The Case of the German Crown Prince and its treatment by Sir Morell Mackenzie.

By Dr. Wilhelm Meyer and Dr. Holmers

In view of the violent attack that has recently been made on Sir Morell Mackenzie by the German press, the question arises whether his treatment of the case of the Crown Prince of Germany affords sufficient grounds for the charges against the renowned English specialist. If want of judgment and reflexion, with his augmented patients, and of want of consideration for his German colleagues, from the facts which have been published from time to time, and after a period of the longest...
medical report by MacKenzie we see nothing to justify the hostile attitude of the German press.

It appears that when MacKenzie was called to Berlin, Gerhardt had been treating the case for some time, that Bergmann had been subsequently called in, and that, shortly before the date of MacKenzie's visit, Woldt had once seen the Crown Prince, and nothing official is known of the treatment carried out by Gerhardt, but it is generally believed that when they had recognised the formation of the Growtke on the left vocal cord they tried to remove it by instruments introduced per vagum naturales. No where is it stated whether they succeeded in removing any part of the Growtke, but
it is certain that they never had any portion examined microscopically. This is as we intend to show further on a point of the greatest importance.

It is certain understood that the three professors hesitated to arrive at the opinion that the growth was cancerous and that it could only be removed by an external operation. Realizing that such an operation would be likely to destroy, or at least greatly impair, the voice, and considering the position of the patient would render such destruction of the vocal function a matter of the greatest importance, they were unwilling to undertake an external operation without further advice.

Mackenzie arrived in Paris in the month of May, and as soon as he saw the growth he stated that in his opinion there was nothing characteristic about it; it was not typical
of cancer nor did it resemble a common benign growth; in fact it was one of those tumours, according to naked eye observation occupying a central ground, and which, on microscopic examination alone, can be proved to be either malignant or benign. Mackenzie proposed taking away a small piece of the tumour to enable a pathologist of the highest rank to report on the nature of the neo-formation. In giving this opinion Mackenzie acted entirely in accordance with the generally accepted surgical principle, i.e., not to undertake any serious operation for the removal of supposed malignant growths until they have been microscopically examined, always presuming that
They occupy situations which permit of the removal of portions for examination. It appears to us that a grave fault was committed by the German doctors in not taking these steps before Mackenzie was called in. On the 21st May Mackenzie removed the first piece of the growth; these were sent to Professor Virchow for microscopic examination, who reported that they showed no signs of malignancy. The part removed seems only from the superficial part of the growth.

On the 26th June Virchow gave another report on the piece then removed; the section showed no sign of malignancy and Virchow declared that the healthy condition of the tissue warranted a very favourable prognosis. It was then decided that the Crown Prince should go to England in order that Mackenzie should be able to remove any new growths that might form, it being well known that even benign tumours often recur. The Crown Prince went to England on the 13th June accompanied by two German physicians, namely,
Dr. Wegner and Dr. Landgraf, a throat specialist. It will be thus seen that the German doctors were able to watch the progress of the case.

The English specialist Dr. Morris Wolffenden also daily attended the Crown Prince. On the 29 June Mackenzie removed the last portion of the growth, and concerning it Vickers reported "that the excised piece has, even more distinctly, than the piece taken away at the previous operation, proved to be a hard wart growing from the highly irritated and hyperplastic surface. There was not the slightest trace of proliferation into the deep lying tissues." When we consider that Professor Vickers is recognized as the first living authority in pathology, that he was entirely impartial in the case, that the general health of the Crown Prince..."
was in every respect satisfactory, and that his course was happily improved, it must be considered that all the circumstances pointed to the conclusion that the treatment of the case had been advantageous. It is absurd to suppose that the treatment carried out by MacKenzie ever had an injurious effect on the patient, notwithstanding the statement of Professor Stock (who was not called to San Remo). Indeed the remarks of the professor appear to have more of passionate animosity than of scientific reasoning.

The almost support to MacKenzie's views was derived from Professor Richardson's lecture, delivered at the Royal Medical Society on July 27th. The professor applied a new name to the disease, namely, leukaemia luposa.
though specialists have been satisfied with the term papilloma. It was fully understood at the time that Verhoeff spoke that the Crown Prince's case called forth the lecture, and that he regarded the case of His Imperial Highness as a typical example of the disease.

He remarked that if in the base of a growth there he found no proliferation of foreign elements, no matter what is found on the surface the local growth is of a benign nature, from which no mischief may be expected to arise later on.

That it will thus be seen, the repeated microscopic examinations absolutely confirmed the idea that the disease was benign and fully justified Mackenzie's treatment.
We had at this time the opportunity of hearing the opinion of many impartial specialists, who all approved of the treatment there being pursued, while at the same time communications from the most trustworthy sources convinced us that Mackenzie was conducting the case with the most conscientious care, and that he was showing a high degree of dexterity in his operations.

As Autumn was approaching, Mackenzie tried to find a suitable resort for his patient, where he could have absolute rest and a favourable climate. That Mackenzie not only visited the Crown Prince on several occasions but even travelled about with the object of finding a proper health resort for
his health better, though, in our opinion, that Mackenzie did not think lightly of his responsible task.

Finally, Cobbe was selected, because the Crown Prince had previously been pleased with that place, having been there before, and being well acquainted with the climates. Unfortunately, the bad weather, so prevalent this last autumn in the South of Europe, affected the Crown Prince's throat unfavourably, it should be remembered that Mr. Mark Howell, who has been for ten years on the Surgical Staff of the Throat Hospital in London, was in daily attendance on the Crown Prince. To suppose that
new writers have been constantly forming, and that Sir Morell Mackenzie and Dr. Willfully ignored their existence, is an accusation of as ridiculous and monstrous a character that we do not think it necessary to refute it. It has been urged against Mackenzie that he did not issue bulletins frequently enough, the explanation offered by Mackenzie, namely, that the value of bulletins was entirely out of his province and depended on the will of the patient, appears too conclusive. We have little doubt that when the case of national antipathy and professional jealousy has settled by the impartial judgment of competent judges will be in favour of the English specialist.
And that in future years Sir Montgery M'Intosh will be able to look back with satisfaction on his share in the treatment of the most important and eventful case in the history of Medicine.