

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - FEB. 8, 1882

SMALL-POX AND VACCINATION.

SMALL-POX is creating quite a scare in Chicago, New York and many other eastern cities. The probability of its spread to different parts of the country from such centres of trade and commerce as the commercial capital of the nation and the great mart of Illinois, is easy to be perceived. The disease has been declared epidemic in the United States by the Executive Committee of the National Board of Health. The question of the benefits or otherwise of vaccination has consequently aroused great public interest and provoked much discussion.

The most eminent physicians of the world are in favor of vaccination, and many of them advocate compulsory measures, which have for some time been adopted in England. Dr. Lewis A. Sayre, writing on this subject for the New York Herald, says:

"From the year 1798 (when the immortal Jenner announced to the world his great discovery) to the present time, facts have been constantly accumulating for the elucidation of the most universally accepted truth ever demonstrated by the science of medicine, and that is that vaccination, when properly performed, is a certain and perfect protection against small-pox. Now there's the point—Hammer that in as hard as ever you can. Vaccination, when properly performed is a certain and perfect protection against small-pox, I repeat. That was my opinion twenty years ago, and all I have heard, read and seen since then strengthens that opinion."

A physician who has been in charge of the New York quarantine hospitals adds:

"I go further than Dr. Sayre in asserting that effectual vaccination is not only a preventive but a cure for small-pox. It was my habit to vaccinate my small-pox patients in the first stage of the disease, when the premonitory symptoms and even the first appearance in the throat indicated the coming evil, and it was gratifying to see vaccination and small-pox developing simultaneously, and the latter to be so modified by the former that a bad case of small-pox was changed into a light form of varioloid."

But the doctors disagree on the necessity for re-vaccination. Dr. Sayre thinks it necessary every five years. Others say that once in childhood and once in adolescence is all-sufficient. Dr. Bailey of Chicago, declares that "a person once properly vaccinated has practically permanent protection against small-pox." His theory is that the system of a person inoculated with the cow-pox is subjected to the same influence as if the patient had the genuine small-pox, as the two diseases present exactly similar types. He advocates compulsory vaccination, and asserts the right of the State to enforce it on these grounds:

1. Vaccination will prevent a loathsome disease, which a man may persist in taking, to his own misery and the distress of his family.

2. To vaccinate a man is therefore a favor to him.

3. It is no invasion of a man's personal liberty to confer a favor on him.

4. Consequently compulsory vaccination is within the proper power of the State.

This is a singular argument. There are a good many things the conferring of which would be a favor to a man, but that would not justify forcing them upon him by legal enactment. Compulsory legislation for the conferring of favors upon citizens would be something out of the ordinary line of the law.

In the February number of the

North American Review, Henry Bergh, better known as the defender of ill-treated animals than as the champion of man, has a paper on vaccination under the euphonious title of "The Lancet and the Law." He takes the position that vaccination is not only a most loathsome and dangerous practice, but is not a preventive of nor a protection against small-pox. He declares that,

"In the period of less than one hundred years that has elapsed since the introduction of this practice, millions upon millions of sound and healthy human beings have been inoculated with the most loathsome pestilence, doomed to carry to the grave bodies wasted by consumption or marred and deformed by scrofula, cancer, and innumerable other ills. What is worse, they have transmitted these diseases to posterity."

"But the advocates of this practice claim, at all events, that vaccination tends to reduce the virulence of the disease. Not even this pretension can be allowed. From official statistics collected in England it plainly appears that vaccination has no mitigating influence on this malady; on the contrary, the mortality from small-pox has steadily increased, and, furthermore, a host of other physical ills, directly produced by the vaccine treatment, have been gratuitously added."

He gives some figures and facts which are worthy of consideration in the investigation of this important subject:

"Since 1853 there have been three epidemics of small-pox in Great Britain, viz:

Dates.	Deaths.
1857, '58, '59	14,244
1863, '64, '65	20,059
1870, '71, '72	44,840

The increase of population between the first and the second epidemic was seven per cent. The increase in small-pox mortality was nearly fifty per cent. Between the second and third epidemic, the population increased ten per cent.

The deaths from small-pox during the ten years immediately following the enactment of the law making vaccination compulsory, viz., 1854 to 1863, amounted to 33,515. In the second decennium, viz., 1864 to 1873, the number was 70,458."

But against these statements here are some figures given by Dr. Bailey:

"In England, for 80 years previous to the discovery of vaccination, the cases of small-pox averaged 3,000 to every 1,000,000, while for 20 years following there were only 250 cases to every 1,000,000. For the year ending in May last, the cases of small-pox among vaccinated patients averaged 92 to the 1,000,000, while of unvaccinated patients the average was 3,550 to the 1,000,000."

"As respecting the power of vaccination to modify the force and character of the disease, the English records show that in unvaccinated patients the mortality averages from 10 to 43 per cent., while among the vaccinated ones the mortality is scarcely more than 7 per cent., and the average has been as low as 2 per cent."

Mr. Bergh proceeds to dilate in vigorous language upon the horrible practice of inoculating healthy children with a virulent blood-poison, and proves that in thousands of cases the most loathsome and repulsive diseases have been implanted by vaccination and transmitted to posterity. The germs of scrofula, consumption, cancer, and even viler diseases have been conveyed by this means to healthy bodies from those inheriting the taint.

However, taking all the information at command, it appears that patients afflicted with small-pox, who have been thoroughly vaccinated, have the malady in a mild form—varioid, and the preponderance of testimony is largely in favor of the tendency of vaccination to overcome and drive out the dread disease. At the same time there are the strongest reasons to believe that by the arm-to-arm system of vaccination, hereditary taints have been conveyed to healthy children and thus diseases of a virulent and horrible character have been spread, deterring many people who believe in the virtues of vaccination, from availing themselves of its aid against the scourge which is now smiting so many people in the East. The remedy against this evil is the dis-

carding of the arm-to-arm process, and the use of none but bovine virus—lymph, taken direct from heifers that have been inoculated for the purpose.

It is to be hoped that the epidemic will not reach these mountain regions, but every precaution possible should be adopted in places along the line of the great railroads, and in the event of any cases being discovered, the quarantine powers of the cities should be strictly enforced.

During the prevalence of this disease in England, the following recipe was in use as a preventive, and, we have good reason to believe, with great effect and we have known it to be used as a curative and palliative with excellent results. One ounce Epsom salts, two ounces cream of tartar, one lemon sliced; pour one quart of boiling water, drink cold, sweetened to taste, a wine glassful three times a day. To prevent pitting, darkness is considered the best remedy. Experience shows that only the exposed parts of the body are usually pitted while those kept covered are very rarely marked. A preparation of flexible collodion with iron and tannin, is used by some physicians, to coat the eruption; this with shutting out the light is said to be a sure preventive of that disfigurement which is dreaded by many more than the disease. We trust that Utah will be spared from the scourge now smiting the cities of the East.

"MORMONISM AND THE LAND LAWS."

When the Mormons settled in Utah there was not a square foot of the soil that was open to pre-emption. The land belonged to the United States, and Congress had done nothing to abdicate absolute federal proprietorship. The records of the Legislature of the Territory from that time to this show a series of interferences with the primary disposal of the soil which speedily vested in the Mormon Church the whole habitable domain east of the eastern boundary of the present State of Nevada. Within ten years grants were made pretending to confer on church dignitaries tracts amounting in the aggregate to more than ten thousand square miles, comprising almost all the woodlands and the streams available for irrigation. This was done in the face of an express prohibition in the organic act. But Congress, with contemptible imbecility or culpable indifference, never interfered. It has annulled none of this legislation. It has confirmed the Mormon Church in the monopoly, and it has included the Mormons in the benefits of all its homestead and pre-emption laws. If it had excluded them the Mormon problem would be susceptible of a plain solution. Nor in the projects of legislation touching the Mormons which are multiplying in Congress have we observed any design to shut them out from the privileges of the land laws for the future.

The above is from the New York Herald, and is a fair specimen of the error into which even the leading journals of the land fall when they run a tilt against "Mormonism." It seems as though anything, however nonsensical and misleading, which may be contributed in an anti-"Mormon" spirit, can find a place in the papers, while the solid truth is excluded and ignored.

To begin with, every one who is at all acquainted with the first settlement of this mountain region knows that when the "Mormons" came here, the land did not belong to the United States. It was Mexican territory, and was subsequently ceded to this Government. True, the "Mormons" raised the United States flag on their arrival here, and maintained their allegiance to it, while their brethren in the "Mormon" Battalion were marching with the army against Mexico. And when the territory was annexed, the land and its inhabitants came fully under the jurisdiction of the United States.

But the Herald charges that the Legislature of this Territory interfered with the primary disposal of the soil, so as to vest it in the control of the "Mormon" Church, and conferred immense tracts of land on Church dignitaries. Also that Congress has annulled none of this legislation, but has confirmed the Church in the monopoly. Why, what rubbish this is to place in the editorial columns of New York's leading

daily! If the statements made were true, such "primary disposal of the soil" would have amounted to nothing, because beyond the powers of the Legislature, and in a contest before the Courts the title would be declared void and the grants of non-effect in law.

The whole charge is based upon a misconception of the facts, which are these: For many years after the settlement of these valleys, the land was not surveyed by the government. There was no land office in the Territory. No absolute title to the land could be obtained. Local laws were passed to govern what are known as squatter's rights or rights of possession. In some instances men went to great labor and expense in preparing places for herd grounds, and in the absence of any land laws, grants were made by the Legislature, protecting them in their possession and use of those grounds, without pretending to confer upon them any title to the land. In other cases, roads were made into the almost inaccessible gorges and canyons, so that the timber on the rugged heights might be reached, and the rights of the builders of those roads were protected by legislative enactment.

But when the lands were surveyed and placed upon the market, they had to be purchased of the Government the same as though no grants had been made by the Legislature. What was done was but of atemporary character, until legal titles could be obtained, and the actual ownership of the land secured. So Congress had nothing to annul. That body is not chargeable with "contemptible imbecility or culpable indifference" in this regard, but papers like the New York Herald, which print such foolishness are guilty of contemptible ignorance or culpable misrepresentation, in helping to still further deceive the public, already grossly deceived on this whole "Mormon" question.

It is not true that the "Mormon" Church was vested with the "primary disposal of the soil," neither indeed could it be under the land laws of the United States. The very fact that it was forbidden by Federal such proceedings null and of no virtue or effect. The Herald talks about church dignitaries getting tracts of land, as though citizens of the United States lost their right to acquire titles to land because of their occupancy of some ecclesiastical position. Does a Bishop of the Episcopal Church forfeit the right to acquire title to real estate by receiving his ordination? Does a Methodist forfeit all rights of property when he preaches Methodism? Cannot a Catholic priest own land? And on what principle of law or equity is a "Mormon" Apostle or Elder to be denied the same rights as to property as other ecclesiastical dignitaries?

But here is the New York Herald complaining that the "Mormons" have the benefit of the homestead and pre-emption laws! Has the anti-"Mormon" editor gone crazy? Or does he imagine that Congress can deny a "pre-emptor the right to purchase a portion of the public domain on the ground that the applicant is a "Mormon"? Was there ever such dense stupidity manifest in the consideration of any other public question as that exhibited by "wise" men on the subject of the "Mormons?"

We will inform the Herald that Congress has not "confirmed the 'Mormon' Church" in any monopoly of the land, because it never had any, and the land Laws of the United States operate the same in Utah as in any other parts of the country. If Congress can pass an act prohibiting a person who complies with the provisions of the land laws from obtaining title because he is a "Mormon," it can do so because he is a Methodist or a Congregationalist, or a Quaker or an infidel? The Herald is off wrong on this whole question and shows its lack of information and discretion. In its anxiety to trim its sails according to the present popular blast, it has run right out to sea and has entirely lost its reckoning. This is not the work of the regular hands; one of those unprincipled "Mormon"-eaters has been taken on board, and he is a pirate instead of a pilot. All journalists should beware of them.

A NON RELIGIOUS VIEW OF THE UTAH QUESTION.

The following letter was recently received by a friend in this city

from a gentleman in California, who, it will be seen, has no connection with the "Mormon" Church nor, indeed, with any other religious organization. We have reason to know that he reflects the sentiment of a great many non-sectarian people in the country who do not express their views in the same out-spoken manner. The present anti-"Mormon" movement is essentially a sectarian crusade, and an attempt of the several churches to direct and influence the State for the destruction of a religious body with doctrines too scriptural and irrefutable to be overcome by argument. The letter we consider worthy of reproduction and, therefore, by permission, give it entire, with the exception of the opening and closing sentences:

"The newspapers are full of the Cannon-Campbell contest, and being a born politician as well as lover of fair play, and perhaps a disposition to sympathize with the under dog in the fight." I have read all that comes in my way pertaining to Utah with redoubled interest.

As I understand it, Cannon had in round numbers 18,000 votes, against not much above 1,300 for his opponent, and the zealous "Gentile" governor, usurping judicial authority, decides Cannon ineligible to the office he has held for years, and gives the certificate of election to Campbell. I am inclined to think that public opinion is rather in favor of Cannon, but it is not so outspoken and aggressive as the *seditionist* "Christian" sentiment, because the religious papers are strongly against Cannon, and the leading secular papers dare not offend the fine moral sense and notions of propriety of their "Christian" readers. Now as to the morality or physical and physiological results of the plural marriage system, I hope I am not so bigoted or so little gifted with good sense, as to judge dogmatically without seeing for myself; but I protest it makes my blood-run hot to see men who live in glass houses, throwing stones at Utah, without even the semblance of appearing to understand what they are stoning. Can't say that I have any religion of any kind myself, and have serious doubts at times if the nature of the human soul is such as to admit of its being an immortal entity, or of immortality essence, but hope I have enough religion to allow my neighbors to enjoy their's without my officious interference (as is guaranteed them by the Constitution), and that is 100 per cent more religion than the majority of the churches show. "History repeats itself," and the burden of its repetition is that men are always fools, who never learn by experience that persecution always gains converts, adherents, supporters and friends to any cause, religious, social or political.

When it is attempted to count Utah out of Congress, she can rest assured of the moral support of millions of conservative people to whom religion is a mere name, but to whom fair play is the sum and substance of free government in America. Let the Methodist and Campbellite church Republican party make it a party issue and count out Cannon if they dare! They have already disfranchised thousands of men in Massachusetts and elsewhere; it would be highly appropriate to conclude by disfranchising Utah, counting out her elected delegate, and substituting her legislature by a council appointed by the President. Such villainy would rest very lightly on the consciences of the men who seated a defeated candidate in the chair of Washington and Jefferson in 1877, and induced the murder of his successor in 1881 by their quarrels over the plunder. But they would certainly lose Congress if not the Presidency by their proposed method of settling the "Mormon question" by strangulation.

Woman suffrage always was a hobby of mine from 14 years of age. I am glad that Utah is so far ahead of eastern "culture and refinement" (?) in that respect."

LOCAL AND OTHER MATTERS.

FROM FRIDAY'S DAILY, FEB. 8.

Deseret Museum.—A Sandwich Island garment, made of "kapa," a kind of paper prepared from the bark of the paper mulberry tree, has been presented to the Museum by President W. Woodruff, for whom the article was made by the natives.