative. Carpenter proposed a resolution: that “This meeting believes that the Church of England Temperance Association will be a powerful means of discouraging drunkenness and promoting temperance among the young, and hereby agrees to form a branch association in this deanery.” The motion was carried.

---

21 Croydon Chronicle, 24 February 1883, p.3.
22 The beginnings of the Church of England Temperance Society can be traced back to a meeting of clergymen in a London coffee house in 1861.
23 The Church of England Temperance Society was a church controlled organisation and its structure of authority was closely tied to that of the church.
24 Croydon Chronicle, 29 January 1876.
In 1877 the Church Congress (described earlier) was held in Croydon and the 
*Croydon Chronicle* reported the following:

… the question discussed was that of intemperance, which was introduced by 
the Rev. Canon Duckworth, who said he was convinced that the clergy could 
make no real or lasting impression in relation to the drinking habits of the 
nation unless the law came to their aid. The law at present sanctioned 
temptation on a colossal scale, and they could have no permanent reform until 
they were backed by material legislative action. He advocated a policy of 
progressive restriction.”

The article continued and it was reported that:

Dr Carpenter followed with a paper, in which he said the action of the Church 
is of greater importance than the legislative remedies which are required. 
“Men cannot be made sober by Acts of Parliament,” said a noted statesman, 
but they can be made sober by producing a change in their mental state - a 
change which it is the duty of the Church to bring about. The religious and 
moral welfare of this country was committed to the care of the Church when 
the parochial system was instituted. A greater development of that system is 
required to arrest the further inroads of intemperance.

Later in the article the *Croydon Chronicle* reported Carpenter as saying: “Every man, 
whatever his position in life, who reels home in a state of intoxication is a public 
scandal, and ought not to be allowed without remonstrance. Lastly, every person 
convicted in the police-court on several occasions for drunkenness ought to be 
committed to a reformatory for a long period.”

---

In March 1882 a large meeting of the Croydon Temperance Union took place in a large crowded Public Hall, to hear Sir Wilfrid Lawson talk. Carpenter was in the Chair for only part of the meeting, as it was reported that he had to leave early to travel to the continent. Later in April 1882 a crowded meeting took place of the Church of England Temperance Society in the Large Public Hall, in which Carpenter took an active part. Following this meeting Carpenter was severely criticised in a letter by Henry G. Bremner, who was a regular correspondent to the *Croydon Chronicle*.

In September 1882 friends and supporters of the Welcome Hall movement celebrated their 200th temperance entertainment at the Public Hall, and Carpenter presented a paper. His subject was the injurious effects of alcohol and the *Croydon Chronicle* reported that, “He had not arrived at this conclusion without a great deal of study upon the subject, and experiments upon himself, and he thought if they would only take the same course as he had done, he had no doubt that they would arrive at the same conclusion.” Later, in October 1882, Carpenter presided at a meeting that wished to hold a Blue Ribbon Mission in Croydon. By 1883, the Blue Ribbon Gospel Temperance Mission started to have regular meetings in the Skating Rink, Park Lane, Croydon, at 3.30pm and 8pm. The advertisement promoted a choir of 100 voices and 1,200 free seats. The programme included an address to men only, by

---

26 Sir Wilfrid Lawson, second baronet (1829-1906), politician and temperance advocate; son of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, an advanced liberal; advocated Sunday Closing in Ireland, 1875-6 (measure carried 1879). *Concise DNB*, 20th Century, p.98.
27 *Croydon Chronicle*, 18 March 1882, p.3.
28 *Croydon Chronicle*, 29 April 1882, p.5.
29 *Croydon Chronicle*, 6 May 1882, p.2.
30 *Croydon Chronicle*, 23 September 1882, p.5.
31 *Croydon Chronicle*, 14 October 1882, p.5.
32 Ibid. The Blue Ribbon Association was founded in Maine by a former drunkard. The organisation emphasised the importance of religion and prayer in reforming men. The blue ribbon was taken from a passage in the Bible, which commanded the children of Israel to wear a ribbon of blue.
Major Evered Poole, on ‘Alcohol and its effect upon the Passions,’ and a ‘Special Address to Servants.’

The establishment of the National Temperance Federation in 1884 encouraged town groups to form unions. However, Croydon was very active in temperance matters and had already formed a Temperance Union on 21 January 1881. The first annual meeting took place in the Large Public Hall with Carpenter as Chairman. The three speakers were Samuel Bowley (President of the National Temperance League), the Rev J. Hasloch Potter (Church of England Temperance Society) and Rev A.W. Jephson. Later, on 26 April 1883 Carpenter chaired the Third Annual Public Meeting of the Croydon Temperance Union in the Large Public Hall.

In 1889 the subject ‘Of Pauper Inebriates’ was discussed at the Croydon Board of Guardians. The Croydon Chronicle reported that:

A circular letter was read from Dr Norman Kerr MD to the effect that the Inebriates Legislation Committee of the British Medical Association wish to obtain the opinion of the Boards of Guardians as to whether Guardians should be invested with the power (if they decide to exercise it) of paying for the detention and treatment of pauper inebriates, on like conditions to those now operative with regard to lunatics and paupers having special diseases; that is either by detention in the workhouse or in some special institution for the treatment of inebriety.

The Croydon Chronicle report continued:

Dr Carpenter spoke in favour of the suggestion. He said the matter had been before the Board on several occasions. The idea was, he took it, a very good one, and if ever the suggestion was generally taken up and acted upon by other

---

33 Croydon Chronicle, 10 February 1883, p.4.
34 Croydon Chronicle, 15 January 1881, p.4.
Unions it would enable Board of Guardians to place under restraint pauper inebriates, for a certain term, say for twelve months. It would be necessary, of course, to obtain the consent of the pauper inebriate to the order in each case, but once obtained he would be prevented from leaving until the time of the order had expired, in fact the inebriate would be very much in the position of the lunatic. The question had been in front of the British Medical Association for a number of years, and when the committee was first formed to take it into consideration he (Dr Carpenter) had the privilege of being its chairman. It appeared to the committee that if Board’s of Guardians had the power to restrain drunkards, that it would be a distinct advantage to the rates, by saving the large sum of money, which the ratepayers were called upon to pay for the maintenance of the families of these drunkards.  

The matter was deferred to the next meeting of the Board of Guardians and it was reported that Carpenter’s resolution was agreed.

LECTURES

Carpenter was able to promote his temperance views by giving lectures. For example, on 6 May 1878 the following is recorded in the *Proceedings of the Medical Society of London*:

The Annual Oration was delivered by Dr Alfred Carpenter, a copy of which has been sent to each Fellow. At the conclusion of the oration, a vote of thanks to the orator was proposed by the President, and carried by acclamation. The

---

36 *Croydon Chronicle*, 26 October 1889, p.2.
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38 The Annual Oration is still given today by eminent speakers.
Conversazione followed, during which the Band of the Royal Artillery played and sung.

The President of the Medical Society of London at this time was Erasmus Wilson, who had treated Archbishop Longley and would have been known to Carpenter. The Oration was entitled 'Alcoholic Drinks - As Diet, as Medicines and as Poisons.' Carpenter printed enough copies to be sold at one shilling each, and reminded the audience that:

The use of alcohol as a diet has been strongly condemned, and indeed prohibited by influential leaders among us. Its usefulness as a medicine has been distinctly challenged, and it has been stigmatised as a poison under all circumstances by some whose professional opinion upon most matters usually commands respect.39

Carpenter included statistics showing that occupations which bring men into contact with the sale of alcoholic drinks materially, shortened their lives.

In 1881 Carpenter was invited to speak to a meeting of the British Women's Temperance Association on, 'Alcoholic Drinks not Necessaries of Life, and ought not to be Taken for Daily use.' 40 Later in January 1885, Carpenter gave a talk to the Hunterian Society on, 'The Place which Alcoholic Drinks Should Occupy in the Treatment of Disease.' 41 In 1889 he spoke to the British Women's Temperance Association at their Annual Meeting in Croydon, in the small public hall on 'The Physiological Aspects of the Temperance Question.' 42

40 The Medical Temperance Journal, April 1881, pp. 125-43.
41 BMJ, 1885, i: 115-7 and 174-6. Also produced as a 13-page pamphlet.
TOTAL ABSTINENCE

In 1886 Carpenter spoke to the total-abstinence members of the new House of Commons in Westminster Town Hall, and the Bishop of London presided. Later, on 4 May 1886, the Temperance Congress was held in Croydon and Carpenter was President of the Health Section. In his address Carpenter said, “I became an abstainer for conscience’ sake, and for the love of others, not myself; but in doing so I have obtained the reward of better health, renewed vigour, and freedom from former pains.” A fellow doctor criticised him in a letter to the *Croydon Chronicle*, prompting Carpenter to write a reply. Carpenter first asked why the correspondent had not asked any questions at the Congress when he had ample opportunity. Carpenter concluded his letter by saying, “The object of the Congress was to deal with facts, and not fancies or persons.”

In 1890 a letter by Carpenter under the title: ‘Dr Carpenter and Total Abstinence’ appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle*. Carpenter pointed out that the natural sequence of the work of the Church of England Temperance Society was prevention. Carpenter went on to say, “I have been practising the art of healing for more than fifty years, and I know how comparatively futile it is to try to cure the true inebriate.” Carpenter continued, “For more than thirty years I have tried to point out that it is easier and nobler to prevent disease than to cure it, and for nearly twenty years I have been satisfied that a large portion of early and middle-age death would be prevented if total abstinence was the rule of life.”

---

42 *Croydon Chronicle*, 6 April 1889, p.5.
44 Croydon Temperance Congress, Address of Alfred Carpenter, President of the Health Section, May 4 1886. Pamphlet, Croydon: Printed by Roffey and Clark, pp.12.
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Later in the year, the total abstaining members of the Board of Guardians came under attack, and Carpenter wrote a full reply in the *Croydon Chronicle* under the heading: “Why Dr Carpenter is a Total Abstainer.” Carpenter did not think it proper to take up the time of the Board by giving them the reasons why he was a total abstainer. First, was that the teachings of science showed conclusively that intoxicating liquors will neither warm nor strengthen the human frame. Second, as a magistrate Carpenter observed that “the use of intoxicating liquor was a very serious evil, producing mischief’s of an intense kind, which compared to rabies, are as a thousand to one. The State takes action against the one, but lets the mischief’s produced by the thousands go unmuzzled.” Third, Carpenter became aware that if there were no drink shops there would be no necessity for Board of Guardians. The ordinary endowments of the other benevolent organisations would deal with all the poverty, which would exist, and no poor rate would be required. Fourth, as a family doctor Carpenter became aware that there was scarcely a large family with which he became acquainted with that did not have a family member who had given way to intemperance.  

**PUBLICANS**

Carpenter had little time for the publicans, believing that a great many of the ‘drunk and disorderly’ cases that came before the Bench were, in a great measure due to want of care on their part. Later, in September, Carpenter’s feelings towards the publicans were made known when Bruce Johnston from the Kings Arms Hotel wrote to the *Croydon Chronicle*:

---

48 *Croydon Chronicle*, 20 December 1890, p.3.
49 *Croydon Chronicle*, 23 February 1884, p.5.
I was not surprised to see that on Saturday last Dr A. Carpenter, our teetotal advocate and JP, had taken the opportunity whilst on the Bench to fling dirty insinuations at the Croydon licensed victuallers, but was rather astonished to find that a portion of the London press had taken the trouble to insert his remarks in their issue, they evidently not knowing his peculiarities so well as they are known in this his own district.\(^{50}\)

Matters came to a head when Carpenter referred to the publicans as scoundrels, and his unpopularity culminated in his effigy being taken through the town on Guy Fawkes Night and burnt behind the Town Hall.\(^{51}\) Later, in the 1885 parliamentary election, Carpenter was the Liberal candidate for Reigate. “His strong opinion on the temperance question raised the ire of the publicans, and one night he was set upon by a mob, very roughly handled and eventually ducked in a pond.”\(^{52}\)

Because of his strong temperance views Carpenter was often the subject of ridicule. For example when his letter of apology was read out at the Annual Dinner of the Licensed Victuallers’ and Beersellers’ Protection Society, it was reported:

Dr Carpenter’s letter, which was most curiously worded, expressed his intention of being present, and stated that though his views might be in opposition to those present, yet he considered no one had a right to force his own particular ideas on to another person. He however said he would be very glad to defend his principles. (Laughter and hisses). The secretary explained that the reason that the doctor was not present was because he had confused his dates, and had that evening to be present at the Young Men’s Christian Association. (Renewed laughter).\(^{53}\)

---

\(^{50}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, 27 September 1884, p.5.

\(^{51}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, 15 November 1884, p.2.

\(^{52}\) *Croydon Review*, 30 January 1892.

\(^{53}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, 28 March 1885, p.3.
This chapter describes how Carpenter retired from general practice in 1883 and became a consulting physician\(^1\) after passing his MRCP (London) by examination.\(^2\) Carpenter purchased a medical brougham in 1883, and the crest on his carriage displayed a stag with wings.\(^3\) His coachman was John Holden and his private secretary was Albert Thorn.\(^4\) Carpenter continued to play an active role in the public health debate and was examiner in State Medicine for the University of Cambridge and in Public Health for the University of London. He was also a member of the Court of Examiners at the Apothecaries Company.\(^5\) He maintained his friendship with Chadwick up until his death in 1890. Carpenter remained active with his philanthropic work, the Church and the temperance movement, and belonged to numerous societies. However, he was never far from criticism and had some disappointments. For example, he was involved in two Court cases against him, twice failed to become an MP and was never elected Croydon’s Mayor despite his wide experience in local affairs. Carpenter died at the relatively early age of 67 in the Esplanade Hotel, Ventnor, Isle of Wight trying to recuperate from a long illness. First Carpenter’s activities in public health are described.

---

1 The exact meaning of the word ‘consulting physician’ is uncertain and was discussed in a high profile court case between Carpenter and his two ex-partners, Whitling and Lanchester. There was no consistent definition given by the witnesses. See page 296.
3 Carpenter’s crest is shown on a stencil from Waghorne and Miles, local carriage builders, and dated 9 July 1883. The stencil is in the possession of Croydon Local Studies Library.
4 *Croydon Review*, 8 February 1892.
5 *Croydon Review*, 30 January 1892
Waghorne & Miles, Carriage Builders,
146, High Street, Croydon.

Medical Brougham and Carpenter’s Crest
PUBLIC HEALTH

This section discusses how Carpenter continued to be involved in a wide range of public health issues, from infectious diseases to London fogs. At times Carpenter had opposing views to his colleagues on some public health issues, such as the muzzling of dogs in rabies and the best way to notify cases of infectious disease. In 1881 he was invited to sit on a Hospitals’ Commission for smallpox and fever hospitals, which acknowledged Carpenter’s knowledge and experience in public health matters. Carpenter continued to be involved with the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain and the BMA, holding office in both and frequently giving lectures on public health topics, which he considered relevant.

Following on from the success of the 1881 International Medical Congress Carpenter received a letter, dated 25 October 1881, from George Buchanan, principal medical officer for the Local Government Board, Whitehall. Buchanan informed Carpenter that he had received a request from Dr G. Varrentrapp, a medical referee to the local board of works in Frankfurt, Germany, whom Buchanan described as “a kind of circulating library.” Varrentrapp asked Buchanan to purchase any publications written by Carpenter on either sewage or drainage except for Carpenter’s 1868 booklet on *House Drainage*, second edition. This was probably

---

6 Buchanan, Sir George (1831-1895), physician; BA London 1851; studied medicine at University College; MD. London 1855; physician at London Fever Hospital, 1861-8, and, later, consulting physician; FRCP, 1866, censor, 1892-4, and Lettsomian lecturer, 1867; FRS 1882; permanent inspector in medical department of privy council 1869; principal medical officer, 1879-92 of local government board; knighted, 1892; honorary LLD Edinburgh 1893; Fellow of University College, 1864; chairman of Royal Commission on tuberculosis. His reports have become classical works in sanitary literature. *Concise DNB*, p.163.

7 Letter from George Buchanan, Local Government Board, Whitehall, 25 October 1881, Private copy. Carpenter met Buchanan in 1875 when, as a Commissioner, Buchanan had chaired the Government Enquiry into the outbreak of typhoid fever in Croydon.

8 Ibid. Varrentrapp was an advocate of sewage disposal by water carriage, water closets and irrigation with sewage liquid and therefore had similar views to Carpenter.
because Carpenter would have sent Buchanan some of his publications, which have been described in earlier chapters.

Carpenter may have also been invited to give lectures or attend Congresses on the continent. He entertained many scientists at Beddington Farm in 1881 during the International Medical Congress and would have kept in touch with some of them. It was reported during a Croydon Temperance Union meeting, when Carpenter presided, that he had to make a hurried exit in order to catch a train for the continent. This may have been to France, as in 1888 the French health journal, *Journal D’Hygiene*, elected Carpenter an honorary member of the Societe Francaise D’Hygiene. Later in 1889 Dr de Pietra de Santa, President of the Societe Francaise D’Hygiene was formally introduced to the Croydon Council (at one of their meetings) at the suggestion of Carpenter. It is important to note that the only wreath placed on top of the coffin, at Carpenter’s funeral in 1892, was the one from the Societe Francaise D’Hygiene. This indicated Carpenter’s close links with that Society and his international recognition.

In the national arena from 1881, until his death, Carpenter was active in both Congresses and meetings of the British Medical Association, the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain, The National Association for the Promotion for Social Science and the Society of Arts. He also corresponded with national and local newspapers, *BMJ*, *Lancet*, *Journal of the Society of Arts*, *Temperance Journal* and Edwin Chadwick.

**CHADWICK LETTERS**

The 1888 meeting of the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain was held in Worcester. The following appeared in the *Transactions of the Sanitary Institute*: “Dr A. Carpenter (Croydon) observed that, like Mr Marten, he had been a disciple of Sir

---

9 *Croydon Chronicle*, 18 March 1882, p.3.
10 *Croydon Chronicle*, 19 May 1888, p.5.
Edwin Chadwick, and had learned from him a large number of lessons which he had been carrying out during the last forty years of his life." 11 Carpenter and Chadwick were both prominent members of the Sanitary Institute (In 1883 Carpenter was Chairman of Council and Edwin Chadwick was Vice President). The 1883 Sanitary Institute Anniversary Dinner held at the St James’s Restaurant, Piccadilly. In proposing the health of the Queen, Carpenter remarked that “… if sanitary science had been better understood 25 yrs ago, possibly Her Majesty would not have had to mourn for the early loss of the Prince Consort.” The *Croydon Chronicle* reported that, “Chadwick proposed the Success to the Sanitary Institute in a speech in which he traced to the diffusion of sounder hygienic principles, the decreased rate of mortality, instancing this by reference to the army.” 12

In a letter from Carpenter to Chadwick written on 12 December 1883 from the University of London, Burlington Gardens, he writes:

Thank you for your paper. It has come to me whilst superintending an exam on subjects connected with Public Health at the University of London. I have read it with much interest. It speaks incisively and decidedly. Let us hope it will not fall upon deaf ears. The Institute ought to have something to say upon the subject. I have shown your paper to my colleague Prof de Chaumont. He expresses approval of it and thinks with me that the last word in it should be applied to the author of the evils of disunity instead of per contra [on the contrary] but so it is. The promoters of public health have to fight under great disadvantage and vested interests in disease production is at present the

---

11 *TSI*, vol. x, 1888-9, p.214.
12 *Croydon Chronicle*, 14 July 1883, p.5.
sharper of the two hence disunity. I hope however you will live to see your efforts in that direction successful.\textsuperscript{13}

Twelve days later Carpenter wrote to Chadwick on 24 December 1883, on notepaper headed 5, Grosvenor Street, W and Duppas House, Croydon. Carpenter was spending more time in London with the BMA, Sanitary Institute, Society of Arts, University of London, Society of Apothecaries and the Medical Society of London and therefore needed a London residence e.g. 5 Grosvenor St, W. The handwriting is also different from Carpenter's normal writing, and may have been written by his secretary Albert Thorn or a member of his family. It says:

My dear Mr Chadwick

Thank you for your paper. One only wonders at the density of the local and even imperial legislators in the face of the facts, which you marshal so conclusively. It is highly important for the Sanitary Institute that its individuality should be bought prominently before the public. The promotion of its objects should help very much to enlighten the public upon the evils of mal administration.

The antagonistic influences of the National Health Society, Smoke Abatements, and Sanitary Aids are all diminishing our power as Sanitarians. I want to get an amalgamation of all these into one body, and want to get ourselves before the Loc Govt Brd. I propose that a deputation wait upon the President of the L G Board asking him to advise Local Government Authorities to appoint those having the Diploma of the Institute to office in preference to others. Cannot we do this?\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13} Chadwick papers, box 444, 12 December 1883. Professor de Chaumont was a council member of the Sanitary Institute at this time.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid, 24 December 1883.
Carpenter's next letter, dated 6 January 1884, said the following: “My dear Mr Chadwick, I return you the paper signed. I hope it may have a good effect. I have added the offices which I have filled in connection with Congresses.”

Carpenter introduced some of the points from these letters at the Annual Meeting of the Sanitary Institute on 7 May 1884 when he said:

The Council of the Parkes Museum, The National Health Society, the National Smoke Abatement Institution together with Sanitary aid committees should amalgamate and that a Charter of Incorporation from the Crown be obtained and persuade the Local Government Board to issue regulations that no one shall be appointed in the future to perform the duties of Surveyors and Inspectors of Nuisances until they have given proof that they know the duties which they propose to perform, and that they are able to give a reason why a given set of sanitary regulations ought to be enforced.

Years later on 6 July 1890 Chadwick died, and Carpenter was invited to represent Croydon Corporation at his funeral. The letter from the Croydon Town Clerk said:

The Council hope that you will be good enough to express to the relatives of the deceased Gentleman the deep regret of the Council at his death and their warm appreciation of the invaluable services which Sir Edwin rendered, not only to the cause of Sanitary Science generally but to the progress of sanitation in Croydon.

Despite being a member of the Society of Arts since 1847, a Council member in 1868 and a Vice-President in the 1870s and 1880s, there was no obituary to Chadwick in the Society of Arts Journal. The reason for this is unclear.

---

15 Chadwick papers, box 444, 6 January 1884. Carpenter uses fs instead of ss, a convention which gradually died out at the end of the 19C.
17 Letter from Croydon Town Clerk, 8 July 1890. Copy in author's possession.
EASTBOURNE SANITARY EXHIBITION

In August 1881 Carpenter was invited to give a talk at the Eastbourne Sanitary Exhibition. He spoke on: 'The duration of life - why is it shortened?' Carpenter commented on the low death rate of eighteen per thousand in Eastbourne, but said that people still died there, as at any other place, and among them were young children. Carpenter contrasted the average age of death of men from the Bible (three score years and ten) to only forty-one years in 1881, and attributed this to disobeying the laws of nature. Carpenter also felt that no one ought to die of disease, and he fully believed that a time would come when people only died of old age. This could be achieved by pure water and good sanitary arrangements. A good example of carrying out the sanitary laws properly and reducing the death rate was in the prisons and barracks, which in earlier years had been among the unhealthiest dwellings in the country. Carpenter also highlighted the large number of deaths caused by alcohol.\(^\text{18}\)

SANITARY INSTITUTE OF GREAT BRITAIN

During the 1881-82 session Carpenter, who was Vice Chairman of Council, gave an Inaugural Address on 7 December 1881. The TSI reported the following:

It had been said that the Sanitary Institute was antagonistic to the Social Sciences Association, and some men have declined to help the one because they belong to the other, and see no object in the establishment of both. I [Carpenter] contend that the Sanitary Institute is the legal offspring of the Social Sciences Association; the natural result of the teachings of social science, and that so far from being antagonistic they stand in the relationship of father and son, and as such ought to have natural affection for each other.

\(^{18}\) Croydon Guardian, 27 August 1881.
Carpenter argued that:

The Sanitary Institute by its certificate proposed to remove one of the many evils which have been so resolutely exposed at Adam St, Adelphi,19 viz, the fact there was no means of knowing the duties of the sanitary inspectorship except by learning them after appointment to office; and the sanitary authorities could not tell whether those applying were qualified for the office they proposed to fill.20

Carpenter also pointed out that 85% of the inspectors appointed to do the sanitary work had no real skilled knowledge of the work they were called upon to perform. This was because, until the Institute was founded, there was no organisation giving guidance upon such matters to which the public could go for information, or for a stamp of fitness to do the work. It was later reported in the TSI that Carpenter said:

The importance of the duties, which surveyors and inspectors of nuisances have to perform, is more patent to medical men than to any other distinct class of persons. The ignorance which exists among these officials is marvellous, and yet these men often guide the health committees of our vestries, our town councils, and our local boards, upon points which are ultimately connected with the health of the people, and they are used very often for counteracting the activity of the medical officer of health. No wonder that small progress is made in our work; no wonder that the action of the sanitary authorities is unsatisfactory, when the minor details upon which the principal success of the whole is often dependant are carried out in a way which enables the sanitary authority to show to the expert the best way of ‘how not to do it.’ 21

---

19 Society of Arts.
20 TSI, 1881-82, vol.iii, p.85.
BRIGHTON HEALTH CONGRESS

On Wednesday 14 December 1881, the Brighton Health Congress was held in the Dome of the Royal Pavilion and both Chadwick and Carpenter took part. Chadwick was President of Section A and gave a talk ‘On The Prevention of Epidemics.’

Chadwick pointed out:

That cases of small-pox, of typhus and of others of the ordinary epidemics, occur in the greatest proportion, on common conditions of foul air, from stagnant putrefaction, from bad house drainage, from sewers of deposit, from excrement sodden sites, from filthy street surfaces, from impure water, and from overcrowding in foul houses.

Chadwick showed, “that the entire removal of such conditions by complete sanitation and by improved dwellings is the effectual preventive of diseases of those species, and of ordinary as well of extraordinary epidemic visitations.” He also felt that if the cases continued to occur, spread could be prevented by separation of the unaffected from the affected, by home treatment if possible. If this was not possible, small temporary accommodation should be provided. This “obviated the necessity of removing the sick to a distance and the danger of aggravating epidemic cases in large hospitals - a proceeding liable to augment the death rates during epidemics.” He went on to say “the skilful and complete works of sanitation and the removal of conditions of stagnancy and putrefactive decomposition are the most efficient means of reducing the expenses of excessive sickness and death rates.” From what we know, Carpenter agreed with Chadwick’s views, and both were supporters of the miasmatic...
theory and the isolation of smallpox cases. Carpenter believed that smallpox occurred in people who had been in contact with another case of the disease and supported isolation as the best way of preventing spread.\textsuperscript{26}

On Friday 16 December 1881 Carpenter, who was President of the Domestic Health Section, spoke on ‘Domestic Health.’\textsuperscript{27} He began by considering the means by which individual health is raised or lowered, and the extent to which life was lengthened or shortened by domestic agencies. Carpenter showed that a person’s life expectancy depended upon the area of the country where one lived. He pointed out that if a family moved to Liverpool or Manchester, or some other great commercial centre, their chance of living a given number of years was less than half that if they had moved to Brighton. With reference to occupation Carpenter was reported as saying the following:

If a man determines that his sons shall become publicans or grocers (with wine licenses), or shall go into any business which brings them constantly in contact with the manufacture or the sale of intoxicating liquors, he takes away from the lives of those sons a number of years which would be theirs if he put them into the trade of a gardener, or sent them into church as parish priests.\textsuperscript{28}

Carpenter highlighted the difference in mortality rates between children in some streets in Liverpool, where 9 out of every 10 died within five years, compared to that of Anerley or the Beddington Female Orphan Asylum, where the mortality rate was only 15 out of every 1000 died within five years. Carpenter had a word too for the anti-vaccinationists. He said that if they were, “as energetic in the promotion of sanitary work, which has for its objects the utilisation of our excreta, as they are in

\textsuperscript{26} A. Carpenter, \textit{The Principles and Practice of School Hygiene}, 1887, London, J. Hughes, p.172.
\textsuperscript{28} ‘The Address on Public Health,’ p.4.
antagonism to vaccination, they would be doing some good in the world, and assist to bring about a condition of things which would render vaccination altogether unnecessary."

Regarding the individual Carpenter was reported as saying:

I am of opinion that sufficient as vaccination is at present in protecting him, from the effects of smallpox the right course to be followed in the prevention of the effects of infectious disease is not to be found in trying to bring into vogue new methods of vaccinating for the prevention of such diseases as cholera, diphtheria, and others in that class, but in removing from our own persons, and from our habitations those debris which arise from the act of living, and which can be properly removed, would render us proof against the evils caused by contagion.  

Later Carpenter went on to say:

I may admire the efforts of Pasteur to prevent the spread of infectious disease at the present time among our domestic animals, I believe that this is not the direction for us to look in the future, with regard to ourselves. We may, however, draw the inference that as it is by cultivation that a germ becomes deadly so by a counter cultivation its deadly character may be done away with and diseases rendered harmless. I prefer to follow upon the lines connected with the latter, rather than the former contingency.  

GLASGOW

In 1883 the Sanitary Institute held its Congress in Glasgow. Carpenter was Chairman of Council whilst Chadwick was Vice President. Carpenter addressed a large

---

gathering of the working classes in St Andrew’s Hall on: ‘Public Health a Working
Man’s Question.’ Carpenter was reported to have said the following:

I am not the great Dr Carpenter who is the philosopher and physiologist
[William Benjamin Carpenter], but I am the Dr Carpenter who is only the
family doctor, and who has been a workingman all his life, with regard to and
in connection with the prevention and cure of disease. I am the Dr Carpenter
who has been before the electors as a member of the civic council in a certain
part of Great Britain, where sanitary science has been specially and practically
studied. One of the results of the action of that sanitary authority has been to
reduce the death rate of the district in which I reside from 28 to 17.

Later in his talk Carpenter made a reference to James Burn Russell, who was
Glasgow’s MOH from 1872-98 and was in connection with infectious disease:

I strongly urge the workingmen of Glasgow when they have got infectious
diseases to take care to get Dr Russell’s assistance, and not to hesitate to have
their children, their wives, and themselves conveyed to those infectious
hospitals as quickly as possible; because by doing so they will help yourselves
materially, and help your neighbours.

Carpenter praised Glasgow for its magnificent water supply and well-swept streets.
However, he felt that the men of Glasgow should set their minds on the purification of
the atmosphere and the Clyde.

---

32 W.B. Carpenter (1813-85), naturalist; eldest son of Lant Carpenter [q.v.]; apprenticed to a physician;
visited West Indies; studied medicine in London and (1835) in Edinburgh; lecturer at Bristol Medical
School; published papers on physiology, 1837, and ‘Principles of … Physiology,’ 1839; professor of
physiology in London, 1844; professor of forensic medicine, University College, London; registrar of
the University of London, 1856-79; an unwearied investigator in the sciences of zoology, botany and
mental physiology, 1843-71; contributed much to scientific journals and cyclopaedias. Concise DNB,
p.208.
33 Ibid, p.375
34 E. Robertson, Glasgow’s Doctor: James Burn Russell, 1837-1904, East Lothian, Tuckwell Press,
1998. It is highly likely that Carpenter would have met Russell at the Conference.
At the Annual Meeting of the Sanitary Institute on 7 May 1884, Carpenter, who was Chairman of Council, gave an Address. The TSI reported Carpenter as saying, “Gentlemen, I find from the agenda paper that it is the duty of the Chairman of the Council to address the members of the Sanitary Institute at the Annual General Meeting.” The following appeared in the TSI when Carpenter decided to confine his remarks to:

... the objects, which the Promoters of the Institute have had in view in founding this association. To ask if those objects are obtainable, and, if they are why seven years have elapsed since the foundation of the Institute without a greater advance being made towards their achievement than has been hitherto effected?

Carpenter reminded his audience that the first Congress of the Sanitary Institute was held in Leamington in 1877. It was reported in the TSI that Carpenter said: “I ask, therefore, why so little has been done to secure the result which was so warmly advocated in 1877, and not repudiated in the succeeding years of our progress.” Carpenter noted that out of the 384 Fellows, Members and Associates belonging to the Institute, scarcely more than ten per cent were present. The TSI reported Carpenter as saying: “I may pertinently ask whether the majority of Members have done all in their power to promote the design we have all had in view?” Carpenter tried to avoid being ‘wearisome and tedious’ and wished to highlight the ninth object of the Institute, which was, “to unite into one comprehensive association all the workers in these important branches of science (viz. those which are connected with the promotion of Public Health).” He felt that the membership had not been loyal to the Institute and had frittered away the power which a body of scientific men such as

those engaged in sanitary work ought to possess, in endeavouring to promote
associations which are upon a much narrower platform than that which the Sanitary
Institute occupies.  

DUBLIN

The 1884 Sanitary Congress was held in Dublin, and on Thursday 2 October
Carpenter gave an evening lecture entitled: ‘Education by Proverb in Sanitary Work.’
It was reported that a large number of the working classes were present and that
Carpenter’s talk incorporated a very wide range of subjects treated in a rather popular
way.  

The TSI quoted Carpenter as saying that “there are two points in the study of
the causes which shorten human life, which must strike all thinkers upon the subjects
of health, of disease, and of death.” First, of these was the sacred feeling, which
attaches to human life, the spiritual essence by which we live and move. Second, was
“the carelessness with regard to this same life, the indifference with which its
extinction is regarded by barbarians and uncivilised communities, and also by a
portion of the civilised world, who ignore the existence of a Supreme and Benevolent
Architect of the Universe.”

Carpenter moved on to euthanasia, of which he did not
approve, and the following appeared in the TSI:

I have even in my own day, in our own native country, heard it represented
that it would be an advantage to the State, to the locality in which they live,
and even to the poor creatures themselves, if some of the inhabitants of our
lunatic asylums, our prisons, and our workhouses, could be put to death in
some painless way, by which their sufferings could be shortened here, and the

---

37 TSI, vol. vi, p.421.
38 Ibid, p.397.
39 Carpenter defined euthanasia as an easy departure and utter annihilation.
expense which their maintenance entailed upon the community altogether avoided. 40

Carpenter later discussed preventive medicine and the following appeared in the TSI.

"We ought to look forward with a pardonable desire to the time when defects in bodily health will be remedied, not as a man with one leg naturally remedies his defect by taking to a wooden one, but by using measures which shall remove the defect itself, and education of the young will then be on developmental principles." 41

In his final remarks, Carpenter offered advice on Sanitary matters to the Dublin authorities (just as he had in Glasgow in 1883 and, later, in Brighton in 1890). The TSI quoted Carpenter as saying:

I would urge upon the inhabitants of this beautiful city that they rest not until the sewage is taken out of the Liffey, and sent to its proper destination, viz, to the land which wants it; that they rest not until the inhabitants in their close quarters have more breathing space among them. That water should be available for every boy and girl, as well as every man and woman wanting it, without stint, and that the pure air from your native hills shall not be fouled with noisome impurities as soon as it reaches the precincts of your city.

Finally, Carpenter offered advice how this could be achieved and it was reported in the TSI that he said, "The householder must desire a healthy home, and to have it he must purify the governing body from the presence of those who prefer an unhealthy people." 42

41 Ibid, p.405.
BOLTON

The 1887 Sanitary Congress was held in Bolton and Carpenter gave a talk on ‘Our Pioneers.’ Carpenter observed that the earliest of the 19th century pioneers had passed away, comparatively unrecognised by the State, and uncared for by the country at large; but they were venerated by those men who had assisted in founding the Sanitary Institute, and its necessary colleague, the Parkes Museum. Carpenter noted that three pioneers, namely, Chadwick, Simon and Rawlinson, were still alive to see the results of their labours established upon a firm basis. Carpenter told the audience that, in 1885, the Council had published an abstract of the works of William Farr on Vital Statistics, and this was felt to be a vital source of facts, which would assist the earnest Sanitarian in all future ages. The TSI reported Carpenter as saying:

The council perceived that they should not rest satisfied with an issue of Farr’s works alone, and looking over the history of the past, it was impossible for them to shut their eyes to a demand for the continuance in the same path.

It appeared to them that John Simon’s writings had assisted to promote true sanitary work, without the actual author being recognised in his true light. The name of the committee was therefore changed from the Farr Committee, to the Sanitary Publications Committee. The committee was instructed to bring out an abstract of John Simon’s works, provided that Simon assisted and approved the project. Carpenter pointed out that Farr’s Works were “compiled from dry statistical records, and are more fitted for consultation as works of reference, and for careful annotation and mental notes than for general reading.” Simon’s, on the other hand were “readable by the general public and capable of being understood by the simplest intellect.” Carpenter recalled that he had “the privilege of acting as Mr Simon’s

---

42 Ibid, p.419.
43 TSI, vol. ix, pp.128-36.
dresser in St Thomas’s Hospital, and of reading his reports in the columns of a London Daily Paper.” Carpenter said of Simon’s writings:

To me, the reading of John Simon’s reports is like to the reading of a chapter in history or of some sensational romance; they commend themselves to me for their clearness of expression, and for their striking simplicity, which enabled the City Commissioners to easily grasp some of the most difficult problems of their work, and to do the best they could to educate a changing population like to that which the city possesses.  

BRIGHTON

The 1890 Sanitary Institute Conference was held in Brighton. Carpenter was President of the Conference of Inspectors of Nuisances and Arthur Newsholme, MOH for Brighton, was President of the Conference for the Medical Officers of Health. In Carpenter’s Address, it was reported in the TSI that he spoke about the work of sanitary inspector and how it should be done. He said there were two classes of officers. The first were those who “went with the threat of legal proceedings in their mouth, and did not attempt to explain why certain work had to be done.” The TSI then quoted Carpenter who said:

It was far better that people should be taught by the Sanitary Inspectors the reasons why different work had to be done, and be persuaded to carry out the principles necessary for the removal of nuisances, and so diminish the chances which lead to the spread of infectious disease. It was far better for the people to do the work willingly, and look upon the Sanitary Inspector as their friend.

44 Ibid, p.129.
46 Ibid, p.131.
47 TSI, vol. xi, p.15.
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than as a prying, intolerant autocrat, who would force down their throats the principles of sanitation whether they liked it or not.  

Carpenter also commented on Brighton, observing that the town had magnificent waterworks and a constant water supply, and that the streets and poorer classes of houses were well looked after by the authorities, as proven by the healthy condition of those classes, and the absence of mischievous disease in their midst.  

Predictably, his main criticism was centred on Brighton's method of sewage disposal; by washing sewage into the sea, Brighton's seashore was rendered unfit for bathing. Carpenter felt that the sewage could be placed on the Downs to the North of Brighton, which would yield additional benefits such as the crops being ten times more abundant and the milk supply being increased ten to twenty fold. In proposing a vote of thanks, the Mayor of Brighton was reported as saying, “As to the disposal sewage, they all knew it should be returned to the land; but when they were surrounded by the ratepayers they had to do the best thing for the smallest amount of money, and he considered that the Brighton Corporation had done the best under the circumstances.” Newsholme seconded and the TSI reported the following: “He was glad to find that the examinations of the Sanitary Institute had been highly spoken of, although he could not help thinking that the examinations should be supplemented by a little building construction. He also thought that the passing of the examination in hygiene at South Kensington was a very great thing.”

Carpenter’s health at this time was a cause for concern and the Mayor was reported as saying, “he expressed the hope that the Chairman might long be spared to do his work as he had done hitherto.” The TSI reported the following: “He [Carpenter] knew that the fifty years work in which he had been engaged could not

---

48 Ibid, p.259.
continue much longer. Still, he was glad to do what he could in promulgating sanitary science.”

BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

In 1882 the BMA celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in Worcester when Carpenter was President of the Public Health Section. Carpenter’s talk was entitled ‘The Early Work of the Association in Preventive Medicine.’ Carpenter regarded himself as being neither metropolitan nor provincial and one whose sanitary work had been mainly observational and executive. He questioned whether he was the right person to be giving the anniversary talk. It was reported in the *BMJ* that Carpenter said that it should have been a “distinguished savant who had himself advanced the study of preventive medicine by his own immediate line of work in the line of original research.”

Parliamentary Bills Committee

From 1886 until 11 February 1891 (when he had to stop due to poor health) Carpenter sat on the BMA Parliamentary Bills Committee, which was chaired by Ernest Hart from 1872 -97. This committee made its views known within Parliament primarily through three men: Sir Lyon Playfair, Sir B. Walter Foster (later Lord Ilkeston) and Sir Robert Farquharson. Foster, who had served as Physician to the Birmingham General Hospital, became liberal MP for Chester in 1885 and was quickly recognised in Parliament as an expert on medical matters. Farquharson was a liberal MP from

---

51 The Provincial Medical Association started in Worcester. (Later to become the BMA)
1880-96 and had served in the Army Medical Service. He later worked as a dermatologist at St Mary’s Hospital, London, and was familiar with the medical problems associated with the poor.\textsuperscript{55}

Carpenter sat on committees for the following Bills: the 1886 Lunacy Act Amendment Bill (the government was defeated and the Bill was withdrawn)\textsuperscript{56}; the 1887 Pharmacy Acts Amendment Bill\textsuperscript{57}; the 1888 Public Health Prevention of Infectious diseases (Hastings Bill);\textsuperscript{58} and the 1889 Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill.\textsuperscript{59} His last meeting was on The Public Health (London) Law Amendment Bill.

**BMA premises**

Between 1853-78 the Association worked from 36-7 Great Queen Street (No.36 as an office and No.37 for printing the Journal).\textsuperscript{60} In 1878 the Association occupied a house, 161a, Strand, London W, on the south side of the street facing St Mary’s Church. This coincided with the time when Carpenter was Chairman of the Council of the BMA.\textsuperscript{61}

By 1886 the BMA needed larger premises owing to the growth of the Journal and association business. Many properties were inspected, and eventually a successful bid for the unexpired leases on 429 Strand and 2-3 Agar Street was made. The filthy state of 429 Strand provoked comment from the architects and some BMA members. The architects described it as “very dirty and neglected…and very much in want of

\textsuperscript{54} This committee was established in 1863 and was one of nine committees at the BMA. The largest, with 38 members, was the Habitual Drunkards Committee. The second largest was the Parliamentary Bills Committee with thirty-seven members.

\textsuperscript{55} Brand, p.161.

\textsuperscript{56} Parliamentary Bills Committee Minutes Book (PBCMB), 161a Strand, Friday 19\textsuperscript{th} February 1886, p.7.

\textsuperscript{57} PBCMB, 26 April 1887, p.41.

\textsuperscript{58} PBCMB, 12 April 1888.

\textsuperscript{59} PBCMB, 1 April 1889.

thorough cleansing, painting and decorating.” Carpenter inspected the building and made his thoughts quite clear. He described it as “quite unfit for occupation by a Society, many of whose members have been instrumental in pressing the sanitary condition of houses and public buildings upon the attention of the legislature.” Despite the adverse comments building work commenced and on the 25 March 1887 the BMA took occupation of the building.\(^62\)

**INFECTIOUS DISEASE**

In 1886 Carpenter gave an illustrated talk to the Croydon Microscopical and Natural History Club on the subject of ‘Disease Germs.’ The *Croydon Chronicle* reported the following:

Dr Carpenter said that the subject of disease germs was one, which occupied his attention for many years past, and in fact ever since he had started in the medical profession. At that time the idea that disease was propagated by germs was thought visionary, but that opinion had now died out, and it was recognised by all that disease was propagated by germs.

His failing eyesight was mentioned and the article said, “At one time he had hoped to have followed the subject up, and perhaps to have achieved some success, but his eyes would not permit of his doing so, since remarkably good eyesight is required to examine the germs under the microscope.” The reporter was not familiar with the names of scientists, as instead of reporting, ‘Mr Koch’ he reported the following, “Mr Cock, the discoverer of the bacillus cholera germs, had found that if a germ was

---

\(^{61}\) Ibid, p.279.

placed in prepared gelatine it would grow and develop.” The article remarked, “Carpenter then showed a quantity of cholera germs mounted which had been properly taken care of.” (prompting laughter from the audience.)

_Carpenter's adviee and opinion on a variety of infectious diseases often appeared in the local as well as national press. For example in 1882 the *Croydon Chronicle* had a subheading, 'A Serious Matter,' which appeared in of the minutes of the weekly Board of Guardians and related to a case of smallpox. At this time Carpenter was sitting on the Commission for smallpox and fever hospitals,’ which will be discussed later. Carpenter had received a letter from Henry Bullock, the MOH for Heston and Isleworth, regarding a woman with smallpox who had slept at the smallpox hospital in Croydon a few days earlier with her sister, who was a nurse there. It was decided to ask the nurse to attend the next meeting of the Croydon Board of Guardians and give an explanation of her conduct as to why she had allowed her sister to sleep at the hospital with the risk of catching smallpox. As a result, Carpenter raised the subject of precautions to be taken against contagion at the Board of Guardians meeting and felt that only persons who were vaccinated should be allowed to enter the smallpox ward.

The debate on smallpox continued and in 1884 the *Croydon Chronicle* reported Carpenter as saying the following at the Board of Guardians, under the subheading ‘Precautions Against Contagion:’

> With reference to the chances of contagious diseases in the infirmary spreading, Dr Carpenter asked if there was sufficient care observed with

---

63 Robert Koch (1843-1910) discovered that microbes caused wounds to go septic in 1878. He identified the microbes responsible for TB in 1882 and cholera in 1883.

64 *Croydon Chronicle*, 17 April 1886, p.2.

65 *Croydon Chronicle*, 6 May 1882, p.3.
regard to the intercourse allowed between sick inmates and the outer world. It ought to be ascertained whether there was any danger of infection and he thought visitors should not be allowed in the small pox wards. These things were so easily caught, and yet people were so careless about taking precautions.  

The *Croydon Chronicle* reported the following:

Dr Carpenter said that such precautions should be adopted as would effectually prevent the possibility of infection. Doctors were always very careful not to convey it themselves, but with other people there was apt to be not so much thought. There was danger in such things as hugging or kissing a sick child. What they ought to do was to prepare a dress to be worn by visitors to the sick wards, and of such a texture as to be incapable of holding any infectious matter.  

It was then reported in the *Croydon Chronicle* that, “The Chairman asked if such a thing were possible? Dr Carpenter [replied] The construction of such a dress is quite possible. It has been adopted already in the London Asylum Wards.” At a further meeting of the Board of Guardians Carpenter showed an illustration of the dress as exhibited at the Health Exhibition. The *Croydon Chronicle* quoted Carpenter as saying that “It was a very simple but important matter, and it would be a beneficial innovation in their own infirmary.” The texture of the dress was very similar to the waterproof-like material of which ladies cloaks were made. Carpenter later was quoted in the *Croydon Chronicle* as saying “Smallpox is dying out in London, and I hope it will do so in Croydon. Perhaps it would be better if all the people in the House [Croydon Infirmary] were re-vaccinated; at any rate, every precaution should be taken

---

66 *Croydon Chronicle*, 28 August 1884, p.5.
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against the spread of the infection.” A motion by Mr Farley [given name not known] was moved that ‘The dress should be adopted in the Croydon Infirmary, and that no one should be allowed to enter the wards without it’ and was carried. 68

On 25 Sept 1884 a Committee meeting took place at the Cane Hill Lunatic Asylum and Carpenter was present. It was proposed by the Medical Superintendent that "a reward of £1 be given to George Drake, an attendant, for his praiseworthy conduct in giving Notice before returning to the Asylum that small-pox has existed at a house which he had visited during his absence upon leave. His wages not to be stopped.” 69

The following year it was reported that Dr Horsley, Medical Officer to the Croydon Board of Guardians, resigned following remarks made about him by the Chairman of the Magistrates. The statement that Horsley and his assistant had attended the inmates of the smallpox hospital and then gone among his private patients, with great risk of spreading the infection, later turned out to be untrue. 70

Ways of preventing the spread of infectious disease in the infirmary became an ever-increasing priority, and in March 1885 Carpenter had a series of meetings with Charles Philpott (Croydon’s MOH) and Horsley. The following appeared in the Croydon Chronicle:

Dr Carpenter referring to the cases of smallpox, thought that a most desirable opportunity of explaining the result of his deliberations with Drs Philpott and Horsley as to the compilations of rules and regulations to be carried out in the infirmary to prevent the spread of infectious diseases. The rules and regulations were divided into three sections, dealing with the patients, visitors, and officers. It was, he

---

68 Croydon Chronicle, 6 September 1884, p.5.
69 LCC/MIN/857/Metropolitan Archives.
thought, very important that the outside public and those having friends in the wards of the infirmary should know something of the arrangements, which had been recommended.”

Carpenter also pointed out that if the rules were approved by the Board, they would be printed in two forms, one in large type for placing in the wards, and the other in small type for circulation amongst the friends of the patients. He also noted that the regulations had been considerably modified since they were first submitted and were now similar to the ones in force in the principal hospitals in the metropolis. Carpenter reminded the Board that in future the Master would have nothing to do with the patients in the infirmary, and instead the medical officer would have sole charge of the management of the patients. The Board thanked Carpenter, and the Rules were approved. \(^{71}\)

**Diphtheria**

Diphtheria has been discussed previously when Carpenter wrote to Archbishop Tait in 1878. Later in 1883 Carpenter read a paper on: ‘Diphtheria; Its Etiology \(^{72}\) and Treatment’ to the Health Section of the British Medical Association meeting in Liverpool.\(^{73}\) Carpenter pointed out that the etiology of diphtheria was still disputed. There were many reasons why this was to be regretted; the most important being that treatment must be empirical until its cause was determined with certainty.\(^{74}\)

In 1890 a heading, ‘Brandy and Diphtheria,’ appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle* in the Minutes of the Croydon Board of Guardians. The report said:

---

\(^{70}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, 21 February 1885, p.5.

\(^{71}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, 7 March 1885, p.2.

\(^{72}\) This is how it is spelt in the *Lancet* and was common practice during this period.

\(^{73}\) *Lancet*, 1883, ii: 448-50.

\(^{74}\) Ibid, p.448.
Dr Carpenter referred to two paragraphs, which he said appeared in the report in close proximity to each other; the one referring to the outbreak of diphtheria, and the other being a statement by the Master that he required two gallons of brandy immediately. He expressed a hope that the brandy was not intended to be used, either for the diphtheritic patients, or by their nurses or attendants. To the former he believed that the use of brandy was most dangerous. In fact in many cases its use proved fatal. For nurses and other attendants its use was also very dangerous, for instead of being a preventative as the common fallacy was, it was a promoter. He sincerely hoped that the brandy so mentioned was not to be used in connection with the outbreak of diphtheria.

Carpenter was later reassured when it was reported that, “Mr Tomlin said that the Master merely announced the fact that he wanted a quantity of brandy. There could be no doubt that he would use it only on the recommendation of the Medical Officer, who would be responsible for its use. (Hear, hear)”  

Later in 1891, Carpenter gave a talk at the BMA Annual Meeting in Bournemouth on ‘The Treatment of Diphtheria With or Without Alcohol.’  

Carpenter pointed out that diphtheria cases, which had been treated with brandy usually ended fatally, and that he felt that this kind of treatment was radically wrong. It was later reported in the Temperance League Annual that Carpenter said:

“Alcohol is not a stimulant; it is a narcotic, a soother of nerves, or it may act as an irritant to cerebral nerve cells. By giving alcohol we put out the danger signals which nature is showing us; we lull our patients and their friends into

---

75 Croydon Chronicle, 22 November 1890, p.2.
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a dangerous lethargy, and give them hopes that the patient is recovering, whilst in reality the disease is rapidly advancing.\textsuperscript{78}

\textit{Rabies}

The subject of rabies was discussed on 31 July 1889 at a meeting of Croydon County Council. The Sanitary Committee reported that a rabies order had come into effect in the Borough of Croydon. Carpenter, who was a councillor, opposed the rabies order and the following appeared in the \textit{Croydon Chronicle}:

Councillor Dr Carpenter said he rose to move that the Council should take no action with regard to the rabies order, which he believed was one of the most senseless pieces of legislation ever perpetrated by Parliament. It was calculated to do harm rather than good. In the first place it could not stamp out rabies, which was the object in view. Again, the number of deaths that occurred from rabies was so very small compared with the excitement that was got up on this action that one was astonished to see the amount of energy thrown into it, while no good could result whatsoever.

The \textit{Croydon Chronicle} later reported the following: “Councillor Dr Carpenter added that the London County Council had done the very thing which he was about to propose the Council should do. He knew the Mayor did not like taking speeches from him.”\textsuperscript{79} Carpenter pointed out that there were 29 cases of hydrophobia recorded in the previous year, in the United Kingdom. However, after a strong debate, Carpenter’s amendment was defeated. Despite this Carpenter continued his opposition to the rabies order, and in 1890 he wrote a letter to the \textit{BMJ} under the title ‘Rabies and the muzzling order.’ Carpenter felt that, in order to be effective, muzzling had to apply to

\textsuperscript{78} Ibid, p.68-9.
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Croydon Chronicle}, 3 August 1889, p.2.
all dogs, unlike the existing legislation, which excluded sportsmen’s dogs. Carpenter also quoted the ‘Bedford Case’ where a dog with rabies managed to unfasten its muzzle and escape into the country with the added risk of transmitting the rabies. 80

Influenza

On 13 May 1891 it was reported in the Croydon Chronicle that influenza 81 had been fatal in many parts of England and London, although Croydon had not had any deaths. 82 At the Croydon County Court several defendants sent letters explaining that their absence was due to influenza and thus escaped commitment, although His Honour facetiously observed that perhaps a change of air and residence would do some of the sufferers good. 83 It was later reported that the death rate [for all causes] was 50 per 1000 in some places whilst in Croydon it was only 19 per 1000. 84

VACCINATION

The anti-vaccination lobby was active in Croydon from 1876-7 and during the 1880s and Carpenter frequently came in for criticism for his support of vaccination. For example in 1882 the September issue of The Vaccination Enquirer, the organ for the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, criticised Carpenter. The article read:

We like Dr Carpenter. There is a power of insolence in him that is pungent as ammonia. Holding forth at Worcester the other day to the British Medical Association, he recommended that the report of the Association upon small-

80 BMJ, 1890, ii: 757.
81 Influenza was also known as epidemic catarrh. In 1782 an influenza epidemic spread over the whole of Europe and affected about half the population. JM’Gregor-Robertson, The Household Physician, London, Blackie and Son, p.415. See also Annals of Influenza, published by the Sydenham Society, 1852.
82 Croydon Chronicle, 16 May 1891, p.2.
pox in 1839 should be reprinted and again distributed throughout the land: -

'For it utterly demolishes all the arguments which are still brought against vaccination by those mischievous individuals who prey upon the weak minds of those who find funds for the anti-vaccination craze, and who provide the funds to pay the salaries of those whose interest is to keep that wicked agitation alive.'

Here we have what has been described as 'the lie at a venture;' and it is not difficult to imagine Dr Carpenter fulfilling the part of accuser with, 'Well, if it is not true, it ought to be, which comes to the same thing.'

By 1888 letters on vaccination started to reappear in the Croydon local press. For example, Heaviside Whitmarsh M.D. commenced his letter with the following:

The theory of Jenner during the past 25yrs has become quite obsolete and Government Theory has taken its place. In my opinion the State has no right to interfere with a healthy subject. The English people should be allowed to use their own discretion in the matter, and the law as it now stands is very cruel and indefensible, and must fall before enlightened public opinion.

On 17 November 1888 letters about vaccination appeared in the Croydon Chronicle from various parts of the country. One heading 'Killed by Vaccination' concerned a baby, aged four months, who had died from vaccination. The correspondent pointed out that thousands of children met the same fate annually, and said that this was a warning to others. Another letter was headed 'Vaccination.' This writer said that "it is absolutely impossible to adduce any proof whatever that the operation called vaccination has been protective against smallpox" and also

---
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highlighted 30,000 failures of vaccination. Another letter was headed ‘Vaccination and Evidence’ and asked, “What is the Evidence upon which the Vaccination Acts are Founded?” The correspondent continued, “I know of none at all. None of them cite any. No preamble refers to any.” A further letter appeared in December 1888, from John Stewart, a retired doctor, with the heading ‘Is Vaccination Doomed?’ The writer felt that the decline in the incidence of smallpox was due to the advances in sanitary measures generally.

In September 1889 at a meeting of the Board of Guardians the following was reported in the *Croydon Chronicle*:

A letter was read from Dr Carpenter with regard to what he termed ‘foolish statements made by anti-vaccinationists at the Borough Bench’ last week. The deluded antagonists believed the statements made by the paid agents of the anti-vaccination society, as if they were gospel, whilst they had no real foundation except such as is based upon the fertile imaginations of individuals whose pay would cease if it was not provided by the deluded victims of the society. I send you the *Lancet* for Saturday. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to read the paragraph on page 161 to show how the statistics of the Anti Vaccination Society are made up. As far as I am concerned I have never seen any case in which serious injury has been caused by vaccination, and I have assisted at 1,008, but if mothers will forget the rules which should be obeyed, and just the same, exposing their children to chill whilst undergoing the vaccine injection, a child may catch cold and suffer in consequence as any other child may do.

---
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Vaccination — A Challenge

In November 1889, Carpenter wrote a letter to the *Croydon Chronicle* with the heading 'Vaccination! - A Challenge.' In this letter Carpenter said:

If it were possible, I could soon put the matter to a test. Let them [anti-vaccinationists] take ten of those who are unvaccinated; I will take other ten who are vaccinated; let the 20 undertake the nursing at a small-pox hospital for a week. I would give £100 to be divided among the unvaccinated for every one who was attacked from my party, provided the anti-vaccinationists would distribute a similar sum for every one of their party who suffered from the disease within six weeks. I am quite certain of one thing, I should not have to contribute anything, and my party would receive at least £50 each for their services. I would also guarantee £1000 to the friends of any one of my party who died in consequence of this discharge of duty; a similar provision to be made on the other side; and I am also as sure that at least one of the ten would succumb to the virulence of the disease.

Carpenter added a P.S. to the letter “Vaccination is like a standing army, it is a necessary evil.” 90 Carpenter’s letter provoked further correspondence that resulted in him writing a reply. Carpenter wrote, “The evidence produced before the Vaccination Commission shows conclusively that if it had not been for the erroneous conclusions of the anti-vaccinationists, small-pox would be, and might be, entirely banished from our shores, and smallpox hospitals quite unnecessary.” 91

---
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NOTIFICATION OF INFECTIOUS DISEASE

From 1880–1900 only two major new acts were passed in Parliament relating to Public Health. This demonstrated that the government’s pursuit of legislation ceased to be a major aim and also marked a change in their thinking. The two acts were the Notification of Diseases Act, 1889 and the Isolation Hospitals Act, 1893. Both acts were permissive, so the use of notification and the diseases to which they applied varied between local authorities. The main strategy for improving the professional and social position of the MOH was to back up the authority they enjoyed from being agents of the state with that of specialist expertise.92

In 1889 the Infectious Disease (Notification) Act required the Metropolitan local authorities and (permitted provincial local authorities adopting the Act) to demand the prompt notification to the MOH of all cases of smallpox, Asiatic cholera, diphtheria, membranous croup, erysipelas, and any of a list of fevers: typhoid, typhus, enteric, relapsing, continued, puerperal, and scarlet.93 However, prior to this Act many people, including Carpenter, had been involved in a long debate as to the best ways of notifying infectious disease.

For example in March 1882 the BMJ reported that Carpenter had written an excellent letter to the Times on the subject of notification of infectious disease, discussing the injustice of requiring the medical man to give, under compulsion, such notification to the sanitary authorities. In this letter Carpenter wrote:

It is absolutely necessary to have the assistance of the medical profession in procuring the repression of infectious disease, but it is not to be obtained by preventing a certain class of people from consulting the doctor at all; it will
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defeat its own object unless the doctor is made the ally of the law. This alliance will be best brought about by giving the patient, or rather the person in charge, a right to request the assistance of the doctor in making the disclosure, and thus relieving the former of the responsibility and the expense. The doctor then becomes the agent of his patient in making the disclosure; while, if the latter does not do this, and the doctor becomes aware that the householder is disobeying the law, he will be very earnest in urging upon him the duty of preventing the spread of the disease to other people. The penal enactment against the doctor may be beneficial in certain cases; but it will lead to injustice to a noble profession, and will fail to effect its object. The result cannot be obtained unless goodwill of the profession goes with it; and I respectfully ask that the one-barrel may be tried before the other is pointed in the same direction.  

The following year, on 24 July 1883, William Corfield, Professor of Hygiene at University College Hospital, London, gave a lecture to the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain on ‘Compulsory Notification of Infectious Diseases.’ Carpenter was in the Chair. Corfield commenced his talk by stating that it was based on replies he had received to a set of questions he had sent eighteen Medical Officers of Health where regulations for the compulsory notification of infectious disease were in force. Corfield felt that compulsory notification was a very important sanitary measure, and felt that there were more cases of concealment without the Act than with it. The evidence, he said, also supported the view that in most places little or no difficulty
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93 An Act to provide for the Notification of Infectious Disease to Local Authorities, 52 & 53 Vict C. 72.
94 BMJ, 1882, i: 469.
95 In 1871 Corfield was invited to Lndonborough Lodge to find out the cause of an outbreak of typhoid, which affected the Prince of Wales. Lord Chesterfield and a groom died.
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had arisen from the medical men being compelled to give this information. On 13 August 1883, Carpenter wrote to the *Lancet* on: ‘The Ethics of Notification.’ He felt he had to write about this important subject because his observations were not reported together with Corfield’s paper, and because he wished to contradict a report, which had appeared in a Sunday newspaper on the same subject. *The Lancet* reported Carpenter as saying: “I stated very clearly to the meeting the views which I hold upon this matter, and gave the most emphatic objections to the private medical attendant being made a State official without his own consent.” Carpenter also pointed out that seven years earlier, on 29 April 1876, he had given a paper to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science at the Society of Arts entitled: ‘On the Right of the State to Obtain early information of the Appearance of Epidemic or Infectious Disease in a given District - Ought the Medical Attendant to be the Informer?’

In 1884 Carpenter gave a paper to the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain at a conference held during the International Health Exhibition. He spoke on ‘The Right of the State to Enforce Notification and the Best Method of Doing it.’ Carpenter highlighted the possibility that a MOH could damage the reputation of another medical practitioner if the doctor did not comply with the notification.

Three years later, in 1887, Carpenter wrote a letter to the *BMJ* on ‘Notification of Infectious Disease.’ Carpenter made reference to the dual notification of infectious diseases, which meant that both the doctor and the patient had to inform the MOH in cases of infectious disease. Carpenter recalled a recent Sanitary Congress in Bolton, in which he had been an active participant. He felt he was considered a bete noir for opposing the principle of dual notification. However, Carpenter pointed out that he
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had been one of the earliest sanitarians to advocate the appointment of medical
officers of health in every place, and to emphasise the need for immediate notification
to the State official of the presence of infective disease. Carpenter concluded his
letter by saying, “A single notifying clause as against the householder, with another
giving the right to a fee to the notifying medical man, would be far more effectual
than the dual plan, which is only teaching how not to do it.”

Carpenter’s concerns about the weaknesses of the notification process were
later justified. For example, on 2 April 1888 he wrote to the BMJ about proceedings
taken by the Corporation of Croydon, against Dr Dalton [given name not known], of
South Norwood, because he did not give notice of a case of infectious disease to the
Town Clerk directly. Instead, Dalton had instructed the householder to give notice to
the Town Clerk, who in turn arranged for the house to be disinfected. Carpenter
concluded his letter with the following:

It could never be intended by the Legislature that a new series of crimes
should be put upon the statute book; namely, that doctors must be common
informers, and that the dignity of the local authority is lessened, unless the
information comes by the medical instead of by another source. The
knowledge was actually obtained, in this case, and the measures for the
prevention of the spread of disease were actually taken primarily by the act of
Dr Dalton, yet he is prosecuted, and the justices were foolish enough to put a
fine upon his conduct, instead of doing him the justice which was really due to
him in the matter; namely, in inflicting a nominal penalty only.

99 Sanitary Record, 1884, 6: 50.
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On 24 May 1888 Carpenter wrote a letter to the Editor of the *Croydon Chronicle* on ‘The Notification of Infectious Disease.’ Carpenter began by saying that “... the British Medical Association asks (with me) for notification through the doctor, but not necessarily by the doctor.” Carpenter pointed out that in all the towns where the dual act was in place the death rate from scarlatina had risen, whereas in London, Kensington and Croydon, where no dual clause was in force, the zymotic rate, including that from scarlatina, had steadily declined. Finally, the *Croydon Chronicle* reported Carpenter as saying the following:

I hope the Government will take the matter up and pass a measure, which shall be in accord with the true spirit of sanitary law, as well as the wishes of the medical profession, and make it applicable to the whole of the United Kingdom. We shall then get rid of the anomaly, which now exists, and does much harm to sanitary progress.\(^{103}\)

The following year, the Infectious Disease (Notification) Act 1889 was passed and Mooney has commented that:

... the various proceedings that could be triggered by notification – against people, their property, and their livelihoods – represented much more than simply an early warning system. In fact, notification was the crucial policy development in the move toward the individualization of public health strategies in the later nineteenth century.\(^{104}\)

---

\(^{103}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, 26 May 1888, p.5.

HOSPITALS’ COMMISSION

In 1881 Carpenter was invited to sit on a Hospitals’ Commission for smallpox and fever hospitals. The six areas of enquiry are detailed below. The Commissioners were Frederick, Baron Blachford; Sir James Paget; Sir Rutherford Alcock; Arthur Wellesley Peel; Edward Leigh Pemberton; John Burdon Sanderson; Alfred Carpenter; William Henry Broadbent; and Jonathon Hutchinson. The committee met in Room 11 of the House of Commons Committee Rooms at 1.30pm (on average twice a week) from 26 November 1881 to 9 June 1882. There were thirty-seven meetings in which forty-eight witnesses were examined to find out the best ways of treating patients with infectious disease. Some of the witnesses were people well known to Carpenter and included John S. Bristowe, F.S.B.F. De Chaumont, George Buchanan, Sir William W. Gull, John Simon, Sir James Risdon Bennett and J. Burdon Sanderson. The 449 page Report was printed in August 1882 and contained 5512 questions. The six areas of enquiry were:

1. The nature, extent, and sufficiency of the hospital accommodation for small-pox and fever patients provided by the Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum Board and the several vestries and district boards in the metropolis, including the Commissioners of Sewers for the City of London.

2. The relative advantages and disadvantages to patients and the public of providing for small-pox and fever cases, whether amongst persons of the pauper class or persons of the non-pauper class without proper means of isolation, or both, by a limited number of hospitals for the whole metropolis under one authority, such as

---

the Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District, or by parochial and district hospitals under vestries and district boards.

3. The expediency of continuing the several existing smallpox and fever hospitals now under the Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District; or, if it be considered desirable that any should be closed, the accommodation for smallpox and fever cases which should be substituted.

4. The expediency of the Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District establishing additional hospitals and of making special provision for convalescent cases.

5. The conditions and limitations under which the hospitals provided by the Managers should be continued, and the general conditions and limitations which should be observed in the case of the establishment of new hospitals, whether by the managers or any other authority, so as to insure, as far as practicable, the recovery of the patients and the protection of the public against contagion.

6. The operation of the Acts relating to the establishment of hospitals for smallpox and fever patients in the metropolis, and the provisions, if any, required for the acquisition of sites for such hospitals, whether by agreement or otherwise; and for the protection of the authorities providing small-pox and fever hospitals, subject to the same being conducted with reasonable care and according to prescribed regulations, from liability to legal proceedings so as to secure the public against the loss of the benefits arising from such institutions; and to make such suggestions as you may deem expedient in connexion with all or any of the matters aforesaid.  

The Commission recommended that the provision of hospital accommodation for persons suffering from infectious disease in the metropolitan districts should be entirely disconnected from the administration of the poor law, and treated as part of

106 Ibid, pp. iii - iv
the sanitary arrangements of the metropolis. The notification of the disease to the Medical Officer of Health by either the sick person, or those in charge of him, or the occupier of the house in which the sick person is residing, or in the case of a pauper his medical attendant, was also highlighted. It recommended that a certificate depicting the nature of the disease should be sent to the MOH and a small fee should be paid to the medical man [as it is today]. Cases where the MOH was satisfied that the patient was properly isolated and a requisite means of disinfection had been adopted required no further action. However, patients could be moved by the Metropolitan Asylums Board, to one of their hospitals, in cases where the MOH was not satisfied that the patient was properly isolated and providing the patient was not seriously ill. In cases where the patient was too sick to be moved or isolated by those about him, the medical officer had the power to take all necessary steps to clear the house of its inmates. In all cases the MOH had to disinfect the house, and in the case of houses invaded by smallpox, should be empowered to require the re-vaccination of all occupants who were not otherwise protected.

VIVISECTION
The Annual Meeting of the BMA, on 11 August 1881, was held at Ryde, Isle of Wight. Carpenter vacated his position as President of Council after three years in office and was made a vice-president for life. A debate took place on vivisection and it was resolved, with one dissident only, "That this association desires to express its deep sense of the importance of vivisection to the advancement of medical science, and the belief that further prohibition of it would be attended with serious injury to the country by preventing investigations which are calculated to provide the better
knowledge and treatment of disease in animals as well as in men.” 107 It is likely, therefore, that Carpenter supported vivisection.

Later, on 21 March 1883, Mr H. R. Cooke FRS 108 gave a public lecture on vivisection in the Small Public Hall, Croydon. The Rev A. Hexton 109 moved a motion condemning vivisection, which was seconded by Mr Stetshall. It is not known if Carpenter was at the meeting. The Croydon Chronicle reported that speaker, who was an anti-vivisectionist, gave a stimulating talk. It was also reported that Mr Stetshall, one of the audience who opposed vivisection, said, “In places where vivisection was practised so in proportion did the sufferings of the people increase.” 110

With regards to the cruelty of animals, we do know that Carpenter was concerned for the welfare of animals going either to the abattoir or to market. For example, in 1881, after the conclusion of his magistrates business in the police court, Carpenter called the attention of the local inspector of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to a case that he observed that morning as he was coming to court. Carpenter reported that he saw a number of milk cows being driven to market with their udders distended to an enormous extent. He could not believe that those cows could travel in such a condition without suffering great distress and pain. As they were being taken to market for sale, Carpenter felt that the owner had allowed them to remain unmilked for twenty-four hours in the hope of getting a better price for them. 111
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FOG

Carpenter became interested in fogs and was concerned about the effect they had on the health of the population. In 1890, he wrote a 46 page pamphlet entitled: ‘On London Fogs,’ addressed to all whom they concern and respectfully dedicated to the London County Council. In the opening paragraph Carpenter wrote:

The steady increase of carbon, and its natural companions in the atmosphere of the Metropolitan area, and indeed of all populous places in England, in consequence of the wasteful expenditure of fuel used for warming and cooking purposes, leads me to appeal again to my countrymen, and try to persuade them to make resolute steps to remedy this evil.

Carpenter’s interest in fog and smoke pollution can be traced back to 1872 when he criticised the Croydon Local Board of Health for smoke nuisance and which has been discussed previously. Later in 1880 Carpenter wrote to the Editor of the Times, as he was concerned about the smoke pollution from coal fires. In this letter Carpenter later made his thoughts quite clear when he said ‘...let me ask whether the time has not also come for efforts to be made for the purification of our atmosphere from the noxious effects of wasteful coal fires.’ Carpenter’s reasons for writing this letter becomes clearer when he wrote:

Sir, - I had occasion to be in the neighbourhood of Hyde Park one Sunday forenoon a few days ago. I had left my residence at Croydon one Sunday afternoon, where the sun was shining brightly, the air clear and pure, and nature all beautiful in the stillness, which pervaded the atmosphere. After we had passed Clapham Junction Station a yellowish brown bank appeared with
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outline as belongs to a distant cloud. It was close to us, and as the train crossed the river we were enveloped in a pall, which allowed us only to see for a few yards in advance. Carpenter went on to say “I ask whether the time is not coming in which an effort should be made to put a stop to this mighty evil, which effort may move side by side with the removal of stagnant sewage from our sewers.” Carpenter was concerned that the pollution was killing thousands of the population before their time. He was able to throw added weight to his argument with the following statement “Cold kills, but cold with London smoke kills with double weight and leads to innumerable sudden deaths, as the Registrar-General’s tables will convincingly tell us.” Carpenter’s remedy was a heavy tax upon all grates or fireplaces, which did not consume their own smoke.

In 1882 Carpenter wrote to the newspapers about the heavy fog that occurred in London during the previous week. The BMJ reported, under the title ‘Unconsumed Carbon,’ that Carpenter had written to the papers on the subject of the heavy fog. In this article it was reported that Carpenter called attention to the Smoke Abatement Exhibition at South Kensington, and complained to the railway companies for lighting hundreds of naked coal fires along the sides of the rails for the purpose of giving light. Carpenter felt these fires were merely acting as ‘fog signals.’

In 1890 the Croydon Chronicle reported the following:

Dr Carpenter does not find fault with the fog nuisance without suggesting a remedy, but one, which Alderman Haggis describes as revolutionary. Well to compel people to give up the cheerful blaze of the coal fire, and the delightful privilege of poking up the red hot coals, as almost frost bitten it may be, or wet

---
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through, you place your feet on the fender and feel the effects of the glow as the heat gradually flows upwards from the pedal extremities and the heart beats cheerfully with its wonted vigour – that may be called a revolution, but would it be greater than others which have gone before? 118

Carpenter felt that gas fires were a good alternative and with the increasing popularity of electric light the price of gas could be reduced.

MISCELLANEOUS

In 1889 a meeting of the Surgical Aid Society took place and Carpenter, who was one of the vice presidents, took the Chair. In his report, Dr H.G. Thompson 119 said that since the commencement of the Croydon Branch in 1884, a total of 1,040 patients had been assisted. The appliances supplied included abdominal and loin belts, air cushions and beds, artificial arms, artificial eyes, artificial and bucket legs, crutches, enemas, high cork and special boots, India rubber bandages, and laced and leather knee caps. He also pointed out that the contribution to the Croydon Branch during the past year was £127 15s. 120

Carpenter’s broad knowledge in public health was evident in a number of other ways. For example he gave a talk on ‘A Consideration of Some of the Causes which give rise to Dental Decay’ to the Odontological Society on 6 November 1882. 121 Carpenter continued to write books and articles. For example, Carpenter’s book Health at School was published in 1882. 122 The chapters dealt with drainage, water supply, baths and bathing, construction of buildings, ventilation, dormitories
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and physical exercise. Later in 1887 *The Principles and Practice of School Hygiene* was published. The book was written for students in training for educational work, as well as for those occupied in preparing them for their future duties. It was divided into two parts. Part I consisted of chapters on the site of the school; drainage of the schoolhouse, ventilation of drains, closets, urinals and their water supply; water supply, baths and bathing; construction of building; ventilation of schools, floor space, warming and lighting; dormitories; physical exercise; time allotted to study, overpressure in elementary schools, examinations and rewards, and punishments; school desks and seats; school costume; and objects to be attained by education. Part II contained chapters on school surgery; wounds and their sequences; cutaneous maladies; disease of the skin; abscesses and their allies; surgical diseases of mouth and throat; burns, scalds and corrosives; drowning; arrest of respiration by strangulation or suffocation; dislocations and fractures; school medicine; digestion and its derangements; influence of exercise; headaches; the care of the eyes; the hearing and the ears; the throat and voice; the management of the voice; the mouth and teeth; and family medicine. In 1891, Carpenter contributed a chapter to *Hughes's Domestic Economy* under the title ‘Preparation of Food for the Sick.’

RELIGION

On 3 April 1888 Carpenter was elected Vicar’s Churchwarden of Croydon Parish Church, and Richard Flint elected Parish Churchwarden. Together they presented the Parish Church of St John the Baptist with a book of Notae Memorabiles, which
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included an entry of the unveiling of the restored Whitgift monument by the Archbishop of Canterbury on 14 November 1888.

In April 1889 the Vestry Meeting, which held in the Town Hall, re-elected Carpenter as Vicar’s Churchwarden. It was reported in the *Croydon Chronicle* that the Rev John Masterman Braithwaite said: “He [Carpenter] had always been a good servant to Croydon, and had always thrown himself heartily into whatever he had been able to undertake; and he had not been behind-hand in his work as churchwarden. (applause)” Braithwaite continued:

Dr Carpenter was at first a little doubtful as to whether he should accept the office for another year, as they all knew, he was growing old in the service of Croydon; but still many of them, he thought, regarded him as a very young old man yet. (Applause and laughter.) They looked upon him still as having a great deal of go in him, and he (the Vicar) thought it his duty rather to do as other churchwardens had done before him and undertake a second year in office. (applause)

Carpenter was unable to say all that he wished at the Vestry meeting, prompting him to write to the *Croydon Chronicle* as follows:

It is quite refreshing to note the fact that we have an advantage in Croydon in being able to depend upon one representative of the Public Press, able and willing to grasp a serious subject in all its bearings, without being warped by prejudice or political rancour.

I thank you for your appreciation of the object I had in view in ventilating my grumbles at the Easter Vestry of 1889.

---

126 Archbishop John Whitgift was regarded as Croydon’s greatest benefactor, and founded the charity called Whitgift’s Hospital in 1596, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. Whitgift Hospital is still open to this day.
127 *Croydon Chronicle*, 27 April 1889, p.2.
In the presence of the Vicar I was unable to express all I wished to say. Carpenter’s main grievance concerned the small collections at the Parish Church, which apart from the eleven persons who contributed £27 in gold, amounted to an average of two and a half pence from each of the 1000 persons who were present in church on most Sundays. Carpenter felt that, “it was not a fair estimate of our gratitude to God, for the spiritual and moral help afforded during the past year for so large a congregation.” The *Croydon Chronicle* summed up the occasion with the following:

Parish Vestries are notorious as arenas wherein it is exemplified how easy it is to find fault, and how native eloquence holds itself ready to burst forth upon slight occasion. The Parish Vestry affords, in fact, the opportunity to the disagreeably inclined, to indulge in their annual grumble, and enables loquacious people who have nothing to say to promulgate the fact in the most prolix fashion possible; while others air their little theories and crotchets in the full belief that the inspiration of a master hand is upon them.

One of Carpenter’s hobbies in his later years was bell ringing. On 6 April 1885 he obtained his Surrey Association of Change Ringers Certificate, which was signed by his son Arthur Bristowe, who was Secretary.

On Friday 28 June 1889 John Masterman Braithwaite, Vicar of Croydon, died suddenly at the age of 43. His death came as a great shock to all who knew him and had a profound effect on the town. The following appeared in the *Croydon Guardian*:

“No time whatever was lost by the officials in getting over the painful, but, under the circumstances, necessary formality of a Coroner’s inquest. It was held at the Vicarage
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by the Coroner for Mid-Surrey, Mr W.P. Morrison, at 5.30 on Saturday afternoon.”
After all the evidence was given the Jury returned a verdict of ‘Death from natural
causes.”

Braithwaite is commemorated by the Braithwaite Memorial Windows in the
Parish Church, which are inscribed with the words: “In memory of John Masterman
Braithwaite, MA, Vicar of Croydon and Rural Dean, 1882-1889, during which time
he laboured unceasingly for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the people.
Suddenly called to his rest 28 June 1889.” As well as the windows, a Memorial
Fund raised enough money to build the Braithwaite Memorial Hall at a cost of £550
which was opened by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Hall has a capacity for
500 persons and is still in use today.

In 1881 the Whitgift Charity received the Royal Assent and in future was to be
called the Whitgift Foundation. The Foundation consisted of the Whitgift Hospital
and two boys’ schools namely Whitgift Grammar School and Whitgift Modern
School. The Foundation was administered by a governing body, which consisted of
the Vicar of Croydon; six nominated governors appointed by the Archbishop of
Canterbury; six elected governors (two Local Justices of the Peace, two from the
School Board and two from the Local Board of Health). Later, in 1888, Carpenter
became Chairman of the Foundation. The Whitgift Grammar School had 300 day
scholars aged between eight and nineteen. The fees were fixed by the Governors, at a
minimum of £8 and a maximum of £16 per annum. The Whitgift Modern School
pupils were aged between seven and sixteen and the fees were half those of the
Grammar School. The entry qualification was similar for both schools.

132 Croydon Guardian, 6 July 1889.
133 Croydon Chronicle, 4 January 1890, p.3.
135 Croydon Chronicle, 3 September 1881, p.3.
COURT CASES

Carpenter was no stranger to the Courts. He was asked to sit on the Grand Jury at the Assizes at Kingston Upon Thames on 5 February 1883, at Croydon both on 25 July 1883 and 17 April 1890. However, Carpenter was also involved in two court cases against himself. The first was in 1884, being a high profile local court case between Carpenter and his previous partners Whitling and Lanchester. The second in 1891 was brought by a patient who felt that she had been wrongly removed to a lunatic asylum after Carpenter and a colleague had signed a certificate.

WHITLING AND LANCHESTER V CARPENTER

This case was heard in the New Law Courts in the Queen’s Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, before Mr Justice Hawkins and a Special Jury. In opening the case for the plaintiffs, Mr Charles Russell QC MP said that Carpenter had retired from the partnership on 1 January 1883 and received £5000 from his partners on the understanding he was not to practice as a medical man except as a consulting physician. However, it was alleged that Carpenter used his son Arthur Bristowe Carpenter as his assistant, and admitted to 679 visits to various patients since the dissolution of the partnership. These visits were entered in Carpenter’s [Alfred] diary with the letters ABC, which were the initials of his son. Russell told the court that some of the patients were visited as many as 50 to 60 times, and several 16, 12 and 10 times, and remarked that if all these were consultations the number was singularly large. The focus of the case rested on the definition of ‘consulting physician.’ The Croydon Chronicle summed up the case as follows: ‘When Doctors differ we know what disorder may be expected. In the action between three of our leading medical
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men on Thursday at the New Law Courts, seven medical men, chiefly physicians, were called and questioned as to the meaning of the term 'consulting physician.' ” 

The report continued:

An epitome of the opinions is of interest - one didn’t know the term, another said ‘consulting’ and ‘consulted’ meant the same, a third had some cock and bull story about attaining the age of sixty-five, a fourth said he was himself a consulting physician, another swore there were no consulting physicians in London, while two or three made the damaging admission that the two words meant just what any third standard boy would say they did, namely, that the physician acted only in consultation with another who had charge of the case. This reading the judge emphatically endorsed, and it is gratifying to note that all parties were exonerated from blame and declared to have been acting within what they considered their rights.137

The plaintiffs were awarded £50 costs to be taxed on the higher scale, and Carpenter was told to adhere to the terms of his circular.

The following year, Lanchester died at his residence at the age of forty-six.138 Carpenter attended the funeral in his capacity as Chairman of the Whitgift Governors. The Croydon Chronicle reported that at the graveside “Dr Carpenter, we are pleased to say, was one of those who witnessed the closing scene in the career of his former partner, thus showing that whatever little feuds existed between him and the deceased, they could all be forgotten in the presence of death.”139 Whitling died in 1889, aged 56, of heart disease. He had recently retired from practice and was on board the Orient, accompanied by his wife en route to Australia when he died.140
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BROWN V DUKES AND CARPENTER

Another court case took place in the Surrey Assizes in 1891, when a Mrs Brown brought an action in law against Carpenter and his colleague Dr Dukes. Mrs Brown claimed damages of £2000, for wrongful and careless conduct in signing certificates by means of which she was removed to Peckham House Lunatic Asylum. Carpenter wrote a letter of reply, pointing out that the report that appeared in the local paper was incorrect. He obtained a copy of the verdict of the jury, which read: “We find that the plaintiff was not proved to be insane on 8 July; and that the certificate given by the doctors was not due to any want of care; or (to use your lordship’s expression) to any want of due care and skill on the part of the defendants.” Mr Justice Matthew decided, “That will be a verdict for the defendants.” Carpenter was clearly upset by this action and wrote:

It is not my intention in future to fill up certificates in lunacy or ever act as a magistrate in such cases, and I strongly advise my professional brethren to adopt a similar course and save themselves from the risk of heavy pecuniary loss such as will fall upon my colleague and myself in the case just decided, the plaintiff being without means to pay the costs awarded to us by the judge.  

The plaintiff, Mrs Brown, made an appeal and Carpenter later wrote:

I send you a report of the proceedings in the appeal made by the plaintiff in the case of Brown v. Dukes and myself. From that report you will observe how emphatically the Master of the Rolls and Lord Justices Lopes and Kay condemned the action of the unfortunate woman’s legal advisers. It is said that
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skinning eels is nothing when they are used to it. Dr Dukes and myself, being in the position of the eels, do not find it a very pleasant proceeding.143

Carpenter did not wish to appear as a martyr, or to act as a defender of the medical profession in courts of law. He concluded by saying, "The emphatic condemnation of all the judges who heard this appeal will do something to check a recurrence of the evil until the law is so improved as to prevent such injustice in the future." The matter did not end there, and what was probably Carpenter’s last letter to the *BMJ* before he died was dated 2 January 1892. He wrote: ‘On Actions in Lunacy Against Medical Men’ from his sick bed at the Esplanade Hotel, Ventnor, Isle of Wight. In the letter, Carpenter commented that his colleague had to find the money in the court case. He also pointed out that he was a member of the Parliamentary Bills sub-committee to whom the Lunacy Act was referred. Carpenter wrote, “I fought for the interests of the profession in the consideration of that measure, and it was at my suggestion that clauses were introduced into the Act for our protection in the case of such actions.” Carpenter continued, “I must say that I was somewhat surprised at the ease with which the Lord Chancellor accepted the proposals made, but I now see that he knew that they would be of very little use.” Carpenter's final paragraph read:

During the five and twenty years that I have been connected with the Council [BMA] I have always endeavoured to promote the best interests of the general practitioner without having any selfish end in view. I am now laid aside - it may or not be for a time only - but I trust that I may yet have an opportunity of taking part in measures for the improvement of the Lunacy Act, and the better protection of medical men.144

143 *BMJ*, 1891, ii: 1289.
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CROYDON LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTION

In October 1886 Carpenter, who was President of the Croydon Literary and Scientific Institution, and Margaret, his wife, held a grand conversazione for 700 guests on the occasion of the re-opening of the Public Halls after renovation. The halls accommodated a number of organisations including the Croydon Literary and Scientific Society, the Croydon School of Art (considered to be one of the foremost schools in the country), the Microscopical Club, and also held music evenings. The evening was also witness to the unveiling of a marble bust of Carpenter, who for many years had been the driving force of the Institution, which he had joined thirty-four years previously when he first came to Croydon. The bust was executed by Mr E. Roscoe Mullins, and had previously been exhibited at the Royal Academy. Mullins was a rising sculptor whose previous work included a bust of Dr Charles Murchison FRS, who was a Physician at Thomas’s. The BMJ reported that as well as the unveiling of his bust (of heroic size); Carpenter was given an illuminated address from the hundred subscribers to the bust, expressing their appreciation of his indefatigable exertions in furthering the interests of the Institution. In his reply Carpenter said that he wanted the Public Halls to be “a home that should be for all classes, and that should not be for one only, as institutions all over the country do not infrequently become.” Carpenter went on to say, “We determined to have it open and free from all kinds of sectarian influences, all political principles, and all kinds of influences that should make it a clique, and we endeavoured to enlarge the premises so that we could have everything that could possibly educate, instruct, or amuse, the
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population of the district." With reference to the location of the public halls, Carpenter said, "The very spot that this hall occupies was taken under an agreement. It had been my intention to have built a house for myself upon it, and when I found it was so proper a place for an institution such as this, I gave up the agreement, and the site was taken by a body of officers that were appointed in 1857." 149

CROYDON MEDICAL READING SOCIETY

On 16 October 1884 Carpenter wrote a letter to the Croydon Medical Reading Society expressing his intention of withdrawing from the Society. The Chairman read out the letter, although we are not told what the contents were or Carpenter's reasons for leaving. However, we do know that Carpenter's previous partners Lanchester and Whitling were both members of the Society. It is possible that the combination of their high profile court case earlier that year, plus Lanchester and Carpenter's antipathy for each other, prompted Carpenter to resign.

For example Lanchester's dislike for Carpenter was evident in June 1883 during a special meeting of the Governors of Croydon General Hospital. Lanchester commented that he was surprised that Carpenter had opposed the proposed enlargement of the Hospital considering the fact that he had rarely attended the hospital and had not worked with the medical staff there. The Croydon Chronicle reported that, at this point, Carpenter said, "But that was because I have a Judas for a friend. (Loud cries of Order) " Lanchester replied, "I leave my character in the hands of the audience (Loud applause, and cries of Hear, hear.) I am sorry we should have degenerated to personalities. (Hear, hear, and applause)." Carpenter had the final say and the following was reported: "I should have been most proud to have acted
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[worked] with the hospital medical staff, and Dr Lanchester was the reason why I did not. It is therefore hardly fair on his part to throw that in my face now."\textsuperscript{150}

PHILANTHROPY

Carpenter gave generously throughout his life, and in 1883 he subscribed £300 to the fund for building new schools in Croydon.\textsuperscript{151} Carpenter also continued to help others in various ways and his annual treat to the children of the Ragged School is now described.

RAGGED SCHOOL

In September 1881 Carpenter gave the children of the Ragged School their usual annual treat, as he had done since moving into Duppas House a few years previously. The following appeared in the \textit{Croydon Chronicle}:

Great was the delight and enjoyment of the children - for no efforts are ever spared on these occasions to make them happy; the only difficulty felt was that so splendid a day should pass so quickly away, though no doubt many of them were tired enough on leaving the Doctor's beautiful grounds, after running so many races, which were kept up with spirit, by the immense variety of toys etc, he had provided for the purpose.

The children's appetite was catered for, and it was reported, "an excellent tea was furnished, with heaps of bread and butter and cake, which vanished with a rapidity that astonished the visitors." Clothing was also distributed to the children and the

\textsuperscript{150} \textit{Croydon Chronicle}, 16 June 1883, p.2.
\textsuperscript{151} \textit{Times}, 1 February 1892, p.14. Letter written by his son Edward to the Editor.
Carpenter and his son Arthur in the garden of Duppas House
article concluded with the following words: “these treats are events in the lives of these poor children, and form matter for talk for months before and afterwards.”

In 1882 it was reported that 530 children assembled at three o’clock at Duppas House, and the following appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle*:

... on entering the grounds, each child received a toy, which formed a brief amusement, games soon followed, and these quickened by occasional supplies of fruit, were pursued with wondrous zest. Then came a bountiful tea to which no one who witnessed the speed, which bread and butter and cake disappear on such occasions, would doubt that ample justice was done.”

CROYDON PROVIDENT DISPENSARY

In 1882 it was reported that the first dinner in connection with the Croydon Provident Dispensary took place at the Victoria Coffee Tavern, Church Street, Croydon. In accordance with the rules of the Coffee Tavern Company, alcohol was not supplied and instead the thirsty souls were provided with sparkling and effervescent beverages. Carpenter was in the chair and pointed out that the object of the association was “to provide proper medical relief by a small weekly payment, thus teaching the working classes to be independent of charity, and inculcating in them a spirit of mutual support and independence, which was the boast of every Englishman.” Carpenter felt that all persons ought to provide against a rainy day, and the very poorest could do so against illness if they were so inclined. He encouraged thrift and self-dependence as against a dependence on charitable agencies when misfortune came. He advocated the engagement by all of a family medical adviser, but when, in the opinion of the adviser, the case could not be treated properly at home, then free admission should be
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given into the General Hospital; this would engender a feeling of independence, and render unnecessary the running about for an out-patients letter.  

EARLY CLOSING MOVEMENT

Carpenter continued to support the Early Closing Movement. For example in 1882 he wrote a letter to the Employers of Shop Labour in Croydon, which appeared in the *Croydon Chronicle*. Carpenter began the letter with the following statement:

Some of the shop assistants in Croydon have asked me to plead their cause with you on behalf of the Wednesday Early Closing Movement. I should be failing in my duty towards those who have great difficulty in helping themselves and forgetful of my exertions on their behalf nearly thirty years ago, if I did not respond to the appeal, and ask you to assist by continuing to give them the three hours relaxation which they seek for on Wednesday afternoons.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Carpenter was a JP and was an ex officio member of the Croydon Board of Guardians, Mayday Hospital Infirmary and Cane Hill Lunatic Asylum. In 1882 Carpenter’s attendances at the meetings of the Board of Guardians were reported as being very few and far between. They were, however, looked upon as ‘events’ in the Board Room. It was reported that at a meeting attended by Carpenter, “in the course of half a dozen speeches he managed to say some very sensible things and give very
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good advice. The chief point in the latter was the substitution of common sense for red tape." 157

Archbishop Benson officially opened Mayday Hospital Infirmary on 16 May 1885, nearly four years after the foundation stone was first laid. Carpenter gave a toast at the luncheon, which has been quoted earlier.

Carpenter was involved in the planning stages of Cane Hill Lunatic Asylum over a period of nine years. He was also on the Visiting Committee from January 1884, when it opened, until the March 1889, when the management of the hospital was taken over by the London County Council. 158

POLITICS

In 1883 Croydon became a municipal Borough. Earlier in March 1881 Carpenter had been a supporter of Croydon becoming a Borough when the matter was first debated. He chaired a meeting in the Large Public Hall, which was reported to be one of the largest and most enthusiastic public meetings ever known in Croydon. 159 The majority of those who attended the meeting supported Croydon becoming a Borough. However, a Croydon Anti-Borough Association was formed, which had the support of many people. A Court of Inquiry was held in November 1881, lasting seven days. The pro-Borough lobby were the victors.

In May 1883 the Croydon Chronicle reported that ‘Wednesday [9 May] witnessed the public reception of the Charter, which has converted Croydon into a Municipal Borough.’ 160 A banquet was held in the evening at the Greyhound Hotel and Carpenter gave a toast to the Army, Navy and Auxiliary Forces. 161

157 Croydon Chronicle, 27 May 1882, p.5.
158 LCC/MIN/860/Metropolitan Archives.
159 Croydon Chronicle, 12 March 1881, p.3.
160 Croydon Chronicle, 12 May 1883, p.5.
Mayday Hospital
In October 1888 Carpenter was elected a Councillor for South Ward, and soon became an active member on the Council. In December 1888 the widening of the High Street was discussed, and the Croydon Chronicle reported the following: "Councillor Dr Carpenter said in former times he had taken an active interest in the widening of the High Street. It was now 28 years since he introduced a motion of this kind in the old Local Board; but if it would have been carried out then, perhaps, it would not have been dealt with so well then as it would be dealt with now." The subject of the Town Hall was also mentioned and the Croydon Chronicle reported Carpenter as saying, "He could not think how it was possible for the Council to erect a Town Hall upon that site; the conditions required would render it impossible unless they obtained a large amount of property at the north side of the present building." 

POLITICS

Carpenter was a Gladstonian Liberal and was involved in local as well as national politics. In 1880 he was a Vice President of the Croydon Liberal Association. J. Spencer Balfour, Esq., M.P. [who later fell from grace] was President. Latham [Carpenter’s adversary] and Lanchester [Carpenter’s partner at this time] were also Vice Presidents.

On 12 January 1882 a meeting was held in Croydon with the purpose of discussing the advisability of forming a Parliamentary debating society, called the Croydon House of Commons. It was reported that some sixty to seventy gentlemen were present, Carpenter was voted to the Chair and he thought the idea was a very good one. On 26 January 1882 the first meeting was held where the rules were

---

161 Ibid, p.3.
162 Croydon Chronicle, 27 October 1888, p.4.
163 Croydon Chronicle, 8 December 1888, p.2.
164 1880 Ward's Croydon Directory.
prepared and the cabinet, ministers, speaker, and officers were elected. Apart from the inaugural meeting, Carpenter did not attend any of the other meetings and this was likely to have been due to his heavy professional commitments. The *Croydon Chronicle* offered the Society some advice, saying “If the Croydon House of Commons is to be a permanent success, some steps must be taken to distinguish between the House of Commons and the debating society which calls itself by the same name.” Within a few years the Society lost its appeal and meetings ceased.

**PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATE**

Chadwick and Carpenter were Gladstonian Liberals and both failed to gain a seat into Parliament.

Chadwick had aspired to become an MP, and was an unsuccessful candidate for Evesham in 1859 and for Kilmarnock Burghs in 1868. In 1867 he also failed to be elected to represent the University of London in Parliament.

Carpenter, on the other hand, appeared in the headlines of the daily newspapers in 1880 in relation to the possibility of his becoming a candidate for the East Surrey seat. Although Carpenter was strongly urged to come forward, he felt obliged to decline. The *BMJ* remarked, “This is very much regretted; for there is a great want in the House of Commons of members who are identified with the daily work of the medical practitioner.” The following week, Carpenter wrote a letter to the *BMJ* giving his reasons why he did not want to become a candidate for East Surrey:

---

165 *Croydon Chronicle*, 14 January 1882, p.5.
167 Finer, p.493.
168 Carpenter mentions representation of the University of London in 1880, when Sir William Gull was nominated as a candidate. Carpenter felt that Gull would carry more weight in the House than himself. *BMJ*, 1880, i: 716.
I should have no objection to become a candidate, but I have objection to the conditions, which are necessarily attached to such candidature - viz, I should spend five thousand pounds in the contest. Such is the vicious principle, upon which parliamentary elections are conducted, that a heavy expenditure is absolutely necessary to fight a good fight in East Surrey. I should have no objection to do a fair share; but I am not prepared to make so heavy a sacrifice.

Carpenter concluded his letter by saying, "Nevertheless, if opportunity arises, I should not hesitate to fight a fair and honest fight on equitable conditions."\(^{170}\)

In March 1883 Carpenter attended the Annual Dinner of the East Surrey Liberal Association at the Crystal Palace. Approximately 500 guests were present from the various branch associations from all parts of East Surrey, and it was around this time that Carpenter may have thought seriously about becoming an MP.\(^{171}\)

Later, in July 1883, some of Carpenter's motives for wanting to become an MP were put forward during an Anniversary Dinner of the Sanitary Institute of Great Britain at St James's Restaurant, Piccadilly, London. After Chadwick's toast the *Croydon Chronicle* reported following:

Dr Carpenter, in responding, pointed out that the advocates of sanitary science were deficient in political power, so that questions, which pressed for immediate solution, were apt to be shelved indefinitely. The Church and the Law and other classes were well represented in the Upper House of Parliament, and he hoped the time was not far distant when the heads of scientific bodies in this country would also find a place there, in order that the

\(^{169}\) *BMJ*, 1880, i: 371.

\(^{170}\) *BMJ*, 1880, i: 420.

\(^{171}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, p.2.
country might have the benefit of their advice upon matters of the greatest importance.172

Nearly five years after his letter to the BMJ giving his reasons on not wanting to be an MP Carpenter changed his mind. On 25 September 1885 he wrote to Chadwick to ask for his support in the forthcoming Reigate parliamentary elections saying, “Please if you know any electors in Reigate, Redhill, Dorking or Godstone, or the neighbourhood just drop them a line, and tell them to vigorously support my candidature. If I do get into the house, I mean to make a point as to the neglect which your counsel have met with at the hands of successive govts.”173 A short article about the election also appeared in the Croydon Chronicle:

We recently referred to the large number of Croydon residents who aspired to seats in the new Parliament. To the list we then gave, the name of Dr Alfred Carpenter must be added. Our local sanitarian and physician is going to beard the Conservative lion in his stronghold in the Reigate division of Surrey, and was well received at a large meeting on Tuesday. Sir Trevor Lawrence, his opponent, is better known locally, and is extremely popular amongst politicians of all shades of opinion, so that our last local candidate will have an uphill battle to fight.174

Archbishop Benson made a Visitation to Croydon for the deaneries of Croydon and East and West Dartford, in October 1885. Carpenter gave a toast to “the health of the Archbishop and Clergy of the Diocese,” and made a reference to the forthcoming elections. The Croydon Chronicle reported Carpenter as saying:

It might appear bold to some now present that in proposing that toast he was doing something antagonistic to the party to which he belonged. (No) But he

172 Croydon Chronicle, 14 July 1883, p.5.
173 Chadwick papers, box 444, 25 September 1885.
wished to point out how important it was for the interests of the Church in England that the Church should not be the Church of the party. (Applause)

In reply it was reported by the *Croydon Chronicle* that Archbishop Benson said:

Dr Carpenter made one delightful little slip. He was sure, though he corrected it, that he did not mean to suppress what he said at first. He went on to explain very clearly and distinctly that, it would be a very sad thing, for the Church if it were deserted by the Liberal party. But what he did begin to say was that it would be a very bad thing for the Liberal party - (loud applause) - if it were deserted by the Church. He begged to say that what Dr Carpenter was going to say was quite as true as what he did say. (Applause) It would be a very unfortunate thing for the Liberal party, if it were deserted by the Church.  

When the Election came Carpenter was thoroughly beaten, and Surrey, together with Middlesex, Kent and Sussex all went to the Tories. The votes for Reigate were Lawrence (C) 4,726 and Carpenter (L) 2,761. Carpenter’s principles about entering a parliamentary election, which he wrote about in his letter to the *BMJ* in 1880, were never realised, for the opposition’s campaign was not ‘a fair and honest fight.’ Instead it was reported:

Dr Carpenter was beaten in the Reigate division, but he fought the battle well, and set his face strongly against canvassing or exercising undue influence. His successful competitor, Sir Trevor Lawrence, is a gentleman also with high notions of honour, and we doubt not that he regrets bitterly the shameful

---

174 *Croydon Chronicle*, 3 October 1885, p.4.
175 *Croydon Chronicle*, 31 October 1885, p.2.
176 *Croydon Chronicle*, 5 December 1885, p.5.
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conduct of the Tory roughs towards Dr Carpenter, who was driven out of the
division long before the closing of the poll.\textsuperscript{178}

This shameful conduct and the reason why it happened can be deduced from one of
Carpenter's obituary notices, written in 1892, which said, "His strong opinion on the
temperance question raised the ire of the publicans, and one night he was set upon by
a mob, very roughly handled, and eventually ducked in a pond." \textsuperscript{179}

Despite all that had happened Carpenter was not deterred from entering
another contest, and in 1886, at short notice, he contested the Bristol North seat in the
General Election again for the liberals. The following report appeared in one of
Carpenter's obituaries:

It was on the 18 June 1886, that his name was submitted to the Liberal 250
[number of members] at the Ward hall, Montpelier, and after a ballot he was
adopted as a Liberal candidate against Mr Lewis Fry. Mr J.D. Marshall, who
was put forward as a Labour candidate and received nine votes on the ballot as
against 105 for Dr Carpenter and 36 for Mr Lewis Fry, pursued his
candidature for some time, and like Mr Lewis Fry and Dr Carpenter, he held
several meetings; but he eventually retired, and the contest was thus left to Mr
Fry and Dr Carpenter, the latter going heartily with Mr Gladstone on the Irish
question and making Home Rule his platform. The nomination was on
Thursday July 1 - less than a fortnight afterwards - and the polling on the
following day with the following result: - Mr Lewis Fry, 3587; Dr Carpenter,
2737; majority for Mr Fry, 850.\textsuperscript{180}

It is likely that because Fry was the sitting member he had an advantage, being known
to the electors. Carpenter's strong views, particularly about temperance, must have

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid, p.5.
\textsuperscript{179} Croydon Review, 30 January 1892.
antagonised some of the electorate. Carpenter later showed his disappointment in a letter to Chadwick on 6 July 1886:

I was check mated by a labour candidate whose supporters turned sulky and did not vote although he retired altogether in my favour it was too late. Better luck another time there will be a new appeal to the country next spring for there will be no working majority in this house.
If I hear of a good valet I will let you know at once. Thanks for your kind sympathy I have lost nothing and gained many friends in Bristol. If I have another opportunity soon I will ask for a word from you.\(^{181}\)

The opportunity never came, and in Carpenter’s last letter to Chadwick (who was now Sir Edwin) on 15 May 1889 he wrote:

If I was 20yrs younger I would try my best to carry out your designs by worrying the Gov’t in the House of Commons but whilst I am not quite so old in years I am nearly on a par with you in constitution and my time for battle in active work is passing now.
I thank you most heartily for all I have learnt through your work. I am trying to throw it into shape in showing how it developed in Croydon from the days of C.W. Johnson (your pupil) and then I shall be among those who have done their work.
Believe me with sincere regards always
Yours truly
Alfred Carpenter
P.S. My sight is failing me.\(^{182}\)

\(^{180}\) Bristol Mercury, 28 January 1892.
\(^{181}\) Chadwick papers, box 444, 6 July 1886.
SIR PETER EADE

The Wellcome Trust Library possesses a letter from Carpenter to a Sir Peter from Norwich (we are not given any other details). The letter reads:

My dear Sir Peter,

Thank you very much for your kind invitation, which I gladly accept. I shall not be able to get to Norwich before the day named and hope to return on the following morning. If therefore you will kindly give me bed and board for the 15th I shall be grateful.

Believe me

Yours faithfully

Alfred Carpenter

It is highly likely that the letter was written to Sir Peter Eade, who had much in common with Carpenter. Both attended the 1873 National Association for the Promotion of Social Science Congress in Norwich, where Sir Peter gave a talk on the Norwich Sewage Works. Both were involved with the Church of England Temperance Society, and in 1878 Sir Peter moved a resolution when the Norwich branch was constituted. In 1878 Sir Peter became a consulting physician to the Norwich Dispensary. Carpenter was also involved with the Dispensary movement, in Croydon. Later in 1881, Sir Peter became Vice President of the East Anglican branch of the BMA. Carpenter, who was Chairman of the Council of the BMA from 1878-81, is therefore likely to have met Sir Peter at some of the BMA meetings.

References:
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CHARACTER

Carpenter’s obituary in the *BMJ* said:

> We cannot conclude this notice of a most useful public man and a valued friend without paying a personal tribute to his charm of character, his warm and affectionate disposition, his catholic sympathy with every thought or movement which could lessen the suffering of his fellow creatures or help the poor in sickness.\(^\text{186}\)

However, others saw Carpenter differently and Henry G. Bremner, who was a regular correspondent and critic of Carpenter wrote:

> Dr Carpenter vaunts his services to Croydon. I can only say that I have lived here nearly twelve years, and I cannot remember a single act of his, either as a public man, M.L.B. [Member of the Local Board], or magistrate, which would entitle him to public gratitude. He has always appeared to me as an individual having a keen eye for the main chance, that his object was to keep his name well before the public, and to puff himself into notoriety, and it must be admitted that he has been successful in this, but the public have no reason to be grateful for it.\(^\text{187}\)

DEATH

Whilst trying to recover from a chronic illness (no details of the illness are known) in the Esplanade Hotel, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Carpenter still found time to write letters to the *Times* and *BMJ*. For example, on 29 December 1891 he wrote to the *Times* on ‘Fogs and Gas.’ He added a P.S. with the words, “While London was suffering from Egyptian darkness last week, we were suffering in the land of Goshen, sitting out of

\(^{186}\) *BMJ*, 1892, i: 312.

\(^{187}\) *Croydon Chronicle*, 28 April 1883, p.3.
doors or with our windows wide open, enjoying brilliant sunshine.” Carpenter’s health deteriorated and he died on 27 January 1892, with his son Edward at his bedside. The cause of death was given as cerebral paralysis and cardiac failure.  

Carpenter had at least eighty obituaries including one from the La Societie Francaise D’Hygiene. The Croydon Advertiser wrote, “Croydon is deprived of the most useful public man among the many who have served the present generation. There is scarcely a public institution in this Borough that does not owe something to the energy and far-seeing intelligence, which Dr Carpenter brought to bear upon every matter which he took in hand.” The Croydon Review said, ‘world-wide fame’ and the Medical Press, ‘esteemed figure of the medical world.’ The Croydon Advertiser ran a series of articles on prominent figures from the town called ‘Croydon Crayons.’ In 1873 the ‘Croydon Crayon’ was on Carpenter, which was reproduced again in the paper after his death:

To some it might appear as if Dr Carpenter were at perfect terms with himself and with all creation, and in this respect he is not singular, for many successful men unconsciously acquire such a manner. Yet while he has inherited or acquired the suaviter in modo [sweetness in manner], he certainly has never lost the power of assuming the fortiter in re [strength of his convictions]. While sufficiently pleasant in manner to win the favour of those who like their doctor to be presentable, intelligent, chatty and good natured, he has enough of determination and independence to assert his own position at any time when needed; and it is in this light we like to make our crayon on this gentleman. Dr Carpenter is perhaps the most prominent of our public men; and we fear we must trespass much upon our limited canvass to limn him at full length. His

---

188 Certified copy of an entry of death, General Register Office, DXZ 093529.
189 Croydon Advertiser, 30 January 1892.
prominence is the natural outcome of his fearlessness, and if he sometimes
errs on the side of rashness, no one will doubt his thorough conscientiousness
in all things, and his own innate belief of being in the right. He has been the
most hardworking man in the parish, and to do more than glance at half of
what he has done for the town would occupy more space than we have at our
disposal. 191

The funeral procession consisted of thirty carriages (six from the family and
twenty-four others), demonstrating Carpenter’s popularity in Croydon. Carpenter had
a strong aversion to flowers and the family allowed only one wreath to be placed on
top of the coffin, from the Societe Francaise D’Hygiene. At Queens Road Cemetery,
Croydon, the coffin was lowered into the grave and it was reported that “Many of the
bystanders as well as the bereaved family and friends were deeply affected at this, the
earthly close of a busy career of singular earnestness in the public weal, and of much
unostentatious benevolence.” 192 Carpenter’s grave survives to this day and is marked
by a large Saxon cross.

In his Will, dated 19 March 1892, Carpenter left £23,019 18s 7p to his wife
and children. 193 His memory lives on to this day and the marble bust by Mullins sits
proudly in the Post-Graduate Centre of Mayday University Hospital. Carpenter’s
name also appears on the large marble plaque, taken from the Duppas Hill Infirmary,
which can be found in the main corridor of Mayday Hospital. The name of the
disgraced Jabez Spencer Balfour (who rose to fame in Croydon and was at one time
reported to be one of the most popular figures there, but was imprisoned for fraud) has

190 Croydon Review, 30 January 1892.
191 Croydon Advertiser, 30 January 1892
192 Croydon Guardian, 6 February 1892.
193 Principal Registry of the Family Division, Probate Dept, Ground Floor, First Avenue House, 42-49,
High Holborn, London WC1V 6NP, ref: 678/1. Chadwick left £47,000 in trust (pending a life
settlement to take care of his family).
been cut out. Unlike Balfour, who became an MP and Croydon’s first Mayor, Carpenter can rest in the knowledge that even though he never held either of these offices he fought for a better and healthier Croydon, and, unlike Balfour, his name is still remembered today for all the right reasons.
CHAPTER 8

WAS CARPENTER A TYPICAL GP?

Carpenter made a successful career in Croydon from 1852-92. He worked as a general practitioner for thirty years, and then became a consulting physician for the final ten years of his life. Anne Digby’s book: The Evolution of British General Practice 1850-1948 gives us a good idea of the attributes of the ‘average’ GP. Whether or not Carpenter conformed to Digby’s picture of a typical GP is now discussed using the seventeen different categories listed.

Digby’s first observation is that general practitioners left little archival information. The only records about Carpenter that have survived are those he wrote to the local and national press, medical journals, pamphlets and books. He also belonged to various societies and was involved with the local hospitals. The only letters written by Carpenter that appear to have survived are those that he wrote to Chadwick, the Archbishops of Canterbury and a few others. There are no practice records, treatment bills or financial ledgers.

Digby says that GPs came from a modest background as compared to the law or church. Carpenter’s father was a surgeon-apothecary, and therefore Carpenter conforms to this assessment. The financial success of a GP could be gauged by a home in a fashionable suburb, servants and a carriage, and Carpenter conforms to this. With regards to training, Digby shows that in the mid-nineteenth century the flexibility of openings into medicine probably encouraged a wider social recruitment

---

1 Digby quotes Lady Warwick, who pointed out the practical implications of having a modest background in Society. Doctors and solicitors might be invited to garden parties, though never of course to lunch or tea. GPO (Garden parties only).
2 In the publication by J.C. Jeaffreson, Book about Doctors, 2nd Edition, 1861, London, Hurst and Blackett, p.7 “In our day an equipage of some sort is considered so necessary an appendage to a medical practitioner that a physician without a carriage … is looked on with suspicion.”
than was the latter case. However, training and preparation for general practice in the mid-to-late nineteenth century was inadequate. Digby sums up general practice as "consisting of a great deal of medicine, a fair amount of obstetrics and gynaecology, and very little surgery; and yet, the recently qualified man knows his work in the reverse order."

The different types of training that doctors underwent are listed. These included an individual apprenticeship, pupillage, unqualified assistantship and walking the wards. Carpenter was apprenticed to his father, which equates with Digby’s evaluation. She shows that 21% of doctors between 1849-59 had an apprenticeship. Apprenticeships gradually declined, and in 1892 they were abolished by the GMC. Carpenter was also a Pupil in Northampton and an unqualified assistant to John Syer Bristowe. This would have given him a good grounding in the basics of clinical practice, and shortened his formal education as he spent only three years as a medical student at Thomas’s.

With regard to qualifications, the 1815 Apothecaries Act made the LSA a legal requirement for people wishing to enter general practice, and many practitioners also had MRCS. When referring to the 1856 Medical Directory and examining the qualifications of the doctors we find that 55% of the doctors had both the LSA and MRCS, 19% MRCS only, 12% LSA only and 14% had MB or MD. Carpenter had MRCS, LSA, MB, MD, MRCP and CSS (Cambridge), more than fulfilling the requirements.

Digby shows that between 40-50% of GPs belonged to medical societies. Carpenter belonged to the BMA, Croydon Medical Reading Society, New Sydenham Society and the Medical Society of London.

---

3 Equivalent to the Diploma in Public Health.
Digby’s next question was ‘Were Practices a family industry?’ Medicine has been generally depicted as being substantially dependent on self-recruitment, with the younger sons of medical families following their fathers’ occupation. However, the GP dataset does not support this historical interpretation of general practice as a ‘family industry.’ Before 1910, only 12% were family practices. Although Carpenter’s father was an apothecary-surgeon and two of his brothers also qualified as doctors, none of them joined their father in Rothwell. Carpenter did, however, look after his father’s practice on two occasions before he moved to London. As Digby points out, “the practice would have been unable to generate enough income to support more than one doctor, so even if the family had desired it, it was not feasible.”

The next question was whether medicine ran in families. The GP dataset shows that between 1820-79, 40% of GPs had another relative within the medical profession and this applied to Carpenter. The GP dataset also shows that the majority of GPs held an outside appointment (64% between 1820-79 and 71% for 1880-1909.) Digby also shows that country practices gained 25% of their income from appointments, compared to only 20% for urban practices. In country practices the patients were scattered over a wider area and therefore home visits took longer when compared to urban practices. The urban practices made up the shortfall in income by signing on more patients on their list. Digby also lists seven types of non-hospital appointment. These were Poor Law, public vaccinator, medical officer of health, school, police, post office and military. Although Carpenter did not fit any of these categories he was medical attendant to the Archbishops of Canterbury and the East India Cadets at Addiscombe College.

During the late Victorian period, 60% of GPs income came from private fees, 20% from outside appointments and 20% from midwifery cases. Digby shows that
between 1850-1940 the level of fees was remarkably stable. Income from midwifery cases for a working class family could be between 15s - £1 per confinement, and 3 - 10 guineas with affluent families. Friendly Societies paid the doctor between 3-5s per patient for providing annual care.

Digby lists four types of practice, and Carpenter fits into all four categories during the various stages of his career. When Carpenter first started work in Croydon he was single-handed, and worked from home in Dingwall Road, and would have expected to earn under £400 per annum. The second category was ‘standard’ with the doctors earning between £400-£799. He would have fitted this category with Westall in the High Street. A good practice was one in which the doctors earned between £800-£999, and would have applied to Carpenter when he was in partnership with Whitling and Lanchester. A first class practice was one in which the income was £1000 or more per annum. Carpenter would have earned this sum when he was a consulting physician.

Transport costs were an important part of the GPs expenditure and medical expenses. Digby compares two doctors. The first is a Dr Hayle, who used a modest bicycle for visits and in bad weather used a cab. His expenses were 18% and his expenditure 16%. The other GP, a Dr Martin (like Carpenter) had a horse and coach (coachman, stables, hay, etc.). His expenses were higher at 27% and expenditure 25%. We also know that Carpenter gave away 10% of his income to the poor.

Assistants were an important part of General Practice, and the viability of a single-handed practice or partnership was often dependent on low-paid assistants. We know that Carpenter worked as an assistant to Bristowe when he started at Thomas’s. Later, when Carpenter started working with Westall, it is likely he would have been an assistant and would have allowed him to build up enough capital to buy into the
practice. Digby quotes a certain James Hill who thought it necessary to produce testimonials from his teachers at Glasgow University when he applied for an assistantship. Carpenter had fourteen when he applied to work with Westall.

With reference to partnerships, Digby shows that in the 1850s the single-handed practice was the norm, and ‘the shop’ was losing its retail function and becoming a working surgery/dispensary where medicines were dispensed or minor surgery was performed. In Carpenter’s case, we know that in 1852 Carpenter lived in Dingwall Road and practised from home. In 1853 Carpenter joined up with Westall at 53 High Street, Croydon. By the 1870s Digby finds that there were mostly two- or three-doctor partnerships, and in Carpenter’s case he was in partnership with Whitling and Lanchester.

With reference to investigation and research Digby says that most GP’s remain obscure compared to medical pioneers. However, there are exceptions, such as Withering, Jenner, Abercrombie and Budd. The habit of sending a single contribution to the *BMJ* or *Lancet* appears to have become more common from 1850-1900, and was often related to the subject of a MD thesis. In the 1850s 50% GPs had MD, and 30% had MD and publications. However, in 1900 40% had MD and 20% MD and publications. Carpenter had both an MD and numerous contributions to the *BMJ*, *Lancet* and other journals.

Patients were the essential requirement of general practice, and Carpenter had both poor and rich clientele. The working-class patients often only wanted a bottle of medicine whereas the middle and upper classes (Archbishops and gentry) were high-fee paying where a good bedside manner was expected. A leisurely medical history and clinical examination were the norm. Robert Woods conducted a study on medical morbidity and mortality amongst doctors from 1860-1911. He found that doctors
suffered from excess mortality, and that GPs had a worst record compared to physicians and surgeons. We know that Carpenter died at 67yrs of age after a chronic illness.

Digby identifies five types of career in general and specialist medicine. The first is a classic GP with mixed social clientele, and Carpenter fits this type. The next is a GP-surgeon with part time appointment as a hospital surgeon - he does not fit this type. The third is a GP with a specialist interest who was consulted in an expert capacity, and Carpenter fits this category. The fourth is a GP who moved towards being a specialist or consultant. Carpenter gained his MRCP in 1883, and therefore conforms to this type. The fifth group were those doctors who were consultants throughout their careers (FRCP or FRCS) and this does not apply to Carpenter.

In conclusion, Carpenter gets an overall score of 15/17 or 88%. Although this suggests that he conformed to type as a GP, this thesis has shown that he had a wide range of interests and skills, and was ‘atypical’ in many ways. Carpenter is still remembered today - he is listed as a Public Health Expert on the Historical Manuscripts’ Register of Archives. According to Roy M Macleod, Carpenter, who was one of the first graduates of the Cambridge Diploma in Sanitary Science, has become ‘a classic in the field of Public Health.’ 4 The Croydon Review went further and said, “Dr Alfred Carpenter was a man of worldwide fame; he was one of the apostles of sanitary science, and for the last forty years had laboured incessantly in the cause which he took so deep an interest.” 5

---

4 Cited in Medicine and Science in the 1860s, from ‘The Anatomy of State Medicine,’ p.223.
5 Croydon Review, 30 January 1892.
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1883 ‘Medical Bulletins,’ *Lancet,* ii: 778.

1883 ‘Public Health as a Working Man’s Question,’ *BMJ,* ii: 745-6; *TSI,* vol.v, 375-92 (Carpenter was Chairman of Council and Chadwick, Vice President of Sanitary Institute of GB).
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* Spelling given in the BMJ
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1886 Address by Alfred Carpenter, President of Health Section, Croydon Temperance Congress, Croydon, Roffey and Clark, booklet 12pages.

1887 ‘Utilisation of Town Sewage by Irrigation,’ JSA, vol.35, 221-36.


1887 Principles and Practice of School Hygiene, London, J. Hughes.


1887 ‘The Duties of Landowners and Capitalists,’ BMJ, ii, 744.
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1888 ‘Notification of Infectious Diseases,’ BMJ, i: 767.

1888 ‘Compulsory Notification of Infectious Diseases,’ BMJ, i: 877.


1889 ‘Microbic Life in Sewer Air,’ Paper read at Croydon Microscopical Club, 10 April 1889, BMJ, i: 1403-4; also published into 16 page booklet, London, J. Bale and Sons.

1889 ‘Chaos in State Medicine,’ BMJ, i: 859.

1890 ‘Expert evidence,’ BMJ, i: 572.

1890 ‘Sanitation,’ Paper read at the Church Congress, Hull, Sept 1890, 7 page booklet, Derby, Bemrose and Sons.

1890 ‘Address to Conference of Inspectors of Nuisances,’ Brighton Congress of Sanitary Institute, *TSI*, vol ii, 258-61.


1891 ‘Hughes’s Domestic Economy,’ Carpenter wrote a chapter on ‘Preparation of Food for the Sick,’ London, J. Hughes.


1892 ‘The Treatment of Diphtheria with or without Alcohol,’ *National Temperance League Annual*, 1892, 67-70.

1892 ‘Actions in Lunacy Against Medical Men,’ *BMJ*, i: 40.

**Carpenter’s Correspondence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Archive</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Sept 1859</td>
<td>Lord Brougham</td>
<td>University College London</td>
<td>Invitation from Croydon Literary and Scientific Inst to lay foundation stone of new Public Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sept 1869</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1874</td>
<td>Archbishop Tait</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td>Plans for a church in Purley, Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March 1875</td>
<td>Jabez Hogg</td>
<td>Wellcome library</td>
<td>Carpenter accepts invitation to join a deputation to Council (we are not told which organisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 May 1877</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>Invitation to lunch and visit Beddington Sewage Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sept 1877</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>Carpenter’s book and answers to question on sewage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Sept 1877</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 April 1878</td>
<td>Mrs Tait (wife of Archbishop)</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Dec 1878</td>
<td>Archbishop Tait</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Dec 1878</td>
<td>Mr Davidson</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Dec 1878</td>
<td>Mr Davidson</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nov 1879</td>
<td>Rev W. Wilks</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Aug 1881</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Dec 1883</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Dec 1883</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jan 1884</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Sept 1885</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July 1886</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jan 1887</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb 1887</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May 1887</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April 1888</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 1889</td>
<td>Edwin Chadwick</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 October 1889</td>
<td>Sir Peter Eade</td>
<td>Wellcome library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July 1890</td>
<td>Croydon Council</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CARPENTER'S OBITUARIES

Bath Herald
Bedford Observer
Belfast Newsletter
Birmingham Daily Gazette
Blackburn Standard
Brighton Herald
Bristol Mercury
Bristol Times and Mirror
British Medical Journal
Bulletin de la Societe Francaise D'Hygiene
Citizen
Christian Herald
Contract Journal
Croydon Advertiser
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Croydon Guardian
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Croydon Review
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Daily Graphic
Daily News
Daily Telegraph
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British Medical Journal (BMJ)
Concise Dictionary of National Biography (Concise DNB)
Dictionary of National Biography (DNB)
Gray, Commercial and General Directory of Croydon (Gray)
Journal of the Society of Arts (JSA)
Lancet
Medical Directory
St Thomas's Hospital Gazette
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The National Temperance League Annual
The Practitioner (TP)
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Transactions of the Medical Society of London (TMSL)
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Bristol Mercury
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Croydon Chronicle
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The Times
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