

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

# Plagues and Pandemics *in a Hurry*

From the Black Death to now

---

**Max Brocklesby**

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

# Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page . . . . . 4

Why You Should Care . . . . . 5

The Core Ideas . . . . . 7

How It Actually Works . . . . . 21

What People Get Wrong . . . . . 32

Use It . . . . . 37

Terms . . . . . 42

Go Deeper . . . . . 45

Notes and Sources . . . . . 47

Bibliography . . . . . 52

# The Whole Thing in One Page

A pandemic is usually remembered as a thing that arrived: a black wave, an invisible enemy, a date at which normal life stopped. That picture makes the pathogen the whole story and turns society into scenery. It is incomplete. Microbial biology sets the possibilities; human systems supply many of the routes, concentrations and inequalities through which infection acquires scale. A pandemic is a chain of encounters moving through roads, ships, homes, hospitals, workplaces and aircraft, among people whose immunity, health, power and choices are unequal.

The Black Death makes the pattern hard to miss. Plague moved through a connected world of commerce, war and crowded settlements, then returned for centuries. The route was not one mechanism repeated everywhere, and the relative weight of transmission pathways remains disputed. Europeans did not know about bacteria, yet they learned to watch arrivals, isolate travellers and organise permanent health offices. Formal maritime quarantine emerged from repeated observation before anyone could explain the mechanism. It was crude, coercive and often corrupt. It also proved that a society could alter an epidemic without understanding every link.

The same lesson keeps changing clothes. Smallpox prevention began with the dangerous practice of variolation, became safer with vaccination, and ended in eradication only when a reliable product was joined to case finding, local knowledge and relentless follow-up. Cholera made contaminated water visible through comparisons, maps and death records, then helped force cities to rebuild pipes and sewers. The 1918 influenza pandemic moved with armies and transport networks, struck populations with different immune histories, and killed through a mixture of viral damage and secondary bacterial pneumonia.

HIV exposed how stigma can become a surveillance failure and how patients can change research itself. SARS showed that a new respiratory disease could be contained by rapid detection, isolation and contact tracing. Ebola showed how a technically sound plan can fail when care is feared or

unsafe. COVID-19 put the whole machine under load at once.

Seven ideas hold the history together. Transmission is a chain, not a cloud. Routes determine scale. Novelty exists in relation to a population's previous exposures. Harm follows social structure as well as biology. An outbreak changes once it is counted. Control works through layers matched to the route and timing. Success survives only when people keep paying for the capacity that produced it.

That last idea is the bill. Effective prevention tends to erase its own evidence. The ward that never fills, the infection that never occurs and the outbreak stopped at twelve cases leave little public memory. Staff disperse, laboratories lose funding, stockpiles expire and trust is treated as a message to be improvised during the next emergency. Then a new threat arrives and the old lesson is rediscovered under pressure.

The connected world creates both sides of the contest. Routes carry infection, warnings, samples, treatments and help. Institutions can hide cases or expose them. A pandemic is neither a natural disaster with humans trapped beneath it nor a political invention detached from biology. It is what happens when a biological chain passes through a social system, and what follows depends partly on whether that system can see and break its own links.

That is the book.

## Why You Should Care

In October 1977, Ali Maow Maalin, a hospital cook in Somalia, developed smallpox. He recovered. Search teams followed his contacts, watched for further cases and found none. In 1980 the World Health Assembly certified that naturally circulating smallpox had been eradicated. A disease that had scarred and killed across recorded history had nowhere left to travel.

That achievement is often reduced to a needle. The vaccine mattered, but the last mile was made from people carrying photographs of the rash, investigating rumours, finding patients in settlements omitted from maps,

persuading families to report illness, tracing contacts and placing vaccination around each chain. Smallpox had useful biological features: humans were its only natural reservoir and cases were usually visible. Even so, eradication required a programme capable of finding the final infection rather than celebrating the millionth dose.

This is why the subject matters now. Your risk during an outbreak is shaped by facts you cannot see in the pathogen's name. Does transmission occur before symptoms? Is the dangerous exposure air, water, blood, touch, an insect or several routes at once? Are most infections caused evenly, or do a few settings produce large clusters? How long do reports lag behind events? Who can stay home without losing wages, and who sleeps six to a room? A list of symptoms answers almost none of these questions. A model of the chain does.

That skill matters outside a formally declared emergency. A winter ward, a cluster in a school, a food recall and a mosquito warning all pose the same problem: turn an alarming report into a chain that can be tested. Outbreak thinking resists panic in both directions. It refuses to treat every novel signal as catastrophe, and it refuses to treat a small number as reassurance when infections are multiplying faster than the system can see them. It replaces mood with questions about route, timing, denominator and capacity.

Pandemics also teach you how institutions know things. A case count is not infection made visible without distortion. It is the result of a definition, access to a test, willingness to seek care, a reporting path and a date. A death toll depends on certification and records. During COVID-19, WHO's modelled estimate for 2020 and 2021 found about 14.9 million excess deaths associated with the pandemic, far above the number then reported directly as COVID-19 deaths. The estimate includes indirect effects and uncertainty. Its value is precisely that it asks what the ordinary register missed.

The history is equally useful when arguments become moral. Epidemics invite blame because blame offers a person where a chain should be. Foreigners, minorities, patients, travellers and the poor have repeatedly been treated as sources rather than people inside the same system.

Sometimes conduct raises risk. More often the argument skips the material question: who had the crowded housing, dangerous work, unsafe care, absent sick pay or no route to treatment? Behaviour matters. Constraints decide which behaviour is available.

There are limits to what one hour can do. This is not a clinical guide, a complete history of any single disease or a verdict on every COVID-era policy. The dedicated books on the Black Death, Spanish Flu, viruses, vaccines and immunity own those subjects in depth. Here they appear as comparative tests of one larger question: how does an infection acquire social scale, and how do people take that scale away?

The answer changes what you notice. You stop asking whether one measure worked in the abstract and ask which link it targeted, when, at what cost and under which conditions. You stop treating preparedness as a cupboard of masks and start seeing laboratories, records, relationships, paid leave and trained staff. You stop mistaking the end of alarm for the end of danger.

The pathogens differ. The recurring system is ours.

## The Core Ideas

### **A Pandemic Is a Chain, Not a Cloud**

Disease maps encourage the wrong picture. A colour spreads across countries until the page is full, as though infection were weather. No person catches a shaded region. One host, or something carrying material from that host, has to place a viable pathogen where another susceptible host can acquire it. The route might be inhaled particles, contaminated water, blood, sexual contact, a mosquito bite, direct contact with body fluids or a mixture. Scale is made one successful transfer at a time.

That sounds obvious until policy begins. Measures that interrupt faecal contamination will transform cholera and do little against influenza. Ventilation can reduce shared-air exposure and cannot clean a well.

Isolating people after a visible rash may work powerfully for smallpox because the disease advertises itself. The same strategy weakens when transmission occurs before symptoms or when infections are often unnoticed. The useful first question in an outbreak is therefore not how frightened should we be. It is what has to happen for the agent to pass from one host to the next.

Epidemiologists compress the result into reproduction numbers. The basic reproduction number,  $R_0$ , describes the average number of secondary infections expected from a typical infectious case in a population treated as susceptible, under stated conditions. Above one, sustained growth is possible. Below one, chains tend to shrink. But  $R_0$  is not a serial number stamped on a microbe. It changes with crowding, contact patterns, climate, behaviour, immunity and the model used to estimate it. The effective reproduction number, often written  $R_t$ , asks the same question under current conditions, including existing immunity and control.

Averages hide the shape. Ten infected people might each infect two others. They might instead produce no onward cases except for one person linked to twenty. Those outbreaks share an average and behave differently. Individual biology matters, but so do timing and setting: a person at home after symptoms is not the same transmission opportunity as the same person singing in a crowded room, working on a ward or attending a funeral. Superspreading names an unusually large transmission event or contribution. It should not become a moral label attached to a human being.

Chains also explain the apparent magic of exponential growth. If each generation of infection replaces itself more than once, additions become multiplications. One becomes two, two become four, and the early totals look harmless because every large curve begins near zero. Detection then arrives late. Symptoms may take days, tests take more time, reports are compiled afterwards, and deaths sit further behind infections. By the time a chart looks alarming, much of the next chart has already happened.

Timing can matter as much as the average. The generation interval is the time between one infection and the infections it produces. Two agents with

the same  $R$  can therefore create different emergencies: the one turning generations faster reaches the same total sooner and leaves less time for testing and tracing. Growth rate is produced by reproduction and the clock on which reproduction occurs. A number without its timescale is an incomplete warning.

The chain model keeps uncertainty in its proper place. You may not know the exact value of  $R$ , the share of hidden infection or which event seeded a cluster. You can still ask where transfers are occurring and which links can be altered. That is why people controlled disease before microbes were visible. They could observe sequence without seeing the agent.

A pandemic feels everywhere at once. It never is. It is many local chains connected well enough to become one historical event.

## **Routes Give Infection Scale**

A pathogen does not possess a passport, but it travels through systems built for other purposes. The Black Death moved through a world of caravans, ports, armies, grain stores and ships. Nineteenth-century cholera followed rivers, troop movements, pilgrims, emigrant vessels and the commercial routes of empire. Influenza crossed the world in 1918 inside military mobilisation. SARS reached several countries rapidly through air travel and hospitals. COVID-19 entered a planet that could move a person between major cities within one incubation period.

Connection does not create every outbreak, and isolation is no guarantee of safety. It changes the opportunity structure. A village road, a shipping lane and an international airport differ in speed and reach, while a household, prison, factory, care home and hospital differ in contact intensity. The relevant network is not a neat web in which everyone meets everyone. It has hubs, bottlenecks and communities. An infection can burn through one dense cluster, fail to cross a weak connection, then jump far through a single journey.

Network shape also changes where control earns the most. Protecting a highly connected ward, dormitory, transport hub or household network may

prevent more onward links than distributing equal effort at random. Yet hubs are not permanent properties of people. A nurse becomes highly connected during a shift; a wedding becomes a bridge for one evening. The useful unit is the encounter structure, not a category of dangerous individuals.

Trade has always carried a double charge. It moves food, income, information and medicines, and it creates routes along which infection can travel. Cities that tried to protect themselves from plague faced an argument that has never gone away: stop movement too aggressively and commerce, supply and cooperation suffer; leave movement untouched and importation becomes easier. Quarantine grew in ports because ports sat at that collision. Officials had to distinguish ships, people and goods considered dangerous without possessing a reliable test or a correct theory of transmission.

Routes operate inside institutions too. Hospitals gather susceptible patients, sick people and staff into one building. That makes treatment possible and can make transmission efficient. The 2003 SARS outbreak exposed how an unrecognised respiratory infection could move through wards and then travel with patients, visitors and clinicians. Ebola treatment centres faced a different version of the same problem. Unsafe care could spread infection; safe care had to be trusted enough that families would use it. A hospital is therefore neither inherently protective nor inherently dangerous. Its design, infection control, staffing and relationship with the community determine which function wins.

Movement can explain speed without explaining blame. The first detected traveller may not be the first infection, and the place that reports a threat may not be where it began. Naming diseases after countries, cities or groups rewards concealment by making detection reputationally costly. The history of the so-called Spanish flu is the classic warning. Spain was neutral in the First World War and its press reported openly, while censorship constrained news in belligerent states. Visibility supplied a misleading name.

Border measures belong inside this model, not above it. Screening, testing,

quarantine and temporary restrictions can sometimes delay importation, especially when applied early and tied to domestic preparation. They rarely create a perfect seal. Infections may arrive before rules, pass through exempt routes, escape symptom screening or already be spreading locally. Delay can be precious if it buys beds, tests and vaccination. Delay wasted is merely a later crisis.

The larger lesson is not that globalisation causes pandemics. Human beings have carried disease along connection for millennia. Modern systems alter distance, speed and volume. The route explains how a biological event acquires geography.

## **Novelty Is Relative**

Pandemic stories often begin with a new pathogen entering an unprotected humanity. The useful word is not new. It is unprotected, and protection is never evenly distributed.

A population carries an immune history. Previous infections, vaccination, maternal antibodies, age and related exposures alter how bodies recognise a threat. That history can reduce infection, blunt severe disease or do little at all. It can also differ between birth cohorts. One reason the 1918 influenza pandemic produced an unusual age pattern may be that people born in different periods had first encountered different influenza viruses. Their childhood exposure did not write destiny, but it changed the starting position from which a later H1N1 virus was met.

Novelty also belongs to the pathogen's relationship with people. A virus may be ancient in an animal reservoir and new to sustained human transmission. A familiar family can produce a variant that escapes part of prior protection. A bacterium can reach a population through a changed water system or acquire resistance that makes treatment less dependable. The biological object may change, the human population may change, or the contact between them may change. Calling all three emergence can hide the mechanism.

A cross-species infection is still not a pandemic. Spillover requires

ecological exposure, a dose that reaches a person and compatibility within that host. Sustained spread requires another achievement: enough onward transmission among people to escape repeated dead ends. Changes in animal infection, farming, land use, wildlife contact, vector ecology or behaviour can alter one or more barriers, but none is a universal origin story. Upstream prevention asks where exposure can be reduced before the first durable human chain. Outbreak control begins when that chain can already replace itself.

The susceptible population is therefore not a blank sheet. Older people may carry useful memory against one strain and face greater physiological risk from another. Infants may be protected briefly by maternal antibodies yet unable to respond strongly to some vaccines at the same age. Pregnancy can change risk. Malnutrition, immune suppression, chronic illness and previous treatment alter consequences. Even when infection risk is similar, the probability of severe disease is not.

Susceptibility and vulnerability must stay separate. A person may be easy to infect yet unlikely to become severely ill, or relatively protected from infection but at high risk if protection fails. Vaccines, prior infection and treatments can alter these stages differently. That is why an intervention may barely change a case curve yet sharply reduce hospital admissions, and why counting infections alone can misdescribe what immunity has achieved.

This destroys the idea that every pandemic follows one natural wave pattern. A wave is a rise and fall in observed disease, not a biological appointment. It can be shaped by depletion of susceptible people, changing behaviour, school terms, weather, intervention, reporting, variant replacement or several forces at once. The second rise of 1918 influenza was not a template waiting for every later pathogen. COVID-19 produced different timings across places because introductions, immunity, policy and variants differed.

The same distinction matters after vaccination or widespread infection. Population immunity is not a switch that flips from absent to present.

Protection can be stronger against severe disease than against infection. It can wane. New births add susceptible people. Unequal access leaves pockets. A threshold calculated from a simplified model may be useful, but it does not promise a permanent wall. Real contact networks are uneven and immunity is imperfect.

Evolution adds another trap. Natural selection does not reward kindness. It favours variants that leave more descendants under prevailing conditions. Severe disease may reduce transmission if it immobilises or kills a host before onward spread. It may impose little penalty when transmission occurs early, when a vector moves the pathogen, or when severity is a later by-product. Virulence can rise, fall or move irregularly. Human immunity and treatment can also make a disease appear milder without the pathogen having evolved towards mercy.

Pandemic novelty is thus relational. The right unit is pathogen plus population plus moment. Change any part and the same named disease can produce a different epidemic.

## **The Same Epidemic Is Unequal**

A pathogen can be biologically indifferent and socially selective. It does not need prejudice to reproduce the shape of a society.

Exposure follows work, housing and care. Someone who can work in a private room, take paid leave and order food has a different set of options from someone paid by the shift, travelling on crowded transport and sharing a bedroom. A care worker can carry risk between institutions because the labour market assigns several workplaces, not because the worker cares less. A family may delay reporting illness when isolation means hunger, lost immigration status or separation without safe care. Advice aimed at an imaginary person with money, space and control becomes blame when applied to everyone else.

Feedback makes inequality self-reinforcing. An outbreak removes staff from already thin services, closes informal care, interrupts treatment and drains household income. Those effects then increase vulnerability to the same

pathogen and to other illnesses. The epidemic is no longer one infection moving through a fixed society; it is changing the conditions through which its next generation will move. Indirect harm belongs inside the causal map.

Consequences follow another unequal path. Baseline health, age, nutrition and access to treatment change the chance that infection becomes severe. Health services can absorb a surge in one place and collapse under the same number of cases elsewhere. Oxygen, antibiotics, protective equipment, trained staff and transport to care sit between pathogen and death. An epidemic's apparent lethality can therefore reflect clinical capacity as well as biology, while a national average can conceal districts where that capacity barely exists.

Counting follows power too. People who reach a clinic and fit a case definition enter the record. Those who die at home, live beyond surveillance, fear authorities or carry symptoms excluded from the definition may not. During the early AIDS epidemic, categories shaped who was recognised as a person with AIDS and who qualified for services. Activists fought over the definition because classification was not clerical housekeeping. It allocated care and made some suffering legible.

Control can intensify inequality. Plague regulations protected cities while exposing guards, port labourers and confined families. Colonial administrations often combined useful disease control with racial hierarchy, coercive inspection and forced movement. During epidemics, officials have repeatedly treated poor districts or minority populations as reservoirs to be disciplined while ignoring the infrastructure that concentrated risk. A technically relevant measure can still be applied unjustly, and unjust application can destroy cooperation needed for the measure to work.

This does not mean every disparity is caused by discrimination, or that biology is irrelevant. Age-specific risk during influenza, for example, cannot be reduced to class. Nor does identifying structure erase individual agency. People make choices, sometimes reckless ones. The error lies in comparing conduct without comparing the available menu. Public health works on populations, and populations live inside material limits.

The distribution of protection makes the same case. A vaccine vial in a national warehouse is not immunity. It must reach a person at the right time, remain potent, be given safely and be accepted. Treatments require diagnosis, supply, prescribing and adherence. During COVID-19, countries with early access to vaccines could protect high-risk groups while many others waited. The biological technology was shared in name and unequal in use.

An epidemic is often described as a common enemy because the phrase encourages solidarity. It is only half true. People may face the same pathogen while carrying different exposure, vulnerability, protection and political voice. The unequal pattern is not an unfortunate detail laid over the outbreak. It is part of how the outbreak operates.

## **Seeing the Outbreak Changes It**

An epidemic begins before it has a name. The first public event is usually not the first infection but the first pattern that somebody recognises.

Recognition requires a system. A clinician notices unusual pneumonia. A laboratory finds an unexpected organism. A death registrar records an excess. A school reports absences. A community health worker hears the same rumour in several households. None of these observations is self-interpreting. Somebody has to decide what counts as a case, connect reports across place and time, test alternatives and communicate the finding without waiting for certainty that may arrive too late.

A case definition is a tool for consistency, not a timeless description of nature. It may combine symptoms, laboratory evidence, exposure, place and date. Early definitions are often narrow to avoid false alarms, then widen as knowledge and testing improve. That changes the count. A sudden rise may reflect transmission, expanded testing, a changed definition or reporting of a backlog. A fall may reflect control, exhausted testing or delayed data. The line on the chart is an observation produced by machinery.

Every surveillance system has an ascertainment fraction: the share of all

infections or illnesses that enters the chosen count. It is rarely known exactly and can change during the outbreak. When home tests replace laboratory tests, or eligibility narrows, confirmed cases may fall while transmission does not. The safest comparison asks whether definition, access and reporting remained sufficiently stable for the line to mean what it appears to mean.

John Snow's cholera work shows what this meant before bacteriology. He did not see *Vibrio cholerae*. He compared who drank which water. During the 1854 Broad Street outbreak he interviewed families, examined local exceptions and mapped deaths around a pump. His stronger London-wide evidence exploited a natural comparison between households supplied by water companies drawing from differently contaminated parts of the Thames. The achievement was not a pretty map discovering a dot. It was turning exposure into a testable difference.

Modern surveillance adds laboratories, electronic reports, genetic sequences and wastewater sampling. Sequencing can connect cases, distinguish repeated importation from local spread and track pathogen change. Wastewater can reveal community circulation without depending on each infected person seeking a test. Neither abolishes inference. Samples come from somewhere, coverage is uneven, and a genetic family tree does not identify every direction of transmission or private encounter.

Death counts reveal the same limits. A reported disease death depends on testing, diagnosis and certification. Excess mortality compares observed all-cause deaths with the number expected under a counterfactual baseline. It can capture missed direct deaths and indirect effects such as disrupted care, while also depending on model choices and record quality. WHO's modelled excess-mortality estimate for 2020 and 2021 was therefore a measure of total pandemic impact, not a corrected list of laboratory-confirmed victims.

Surveillance changes behaviour once it works. A detected cluster can be isolated. Contacts can be warned. Hospitals can alter infection control. A contaminated water source can be closed. A variant can prompt new study

or vaccine planning. This makes observation one of the interventions, not merely an account written after the event.

It also creates incentives to hide. Reporting may threaten trade, travel, reputation or political careers. Punishing the place that detects a danger teaches the next place to delay. A global surveillance system therefore depends on trust and reciprocal benefit as much as technical capacity.

The outbreak you can see is already different from the one you cannot. Making it legible is the first break in the chain.

## **Control Works in Layers**

There is no universal anti-pandemic measure because there is no universal transmission chain. Control begins by matching a tool to a link.

For waterborne cholera, safe water, sewage separation and rapid rehydration change the outcome. For mosquito-borne infection, vector control and protection from bites matter. For respiratory spread, ventilation, filtration, reducing crowded exposure, well-fitted masks in relevant settings and staying away from others while infectious can each reduce opportunities. For Ebola, safe clinical care, protective equipment, tracing, isolation, dignified burial practice and vaccination where suitable operate together. The list is not a menu to apply wholesale. It is a demand to specify route, setting and timing.

Order matters as much as variety. Preventing exposure at source can protect people who never make an individual choice; relying on personal equipment places more burden on each person and each encounter. In practice, source control, environmental change, organisational rules and personal protection overlap. The hierarchy is not absolute, but it forces a useful question: has the system reduced the hazard, or handed everyone a rule for surviving it?

Isolation and quarantine are often confused. Isolation separates people known or believed to be infected from others. Quarantine restricts people who may have been exposed while waiting to see whether they become ill

or infectious. The distinction matters because quarantine imposes costs on people who may never develop disease. Its value depends on incubation, the timing of infectiousness, the reliability of exposure information and whether support makes compliance possible. A rule that leaves a family without food is both harsh and badly engineered.

Vaccination acts on the host side of the chain, but its effect depends on the product and programme. Some vaccines prevent much infection and onward transmission; others protect more strongly against severe disease. Coverage, timing, cold chains, doses, confidence and access determine the population result. Smallpox eradication succeeded because a visible disease with no non-human reservoir met an effective vaccine and a search-and-containment system. Copying the slogan while changing those conditions does not copy the outcome.

Treatment can alter transmission as well as suffering. Effective antiretroviral therapy suppresses HIV, protects health and can prevent sexual transmission when viral suppression is maintained. Antibiotics transformed the prospects of bacterial complications that had made influenza more lethal in 1918, while resistance now threatens that protection. Clinical care also affects trust. People report earlier when a treatment centre offers a chance of recovery rather than removal into an institution they fear.

Contact tracing is a race against the generation interval. Find an infected person, identify relevant contacts, warn or test them, and interrupt onward spread before the next links form. It worked powerfully against SARS because many transmissions could be found after symptoms and chains were sufficiently traceable. It performs worse when transmission is rapid, largely presymptomatic, highly dispersed or already widespread. Digital tools can increase speed and create privacy costs; they cannot repair missing tests, unwilling participation or an overwhelmed workforce.

Layers matter because each tool leaks. Tests miss infections or arrive late. Masks fit badly. Vaccines are not perfect. People cannot always isolate. Ventilation varies by building. A single failure should not decide the outcome when other layers remain. Nor does the existence of several partial

protections prove that every added restriction is proportionate. Benefits, harms, feasibility and distribution still need judgement.

The cleanest historical victories often look like one invention because memory prefers an object: Jenner's lancet, Snow's pump, a vaccine vial. In practice the object entered a system of records, labour, law, logistics and consent. A product can be manufactured. Protection has to be organised.

## **Success Must Be Maintained**

Public health has a publicity problem. A bridge can be photographed. Prevention is an empty bed.

When control works, the visible threat recedes and the supporting system begins to look excessive. Laboratories process fewer urgent samples. Tracing teams seem idle. Emergency stockpiles expire. Experienced staff leave. Budgets move towards needs that can display present suffering. This is understandable. It is also how the capacity to stop a small outbreak is converted into the need to fight a large one.

Preparedness is difficult to evaluate because its output is a counterfactual. A laboratory that detects an outbreak on day two looks expensive until the alternative is day twenty. A stockpile looks wasteful until supply collapses. This does not make every preparedness budget wise. It means evaluation must test readiness, rotation, staffing and decision rights before crisis, rather than waiting for a disaster to prove what was missing.

Eradication is the rare exception that ends transmission everywhere. Smallpox remains the only human infectious disease eradicated globally. Elimination means reducing transmission to zero in a defined area, with continuing measures needed against reintroduction. Control means lowering disease to an accepted level. These are different promises. Calling a disease endemic says something about its established pattern in a place, not that it is harmless or that no work remains.

Maintenance operates at several scales. A clinic needs trained staff and infection control. A country needs laboratories, reporting, surge plans, paid

people who can investigate cases and supply systems that rotate stock rather than discover unusable equipment in a crisis. Internationally, countries need incentives to share information and samples, and credible routes by which diagnostics, treatments and vaccines will return. A system that asks one state to reveal a dangerous pathogen while leaving it last in the queue for countermeasures is unstable by design.

SARS produced reforms because the weakness was visible. The International Health Regulations were extensively revised in 2005, moving beyond a short list of named diseases towards events that might constitute an international public-health emergency. COVID-19 then exposed gaps in national capacity, notification, supply, coordination and equitable access. Further IHR amendments entered into force for 182 States Parties on 19 September 2025. WHO Member States also adopted a Pandemic Agreement in May 2025, but its Pathogen Access and Benefit-Sharing annex was still under negotiation on 4 September 2026. Adoption created a framework. It did not complete the operating system.

Trust belongs on the maintenance ledger. It cannot be ordered into existence at a press conference. It accumulates through competent routine care, honest admission of uncertainty, fair treatment, visible correction and relationships with communities before a crisis. Communication is not a polish applied to policy. People need enough reason to report symptoms, accept care, follow advice and believe that burdens are shared. Coercion can sometimes be justified, but force spends trust quickly and can make surveillance blind.

The causal loop now closes. An epidemic is a chain, and chains can be broken. Yet the ability to find and break them rests on institutions whose value is hardest to see when they are succeeding. The same networks that move people and pathogens can move warnings, samples, staff and protection. Connection creates vulnerability and the means of response.

Preparedness is therefore not a prediction about which microbe comes next. It is a decision to preserve options: see early, learn quickly, protect workers, support isolation, treat patients, manufacture at scale and share enough

benefit that reporting remains rational. The next outbreak will violate part of the plan. Capacity is what lets the plan change before the chain outruns it.

## How It Actually Works

In October 1347, ships reached Messina in Sicily carrying an epidemic whose main wave would tear through much of Europe, North Africa and western Asia. People saw fever, swellings and sudden death. They did not see *Yersinia pestis*, and the relative importance of animal reservoirs, fleas and human transmission remains disputed across places and forms of plague. They had no laboratory, no agreed case definition and no national health service waiting behind the harbour wall. They had routes, repeated experience and governments afraid of what the next ship might contain.

### The pestilence and the waiting island

The Black Death did not create organised disease control in one stroke. Its recurrences made administration permanent. Cities watched one another, demanded bills of health, regulated burials, inspected travellers and created boards able to act when plague was reported elsewhere. In 1377 the Adriatic republic of Ragusa, now Dubrovnik, ordered people arriving from infected places to spend thirty days at designated sites before entering. The period later became forty days, from which quarantine takes its name.

The practice mixed observation, commerce and coercion. Separating arrivals sometimes interrupted transmission even though officials misunderstood the route. It also stranded healthy people, invited bribery, diverted trade and punished groups already treated as suspect. Lazarettos, health passes and cordons became part of a state apparatus that could protect and persecute with the same paperwork.

The important change was institutional. Epidemic response moved beyond prayer, flight and emergency burial towards continuous intelligence about disease in other places. A port had to know what was happening along its routes. Some of Europe's earliest enduring public-health networks were built because merchants wanted connection without accepting every danger

connection brought.

## **A scar used as a shield**

Smallpox supplied a different route to prevention. Long before vaccination, communities in parts of Asia, Africa and the Ottoman world practised forms of variolation: introducing material from a smallpox case into a healthy person in the hope of producing a controlled infection and later protection. The method could work, and it could cause severe disease or start an outbreak. It was a calculated exposure to the danger itself.

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu observed Ottoman practice and promoted inoculation in Britain in the early eighteenth century. Adoption was neither a clean march of science nor a European discovery of protection. Knowledge crossed cultures, was tested through unequal social arrangements and remained contested because the risk was real.

Edward Jenner's 1796 experiment used material associated with cowpox to inoculate eight-year-old James Phipps, then deliberately exposed the boy to smallpox material. Phipps did not develop smallpox. Jenner published an expanded account in 1798 and campaigned for the safer method. The experiment helped establish vaccination, though the challenge would fail modern ethical standards and others had noticed or used cowpox protection before him.

The decisive achievement came much later. Vaccination could suppress smallpox, yet uneven delivery left chains alive. WHO began a global programme in 1959 and intensified it in 1967 with better vaccine, the bifurcated needle, stronger surveillance and concentrated containment. Search teams investigated rumours and displayed recognition cards. A found case triggered isolation, tracing and vaccination around the chain. Ali Maow Maalin's infection in Somalia in 1977 became the last known naturally acquired case. Certification followed in 1980.

The campaign worked because biology and organisation aligned. Humans were the only natural reservoir, disease was usually recognisable, infectiousness followed a pattern that made tracing useful, and vaccination

was effective. Eradication was not proof that determination can remove any pathogen. It was proof that an exact chain can be ended when its conditions permit and the programme reaches the final link.

## **The water beneath the city**

Cholera turned the nineteenth-century city into an epidemiological instrument. Beginning in 1817, successive pandemics spread from South Asia along military, commercial and pilgrimage routes. Infected people could lose fluid with terrifying speed. European governments responded with quarantine and international sanitary conferences while physicians argued over contagion, atmosphere, filth and individual predisposition.

John Snow believed cholera was transmitted through material swallowed in contaminated water. During the 1854 outbreak around Broad Street in Soho, he gathered addresses, interviewed households and investigated exceptions. A workhouse with its own water and brewery workers who drank little from the public supply helped sharpen the pattern. Local governors removed the pump handle. By then the outbreak was already declining, so the act cannot carry the later legend placed upon it.

Snow's deeper evidence lay beyond one pump. Parts of south London were supplied by competing companies whose pipes crossed the same districts. One company had moved its intake upstream to cleaner water while another continued drawing from a polluted reach. Comparing deaths among their customers gave Snow something close to a natural experiment: households living near one another but receiving different exposure. The water source predicted cholera risk more convincingly than smell or neighbourhood alone.

Filippo Pacini described the cholera organism in 1854, but his work gained little immediate authority. Robert Koch identified and cultivated the comma-shaped bacterium during investigations in Egypt and India in 1883 and 1884. Germ-based explanation strengthened. Yet sanitation did not wait for final microbiological agreement. Cities built sewers, protected water supplies and improved waste removal for several reasons, including miasmatic fears. A mistaken theory could support a useful intervention when

it targeted the same contaminated environment.

Cholera exposed the political economy beneath disease. Clean water requires pipes, treatment, maintenance and institutions able to organise them, not advice to individuals. Places that acquired those systems pushed cholera out. Places denied them remained vulnerable. The organism did not become a disease of poverty through preference. Infrastructure sorted where faecal contamination could reach a mouth.

## **Microbes under empire**

Late nineteenth-century bacteriology made pathogens visible at the same time imperial states expanded their power to classify and move people. The third plague pandemic, conventionally dated from the late nineteenth century, spread widely from southern China through port networks. Alexandre Yersin identified the plague bacillus in Hong Kong in 1894. Investigators then established the central role of rat fleas in much bubonic plague transmission.

Better mechanism did not guarantee better government. Colonial and municipal responses included surveillance, sanitation and laboratory work, but also forced entry, segregation, property destruction and racialised quarantine. In Honolulu in 1900, a controlled burn intended to destroy a plague-infected building escaped and consumed much of Chinatown. In San Francisco, officials initially directed restrictions at Chinatown while political and commercial pressure distorted acknowledgement of plague.

The episode breaks any easy division between ignorant cruelty and enlightened science. Accurate bacteriology could sit inside unequal institutions. Communities resisting officials were not necessarily rejecting medicine; they could be responding to previous humiliation, lost property or dangerous treatment. Public health gained sharper tools without losing the old temptation to turn a population into the problem.

## War's influenza

In 1918 an influenza A(H1N1) virus entered a world moving millions of soldiers and labourers through camps, ships, railways and hospitals. The war did not create the virus. Mobilisation gave it extraordinary routes, while censorship and military priorities shaped what was reported. Neutral Spain's freer press helped attach the country's name to a pandemic that did not begin there.

The pandemic came in uneven waves. A comparatively mild spring rise was followed in many places by a devastating autumn wave, then further recurrence. This pattern has become a story template, but it was produced by changing virus, movement, population immunity, season, behaviour and control. Different places experienced different timing and severity.

Global mortality remains uncertain because registration was incomplete and colonial records were especially weak. One widely cited historical reconstruction estimated roughly fifty million deaths, while warning that even this could be low. The age pattern was unusual, with severe mortality among many young adults as well as the youngest and older groups. Immune histories may help explain part of it, but no single mechanism accounts for every population.

Autopsy evidence adds a practical lesson. Much mortality probably resulted from secondary bacterial pneumonia following influenza damage. Physicians had no influenza vaccine, no antiviral treatment and no antibiotics for those infections. They used isolation, masks, gathering restrictions, nursing and improvised hospitals with inconsistent timing and compliance. The same viral pandemic would meet a different clinical world after antibiotics and intensive care, though neither removes the need to prevent overload.

## **A world health system**

After the Second World War, outbreak control acquired a standing international institution. WHO's constitution came into force in 1948. Member States adopted International Sanitary Regulations in 1951, consolidating a century of attempts to control cross-border disease while limiting needless obstruction of trade. Renamed the International Health Regulations in 1969, the rules initially centred on a small named set of diseases.

The period encouraged confidence. Antibiotics transformed bacterial treatment. Vaccination expanded. Smallpox disappeared. Surveillance networks improved. Yet infectious disease did not leave history. Influenza pandemics occurred in 1957 and 1968. Cholera's seventh pandemic began in 1961. Ebola was recognised in 1976. New pathogens emerged, old ones entered changed environments, and drug resistance grew inside the success of treatment.

Influenza kept testing the machinery. The H2N2 pandemic of 1957 and the H3N2 pandemic of 1968 arose from viruses carrying antigenic combinations new to many people. Laboratories could identify strains, surveillance could compare countries, and manufacturers could update vaccines, yet production still ran behind the first transmission. These pandemics were less socially dislocating than 1918, which made them easy to compress into footnotes. They established the modern race: turn a newly characterised virus into a manufactured countermeasure while the epidemic clock is already running.

## **The epidemic that patients made visible**

On 5 June 1981, the US Centers for Disease Control published a brief report about five young gay men in Los Angeles with a rare pneumonia. Two had died. The report marks an early moment of recognition, not the origin of HIV. The virus had circulated for years and was already present in several populations and countries. What changed was that an unusual pattern entered a surveillance channel.

The response showed how categories can injure. Early talk of a disease confined to gay men, Haitians, haemophiliacs and heroin users confused identity with route. Stigma discouraged testing, justified neglect and made people outside named groups appear safe. Women could become seriously ill while case definitions failed to capture conditions common in them, limiting recognition and access to benefits.

People with AIDS and affected communities did not wait to become passive subjects of research. Activists developed safer-sex information, built care networks, demanded faster and more inclusive trials, challenged drug prices and fought to change definitions. ACT UP's confrontational campaigns altered relations among patients, regulators and researchers. The result was not activists defeating science. It was people carrying urgent knowledge about risk, tolerable uncertainty and lived outcomes into scientific institutions.

Identifying HIV and developing antiretroviral drugs took sustained laboratory and clinical work. From 1996, effective combination therapy sharply reduced illness and death where it was available. Treatment also became prevention because sustained viral suppression prevents sexual transmission. Yet access divided the history. A transformable infection remained lethal where diagnosis, drugs, funding and care were absent. HIV made the programme-product distinction impossible to ignore.

The post-war system had improved surveillance without solving the weakness of a named disease list. A system designed to await official notification of recognised threats could be slow when the danger was unknown, politically embarrassing or outside the list. SARS would force the rules to follow events rather than labels.

## **SARS and the revised rules**

Severe acute respiratory syndrome emerged in southern China in late 2002 and moved through hospitals and air routes before a coordinated warning took shape. In 2003 more than eight thousand probable cases and 774 deaths were reported worldwide. The totals were small beside later COVID-19, but the outbreak frightened governments because a new coronavirus had crossed borders rapidly and infected health workers.

SARS was contained. Prompt detection, isolation, infection control, tracing and quarantine reduced onward spread until chains ended. Several biological and epidemiological features helped, including the greater usefulness of symptom-based detection than would later be possible for SARS-CoV-2. Containment was an achievement under favourable conditions, not proof that every respiratory coronavirus could be handled the same way.

The reporting failures and international scramble accelerated revision of the International Health Regulations. Adopted in 2005, the revised rules covered events that might constitute a public-health emergency of international concern rather than waiting for one of a few named diseases. States accepted duties to build core capacities and notify WHO, though legal commitment did not ensure equal resources or compliance.

## **The influenza plan meets the clock**

The influenza race surfaced again in 2009. A novel H1N1 virus was detected in North America in April and spread rapidly; WHO declared an influenza pandemic in June after international spread was clear. The label described geography, but many heard a prediction of extreme severity. Most infections were mild, yet the burden was not trivial and fell unusually on younger people. Laboratory-confirmed deaths captured only a fraction of the estimated total. A matched vaccine was produced, but in the United States large quantities arrived after the main autumn peak. Scientists could identify the virus and build a vaccine within months, while manufacturing and delivery still moved more slowly than a respiratory chain. The virus then joined seasonal influenza rather than vanishing when the pandemic phase ended.

Pandemic planning around influenza shaped stockpiles, exercises and assumptions later carried into COVID-19. Some transferred well, including laboratory networks and vaccine-production experience. Others did not, especially plans built around symptoms and transmission patterns unlike those of SARS-CoV-2. Preparedness preserved options. It did not supply a script.

## **Ebola and the missing trust**

West Africa's Ebola epidemic from 2014 to 2016 tested the gap between international duties and local capacity. Earlier Ebola outbreaks had often occurred in more remote settings and been stopped through tracing and isolation. In Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, delayed recognition met porous borders, urban movement, fragile health systems and distrust shaped by history. Health workers became infected. Ordinary care collapsed. Fear of treatment centres and changes to burial practice could not be solved by issuing clearer orders.

Control improved as laboratories, treatment capacity, tracing, safe and dignified burials, social mobilisation and community knowledge were joined. Local responders understood family links and language that outside teams

did not. The epidemic demonstrated that community engagement is not a courtesy added after the technical plan. It is one of the mechanisms by which cases are reported, contacts found and safe care accepted.

## **COVID-19 and the unfinished settlement**

At the end of 2019, reports of pneumonia of unknown cause in Wuhan entered the international system. WHO declared a public-health emergency of international concern on 30 January 2020 and characterised COVID-19 as a pandemic on 11 March. By then, multiple countries had sustained transmission. The interval became a permanent argument about warning, evidence and speed.

SARS-CoV-2 combined traits that made classic containment hard: respiratory spread, transmission before or without recognised symptoms, rapid international movement and populations with little initial immunity. Testing, isolation and tracing worked best before incidence overwhelmed capacity. Ventilation, masks, reduced contact, vaccines and treatment each altered different links or consequences. Their effects varied with timing, design, adherence, population and variant. No intervention can be judged honestly without those conditions.

The pandemic also exposed the measurement machine. Reported cases followed access to tests and changing policy. Certified deaths missed people and differed across countries. For 2020 and 2021, WHO estimated an all-cause mortality excess of about 14.9 million associated with the pandemic, including direct and indirect effects, with uncertainty around the model. The gap from reported deaths was evidence about health systems and records as well as disease.

Vaccines arrived at extraordinary speed, then moved through an unequal world. Rich states secured early supply while many health workers and older people elsewhere waited. Hospitals learned, treatments improved and population immunity accumulated through vaccination and infection. On 5 May 2023 the WHO Director-General accepted advice to close the COVID-19 public-health emergency of international concern, while warning

that the virus remained a global health threat. An emergency classification had ended. Transmission had not.

Countries responded to the wider failure by amending the International Health Regulations and negotiating a Pandemic Agreement. The Agreement was adopted in May 2025. On 4 September 2026, its Pathogen Access and Benefit-Sharing annex remained unfinished, with the next formal negotiating meeting scheduled for 14 to 18 September. The Agreement had therefore not opened for signature and ratification. The legal architecture reflected the central dispute COVID-19 had made visible: the world wants rapid access to information about threats, while countries want a fair claim on the products made from what they share.

That is where the history reaches the present. The technical capacity to detect, sequence, vaccinate and treat has never been greater. Its distribution, maintenance and legitimacy remain the difficult parts.

## **How we know**

Pandemic history is assembled from evidence that changes with the period. Medieval chronicles, wills, tax records, cemeteries and pathogen DNA illuminate the Black Death but do not produce one complete mortality register. Port laws document quarantine more securely than they show whether every rule was obeyed. Nineteenth-century civil registration, newspapers, hospital records and investigations such as Snow's permit stronger comparison, while leaving poorer and colonised populations undercounted.

Twentieth-century surveillance adds case reports, laboratory confirmation, trials and international statistics, yet definitions and coverage still shift. The first recognised case is seldom the first infection. Reported deaths cannot be compared across places without checking testing and certification. Excess mortality widens the view but relies on a counterfactual baseline. Genetic sequences show relationships among samples, not every human encounter.

Named turning points are easiest to preserve and easiest to exaggerate.

Jenner, Snow and the SARS alert mattered. Each depended on prior knowledge, institutions and unrecorded labour. This account therefore treats exact totals as estimates where the archive requires it and uses the best-observed outbreaks to explain mechanisms, not to claim that every population experienced the same event.

## What People Get Wrong

### **"Pandemic means exceptionally deadly"**

There is no single timeless operational definition for every pathogen, but ordinary epidemiological use centres on extensive geographic spread and sustained transmission, not a fixed fatality threshold. A widespread infection can be called a pandemic while causing a low risk of death for most infected people. A devastating local epidemic can remain geographically limited and never become one.

The confusion became politically charged during the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic, when critics treated the label as a claim that catastrophe was certain. Pandemic phases then focused mainly on international spread, while severity had to be assessed separately. The two questions belong together in decisions and apart in language.

Severity itself needs a denominator. Deaths among diagnosed cases, deaths among all estimated infections and deaths in the whole population answer different questions. Age, treatment and health-system capacity shift each measure. Calling something a pandemic tells you that transmission has acquired wide geography. It does not tell you, by itself, how frightened an individual should be or how strong a response should become.

The label can still matter operationally. Wide spread changes supply, staffing, coordination and the chance that local control will be repeatedly challenged by importation. Geography and severity are separate dimensions, not competing descriptions. Good communication reports both, then updates each as evidence changes.

## **"Every pandemic has a natural second wave"**

The familiar picture comes largely from 1918: a spring rise, a far deadlier autumn wave and later recurrence. It has been copied into a rule that pathogens are expected to return on schedule, sometimes after mutating into a harsher form.

A wave is a pattern in observed disease. It can be produced by new introductions, season, school and work patterns, changing behaviour, intervention, waning protection, variant replacement, reporting or susceptible people becoming concentrated in different groups. Several causes can operate at once. Places facing the same pathogen may show different curves.

This matters because wave language can encourage passivity. A rise described as natural may be treated as unavoidable; a fall may be mistaken for permanent safety. Curves do not arrive with labels explaining their cause. The work is to identify what changed in transmission, susceptibility, observation or control. History supplies examples, not a timetable.

The word can also hide scale. A national curve may contain local outbreaks rising and falling at different times, while a smooth global line may be the sum of epidemics that never moved together. Before explaining a wave, decide which population, place, outcome and reporting system produced it.

## **"People before germ theory could do nothing"**

They could not see bacteria or viruses, and many explanations were wrong. That did not make observation useless. Communities noticed that contact, clothing, ships, water, insects, places or seasons could be associated with disease, though they often combined sound patterns with superstition and blame.

Ragusa's 1377 isolation rule preceded bacteriology by five centuries. Variolation used acquired protection before immune mechanisms were known. Sanitary reform improved some cities while miasma remained influential. A measure can hit part of the correct chain for the wrong stated

reason.

The correction is not that pre-modern medicine secretly understood infection. Quarantine was leaky and coercive. Variolation carried real danger. Filth theories often targeted poor people instead of water systems. The useful distinction is between knowing the agent and altering exposure. Mechanism makes control more precise, but repeated experience can reveal a breakable link before theory catches up.

The older measures also remind us that usefulness and justification are different questions. A cordon might reduce movement and still be imposed selectively, maintained after its benefit faded or enforced without food and care. Historical credit for partial control should not be converted into approval of every burden used in its name.

## **"A closed border can seal a country"**

Borders can change epidemic timing. Early testing, quarantine or temporary limits may reduce introductions and buy time. The strongest versions of the claim go further: close the frontier and infection stays outside.

Real borders contain citizens returning, freight, crews, diplomats, informal crossings and political exemptions. Symptom screening misses infection before symptoms and infections that never become obvious. Rules may begin after importation or after local transmission is established. Long closures also impose economic, social and medical costs that can weaken response elsewhere.

The opposite slogan, that travel measures never work, is too broad as well. Evidence from COVID-19 suggests some measures delayed spread under selected conditions but were insufficient alone. Delay has value only when used. A country that converts weeks into testing, hospital capacity, communication and vaccination planning has purchased an advantage. A country that merely celebrates the closed gate has purchased time and thrown it away.

Border policy is especially vulnerable to theatre because the checkpoint is

visible and domestic transmission is not. A dramatic restriction may signal action while quieter work on hospitals, ventilation, testing and paid isolation receives less attention. The correct comparison includes what the border measure displaced as well as what it delayed.

## **"John Snow ended cholera by removing one pump handle"**

The handle is perfect history: one doctor, one map, one decisive object. It compresses a difficult argument into a gesture and gives epidemiology a clean birth scene.

Snow did persuade local governors to disable the Broad Street pump during the 1854 Soho outbreak. He had interviewed residents, examined exceptions and connected deaths with water use. Yet cases were already falling, partly because people had left. Removing the handle did not provide a controlled demonstration that ended cholera in London.

His stronger work compared customers of water companies supplying neighbouring households from differently polluted parts of the Thames. That design separated water exposure from much of the surrounding environment. Nor was Snow alone: local residents, registrars, investigators and earlier mapping traditions supplied the evidence he used. The correction matters because public health advances through comparisons and systems, not because a heroic object carries causal proof.

The legend survives because it gives reform a moment and a protagonist. Sewer finance, registration law, water-company records and household investigation are harder to paint on a classroom wall. Yet those duller structures are the transferable part. The handle mattered as an action under uncertainty; it did not substitute for the evidence around it.

## **"Pathogens inevitably evolve to become milder"**

Killing or immobilising a host can reduce opportunities for onward spread, so lower virulence may sometimes be favoured. The mistake is converting one possible trade-off into an evolutionary law.

Selection favours successful transmission under the conditions present. If spread occurs before severe illness, if a vector carries the agent, if hosts remain mobile or if severity is an accidental consequence of replication, there may be little reward for mildness. Immunity, treatment and the age profile of infected people can also lower observed severity without any helpful genetic change in the pathogen.

Virulence can move down, up or sideways. Even the word hides several outcomes: symptoms, hospitalisation, long-term damage and death may change differently. Planning around inevitable domestication is therefore hope presented as biology. The safer assumption is that evolution has no obligation to solve the human problem.

The same error can run backwards. A more transmissible variant is not automatically more severe, and a rise in hospital admissions may reflect more infections rather than greater risk per infection. Evolutionary claims require separate measures of transmission, immune escape and clinical outcome. One curve cannot stand in for all three.

## **"The first detected case started the outbreak"**

Outbreak stories crave an origin person. Surveillance does something narrower: it identifies the first case noticed within a particular investigation or dataset. Infection may already have circulated elsewhere, crossed borders repeatedly or been present for years. An index case marks where an inquiry began. It does not necessarily identify where transmission began.

The AIDS "Patient Zero" story shows the damage. A cluster diagram used the letter O for "outside California". Later readers interpreted it as the number zero. Flight attendant Gaétan Dugas became the supposed source of the North American epidemic, although HIV was present in the United States before his documented infections and the diagram never established him as an origin.

The error persists because a person supplies blame, motive and a photograph. A chain usually offers none of those. Early detected cases remain operationally useful: they reveal routes, contacts and gaps. Turning

recognition into origin, however, punishes reporting and converts incomplete surveillance into biography.

Ask which first is being claimed: first infection, first symptoms, first diagnosis, first report or first case linked to one cluster. They are different events. "Patient zero" often collapses them into one story the evidence cannot support.

## Use It

### Follow the chain

When a new threat appears, resist the urge to begin with a verdict. Draw the route.

What leaves an infected host? Where does it survive? How does it reach the next host? When does infectiousness begin and end? Which settings create repeated or intense exposure? Which people connect otherwise separate groups? These questions turn a frightening noun into a sequence.

The exercise also reveals false substitutions. Cleaning surfaces may be sensible hygiene while doing little against transmission occurring mainly through shared air. Closing a park may reduce little risk while pushing people into crowded homes. A test offered after the infectious period may describe yesterday without interrupting tomorrow. The measure has to meet the link in the correct place and time.

Demand the missing verb. Infection does not spread in the abstract. It is inhaled, swallowed, inoculated, carried by a vector or transferred by contact. The verb points towards the breakable link. A chain can be inspected. A cloud can only be feared.

### Ask for the denominator

A number without its denominator is usually a story wearing arithmetic.

Ten deaths among ten confirmed cases is not the same claim as ten deaths among ten thousand infections. A doubling from two cases to four may be

epidemiologically important and statistically fragile. A national average can hide a care home outbreak or a district with no testing. Cumulative cases answer a different question from current hospital admissions.

Ask four things: who was counted, who could have been counted, over what period, and with what delay. For fatality measures, distinguish diagnosed cases from estimated infections and both from the population as a whole. For excess deaths, ask how expected mortality was modelled and what indirect effects are included.

This does not make every figure unusable. It makes comparisons conditional. The denominator is where access, definition and surveillance enter the number. It is often the most political part of a statistic while looking like the least interesting.

## **Read delay as part of the system**

An epidemic dashboard is a rear-view mirror with several layers of glass. Infection occurs. Symptoms may follow. A person seeks care or tests. A laboratory reports. A database updates. Hospital admission and death sit on different timelines. Weekend practice, backlogs and revised definitions add distortion.

So ask what event each line represents. A fall in reported cases today may reflect less testing last week. Rising hospital admissions may record infections acquired before a new measure began. Deaths can continue after transmission has turned. Judging an intervention against the wrong lag can make an effective measure look useless or an ineffective one look successful.

Delay also creates a decision problem. Waiting for complete evidence means acting on an outbreak that has already multiplied. Acting early means accepting a greater chance of false alarm. Good systems state this trade-off instead of pretending that certainty and speed can both be maximised.

## **Separate the product from the programme**

A vaccine, diagnostic or medicine has properties. A programme produces population results.

For a vaccine, ask who receives it, when protection develops, what outcomes it reduces, how long protection lasts and whether supply reaches the highest-risk groups. For a test, add sampling, turnaround, reporting and action after the result. For treatment, add diagnosis, prescribing, transport, adherence and clinical capacity. A tool stranded at any one step can look abundant on a procurement sheet and scarce in life.

Smallpox eradication is the cleanest example. The vaccine was indispensable. The final chains ended because search teams found cases, contacts were followed, communities participated and doses were placed around transmission. HIV treatment shows the reverse: a powerful therapy can transform prognosis and prevention where available while leaving an epidemic intact where access fails.

This lens protects against technological theatre. Announcing an object is easier than building the delivery system that makes the object matter.

## **Map constraints before blaming behaviour**

Public-health advice often contains an invisible citizen: housed securely, paid while absent, able to understand the message, free to refuse unsafe work and supported during isolation. Real populations contain people with none of those conditions.

Before deciding that non-compliance explains an outbreak, ask what the requested action costs. Can the person lose wages, housing, custody, status or access to food? Is isolation possible in the home? Is the treatment centre safe? Has the same authority used disease control to humiliate this community before? A behaviour that looks irrational from an office may be the least harmful available option.

None of this removes responsibility. It improves the intervention. Paid leave can make staying home feasible. Food delivery can make quarantine

bearable. Dignified burial practice can reduce Ebola transmission without treating families as obstacles. Translation and local leadership can alter who hears and trusts a warning.

The useful moral question is not who failed to obey. It is whether the system made protective conduct possible.

## **Treat trust as infrastructure**

Trust is often discussed as a feeling generated by better messaging. In an epidemic it behaves more like infrastructure. It carries reports from households to authorities and guidance back again.

It is built before the emergency through competent routine care, fair treatment and visible correction. During a crisis it is protected by distinguishing evidence from judgement, admitting what has changed, explaining burdens and applying rules consistently. Concealing uncertainty may buy a day of confidence and create months of suspicion when the story shifts.

Trust does not require universal agreement. Nor should authorities accept false claims to avoid offence. It means people have reason to believe that evidence will be handled honestly, mistakes corrected and sacrifice reciprocated. Communities can then contribute knowledge that central institutions lack.

Punitive responses can consume this asset. Sometimes restrictions are necessary. Each use should be treated as spending from a finite account, with support and justification determining how much remains.

## **The limits**

Pandemic history does not supply a policy machine. Pathogens differ in route, incubation, severity, visibility and available treatment. Measures effective against one can fail against another. Evidence from an island, city or past century cannot be transferred without checking conditions.

The record is unequal. Medieval mortality is reconstructed from fragments.

Colonial subjects, poor households and marginalised groups are often least visible. Modern datasets remain shaped by testing and registration.

Precision in the source does not guarantee compatibility between sources.

Public health also contains real conflicts. Restricting movement may reduce transmission and cause other harms. Surveillance may improve control and invade privacy. Fast approval may save lives and increase uncertainty about rare effects. There is no honest way to erase these choices by saying follow the science. Science estimates mechanisms and consequences. Values, law and distribution enter the decision.

Finally, chain thinking can become too neat. People are not passive nodes, and institutions change when they are observed. Fear, rumour, fatigue, solidarity and resistance alter the route. A model earns trust by showing where human response enters it.

## **The one thing to keep**

Keep looking for the link.

A plague ship waits offshore. A pump draws from a contaminated well. A hospital joins patients through unprotected care. A case definition excludes a woman who is dying. A contact tracer reaches a household before the next funeral. A vaccine exists but not where the exposed people are. These are different moments in one argument: an epidemic becomes large through specific transfers and remains large through specific failures to interrupt them.

Once you see that, two comforting stories become harder to believe. The first says pandemics are blows from nature, leaving society only to endure. The second says they are products of politics, leaving biology as an excuse. Pathogens supply constraints. Human systems arrange opportunity, visibility, protection and cost.

The permanent change should be this. When the next outbreak is described by one frightening total or one heroic solution, ask what chain produced the number and what programme can break it. Then ask who can use that

programme, who pays for it, and whether the capacity will remain after success makes itself invisible.

The history from the Black Death to now is not a sequence of victories over microbes. It is the repeated discovery that connection creates danger, observation creates options and neglected competence has to be rebuilt under pressure. The next pathogen is unknown. The work it will test is already visible.

## Terms

**Outbreak.** More cases of a disease than expected in a limited place, group or period. The word often means a local epidemic and prompts investigation of a shared source or linked transmission.

**Epidemic.** Disease occurrence above the expected level in a population or area. Expected matters: one case of a rare infection can constitute an epidemic, while many seasonal cases may not.

**Pandemic.** A term for an epidemic spreading extensively across countries or continents, usually through sustained transmission. Definitions and institutional uses vary. The label concerns geographic scale and coordination; it does not impose one fixed threshold of severity or death.

**Pathogen.** An agent capable of causing disease, including viruses, bacteria, fungi and parasites. Disease still depends on route, dose, host and setting; the agent alone does not determine the outcome.

**Reservoir.** The population, species or environment in which a pathogen normally persists and multiplies. A non-human reservoir can make eradication harder because ending human transmission does not remove the source.

**Zoonosis.** An infection transmitted naturally between vertebrate animals and humans. Some zoonoses repeatedly spill over but spread poorly between people; others acquire sustained human-to-human transmission.

**Spillover.** A transmission event in which a pathogen crosses from its usual

animal reservoir or host population into humans. Most spillovers end; a minority begin longer chains.

**Vector.** A living carrier, commonly an arthropod such as a mosquito, tick or flea, that transmits a pathogen between hosts. Vector ecology changes where and when transmission can occur.

**Incubation period.** Time between infection and the onset of symptoms. It helps determine quarantine length, but does not by itself reveal when a person becomes infectious.

**Latent period.** Time between infection and becoming infectious. When it is shorter than the incubation period, transmission can occur before symptoms, weakening symptom-based control.

**Infectious period.** The interval during which an infected host can transmit the pathogen. Its timing, not merely its length, determines how useful isolation and contact tracing can be.

**Case definition.** Standard criteria used to decide whether a person counts as a suspected, probable or confirmed case. Changing the definition can change the epidemic curve without changing transmission.

**Surveillance.** Continuous collection, analysis and use of health information for action. It includes clinical reports, laboratories, community alerts, death registration, sequencing and environmental signals such as wastewater.

**Attack rate.** The proportion of an at-risk group that develops disease during a defined outbreak period. It is a risk measure, despite the historical word rate.

**Case fatality ratio.** The proportion of identified cases that die from the disease. It depends heavily on who qualifies as a case, testing, treatment, time and whether outcomes are complete.

**Infection fatality ratio.** The proportion of all infected people, including undiagnosed infections, who die. It requires an estimate of total infection and is therefore harder to measure directly.

**Excess mortality.** Deaths above the number expected from previous patterns or a modelled baseline. It can reveal direct deaths missed by diagnosis as well as indirect disruption, while depending on records and counterfactual assumptions.

**Basic reproduction number.**  $R_0$ : the average secondary infections expected from a typical case in a modelled susceptible population under stated conditions. It is not a permanent property of the pathogen.

**Effective reproduction number.**  $R_t$  or  $R_e$ : average onward infections under current conditions, including immunity, behaviour and controls. Values below one usually indicate shrinking transmission, though estimates carry delay and uncertainty.

**Generation interval.** Time between infection of one person and infection of someone they infect. It links biological timing to the speed at which an epidemic grows or declines.

**Serial interval.** Time between symptom onset in an infector and symptom onset in the person infected. It is observable more often than the generation interval but is not identical to it.

**Exponential growth.** Growth proportional to the current total, so additions become larger with each generation. Early numbers can appear modest even when the process is moving towards a large outbreak.

**Doubling time.** Time required for cases, infections or another measure to double during approximately exponential growth. It changes when transmission changes and depends on which dated events are counted.

**Superspreading.** Transmission in which one case or event generates far more secondary infections than average. It reflects biology, timing and setting and should not be used as a moral identity.

**Overdispersion.** A distribution in which transmission is concentrated, with many cases causing little onward spread and a minority causing much more. It makes averages insufficient for understanding clusters.

**Endemic.** Persistently present or predictably recurring in a population or area. Endemic does not mean mild, acceptable or unchanging; malaria can be endemic and devastating.

**Elimination.** Reduction to zero transmission or incidence in a defined geographical area, with continuing measures needed to prevent reintroduction. It is a regional achievement, not global extinction.

**Eradication.** Permanent worldwide reduction of a disease agent's natural transmission to zero, after which routine control can cease. Smallpox is the only human infectious disease eradicated globally.

**Isolation.** Keeping someone known or suspected to be infected apart from people who are not. Its effectiveness depends on early detection, infectious timing, safe facilities and practical support.

**Quarantine.** Restriction of people who may have been exposed but are not known to be ill, while infection might emerge. Because it burdens healthy people, evidence and support matter greatly.

## Go Deeper

**The broad history.** Frank M. Snowden, *Epidemics and Society: From the Black Death to the Present* (Yale University Press, 2019). This is the closest full-sized parent to the present book: a wide history of plague, smallpox, cholera, tuberculosis, malaria, polio, HIV/AIDS, Ebola and other diseases, tied to war, religion, politics and public health. Snowden writes for serious general readers without flattening disagreement. The scale is a strength and a warning. At more than five hundred pages in the later paperback, it asks for time, but it shows how much social history sits behind any epidemic curve.

**The primary investigation.** John Snow, *On the Mode of Communication of Cholera*, second edition (John Churchill, 1855). Read this to replace the pump-handle fable with Snow's evidence. The Broad Street material is here, but so are household interviews, awkward exceptions and the comparison between London water companies that makes the causal case stronger.

The language is nineteenth-century medical prose and some reasoning reflects the limits of the period. The book remains readable in sections, especially with a map beside you. It shows epidemiology being built from exposure differences before the organism was accepted.

**The state response.** Peter Baldwin, *Contagion and the State in Europe, 1830-1930* (Cambridge University Press, 1999). Baldwin asks why European states facing related threats chose different mixtures of quarantine, surveillance, compulsory measures and sanitation. The answer runs through political traditions, geography, commerce and administrative power rather than one clean march towards good policy. This is the hardest recommendation here and the most useful for readers interested in government. It corrects the idea that evidence mechanically dictates one response, while refusing the opposite claim that public-health choices are detached from disease biology. It is especially strong on the trade-off between protecting health and preserving movement, and on why neighbouring governments can read the same threat through different political traditions.

**The warning about outbreak stories.** Richard A. McKay, *Patient Zero and the Making of the AIDS Epidemic* (University of Chicago Press, 2017). McKay reconstructs how a notation meaning “out-of-California” became the number zero and helped turn flight attendant Gaétan Dugas into the man blamed for bringing AIDS to America. The book is about HIV history, but its larger subject is how surveillance diagrams, journalism and the appetite for an origin villain can distort evidence. It is humane, exact and especially valuable after any outbreak in which the first detected case is treated as the first cause. McKay also shows how a technical diagram can acquire a moral story once it leaves the surveillance office, a warning that applies far beyond HIV.

# Notes and Sources

## Opening model and reader relevance

The book's central model draws on standard infectious-disease epidemiology while treating transmission quantities as properties of a defined system. Paul L. Delamater and colleagues explain why  $R_0$  depends on assumptions, population and setting rather than functioning as a pathogen's permanent constant. James O. Lloyd-Smith and colleagues supply the classic analysis of variation in individual onward transmission and superspreading.

WHO's smallpox histories support the 1967 intensified programme, the last naturally acquired case in Somalia in 1977 and certification in 1980. The programme combined reliable vaccine with surveillance, investigation, isolation, contact work and focused vaccination. The opening does not claim that Ali Maow Maalin was the last person ever infected with variola virus: a laboratory-associated infection in Birmingham killed Janet Parker in 1978.

WHO estimated about 14.9 million excess deaths associated with the COVID-19 pandemic from 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2021, with a 95 per cent interval of 13.3 to 16.6 million. Excess mortality is an all-cause modelled comparison with expected deaths. It includes estimated direct and indirect pandemic effects and is not equivalent to a register of confirmed COVID-19 deaths.

## Mechanisms and concepts

Definitions of outbreak, epidemic, attack rate and case definition follow the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's *Principles of Epidemiology* materials. Pandemic terminology has varied across time, pathogens and institutions. Heath Kelly's account of the classical epidemiological use supports the narrow correction retained here: extensive geographical spread and sustained transmission are distinct from clinical severity, so the label alone cannot determine proportional response.

The treatment of  $R_0$  and  $R_t$  follows Delamater et al. and later modelling

practice. Estimates depend on the population, contact system, time period and model. The account avoids a universal claim that a fixed share of cases causes a fixed share of transmission; Lloyd-Smith et al. establish heterogeneity, not one rule for every pathogen. Raina Plowright and colleagues support the barrier model for animal-to-human spillover. James Lloyd-Smith and colleagues distinguish repeated spillover and short, self-limiting human chains from sustained human transmission. The body does not assign one universal ecological cause to emergence.

Travel measures are described cautiously. A review by Karen Ann Grépin and colleagues found that some border and travel measures delayed spread or reduced importation under selected COVID-19 conditions, while evidence quality and comparability were limited. The manuscript therefore rejects both a perfect-seal model and the claim that such measures can never buy time.

Alain Gagnon and colleagues proposed an immune-history explanation for part of the 1918 young-adult age pattern. The manuscript treats this as a plausible partial account, not a settled explanation for every population. Pregnancy, bacterial complications, access to care, war conditions and other factors also mattered.

The virulence correction follows modern evolutionary reviews, including Ádám Kun and colleagues. Selection acts on reproductive success under particular transmission conditions. It supplies no general law that human pathogens must become milder.

Case fatality and infection fatality definitions follow WHO mortality guidance. Both require a defined period and complete enough outcomes; infection fatality additionally requires an estimate of infections that were never diagnosed.

## Historical sequence

The Black Death is treated at comparative depth to avoid duplicating *The Black Death in a Hurry*. Its chronology, mortality and routes remain reconstructed and regionally uneven. Monica H. Green's work and ancient-DNA research have changed accounts of plague's deeper history. Maria Spyrou and colleagues identify a Central Eurasian source close to the major fourteenth-century diversification of *Yersinia pestis*. That result does not establish one complete route to the Mediterranean or the relative contribution of animal reservoirs, fleas and human transmission in every setting.

The 1377 Ragusan measure is supported by Gian Franco Gensini, Magdi Yacoub and Andrea Conti, and by Eugenia Tognotti. It imposed thirty days on arrivals from infected places. Forty-day detention and the word quarantine developed later. Calling this the earliest surviving formal plague-quarantine law commonly identified avoids claiming that nobody had isolated travellers before it.

Variolation existed in several regions before British adoption. The Jenner passage follows Stefan Riedel and Andrea Morabia's examination of the 1796 experiment and 1798 report. Jenner's contribution was experimental publication and promotion of cowpox-derived protection, not the first human observation that cowpox could protect. Deliberate smallpox challenge of a child would be ethically impermissible now.

Snow's 1855 second edition is the primary source for the Broad Street investigation and the South London water-company comparison. Peter Vinten-Johansen and colleagues correct the lone-genius story: the pump handle was removed when the local outbreak was already declining, and Snow relied on registrars, local testimony and administrative action. Filippo Pacini described the cholera organism in 1854; Robert Koch's later work gave the bacteriological account wider authority. WHO's current cholera fact sheet supports the continuing importance of safe water, sanitation, surveillance and rapid rehydration.

James Mohr documents the Honolulu plague response and escaped controlled burn; Nayan Shah reconstructs racialised public health in San Francisco's Chinatown. The two cities are used as bounded municipal examples, not as a claim about every colonial response.

Niall Johnson and Juergen Mueller estimated global 1918 influenza mortality at roughly fifty million and warned that the figure might be low. Registration gaps make precision impossible. David Morens, Jeffery Taubenberger and Anthony Fauci concluded from historical pathology and autopsy evidence that secondary bacterial pneumonia probably caused most deaths. This does not mean primary viral pneumonia was absent.

The 1957 and 1968 influenza passages use Edwin Kilbourne's historical review to show the post-war cycle of strain identification, international surveillance and vaccine adaptation, not to equate their social or mortality impact with 1918. WHO's H1N1 overview supports the April 2009 recognition, rapid international spread, June pandemic declaration and later incorporation of the virus into seasonal influenza. CDC's archived timeline supports the US vaccine timing. Fatimah Dawood and colleagues demonstrate why the laboratory-confirmed global death count captured only a fraction of modelled respiratory and cardiovascular mortality; the manuscript avoids turning their uncertain estimate into an exact toll.

The first recognised US AIDS signal is the CDC's 5 June 1981 report of five young gay men with *Pneumocystis pneumonia* in Los Angeles, two of whom had died. HIV had circulated before recognition. The US National Library of Medicine's *Surviving and Thriving* exhibition, Steven Epstein and Richard McKay support the treatment of stigma, changing case definitions, activism and the false Patient Zero story. Effective combination antiretroviral therapy emerged from cumulative laboratory, clinical, regulatory and activist work; no single protest produced it. Alison Rodger and colleagues provide the direct modern evidence that sustained viral suppression makes sexual transmission risk effectively zero.

WHO's final tabulation recorded 8,096 probable SARS cases and 774 deaths; a CDC historical total differs by two cases. The body therefore says

more than eight thousand. Prompt detection, isolation, contact tracing, quarantine and infection control ended sustained chains. SARS differed from COVID-19 in ways that made symptom-led containment more feasible.

WHO describes the 2014-2016 West African Ebola epidemic as the largest and most complex recorded Ebola outbreak to that point. Its control account lists clinical care, laboratories, surveillance, tracing, infection prevention, safe and dignified burials, vaccination where available and community mobilisation. The text does not use mistrust as a cultural explanation detached from unsafe care and political history.

WHO declared the COVID-19 outbreak a public-health emergency of international concern on 30 January 2020 and characterised it as a pandemic on 11 March. On 5 May 2023 the Director-General ended the PHEIC while stating that COVID-19 remained a global health threat.

## **The international settlement**

The International Sanitary Regulations were adopted in 1951 and renamed the International Health Regulations in 1969. The extensive 2005 revision followed SARS and widened the framework beyond a short disease list. Amendments adopted in 2024 entered into force for 182 States Parties on 19 September 2025.

The World Health Assembly adopted the WHO Pandemic Agreement on 20 May 2025. As checked on 4 September 2026, the Pathogen Access and Benefit-Sharing annex remained under negotiation. WHO's July 2026 report states that further discussion was required and schedules the eighth formal meeting for 14 to 18 September 2026. WHO also states that the Agreement will open for signature only after the annex is adopted. This is the newest important institutional status used in the manuscript.

## What People Get Wrong and Use It

The misconceptions are framed as mistaken models rather than claims that no expert holds nuance. Wave structure, border effects and intervention effects vary by pathogen, timing and setting. The book therefore does not infer a universal COVID policy verdict from one country or one period.

The product-programme distinction follows the operational history of smallpox, HIV and Ebola. WHO and COVAX reporting documented severe early inequality in COVID-19 vaccine access and later operational gaps in delivery and uptake. The book uses this as a distribution claim, not as a claim that supply alone explains every coverage gap. The trust discussion is a causal claim at the level supported by outbreak practice: trust can affect reporting, care-seeking, tracing and adherence. It does not imply that communication can compensate for absent clinical capacity or that every refusal is caused by authorities.

## Bibliography

### Primary and institutional sources

Centers for Disease Control. "Pneumocystis Pneumonia, Los Angeles." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 30, no. 21 (5 June 1981): 250-252.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "2009 H1N1 Pandemic Timeline." Archived pandemic-influenza resource.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Principles of Epidemiology in Public Health Practice*. 3rd ed. Atlanta: CDC, 2012.

Snow, John. *On the Mode of Communication of Cholera*. 2nd ed. London: John Churchill, 1855.

US National Library of Medicine. *Surviving and Thriving: AIDS, Politics, and Culture*. Online exhibition.

World Health Organization. "14.9 Million Excess Deaths Associated with the COVID-19 Pandemic in 2020 and 2021." 5 May 2022.

World Health Organization. “Cholera.” Fact sheet, updated 5 December 2024.

World Health Organization. “COVAX Calls for Urgent Action to Close Vaccine Equity Gap.” 20 May 2022.

World Health Organization. “Ebola Disease.” Current health-topic and outbreak-control overview.

World Health Organization. “History of Smallpox Vaccination.” Current historical overview.

World Health Organization. “Influenza A (H1N1) Outbreak.” Current historical overview.

World Health Organization. *International Health Regulations (2005), as Amended in 2014, 2022 and 2024*. Geneva: WHO, current text from 19 September 2025.

World Health Organization. “Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response Agreement.” Current questions and answers, checked 4 September 2026.

World Health Organization. “WHO Member States Continue Negotiations on the Pathogen Access and Benefit Sharing Annex.” 20 July 2026.

World Health Organization. “Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS).” Current health-topic overview.

World Health Organization. “Statement on the Fifteenth Meeting of the IHR Emergency Committee on the COVID-19 Pandemic.” 5 May 2023.

World Health Organization. *WHO Pandemic Agreement*. Adopted 20 May 2025.

## **Modern works**

Baldwin, Peter. *Contagion and the State in Europe, 1830-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Dawood, Fatimah S., et al. "Estimated Global Mortality Associated with the First 12 Months of 2009 Pandemic Influenza A H1N1 Virus Circulation: A Modelling Study." *Lancet Infectious Diseases* 12, no. 9 (2012): 687-695.

Delamater, Paul L., Erica J. Street, Timothy F. Leslie, Y. Tony Yang, and Kathryn H. Jacobsen. "Complexity of the Basic Reproduction Number ( $R_0$ )." *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 25, no. 1 (2019): 1-4.

Epstein, Steven. *Impure Science: AIDS, Activism, and the Politics of Knowledge*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Gagnon, Alain, Matthew S. Miller, Stacey A. Hallman, Robert Bourbeau, D. Ann Herring, David J. D. Earn, and Joaquín Madrenas. "Age-Specific Mortality During the 1918 Influenza Pandemic: Unravelling the Mystery of High Young Adult Mortality." *PLoS ONE* 8, no. 8 (2013): e69586.

Gensini, Gian Franco, Magdi H. Yacoub, and Andrea A. Conti. "The Concept of Quarantine in History: From Plague to SARS." *Journal of Infection* 49, no. 4 (2004): 257-261.

Green, Monica H. "The Four Black Deaths." *American Historical Review* 125, no. 5 (2020): 1601-1631.

Grépin, Karen Ann, Tsi-Lok Ho, Zhihan Liu, Summer Marion, Julianne Piper, Catherine Z. Worsnop, and Kelley Lee. "Evidence of the Effectiveness of Travel-Related Measures during the Early Phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Rapid Systematic Review." *BMJ Global Health* 6, no. 3 (2021): e004537.

Harrison, Mark. *Contagion: How Commerce Has Spread Disease*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Johnson, Niall P. A. S., and Juergen Mueller. "Updating the Accounts: Global Mortality of the 1918-1920 'Spanish' Influenza Pandemic." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 76, no. 1 (2002): 105-115.

Kelly, Heath. "The Classical Definition of a Pandemic Is Not Elusive." *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 89, no. 7 (2011): 540-541.

Kilbourne, Edwin D. "Influenza Pandemics of the 20th Century." *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 12, no. 1 (2006): 9-14.

Kun, Ádám, András G. Hubai, Adrienn Král, Judit Mokos, Benjámín Áron Mikulecz, and Ádám Radványi. "Do Pathogens Always Evolve to Be Less Virulent? The Virulence-Transmission Trade-Off in Light of the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Biologia Futura* 74 (2023): 69-80.

Lloyd-Smith, James O., Sebastian J. Schreiber, P. Ekkehard Kopp, and Wayne M. Getz. "Superspreading and the Effect of Individual Variation on Disease Emergence." *Nature* 438 (2005): 355-359.

Lloyd-Smith, James O., Dylan George, Kim M. Pepin, Virginia E. Pitzer, Juliet R. C. Pulliam, Andrew P. Dobson, Peter J. Hudson, and Bryan T. Grenfell. "Epidemic Dynamics at the Human-Animal Interface." *Science* 326, no. 5958 (2009): 1362-1367.

McKay, Richard A. *Patient Zero and the Making of the AIDS Epidemic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Mohr, James C. *Plague and Fire: Battling Black Death and the 1900 Burning of Honolulu's Chinatown*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Morabia, Alfredo. "Edward Jenner's 1798 Report of Challenge Experiments Demonstrating the Protective Effects of Cowpox against Smallpox." *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 111, no. 7 (2018): 255-257.

Morens, David M., Jeffery K. Taubenberger, and Anthony S. Fauci. "Predominant Role of Bacterial Pneumonia as a Cause of Death in Pandemic Influenza: Implications for Pandemic Influenza Preparedness." *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 198, no. 7 (2008): 962-970.

Plowright, Raina K., Colin R. Parrish, Hamish McCallum, Peter J. Hudson, Albert I. Ko, Andrea L. Graham, and James O. Lloyd-Smith. "Pathways to Zoonotic Spillover." *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 15 (2017): 502-510.

Riedel, Stefan. "Edward Jenner and the History of Smallpox and Vaccination." *Proceedings (Baylor University Medical Center)* 18, no. 1

(2005): 21-25.

Rodger, Alison J., et al. "Risk of HIV Transmission through Condomless Sex in Serodifferent Gay Couples with the HIV-Positive Partner Taking Suppressive Antiretroviral Therapy (PARTNER): Final Results of a Multicentre, Prospective, Observational Study." *Lancet* 393, no. 10189 (2019): 2428-2438.

Rosenberg, Charles E. *The Cholera Years: The United States in 1832, 1849, and 1866*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Shah, Nayan. *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Snowden, Frank M. *Epidemics and Society: From the Black Death to the Present*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.

Spyrou, Maria A., et al. "The Source of the Black Death in Fourteenth-Century Central Eurasia." *Nature* 606 (2022): 718-724.

Tognotti, Eugenia. "Lessons from the History of Quarantine, from Plague to Influenza A." *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 19, no. 2 (2013): 254-259.

Vinten-Johansen, Peter, Howard Brody, Nigel Paneth, Stephen Rachman, and Michael Rip. *Cholera, Chloroform, and the Science of Medicine: A Life of John Snow*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.