

EDITORIALS.

LIBEL MAKERS AND THEIR SUPPORTERS.

THE verdict in the case of the editors of the Silver Reef Miner will be cordially approved by the public. If the press has no right to express opinions contrary to the private interests of mining companies or other corporations, however wealthy or influential they may be or expect to be, the boasted freedom of speech and of the press, for which this country is famed throughout the world, will be nothing but a mockery.

If the Miner editors had wilfully misrepresented the mining property about which they wrote, or had slandered its owners or managers, the case would have been very different. But they merely expressed their views, on general principles, in regard to the formation and position of the property in question, by the sale of which certain individuals expected to make a "big raise" and were disappointed in their anticipations. It is possible that the statements and arguments of the Miner had something to do with their failure. We are not able to say whether this was the case or not. But if so we do not see wherein the writers were liable to an action for damages, as they merely published their opinions with what they considered good and sufficient reasons as a basis therefor.

Of a very different class are those scurrilous personalities in which certain scavengers of the press take so much delight. Action for libel against the cowardly rascals who lampoon the living and defame the dead would successfully lie, in any part of the civilized world where the courts could be relied upon for fair rulings and just decisions. And we consider that a civil suit does not meet the demands of outraged reputation, no matter what damages might be assessed—in most cases there is little hope that any would be recovered, for the blackguards are usually as bankrupt in property as in honor and public respect. But criminal prosecution added to the suit at law, with full penalties on conviction, would come a little nearer to the mark. This is possible under the laws of this Territory, which provide for either or both proceedings in cases of libel. As to the probabilities of the outcome, we have nothing at present to say.

But the practice of a few journals in the country, of raking up all the slander and gossip that is uttered by the vile and prurient, which is often entirely false and usually colored and twisted out of any genuine resemblance to the truth, and publishing those foul effusions with the names of the real or supposed actors in the scenes depicted, is one that should not only receive the condemnation of the decent people in any community, but should be stamped out by the firm foot of the law. Grand juries neglect their duty when they fail to take cognizance of such flagrant violations of law and decency as occur daily in some localities, and fail to act in the spirit of their oath of office by letting slip these public nuisances and destroyers of morality, while they assiduously hunt up things with which they have no real official business.

The continued existence of papers of the kind to which we have alluded, is not to the credit of the communities where they are permitted to carry on their nefarious business. A proper condition of the public mind would not furnish them the necessary support, and the fact that they live, shows that there are a sufficient number of individuals in their neighborhood who feed on literary carrion and revel in abuse, to provide the motive power for the running of these daily scandal mills.

Newspaper proprietors, like theatrical managers, as a general rule, provide such pabulum or amusement as is in public demand. True, they aid in forming and feeding the public appetite, but if the populace had no relish for such papers and performances as are a reproach to the civilization of the nineteenth century, those who cater to this craving would soon find that their occupation was gone. The patronizers of the dirty drama and the purchasers of the dirty paper are parties to the crime of their exhibition and publication. The authors and their supporters should be put into the same sack.

WATER AS NUTRIMENT.

ALTHOUGH the prolonged fast of Dr. Tanner may not prove of any very great value to science, it is the sensation of the hour, and is attracting more public attention than any other topic of the times. The newspapers are publishing accounts of fasters who have considerably distanced Tanner in his feat of abstinence, but in most cases the fasting reported was the result of disease, while his has been attempted voluntarily and in support of theories which he holds.

In mentioning his case a few days ago, we referred to the great change in Tanner's condition when he abandoned his determination to abstain from drink as well as food, and commenced the internal use of water. He not only gained in weight, but he lost his fever and moroseness, became cheerful and vigorous, and exhibited vital and mental energy in great contrast to his condition when he abstained from drinking. This, we remarked, demonstrated the fact that water contains nutritive qualities in a large degree, and that it has evidently kept Tanner from fading out of this world.

We are informed that some would-be remarkable critic has pronounced this "manifestly absurd," because the composition of water is well known and it "simply makes fluid," and is only necessary to the body as a fluid and not as nutriment," etc. The amount of dogmatism which a smattering of knowledge creates in a small mind is wonderful. That oxygen and hydrogen in given proportions enter into the composition of the fluid called water, almost every schoolboy has learned from teacher or text book. But that the properties of those so-called elements have all been discovered and explained is a statement a little too sweeping for any really thoughtful mind to make. And since when has it been proven that there is no nutriment in oxygen or hydrogen or both combined? This brings up the question what is "nutriment?" The word signifies anything that will nourish. That which promotes growth, repairs the natural waste of animal or vegetable life; or, as Webster says, "that which promotes enlargement or improvement." With this definition can it be truthfully asserted that water is not nutritious? Does it not aid in nourishing, supporting and improving the body, and in arresting or repairing the waste of tissue? "It simply makes fluid." Really! And is nutriment confined to solids. Is no fluid nutritious? When the fluids of the body decrease by natural waste, is not a new supply of needful fluid nutrition? And is it not manifestly absurd to place the words "fluid" and "nutriment" in absolute contrast?

The experience of Dr. Tanner has shown that a man can live longer on a simple water diet than was generally supposed possible. This is admitted by many physicians who have watched his case with interest. Is it inconsistent then to state that water contains nutritive qualities in a very large degree? We think not. And since writing on this subject we have noticed some remarks of the New York Herald in relation to it which fit in here very nicely. That paper closes a long editorial on the good effects on Tanner of drinking water as follows; the italics are ours:

"Had he been cut off from the use of water in any form from the first day not a man of those who have been most close in their attendance upon him believes that he would have been alive or sane at the end of 12 days. That he could have gone 20 days using water externally and only very small quantities internally is considered improbable by many and those whose opinions are most entitled to weight. But with freely drinking all the water he feels inclined to he may perhaps complete his self-imposed task. He will, in that event, have demonstrated that there is a great and hitherto unknown degree of nutriment in water, but not that life can be sustained under conditions of complete starvation for a longer period than previous experience has shown to be possible."

To dispute over the meaning of a word would be too small an occupation in these busy and heated days. But the value of the glorious beverage which nature has so abundantly provided for the benefit of mankind is worth enlarging upon, and time is not wasted in bringing it to the atten-

tion of the public. Water, it appears, is capable of supporting life and nourishing the body in a larger degree than has been supposed, and while this demonstration should not have the effect of causing people to drench themselves with Nature's free drink to the world; it may cause some who imagine that it has no nutritive qualities because it is a fluid, to adopt its use as it comes flowing from the fountains of the earth, un-mixed with stimulants or flavorings.

All the processes by which the human system is sustained, repaired and vitalized, are not yet fully comprehended even by the wonderful chemist who professes to "thoroughly understand" the properties of the elements. A great many so-called elements have been proven not to be elementary, and science is continually shifting its ground from points once considered sure and impregnable. It may yet be shown that Dr. Smith, the faster of Newburyport, is correct in his idea that the atmosphere imparts nutriment largely to man, as it certainly does to trees and plants. The action of food on the human system may yet be proven different in some respects to that which is now accepted as the process. It may be shown that its effects are such as to incite the system to absorb electric, atmospheric and other agencies that stimulate and support life, and to accomplish as much by arousing the vital energy to grasp and assimilate them as by actual material supply. There are a great many things in relation to "the house we live in" which even those who have grown grey in the study of biology, physiology and many otherologies have never dreamed of, and dogmatism in matters in relation to it is not often found in their writings, although it comes easy to the superficial.

Whether Dr. Tanner can survive the action of solid food after so long a fast is one of the present queries that no man can answer with certainty. Time will show. We hope he will live to tell the story of his fast in detail, and to reap some material profit from his trying experience.

MINING, THE "MORMONS" AND THE GOVERNMENT.

UNDER the head of Religious Intelligence the Grand Rapids (Michigan) Times speaks of the celebration in this city on the 24th of July. But that paper falls into a singular blunder, in debiting the DESERET NEWS with some stupid remarks in regard to mining and hostility to the Government. The Times says:

"The Deseret News, of Salt Lake, closes a long article on the subject thus:

"Eleven years ago a coterie of prominent Mormons was proscribed and excommunicated for advocating mining as a legitimate branch of industry in Utah. The ceremonies were concluded in the big Tabernacle, and consisted of speeches and music. It was full of overflowing and presented an impressive spectacle. There was less show of hostility to the Government and outsiders than has been formerly made on this anniversary. The federal officers of Utah were invited to attend as guests."

The paragraph quoted by the Times never appeared in any article in this paper. It is part of a telegram which some dispatch flend sent over the wires, and which has appeared in several eastern journals. It contains one direct and unequivocal falsehood, and others by implication. The statement that eleven years ago a number of persons were excommunicated for advocating mining, is untrue. Several persons, who were cut off from the Church some years ago, were advocates of mining at a time when it was not considered for the best interests of the people to encourage the search for the so-called precious metals, but that was not the offence for which they lost the fellowship of their brethren. There is no law of the Church which says, in letter or spirit, "Thou shalt not engage in mining." Hundreds of persons have not only advocated the benefits of mining, but worked in the mines and speculated in mining property, and are still counted as members of the Church.

The policy of the "Mormon" leaders, which our history past and present has proven to be wise and beneficial, was to encourage the agricultural, stock-raising and manufacturing interests in advance of mineral

developments. The people were strongly advised to stay on their farms and work in their shops instead of roaming over the hills and making holes in the ground. This counsel, it has been demonstrated in numberless instances, was for the best good of the people who have come here to serve God and make permanent homes. A mining camp is not usually the best place in which to learn reverence for sacred things, nor regard for the restraints and peaceful pursuits of a religious community. And those Latter-day Saints who have spent either time or money in mining speculations or enterprises, have in a very large majority of instances lost in cash if not in faith, and proven that the counsel of the Church authorities was good, both from a temporal and a spiritual standpoint.

Those who have chosen to embark in mining as a business have not been molested in any way. The existence of gold and silver in the mountains was known to President Brigham Young and others years before the influx of the mining element, and that knowledge was kept quiet because it was considered for the permanent interests of this Territory to lay a broad and deep foundation of the essential industries, before the treasures of the mountains should be uncovered, attracting, as they always do, the lawless and the disreputable as well as the honest and hardy miner and prospector and the legitimate investor of capital and skill. All the stories that have been told about danger from the "Mormons" in the search for gold and silver in Utah is the cheapest kind of trash. No man was ever hurt or hindered in such work by the Latter-day Saints, and none but makers or lovers of lies have ever stated to the contrary.

"Hostility to the government" is another invention of unprincipled anti "Mormons." The proceedings of our Pioneer celebrations have been published to the world on every occasion that they were held, and no word that can be construed into any such thing can be gleaned from those accounts. We have had no such hostility in our hearts, therefore it has not proceeded from our lips. We have spoken against the acts of men in authority under the government because they deserved censure. We may do so again. But we do not consider that disgust at the villainy of corrupt officials is any disrespect to the office which they disgrace, nor opposition to the government under which they serve. We regard them as public servants not rulers, and when they act like rascals, comport themselves like blackguards, consort with the vile and base, and join in conspiracies for the misrepresentation and injury of the people whose interests they are paid to subserve, we claim the right to speak the truth about them in plainness, and if they cannot discern the difference between showing up their folly and wickedness and opposing the Government, which is as much above them as us, we can smile at their vanity while we pity their ignorance. Between men and principles, officers and governments, individuals and institutions, we perceive a wide distinction, and while we will uphold the constitution, sustain the government, and respect the offices by them created, we see no reason to worship men whatever be their dignities, nor to regard their persons in any way except according to their merits.

We assure the Times not only that it has made a big mistake in its clipping, but that in both instances we have named, the statements contained therein are malicious untruths. Please correct and oblige the DESERET NEWS.

"Does running water purify itself?" Yes, to some extent. In the same way that water is cleansed by passing through a filter, it loses many impurities after it is befouled, by a swift course over sand, gravel, rocks, etc., depositing much solid matter that may have been mingled with it. This is a fact patent to the naked eye in town and cañon. As to the noxious matter in solution, that is another thing, and water impregnated therewith may hold it as it flows for an indefinite distance.

A young man in Hartford, Conn. who incurred the displeasure of his kinspeople and acquaintance by marrying a German servant girl, now holds his head very high when he meets any of his critics. His wife has fallen heir to an estate in the Fatherland worth \$600,000.

Correspondence.

Advice to Arizona Settlers.

JONESVILLE, Maricopa Co.,

July 20th, 1881.

Editors Deseret News:

Hearing that quite a number of persons intend moving from Utah to this country, I think a few items of information may be of benefit to some of them. All that possible should start by the 1st of September for the following reasons:

Wheat and barley should be sown not later than Christmas. Farmers should make calculations to live in tents and wagons until their grain is sown, as a few weeks' delay in putting in grain make a great difference in the yield.

All kinds of light farm tools, such as shovels, hoes, forks, etc., should be brought along in convenient. Heavy machinery and tools can be got cheaper than they are here, and hauled in wagons from Utah. As many and as great a variety of seeds as possible. We sometimes think we cannot raise certain kinds of vegetables here and report as failures, that afterwards prove successful when properly cultivated. Fetch them along and experiment for yourselves, for I do not know one who can tell all about agricultural things as yet.

For the encouragement of those who will give a list of some produce that do well here and the best for planting them, to the best of my knowledge.

Wheat and Barley—October, November and December.

Alfalfa or Lucern—fall or spring.

Sorghum—from April to July.

Egyptian Corn—from April to July.

Peas, potatoes, tomatoes, and early garden stuff should be planted in January or February; pumpkins, melons, and late stuff in May or June.

Some persons plant cabbage, onions, beets, radishes, lettuce and hardy stuff about the 10th of September, and make a success of it. Potatoes are sometimes planted at the same time; they ripen last Christmas. Sweet potatoes should be bedded out in January; they do to be transplanted as late as they yield abundantly.

Fruits do well here, especially grapes. We have the Hamburg, Catael, Sultana, and several other varieties, also the Mission grape, well, in fact superior to any I ever seen.

This is a good cotton country; sugar cane does well; they plant as soon as the ground gets warm in the spring. Stock and poultry: Cattle, goats, pigs, chickens, turkeys, etc., do well here.

Now if there is any one who thinks the above list short, let them bring on the seeds and experiment awhile, and maybe they can do something to their taste, or create an appetite in trying, that they can relish some of the mentioned.

For an outfit to come here would from personal experience advise the poor man to get the best he can and come along. To those who have means and wish to use it to the best advantage, both for moving here for use after getting here, in my opinion what they should do is to bring any small teams; the heavy teams or good cows are here heavy to plow. A horse team of 1,000 lbs. is not worth anything here for team work. Now remember this, we have to keep our stock here, and any team or cow that is not worth their feed, while they are here, is not worth anything. Do not bring ox teams, they are cheap on foot; ox teams are the best here.

Iron axle wagons with wide wheels are best here as the country is rough and soft formation. A team of 30 will haul 30 hundred on the loose roads, and make good traveling. You would soon fag here with the heavy load and same kind of wagon. This is not a fast country. People who come here are apt to over-exhaust themselves for awhile, but they will sweat down to the common level after a little while, when they will come more tolerant to the old way and acknowledge that they were a little mistaken in their calculations.

I would advise all to come to a good organization, with full participation to carry out the principles of union and the counsels of the priesthood, and try and stick to it and not get discouraged too soon.

Respectfully, your brother,

D. W. Jones.