

FRENCH EMBROGLIO IN MEXICO.

The French Regency in Mexico have got into trouble with the Archbishops in relation to the lands which were sequestered from the Church to the Juarez Government. It was expected by the clergy that the French authorities would favor the Church by restoring the possessions which the previous Government had, as they termed it, plundered for the replenishment of the public treasury. But instead of thus rewarding the bishops and clergy for their countenance of the invasion and conquest, the French Regency issued orders involving a recognition of the sequestration of their property. Another indignity was the removal of the Archbishop from his office, as Regent of the Empire.

Against these acts of the Regency the Archbishop of Mexico entered his decided protest, declaring his removal from office null and void and all the archbishops of the empire unite in declaring against all who shall execute or co-operate in executing the circulars and orders issued against the church property by command of the French General. They declare their situation under these orders to be worse than it was under the Juarez Government. The protest was issued December 26, 1863. On January 2, 1864, the French Regents, Almonte and Solas, issued a decree removing all the Judges and other officers of the Supreme Court, on the ground of their refusal to enforce the laws or orders regarding the nationalization of the church property; this they explained by saying that it was necessary in order to conform their action to the "French Policy." On the 16th of January General Neigre wrote a sharp letter to the Bishop of Mexico complaining of the incendiary character of the publications which were being clandestinely circulated by the clergy in the capital. To this the Archbishop replies categorically that never was the church so bitterly persecuted, and that he, the Chief Prelate, finds himself in a worse position than under the former Government.

The Bishop's protest against being removed from the Government, was written November 17, 1863. On the 20th, General Bazaine replied to the Bishop, and used the following language:

"May I be permitted to express the desire that your Grace, well inspired, will accept the position as it is to-day, and will reject the advice and suggestions of imprudent friends, against whom, notwithstanding, I am well decided to take the most rigorous measures that I am authorized to employ under the powers with which I am invested. I rely on the abnegation of your Grace, and on your devotion to the country, that, at the moment I am about setting out for the interior of the work of the pacification and regeneration of Mexico, your opposition will not delay the march of the Government."

On the 28th the Archbishop rejoins firmly, as will be seen by the following extract:

"Your Excellency continues, expressing your desire that I will accept the situation as it is, and will repel the counsels and suggestions of imprudent friends, against whom your Excellency is resolved to take the most rigorous measures in use of the powers with which you are invested. With reference to the first, I have to say to your Excellency that I do not understand the exact meaning which you place upon the words 'accept the position'; but as accepting is consenting and admitting I have to say to your Excellency that I have not, and I never will, agree to any of the steps that have been taken against the rights I have defended; but that, on the contrary, I insist upon all and each one of my protests. If these words have a signification strictly personal, I have to say, with all frankness, that I have no aspirations of a personal character; that I entered the Regency, not for pleasure, but to labor, and to sacrifice myself for the public good, and yielding to suggestions of the most elevated character. If, finally, they mean that I, in my character of Archbishop, have to remain silent and impassible in view of these attacks upon the supreme authority of the Church, its immunities, I have to say, with all frankness, that neither myself nor my illustrious brethren can maintain silence without doing violence to our consciences, and that we are disposed to suffer everything rather than prove wanting in the execution of such holy duties when the occasion shall arrive."

The united protest of all the bishops to wit: Pelagio, A., Archbishop of Mexico; Cleminé, D. J., Archbishop of Michoacan; Pedro, Archbishop of Guadalajara; Pedro, Bishop of San Luis Potosi; Jose Maria, Bishop of Ojaca, is a long and strong document, of which we give the closing paragraph, which is most significant of the fact that the French Regency must yield or they will have trouble in maintaining their authority.

"But your Excellencies can believe us, we cannot keep silence without making ourselves criminal by this silence before the strict justice of the government before whose tribunal we shall have to appear at the end of a life which is rapidly escaping. When these terrible occasions present themselves which call for the exercise of our pastoral charge, when we see that a soul lost through our silence will call down upon ourselves the same perdition, we tremble with terror. Not even evident knowledge of the inutility of our expostulations and protests would excuse us before God. See the fearful confirmation of this truth which the Holy Spirit gives us in chapter III, verses 18 and 19, of Ezekiel: 'When I say unto the wicked, thou shalt surely die, and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn

the wicked from his wicked way to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity, but his blood or perdition will I require at thine hand. Yet if thou warn the wicked, and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul.'"

The following is the conclusion of the order of the regents, Almonte and Salos, removing the judges and other officers of the Supreme Court:

"Mexicans—be tranquil and secure. The Regency, invested with authority, will watch over your interests conjointly with the chiefs of the intervention. The course of justice will not be interrupted. In making new nominations of those who are to be charged with its administration, we shall not inquire of those magistrates to what party they have belonged, but we shall exact from them that they will faithfully maintain equal rights for all, without distinction of opinions; and if it be necessary we shall recall to them—if they forget it—that the dissensions of the nation were conducting it to certain ruin, when the powerful hand of the Emperor Napoleon was stretched out to arrest it on the fatal decline."

From this showing it seems that the controversy is rapidly coming to a head. As the French went out to Mexico on the express invitation of the Church party, it is no matter of surprise that the clergy should keenly feel the sting of the serpent, that was warmed to life in the bosom of the Church. What view may be taken of the controversy in the Tuileries, and especially by Maximilian, remains to be seen. If the proposed Emperor has really been as solicitous as represented about having adequate guarantees thrown around his Mexican throne, he will hesitate about being crowned under such embarrassing circumstances.

There is, doubtless, a very large party in Mexico bitterly opposed to the French dynasty, and if the disaffected obtain the support of the Church party, who will there be besides the French soldiers and some Mexicans who are in comfortable offices, to constitute the French party? It looks as if there were no hope of the empire being tranquilized under French rule, if all efforts to conciliate the Church party shall fail. The more intelligent of the Mexicans cannot but see that there will be little progress of that country in its true nationality, unless this external power installed in their midst shall be overthrown. We shall await with interest the result of this embroglio.

[From the Hebrew, San Francisco.]

MORE SLANDERS REFUTED.

The *Golden Era*, a literary paper of this city, has from time to time, published articles of a trip overland to the Pacific, written by Fitz Hugh Ludlow, of New York. In its issue of March 27th, the writer speaks of the Mormons, and indulges in the following remarks:

"The whole secret of their fanaticism is intelligible the moment that you understand one fact—they are saturated through and through with a love for the Old Testament civilization as understood by them. You cannot talk with one of their strongest men—like Young or Kimball—for an hour without seeing that their national model is the Jewish people. Like the Jews, they are grossly sensual and physical in all their ideas of religion and a future state. Like them they have no notion of the pure conjugal relation, and consider polygamy its highest form. Like them, they believe themselves the constituted rulers of the Gentiles and will 'compass heaven and earth to make a proselyte.' Like them, they think themselves doing God a service by assassinating such as have made defection from their creed: and murder the enemies of their faith with as little compunction as the old Israelitish barbarians were wont to slay the Canaanites. Like them they extort involuntary contributions for the support of their ecclesiastical organization, and exact the same blind obedience to a privileged priesthood as under pain of death was paid to the Levitical behests. But I might run the parallel interminably. It only remains necessary for me to add, that in spite of their being like the Jews, shameless polygamists, assassins, bigots, inquisitors, delirious in massacre, extortioners and zealots, they claim to do all these things under the sanction and by the order of God Almighty—in fact to be 'His chosen people.' They are an attempt to revive the Israelitish Civilization in the 19th century."

Whether Mr. Ludlow writes of ancient or modern Jews, his argument is untenable, as besides the bigotry expressed in the above, the writer most signally exposes his own ignorance. It is admitted by all theologians and jurists that the foundation of the Christian Church as well as the legal enactments which govern man in a civilized and enlightened condition, is the Mosaic law, the code which is at once, the moral and religious creed of the Jew, how can it be that the latter are "assassins, extortionists, polygamists, bigots, inquisitors and zealots," for such are the terms he employs in speaking of the children of Israel. It is not our purpose to defend the Mormon creed; we know no hing of the people, or their customs, save by report. The report, also says that they were most shamefully persecuted in free America for their religious belief; driven out by fire and the sword from their towns and cities, and despoiled by their adversaries, until they were forced to seek a shelter and a habitation. Under a leader

they traversed the Rocky Mountains, and in the great basin of the continent, on the shores of a salt lake, in a desert country, as uninhabited as that surrounding the Dead Sea, they settled, prospered, and became a people.

Even the ascetic Mr. Ludlow says in another part of his article:

"The Mormons fled to a desert where life itself would be a burden to most of us; by incredible labor have replaced the sage brush and the alkali plains with smiling gardens, green meadows, luxuriant orchards and golden harvest fields; have never ceased to wage war with hostile nature, knowing that armistice means defeat to them of the sorest kind, and that one year's neglect of their laborious system of artificial irrigation would blot out the triumphs of the past painful years; they stand thus, holding the desert from their doors by main force."

He could pay them no higher tribute for the constancy with which they have upheld their belief in the creed of their adoption—no matter how antagonistic it may be with the belief of others—in which they have exhibited an abiding faith in the Almighty. To do this, as the writer observes, they added to the ordinary formula of Christianity, forms of the Jewish civil and religious code, and for this they are held up as an immoral people.

That there have been, and still are "thieves, murderers, assassins, extortioners and bigots" in other Christian communities than the Mormons, the criminal history of the world best attests, and we can see no reason why Mormonism should become the especial mark for Christian malevolence in this respect. We do protest, however, against the outrageous libel, the writer endeavors to fasten on the Jews. In the whole history of crime in the United States, and it is not less prolific here than in Europe, it has always been a matter of just pride with the Jews, that no one was ever punished for murder or assassination, and in the list of derelicts for felonies and high crimes, the prison records of the world are comparatively bare of Jews. A distinguished jurist who has taken pains to ascertain facts, informs us that the proportion of Jews to Christians, as criminals throughout the world, is but one in ten thousand. We can see nothing to brag of, then, Mr. Ludlow, in the morality you advocate, to the prejudice of the fair fame of the Jews.

The Mormons, in making proselytes, do just the same as other Christian denominations—the Jews do not refuse admission to their church, but they have invariably discountenanced proselytism. The "inquisitorial" portion of the crimes laid at the door of the Jewish church, is a great stretch of imagination. Is not Mr. Ludlow familiar with the history of the Christian inquisition, of the war that fanatics and bigots so cruelly waged against the Jews, under the cloak of religion? Yet the Jews survived all such persecutions. The Jews never sanctioned such a moral outrage, and if the Mormons do, they are indebted for that feature of their religious belief to the Catholic church. The Jew has had to bear enough of this world's contumely, just such as Mr. Ludlow exhibits, and it is time that such calumnies should be refuted.

We do not defend our own creed; it has been handed down to us from generation to generation for nearly six thousand years. It has been maintained through ages of persecution, with a devotion and constancy no other nation can exhibit, whilst history alone is the record of the many powerful nations, who have risen and fallen during that period. Yet the Jew exists, and is the living witness of the Christian.

In regard to polygamy, Mr. Ludlow, as well as other writers of the day, classes it as an immorality. We differ with him, but only in the exact term to be applied to it. The Jews as a people are polygamists only in the lands where that custom exists. It is an eastern custom—the custom of the Holy Land, but it is not the custom in what is termed Christian lands. Whenever the Jew dwells in Christian lands, he conforms to its moral laws, and we have yet to meet with a Jew who is a polygamist; or an advocate or defender thereof, in the United States. In a land where universal religious liberty is one of the boons granted by character, it is difficult to legislate on marriage. Some States hold it to be a religious, whilst others, a civil contract—and when doctors disagree, who can decide? If a civil community have a right to discriminate in relation to the marriage act, according to monogamy, others certainly have the same right to decide according to polygamy. The law of the land, the Constitution of the United States is their shield for this.

But polygamy is offensive to the moral sense of the public, and in this, consists the crime of the Mormons. That same moral sensitiveness of the Christians, is of a peculiar character. It deserves and is offended by the iniquities of their neighbors, whilst it hides and batters over an immoral pestilence of far greater horror. The millions of "poor unfortunate females," who are the victims of "the social evil," reflect a far more lasting disgrace on monogamy, than the abuse of polygamy by the Mormons.

There are evils in all social regulations, which cannot be set aright by controversy, and the Mormon question is one of them. If people do not like their habits, they are not compelled to adopt them. We believe, and conscientiously too, that a greater portion of the ill-fame of the Mormons, has arisen from prejudice, bigotry and persecution. The Jewish people, as a body, are a monument of what Christian intolerance can inflict; and we judge from our past history and persecutions, what

the Mormons have in the past, and are yet to endure in the future. Aside from their religion, they are an industrious, united people, who maintain an abiding faith in the correctness of their belief, and in the multiplicity of the creeds of the Christian church, the followers of each individual one, entertaining the same idea, is it right for any man to say—"That is wrong,"—"That is right?"—"Ye shall be blessed, and ye accursed?"

THE POISON WIND OF CALIFORNIA—THE NOR'WESTER.

The northwest winds which annually sweep over the plains of California and the central land between the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada, are among the peculiar features of the Pacific. They commonly set in towards the middle of April, and continue through the spring and summer until the turn of the equinox in the first week of October. They generally come in with fogs which grow exceedingly heavy in the middle of the summer, when they sometimes blow for days, the sun in full blaze, and not a mist or obscuration to dull the sky. And even when attended with heavy fogs, these fogs often do not for days precipitate a particle of moisture, and the sun in the clearest sky in midsummer seems to lose its heat before its rays can reach the earth.

These winds generally rise in the morning, at least in such extra dry seasons as 1856 and 1864, before 10 o'clock, and go out before nightfall. After an interval of two or three hours of pleasant calm they rise again and continue all night till about sunrise, when there is another tranquilization for several hours. Then they lift their voices again a little later than in the preceding morning, and blow out half an hour earlier in the afternoon, and so perform a similar diminution at night again. But each day they blow stronger, until the third, fourth or sixth day, when there is a culmination of their violence, and they will after that gradually disappear, less and less daily, until they entirely blow all their strength away. Some of them are of five days duration, while others last ten and even twenty days.

If obliged to travel by stage, sea or horseback, and exposed to this ruffian wind, particularly in a clear sky, with its usual temperature of 46 deg., a great depression of spirits ensues—the skin becomes cold and dry, the hair and whiskers seem to crisp and curl, the head throbs and aches, the nose and ears tingle with nervous tremblings, the eyes redden and run, and the wiper is constantly rubbing and sopping the beak and peepers, the lips and face crack or chap, and about as blue-devilish a feeling comes over one as could possibly be envied by anybody "who likes to be miserable." These winds have a terribly parching effect on growing vegetation, particularly the green pastures. In the Tulare Lake country they are said by old hunters and herdsmen to almost visibly lick up and evaporate the waters of that dead level exposure. All who are caught riding in that vicinity in such gales find difficulty in alighting from their horses after a few hours exposure. An experiment was once tried while one of these desperadoes of Boreas was on a midsummer "bust" of 50 miles an hour—for they blow at times at that violent rate—and it was found that a gallon of water, in six hours exposure in a shallow vessel, was dried up to five-eighths of its normal quantity, and the temperature of the air had fallen at the pivot of the gale 15 degrees from that of its commencement, three hours before. The desiccating, aridified, pulverizing effect on our California soils of the northwesterers with their clouds of dust, is one of the most disagreeable features of the climate of the Pacific domain, and exceeds that of the scorching suns. These winds were exceedingly severe in 1855 and 1856. Those of 1864, from March 20th to 23d, appear to have extended from the Columbia river to San Diego, and were felt as far east as Great Salt Lake. The native Californians call them Poison Winds, from their not only drying the face, but sometimes swelling it as if by the venom of fish sickness.—[S. F. Bulletin.]

READING AND THINKING.—This is emphatically the age of reading. But is it one of thinking also? Our grandfathers had fewer books, still fewer newspapers, and no system of popular lecturing; yet what they acquired they had time mentally to digest, and so became sounder men. When Bacon said that reading made the correct man, but conversation only a ready one, he meant the reading of a more thorough age than this. What conversation was then, common reading is now. Men read light and easy books instead of talking with their gossips, and gain very little if any more improvement.

The true end of books, or even of good newspapers, is not merely to gratify curiosity, but to supply facts and principles which may be laid away in the mind, to be drawn upon subsequently, as exigencies of life demand. He who reads without digesting, even if he learns how to think, never has a stock of ideas on hand to think about. He is like the Iselite in Egypt, when they had no straw to make bricks. But a careless reader is also a bad thinker. The mind of a thoughtful reader is like the bolting apparatus of a mill, separating the bran from the flour, coincident with the act of reading. The hasty reader neglects this duty. Men forget what they have read almost as soon as the book or paper is laid down. They rarely or never exercise judgment. They don't think.