

EDITORIALS.

SHAM LIBERALISM.

INGERSOLL the infidel is a great clamor for liberty. He advocates not only liberty of speech but liberty of action. And particularly he inveighs against the interference of any professedly divine power in human affairs. He would have the mind of man free from every trammel, and rejoices at every public opportunity afforded him of ridiculing all that religious people hold sacred, and assailing with ribald abuse, coarse jokes and blasphemous epithets, the motives, acts and aspirations of the best part of humanity, of all ages. He claims the right to do this without let or hindrance. Yet, at one of his recent lectures in New York, when he used language more than commonly offensive to believing minds, and the response was a hiss, the objecting individual was at once hustled out of the hall. The audience were at liberty to applaud, but not to exhibit any mark of disapproval.

This is the kind of liberty that a great many so-called "liberals" accord to others. They desire to throw off all restraint, to attack whom or what they please, to do just what they have a mind to, without check. But let others who disagree with them claim similar privileges, and they are in arms at once, ready to crush by force in others the freedom they demand for themselves.

We have seen just such consistency in "liberal" movements in this Territory. The slanderers and libellers who defame the good and misrepresent facts and principles cannot endure in others the liberty of speech they claim for themselves, even when assailed with the simple truth. Blatant demands for extreme liberty generally mean perfect freedom for the shouter, but a muzzle for the mouth of a dissenting hearer. There is a vast deal of humbug in the professional shriek for "liberty or death."

FINDING HIM OUT.

Cook, the Boston surface philosopher, reckless assenter of guessed at figures and facts, anti-"Mormon" lecturer, and "Christian" blather-skite, is getting to be generally appreciated by the better class of minds. The more he is known the greater he is despised. His assumption of learning and pretended quotations from standard authorities have given him weight with the superficial, but the well informed are able to see through his assumption and detect his unscrupulous falsehood.

Professor Hall has been paying his respects to the Boston declaimer, and says:

"Mr. Cook's mind, temper and work are at every point exactly contrasted and opposed to that of a man of science. * * * A man of science is often the very first to correct his own errors; Mr. Cook ascribes to Schopenhauer, Lotz, M. D. Conway, and I know not at this distance how many others, opinions the exact opposite of those they have always labored to inculcate, and allows them to circulate uncorrected through the 'more than five hundred thousand' printed copies of his lectures, despite the most prompt and urgent correction and protest."

How much respect can be entertained for a religious teacher who takes such a course as that described by Professor Hall? Cook adopted the same kind of tactics in his assaults on "Mormonism." Perhaps in this he offered no contrast to his religious confederates of different sects. But in the face of exposure from different sources, how much longer will the people of the hub support and countenance one of the greatest clerical charlatans of the age? Thinking people everywhere else are fast finding him out.

NEW TREATMENT FOR CANCER.

THE London medical journal called the *Lancet*, an authority amongst the profession, publishes a paper by Professor John Clay, of Queen's Col-

lege, on a new method of treating that terrible disease, cancer, which has carried off so many victims even under the most skillful treatment.

Professor Clay's treatment dispenses entirely with the use of the knife. Perhaps this statement will provoke a smile from surgeons of the old school of practice, as they generally look upon those who pretend to the discovery of nostrums for the cure of cancer by drugs and plasters, as quacks and impostors. But they may change their minds after hearing what is certified to by a professor of obstetrics in an English hospital, and published in so respectable a paper as the *Lancet*.

The new remedy is Chian (or Cyprus) turpentine, administered internally, the maximum dose being twenty-five grains daily. Ordinary turpentine, or Venice or Strasburg turpentine will not answer the purpose. Dr. Clay uses it in combination with sulphur, as he found by repeated and varied experiments with other substances that the Chian turpentine acted with uniform benefit in this combination.

He describes as follows the first case, in which, after long study of the subject, he attempted the use of the new remedy, on a woman who was taken to the hospital afflicted with cirrhous cancer of the cervix and body of the uterus:

"Hemorrhage was excessive, pain of the back and abdomen agonizing, and cancerous cachexia well marked. The patient evidently had not a long time to live. In such a case it appeared to be justifiable to attempt to relieve the sufferings of the patient, even if the remedy should produce unfavorable symptoms, or should prove of no avail. I therefore prescribed Chian turpentine, six grains; flowers of sulphur, four grains; to be made into two pills, to be taken every four hours. No opiates were prescribed or lotion used. No change was to be made in her diet or occupation. On the fourth day after taking the medicine, the patient reported herself greatly relieved from pain, and was in better spirits, but she complained of a large amount of discharge. It was feared that she referred to a discharge of a sanguineous nature. On examination, however, the vagina was found to be filled with a dirty-white secretion, so tenacious as to be capable of being pulled out rope-like, and this although she had syringed herself three hours previously."

After continuing the medicine 12 weeks with excellent effects, the patient suddenly went away without leaving any particulars by which the final result could be learned. In his next case—a woman 31 years of age—the cancer was entirely removed in about five weeks. Several other cases are reported of the complete cure of cancers in different parts of the body. In some instances the turpentine in the form of pills could not be digested, and the manager of the hospital dispensary prepared:

"An ethereal solution of Chian turpentine by dissolving 1 oz. of the turpentine in 2 oz. of pure sulphuric ether (anæsthetic). The ether dissolved the turpentine instantly. Of this solution, ½ oz.; solution of tragacanth, 4 oz.; syrup, 1 oz.; flowers of sulphur, 40 grains; water to 16 oz.; 1 oz. three times daily."

The following remarks of Dr. Clay will explain his theory of the action of the turpentine in dissolving the tumor, and giving permanent relief in a disease considered by many to be incurable.

"The turpentine appears to act upon the periphery of the growth with great vigor, causing the speedy disappearance of what is usually termed the cancerous infiltration, and thereby arresting the further development of the tumor. It produces equally efficient results on the whole mass, seemingly destroying its vitality, but more slowly. It appears to dissolve all the cancer cells, leaving the vessel to become subsequently atrophied, and the firmer structures to gradually gain a comparatively normal condition."

It is a most efficient anodyne, causing an entire cessation of pain in a few days, and far more effectually than any sedative that I have ever given. In the cases I have described no sedative was employed in any instance, although in some cases where great pain had existed previously to commencing the treatment, large doses had been given. Whether this arrest of pain arises from the death of the tumor, or, as my son suggests, is due to there being no longer irritation of the sensitive nerves (in consequence of ten-

tion being withdrawn by the removal of the cells), the fact is the same."

The discoverer of any method of assuaging pain and eradicating either of the many ills that flesh is heir to, and who makes his knowledge known, is a public benefactor, worthy of public reward.

FOR THE LADIES.

THE London *Spectator* has been calling the attention of English ladies to the necessity for dress reform. That paper deprecates the lack of real taste in woman's costume, even among ladies who are gifted with artistic powers, who can draw and paint, and who are familiar with objects of beauty, and have the advantage of the society of acknowledged artists; and says: "To dress so that their aspect, and that of all who imitate their fashion, should be beautiful in the sense which satisfies a fine and pure taste, would be to render, not only to art and artists but to the world at large, a very great benefit." That is the kind of dress reform that we have aimed to advocate. This would set the world of woman free from the slavish chains of fashion. The error into which the ladies fall in this respect is a sheep-like following of styles prescribed without their voice or vote. And these fashions are in very many instances first started by women whose social standing is outside the pale of purity.

The desire to make an attractive appearance is inborn in woman. Some people deplore this and would destroy it if they could. But they cannot succeed, either by reason, ridicule or force, because their efforts are a war against nature. As well might we find fault with that Power which expresses itself as much in forms of beauty and colors that delight all beholders as in grandeur, order and might, as to condemn woman for the love of adornment, which is a gift of heaven as natural as the powers of the senses.

But in the vast variety of shapes, and colors and trimmings, and dainty bits of ornament that are cut, and contrived, and gleaned from the broad domain of the floral kingdom, surely there is enough for each to select that is suitable and harmonious with each different style of form, height, carriage and complexion, without the need for conformity to the edicts of the dressmaker or the self-constituted leaders of fashion. Yet "blind obedience" to these decrees seems so to be the rule, and ladies bend to them with common consent, regardless of frequent and glaring incongruities, laughable absurdities and palpable inconveniences.

The ladies of Utah have received many words of counsel on the subject of fashion's follies, and the propriety of dress reform. We cannot say that the advice has in many cases been received according to its value. Perhaps wrong inferences have been drawn in regard to its meaning. The revelation is regard to this matter does not deny adornment. It speaks of the beauty of our garments without disapproval, but says it should be "the beauty of the workmanship of thine own hands." If that word of wisdom was obeyed, the despotism of fashion would be overthrown and woman would be free. Each one would devise that which is suitable and becoming, without regard to any fixed style to be changed by the dictates of others. Comfort as well as beauty would be studied, freedom of motion and ease of body more than formulated lines, and fixed cuts and special dimensions.

One cause of the failure of many projected dress reforms is the tendency of strong-minded women either to ape the masculine or to run towards the extrem of utility, regardless of the ornate and attractive. Violent and radical changes such as have been attempted defeat their own object and make their projectors objects of ridicule instead of benefactors of their sex.

The idea of a uniform for woman is not intended in this advice about dress reform. God does not make people alike any more than the flowers and the trees. Variety is exhibited in all His universe. We can learn of him by studying His works in the heavens above and the earth beneath. And while we see that He delights in beauty, we may also perceive that harmony of tints and

adaptation of shape to color and size to form, are plainly exhibited in all His glorious handiwork. In these are hints for His children. Whatever He clothes is covered and adorned with garments suitable and proper to meet, alike, the wants of the creature and the sense of pleasure and propriety in all beholders. If our sisters would learn of Him, there would be little or no need for lectures from men or women on the subject of dress reform.

A HINT TO HOUSEWIVES.

THE fruit crop of Utah is of great value. A large quantity of dried apples, plums, peaches, etc., is exported annually, in addition to that reserved for home consumption. Of late years tin cans and glass bottles have been very extensively brought into use for preserving fruit for winter use. This is perhaps the best method that can be employed to retain the natural flavor of the fruit. The acid in some kinds, however, appears to be destructive to the tin coating of the cans in use and they are spoilt in one season's use. Hence the glass bottles, although more expensive at first cost, are better and cheaper in the long run for that kind of fruit than the cheaper article.

But we have noticed several allusions in the papers recently to injurious effects proceeding from the eating of fruit kept in a zinc-covered bottle or jar. The object of this article is to call attention to the report of a New York chemist in a case of poisoning in Brooklyn, when four persons were seriously injured by eating cherries put up in a jar with a zinc cover. The chemist said:

"The presence of a zinc compound in the sirup was unmistakable, and it appeared in such abundance that some lack of precaution in preparing the fruit seemed probable. I learned, however, upon inquiry that the preserving had been done with scrupulous care by a friend of the family. Moreover, the contents of other jars of the collection prepared at the same time had been eaten without unpleasant results. As the jars yet unopened were placed at my disposal through the politeness of Mr. Gilbert [whose family had been poisoned,] I selected one having a zinc top with a porcelain lining. There was no indication of zinc in the contents of this jar. I then poured about a fluid ounce of the sirup of this jar into the cover of the first jar and warmed it over a water bath for three-quarters of an hour. The solution then yielded promptly to the test for zinc."

The case is not without parallel, but it is not sufficiently well known to the public that zinc yields so readily to the action of fruit acids, and consequently that the use of zinc or galvanized iron in the preparation or preservation of canned fruits is not free from danger."

This is a matter worthy of attention, and we advise the housewives of Utah to avoid putting their preserves or bottled fruit into contact with zinc, or what is called galvanized iron, which is not really galvanized, but coated with a preparation of zinc, if they do not want to introduce sickness into the family and dish up death with their dainties.

FLESH CHANGED TO STONE.

IN spite of the dictum of scientists, that the petrification of a human body is unproved and in fact impossible, every now and again a well-authenticated report comes to hand of the rapid change of a corpse into stone. The wisest of men do not know everything, and facts often prove that accepted theories are not always infallible. Without presuming to affirm or deny the truth of the account, we clip the following from the *Grass Valley Union*, as one of the most recent cases of alleged petrification which has come to light:

"Police officer William Blanford died on the 11th of June 1874. The body was placed in the Philanthropic Cemetery, on Passayunk road, New York. A day or two ago a son of the deceased had the body disinter-

red, with the object of removing it to another cemetery. Four men took hold of the box in which the coffin was packed, and it required their united efforts to lift it to the surface. The body was not decayed, and the coffin inside was as bright as on the day of burial; the silver plate was not even tarnished. When the lid was removed it was discovered that the body was petrified. The remains were in an almost perfect state of preservation. The clothing was somewhat mouldy, and what was once flesh had changed to a hard stony substance, resembling yellowish marble. The eyes were gone, the lips had partially disappeared, and there was no hair on the head; but otherwise the body was perfect. The features were perfect, and even the whiskers on the chin were turned into stone. The body weighed almost five hundred pounds. Mrs. Blanford died in February last and was buried near her husband. Her body was undergoing the natural process.

SELF-CONFESSED HERETICS.

THE General Conference of the M. E. Church, which closed its session on the 27th ult., enunciated the following item of ecclesiastical law:

"When a minister or preacher disseminates, publicly or privately, doctrines which are contrary to our Articles of Religion or established standards, let the same process be observed as in cases of gross immorality; but if the minister or preacher so offending do solemnly engage not to disseminate such erroneous doctrines in public or private, he shall be borne with till his case be laid before the next annual conference, which shall determine the matter."

Among the principal "established standards" of the Methodists are the Sermons and Notes of the founder of their system, the celebrated John Wesley. We believe there are very few of the leading preachers among the Methodists to-day who would pretend to endorse some of the doctrines promulgated by their great chief. Wesley believed in present inspiration and taught that the reason why the gifts called miraculous, which were exercised by primitive Christians, are not enjoyed in modern times, is because of the lack of modern faith. His followers, including the Bishops who helped to make the above section of church law, teach that those gifts are "done away because no longer needed."

But the widest difference between the views of Wesley and those of his professed disciples, is in the doctrine of the punishment of the wicked. Wesley proclaimed an eternal hell of material fire as the endless fate of the unbelieving sinner. The very men who rank the dissemination of a contrary doctrine to that of Wesley's with gross immorality, repudiate in private, and most of them in public, any faith whatever in literal hell fire or material torment of the wicked. How will they attempt to reconcile their actual belief with their published profession?

Lest there should be any denial of Wesley's enunciation of this once prominent and fundamental doctrine of Methodism—still a cardinal point in its written code—we give a few quotations from Wesley's sermon on hell:

"But it has been questioned by some, 'Whether there be any fire in hell?' that is any material fire. Nay, if there be any fire, it is unquestionably material. For what is immaterial fire? the same as immaterial water on earth! Both the one and the other is absolute nonsense; a contradiction in terms. Either, therefore, we must affirm it to be material, or we deny its existence. But if we granted them there is no fire at all there, what would they gain thereby? Seeing this is allowed on all hands, that it is either fire or something worse. And consider this—does not our Lord speak as if it were real fire? No one can deny or doubt of this. Is it possible, then, to suppose that the God of truth would speak in this manner, if it were not so? Does he design to fright his poor creatures? What, with scare-crows? With vain shadows of things that have no being? Oh, let not any one think so! I impute no such folly to the Most High. * * Let us keep to the written word. It is torn enough to dwell with everlasting burnings."

This is strongly illustrated by a fabulous story, taken from one of the Eastern writers, concerning a Turkish king, who after he had been