Historian Kathryn Olivarius invented the term “immunocapital” to describe the advantages that white residents of New Orleans could get from having immunity to yellow fever. According to Olivarius, New Orleanians could use “immunocapital” to acquire other types of capital – social, cultural, and economic. “Most unacclimated migrants bought into immunocapital and the hierarchy it created, believing that the system would benefit them eventually,” writes Olivarius. Is “immunocapital” a transferable concept? Consider attitudes towards smallpox vaccination in nineteenth-century London. Vaccination was supposed to give life-long immunity to smallpox, yet laws for mandatory vaccination did not win favor among working-class residents of London. Many Londoners opposed the practice of vaccination against smallpox and protested against the Compulsory Vaccination Act of 1853, which made vaccination mandatory for all infants born in England or Wales. Evidently, they did not equate vaccination to “immunocapital.” While Olivarius’s idea of “immunocapital” is not directly transferable, we can borrow from her work to understand resistance to vaccination. How can we do this? We can analyze the motives of anti-vaccinators using the concept of capital – social, cultural, and economic. Your task: Use the concept of capital to explain resistance to vaccination in the nineteenth-century. Drawing from Nadja Durbach’s study of anti-vaccinators, explain why many working-class Londoners worried that compulsory vaccination would diminish their or their child’s capital – social, cultural, and/or economic. Your essay should have 3 sections: In section 1, you should explain the procedure of smallpox vaccination and the Compulsory Vaccination Acts based on Nadja Durbach’s article. In section 2, you should explain the basis for resistance to vaccination in London during the second half of the nineteenth century (the topic of Durbach’s article). Illustrate the arguments of anti-vaccinators with evidence from Durbach’s article and the primary source discussed in class, John Gibb’s Compulsory Vaccination Briefly Considered (London 1856). In section 3, you need to match the criticisms of anti-vaccinators to types of capital. Consider all types of capital – economic, social and cultural. Not all the arguments that anti-vaccinators used fall into these categories, but you should be able to identify at least one criticism that fits each category. For example, you could link criticism of the fine for non-compliance with loss of economic capital. Finally, in the conclusion, you should assess whether the concept of capital explains the roots of resistance to compulsory vaccination or whether it fails to capture the most important reasons for resistance. To address this issue, you will have to decide which motives were the strongest among anti-vaccinators and whether you can capture those motives with the concept of capital. If you wish, you may also compare resistance to vaccination in the nineteenth-century and resistance today to childhood immunization. Relevant readings: Nadja Durbach, “’They Might as Well Brand Us’: Working-Class Resistance to Compulsory Vaccination in Victorian England,” Social History of Medicine 13 no. 1 (2000): 45-62 Kathryn Olivarius, “Immunity, Capital, and Power in Antebellum New Orleans,” American Historical Review (April 2019): 425-455 Supplemental material: Pierre Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” in John Richardson, ed., Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education (New York, 1986), 241-258 John Gibbs, Compulsory Vaccination Briefly Considered (London 1856)