

QTA
MI75e
1869

EARLY HISTORY

OF

MARYLAND & C. & C.

R. M^o SHERRY M.D.

Surgeon General's Office

LIBRARY

Section, *Essay*

No. *85863*

9/5

Pho. H. Gough



1

726806
Wm
Lot 0
11

ESSAYS AND LECTURES

ON

1. THE EARLY HISTORY OF MARYLAND:
2. MEXICO AND MEXICAN AFFAIRS:
3. A MEXICAN CAMPAIGN:
4. HOMŒOPATHY:
5. ELEMENTS OF HYGIENE:
6. HEALTH AND HAPPINESS.



BY

RICHARD McSHERRY, M. D.

Professor of Principles and Practice of Medicine, University of Maryland.

Member of the Maryland Historical Society, &c.

BALTIMORE:

KELLY, PIET & COMPANY.

1869.

P R E F A C E .

The following Essays were written for the most part as a diversion from the severer studies and labors attendant upon the Profession of Medicine.

The article on EARLY MARYLAND, was written as a labor of love, *con amore*, because of the author's deep and abiding interest in the subject. Bossuet has said that a general history is like a chart of a country wherein all the prominent outlines are shown, whereas a special history is like a map which shows a country in detail, even to its hamlets and rivulets. This article, it is believed, will be found to be a faithful chart of Colonial Maryland.

Of the two Essays on MEXICO, the principal one was written at the suggestion of the distinguished Senior Editor of the *Southern Review*, who knew of the author's familiar acquaintance with the history and condition of the Sister Republic. The *Campaign Sketch* is a companion piece to MEXICO and MEXICAN AFFAIRS, and the two will probably give as much information as the general reader may desire in regard to that country, from the date of its independence down to the death of Maximilian.

The *Epistle on Homœopathy*, and the lectures on *Hygiene*, and *Health and Happiness*, are on the border ground between medical and general literature, which certainly will be intelligible, and probably will be interesting, to both professional and general readers. The two Lectures, it will be observed, are upon kindred topics, and each one serves to illustrate and sustain the other.

BALTIMORE, December, 1868.

TABLES OF CONTENTS.

PAGE.

I. THE EARLY HISTORY OF MARYLAND. - - - 1

George Calvert—resigns his offices on account of change of religion—page 1-4. Repelled from Virginia—5. Obtains a Charter from Charles I.—5. Draws it up according to his own views—6. The Clauses bearing upon Religion—6. Name of Maryland—6. Cecilius, 2d Lord Baltimore, carries out his father's views—8. The *Ark* and the *Dove*—8. The Pilgrims take possession—8. The Cross, in good and evil repute—8-9. Cecilius aids his Colony—10. Missionary Priests among the Indians—11. The Indians in Massachusetts—12. Harmony between Catholics and Protestants—12. Practical Toleration of Jews—13. Toleration Act of 1649—13. Bancroft's Testimony—14. Case of Wm. Lewis—15. Comparative Toleration in Maryland and in Massachusetts—16. Roger Williams colonizes Rhode Island—17. Gov. Calvert invites Colonists persecuted in Massachusetts to Maryland—17. Gov. Stone invites persecuted Puritans in Virginia to Maryland—17. Puritans accept land, but refuse to take oath annexed—18. Toleration Act of '49—18. William Clayborne, the *evil genius* of Maryland—19. Clayborne's agency in driving Lord Baltimore from Virginia—20. He incites the Indians against the Maryland Colonists—20. Clayborne's claims; he resorts to force and fraud; conspires with the pirate Ingle and other parties to overthrow the Proprietary Government—21. Puritan Assembly excludes Catholics and members of Church of England from the protection of the Government—22. Gov. Stone attempts to regain the lost rights of the Proprietary—22. Mr. Coode's Association for the defence of the Protestant religion—23. Address of the Protestants of Kent to the King—23. Maryland a 'Royal Government'—25. Test Oaths and Disabilities—25. Baltimore town—25. The last Lord Baltimore—25. Laws against the Catholics—26. The Portents of the Revolution—26. Tea-burning—26. Conventions at Annapolis—27. Resolutions in aid of Massachusetts—27. The Old Maryland Line—28. The Revolution restored lost rights to the people of Maryland—28. The magnanimity of Lord Baltimore's government—29. Marylanders justly proud of his name, of his character, of his Charter.

II. MEXICO AND MEXICAN AFFAIRS. - - - 30

Prescott; Alaman—page 32. Whitening colored races—32. Rio-del-dea-güé—33. Brazen Age—33. Empire of Iturbide—33. Forty years of Anarchy—34. Intervention of United States desired—34. Maximilian at Vera Cruz—34. Invited to Mexico by assembly of Notables—34. Maximilian executed—35. The Viceroy Revillagigedo—36. Outlawry of Juarez's soldiers, by decree of Maximilian—36. A like decree issued by Gen'l Scott—37. Dictatorship offered to Scott—37. 240 Revolutions—38. Claim of Juarez to Presidency—38. The United States held responsible for execution of Maximilian—38. Two Presidents—39. Mr. McLane's election—39. United States Ship *Saratoga* aids Juarez—39. United States not to interfere in Mexican affairs—40. United States agents sustain Juarez—41. Mexican Bonds—41. Liberal ways and means of raising funds—42. *Cosas de Mejico*—43. Black Mail—43. Intervention of United States—44. Maximilian prepares to leave Mexico—45. His cause betrayed—45. N. Y. *Tribune* on his execution—46. Mr. Seward's efforts to save

	him—47. Factitious public opinion in United States—48. Liberals destructive—49. Conservatism inducing prosperity—50. Incessant Revolutions—51. The Liberals perturbators—52. Mexico not a Republic—53. Lepe-ros—56. Mexican popular government and free institutions illustrated—57. No Mexican people; preponderance of Indians—59. <i>Rancheros</i> the yeomanry—60. Mixed races incapable of forming a stable government—61. Mexican ladies—62. Kindness to Texan prisoners—63. Need of im-migration—63.	
III.	MEXICAN CAMPAIGN SKETCH. - - - - -	64
	Camp Vergara, near Vera Cruz—page 64. A Storm on the beach—65. Peak of Orizaba—65. Santa Anna's wild beef—66. Mexican Escopetas—66. El Vomito—66. March in Tierras Calientes—66. Guerrillas—66. Ja-lapa—67. Prolific Vegetation—68. The Banana—68. Scott's Army at Puebla—68. Division Commanders—68. Popocatepetl—68. Istacchihuatl—68. Tierras Templadas to Tierras Frias—69. First glimpses of valley of Mexico—69. Physical Geography—70. Products and Resources—70. El Peñon—70. The war god; his wife—72. Battles of Contreras, &c—73. General demoralization of the people—73. Influence of fair dealing—74. Battle of Molino del Rey—74. Capture of Chapultepec—74. Taking pos-session of the City of Mexico—75. Winfield Scott; Robert E. Lee—76. Withdrawal of the army deplored by the Mexicans—77. Reign of Terror—77. Memorial crosses—77. The lessons derived from bad government—77.	
IV.	EPISTLE ON HOMŒOPATHY. - - - - -	78
	Homœopathic Essays—78. Infinitesimal doses—79. Revelations of philo-sophy—80. Contagious matter in scarlet fever—82. The millionth of a grain of belladonna remedial—82. Cure of Croup—84. Of Erysipelas—85. Of Warts—86. Contradictions among regular physicians—87. Unanimity among Homœopaths—88. Hahnemann's fictions—88. Large doses in small bulk—89. Definition of Homœopathy—89. Gregory the Great on Practice of Medicine—89. Infinitesimal doses have no marked effect—90. Homœopaths <i>versus</i> Homœopathy—91. Ignorance of Allopathy—91. Com-mon sense of Homœopathy—91. Successful practice in Tartary and Thibet—92. Allopathy sectarian and objectionable—93. Homœopathic pol-sons in our daily bread—94.	
V.	LECTURE ON HYGIENE. - - - - -	96
	Health—page 97. Disease—97. Ease, and dis-ease—98. Predisposing and exciting causes—98. Cognizable causes—99. Non-cognizable—99. Requi-sites for preservation of Health—100. Deleterious influences of impure air—101. Black Hole of Calcutta—101. Air of cities—102. Affects chil-dren—103. Disinfectants—103. Air of mines, shops, &c.—103. Slaves of Civilization—103. Ventilation—104. Food and Drink—104. Milk the pro-totype of food—105. Good and bad bread—105. Boiled wheat—105. Fresh and salt meat—106. Water in cities—106. Wines and liquors—107. Drunk-ard's disease—107. Alcohol—108. Clothing—109. Woollen, silk, cotton, linen fabrics—109. Protection of feet—109. Of head—109. Habits of life—109. A good stomach—110. Cleanliness—111. Labor and rest, of mind and body—111.	
VI.	HEALTH AND HAPPINESS. - - - - -	
	Health—113. Happiness—114. True Science—115. Virtues and Vices—116. Excesses in eating—117. History of Cornaro—118. Excesses in drink—119. Alcohol pernicious in the Tropics—120. Alcohol pernicious in Arctic regions—120. A proper beverage in Utopia—121. Tobacco—121. Bulwer and the gods—121. Mrs. Abstinence—122. A monk of the desert of Cordova—122. Dan Cupid—123. Repression of the passions—124. Di-vores—124. Habit of early self-control—125.	

The Early History of Maryland.

[SOUTHERN REVIEW, JANUARY, 1869.]

- ART. VI.—1. *An Historical View of the Government of Maryland from its Colonization to the Present Day.* By John V. L. McMahon. Baltimore: F. Lucas, Jr. & Co. 1831.
2. *The History of Maryland, from its first Settlement in 1633 to the Restoration in 1660.* By John Leeds Bozman. Baltimore: Lucas & Deaver. 1837.
3. *The Landholder's Assistant.* By John Kilty, Register of the Land Office, &c. Baltimore: S. Dobbin & Murphy. 1808.
4. *A History of Maryland, from its Settlement in the year 1634 to the year 1848.* By James McSherry. Baltimore: Jno. Murphy & Co. 1850.
5. *The Day-Star of American Freedom, or the Birth and Early Growth of Toleration in the Province of Maryland.* By George Lynn-Lachlan Davis. New York: Scribner. Baltimore: Murphy. 1855.
6. *Terra Mariæ, or Threads of Maryland Colonial History.* By Edward D. Neill. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1867.

It is, and it ought to be, a genuine refreshment to the wayfarer over the rugged road of life, to find among our fellow men, whether living or dead, examples of the combination in one person of the two rare qualities of greatness and goodness. There are, indeed, ingenuous thinkers who deem these qualities, to a certain extent, inseparable; or, at least, who imagine there is no true greatness without that aggregation of virtues recognized as

goodness; but this is a mistake which may be disproved by nearly every page of general history. We have seen it somewhere asserted, by an over-zealous champion of Christianity, that there was no true eloquence but that inspired by Christianity, in utter ignorance or oblivion of the fact that Demosthenes and Cicero have now, and have ever had, more admirers than Paul and Chrysostom; and those champions of goodness, who deem it necessary to greatness, must likewise ignore or forget that Alexander, Cæsar, Cromwell, and Napoleon, are conspicuous among the great men of the earth. We fear that, in point of fact, greatness and goodness are as little akin as Petruchio's stirrups; and yet they are, happily, sometimes combined. To say nothing of the great and good of the Christian ministry, living lights, or shining through all Christian ages and nations, we may offer as familiar examples or representative men, an Alfred the Great, a Sir Thomas More, a Christopher Columbus, and last, not least, the great American — no, let us give him his local habitation,—the great VIRGINIAN, whose name towers above all others, sprung from this new and vigorous western world of ours.

The seventeenth century abounded in men of mark, in every line of human distinction; and prominent among them were the founders of the various American colonies, which were the sources or fountain heads of states already great and powerful; but which are, as yet, but slightly developed in comparison with their future destinies. All of these founders are more or less objects of the world's admiration; all were cast more or less in the same heroic mould; all were brave, resolute, and self-reliant; men of bold emprise, who won, without exception, the 'bubble reputation', while seeking, for the most part, much more substantial rewards.

For ourselves, we believe that among the colonial founders there are none more worthy of love, of praise, of admiration, or, in like circumstances, of imitation, than George Calvert. In the seventeenth century, knowledge was making immense strides; and men's minds were expanding with what may be considered the world's expansion. And yet, in some respects, and those the most interesting as well as the most important to the happiness of the

human race, the darkest shadows were lowering over the face of Christendom; and that faith which in intelligent minds must needs be free to be real, was subject, in the mother country especially, to civil or military power, or to the caprice of any reigning tyrant.

Under the reign of James I., religious persecution was very active, and Catholics and Protestants had to bear penalties that were sometimes almost beyond human endurance, for adhering to the faith of their fathers, on the one hand, or, on the other, for diverging from the tenets approved by the British Solomon. This king himself, born of a Catholic mother, and bred a Presbyterian, 'half Pope and half Puritan', gave to both Catholics and Calvinists a foretaste in this world of what he supposed they were to endure in the world to come. Without dwelling upon these matters, we may say briefly, that numbers of the sufferers were driven to seek homes beyond the seas. The virgin soil of America offered the highest inducements to the persecuted, of whatever denomination. The Puritan emigrants made a lodgment, first in Holland, where they were free from persecution, but where they found no prospect of material advancement; and then they wisely determined that their promised land was in the new world, whither many of them directed their steps, to build up a new nation in the wilderness.

The Catholics, sorely beset in their native land, knew not where nor how to find a place of peace and safety. Fortunately for them, in the last year of the reign of King James, a courtier, a gentleman, a scholar, a man of unquestioned ability in wielding either the sword or the pen, publicly announced his attachment to the Catholic faith. This was in 1624. It has been a matter of keen controversy as to whether this conversion, or perversion, as it was respectively considered, took place in 1624, or at an earlier date. From the data furnished by the various disputants, as well as by the most trustworthy authorities, we infer that the gentleman in question adopted the Catholic faith positively in the year 1624, although his inclination had been tending that way for some years. Be this as it may, the able, accomplished, and favorite courtier, Sir George Calvert, made his public profession in the year above mentioned; and, with this public pro-

fession, he resigned the offices with which the King had honored him. He held the office at that time, *inter alia*, of Chief Secretary of State. 'This place he discharged', says Fuller, in his *Worthies of England*, 'above five years; until he willingly resigned the same, 1624, on this occasion. He freely confessed himself to the king that he was then become a Roman Catholic, so that he must either be wanting in his trust, or violate his conscience, in discharging his office. This, his ingenuity, so highly affected King James, that he continued him privy councillor all his reign, (as appeareth in the council book), and soon after created him Lord Baltimore, of Baltimore, in Ireland.'

The courtier knew full well that his religious principles would be of no worldly advantage to him; but, being stout of heart and strong in faith, he declared them frankly, and prepared to abide the consequences. In the words of Bancroft, 'preferring the avowal of his opinions to the emoluments of office, he resigned his place and openly professed his conversion.' Being a personal favorite of the king, whom he had served with fidelity and zeal, he retained position at court in spite of the clamor of a rising party in the State, whose influence became much more potent in subsequent years.

The privy councillor was not a man to rely exclusively and devotedly upon royal favor. He was too sagacious to place all his trust in princes. And even if the king should be always friendly, there were other parties willing and ready to mar the peace of his life. He was not exempt, notwithstanding the king's favor, as McMahon remarks, from those difficulties and mortifications which always attend the profession and exercise of a proscribed religion. 'It was natural', says this author, 'that thus situated, he should desire to establish himself in some more happy land, where, in every event, he might be free from the persecutions of the Established Church. Men are not content with the enjoyment, by mere sufferance, of either political or religious liberty. The insecurity of the tenure robs them of half their enjoyment.' He went to Avalon,¹ in Newfoundland, to find a peaceful home, but left it on account of the rigor of the

¹ He called his first province *Avalon*, from the place where it is said Christianity was first planted in England.

climate; ² he went thence to Virginia, but was repelled from that province by the local government on account of his religious tenets. 'Then it was', continues McMahon, 'that his eyes were cast upon the territory along the Chesapeake Bay, as yet unsettled; and by the amenity of its situation, and the fertility of its resources, inviting him to its retreat. Here, if he could but obtain a grant of it from the crown, he might dwell in his own territory and under his own government; and build up in the wilderness a home for religious freedom. These were the leading views which seem to have operated upon him, in applying for the charter of Maryland; and but for his untimely death, at the moment of accomplishing his wishes, it is probable he would have removed to the province, and would have here permanently established his family. Hence it may be truly said, from the consideration of the views of its founder, and of the character and objects of its first colonists, that the State of Maryland, as well as the New England States, originated in the search for civil and religious freedom; and the character of the former is still further consecrated by the fact, that her government, for a long period after the colonisation, was true to the principles which laid the foundations of his colony. Her colonists, in escaping from the proscriptions and persecutions of the mother country, unlike those of some of the Puritan settlements of the North, did not catch the contagion of the spirit which had driven them from their homes.' ³

The buffetings which Calvert received on account of his religion, probably opened his eyes to the enormity of persecuting men for their religious tenets. He had felt the wrong in his own person, and he had witnessed the sufferings of others, both of his own faith and of divers dissenting creeds, for their religious opinions. It seemed to be sent to him, a just and a wise man, like an inspiration, that this great evil, this perennial scourge of Christendom, could and should be redressed at once and forever. Returning to England from Virginia, he made a successful application to King Charles I. for a grant

² A French author complacently observes that he (Calvert) was '*obligé de l'abandonner à cause des excursions des Français*'; but in point of fact, in his engagements with the French, he bore off the laurels, and they the cypress.

³ McMahon's History of Maryland.

of land within certain limits bordering upon the Chesapeake Bay. He drew up the charter with his own hand, and he took care to keep out of it anything which might trench upon liberty of conscience. His own plans were already made. Except a couple of phrases, one merely conventional, which declared that nothing should be done in the colony to the detriment of God's holy religion, and another that all ecclesiastical benefices were to be within the gift of the proprietary, there was nothing in the charter bearing upon the subject of religion. It is to be presumed that the king did not mean that the members of his own church should be in any way molested on account of their creed; but, at the same time, there was a careful avoidance of making the Established Church of England the established church of the new colony. King Charles meant to act gracefully and gratefully by his father's old and trusted friend. He probably wished that Calvert and his followers should have, in the wilderness beyond the seas, as happy and as peaceful a home as possible. If the Catholics could find an asylum far away from England, where the king was often obliged to persecute, *bongré malgré*, his majesty who, though selfish, was not cruel, by nature, would rather favor than hinder the enterprise. Accordingly, he allowed Lord Baltimore to shape the charter to suit himself, reserving only a nominal tribute, besides an interest in the precious metals to be discovered in the province. So far, the provincial possessions had been the source of about as much trouble as profit to the crown; and the king set very little store by the then nameless territory asked by the petitioner. He gave it a name, however, and happily hit upon the beautiful name of Mary, or Maria, the second name of the queen, Henrietta Maria. And thenceforth the brightest gem in the American cluster of provinces or states was known as *Terra Mariæ*, or *Maryland*, otherwise called with reason, the *Land of the Sanctuary*.

At this stage of the proceedings, the great and good George Calvert was gathered to his fathers; but his works have survived him. He had projected a scheme for the happiness of his fellow men, which was carried into execution by his son and successor, Cecilius, with results with which the world is familiar. 'Sir George Calvert died,' says Bancroft, 'leaving a name against

which the breath of calumny has hardly dared whisper a reproach.'

We should like to dwell upon his fame and memory if our space permitted; for calumny has dared to touch his name—only to recoil, and to plague the inventors. Detraction has been busy, and, since the facts are all in favor of Calvert, his motives have been assailed; but empty assertion, and conjectures, or surmises, have fortunately exerted very little influence over the minds of men capable of thinking and judging for themselves.

We pass on rapidly to the actual settlement of Maryland. George Calvert dying, the charter was made out in favor of the second Lord Baltimore, Cecilius Calvert. In the words of the instrument, the son and heir, 'treading in the steps of his father, and being animated with a laudable and pious zeal for extending the *Christian religion*, and also the territories of our empire, hath humbly besought leave of Us, that he may transport by his own industry and expense, a numerous colony of the English nation to a certain region, hereinafter described, in a country hitherto uncultivated, in the parts of *America*, and partly occupied by savages, having no knowledge of the Divine Being, and that all that region, &c., may by our royal highness be given, granted, and confirmed unto him and his heirs.

'Know ye therefore, that WE, encouraging with our royal favor the pious and noble purpose of the aforesaid barons of Baltimore, of our special grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have GIVEN, GRANTED, and CONFIRMED, and by this our present CHARTER, for US, our heirs and successors, do give, grant, and confirm unto the aforesaid Cecilius, now baron of Baltimore, his heirs and assigns, all that part of the Peninsula or Chersonese, lying in the parts of America between the ocean on the East, and the bay of Chesapeake on the West,'⁴ &c., &c.

'Treading in the steps of his father', in the words of the king, is not, in this instance, the language of empty compliment. The great soul of George Calvert designed to establish a government wherein liberty of conscience should be the crowning glory of a just, liberal, and generous rule. But George Calvert did not establish

⁴ See Charter in Bozman's History of Maryland.

his government. This work was left for his son and successor, and it often happens that the son and heir has widely different views from those of his progenitor. In this case, however, the son was fully imbued with the sentiments of the father, and it devolved upon him to reduce theory to practice. It was a grand experiment at that day, but a successful one, for a time at least, as we shall see; and though interrupted for a time, it was, we may hope, the harbinger of better and brighter days for all Christendom, to the end.

In the month of November, 1633, two vessels of significant and memorable names—the *Ark* and the *Dove*—sailed from England with the first pilgrims destined for Maryland. These pilgrims were, for the most part, gentlemen of means and condition, who, with their families,—wives, children, and servants,—were in search of the most desirable of earthly blessings—peaceful and happy homes. After various adventures and perils, the pilgrims landed on the banks of the Potomac in March, 1634. They were met by large bodies of armed natives, who swarmed upon the shores, who sent messengers inland, and who, by night, illumined earth and sky with their alarm fires, to invite the neighboring savages from far and near to repel the invaders. The hostility of these simple children of nature was soon disarmed by the conciliatory policy of the immigrants. At the head of these was Leonard Calvert, brother to the proprietary, and now governor of the new commonwealth, another worthy son of a worthy sire. The governor immediately entered into friendly relations with the Indians, and ‘Maryland’, as McSherry remarks, ‘was almost the only State whose early settlement was not stained with the blood of the unfortunate natives.’ This is another crown of glory for the lovely princess of the Chesapeake.

On the 25th of March, the colonists ‘took solemn possession of Maryland, and their priests performed divine service for the first time within its borders. After mass was ended, the pilgrims formed in procession, led by the governor, Leonard Calvert, the secretary and other officers, carrying on their shoulders a huge cross, hewn from a tree, and erected it upon the island, as the emblem of Christianity and civilization, which they were about

to plant upon those shores. Under these auspices was begun the founding of Maryland.’⁵

The cross was not, in those days, considered by all American colonists, as a Christian emblem. A curious illustration of hostility to this ancient and venerable symbol, may be found in the life of Sir Henry Vane, when governor of Massachusetts. The Bostonians and some English captains had certain compromises to make to get on satisfactorily, and *inter alia*, the captains desired that the royal ensign should be displayed on the fort in the harbor. ‘Fair and reasonable as this request seems,’ says Mr. Upham, Vane’s biographer, ‘it would have been impossible for the captains to contrive a more effectual dilemma for the poor Puritans.’ They did not want to appear disloyal to the crown from which they held their charter, but to hoist the ensign was to hoist the cross also in the chosen centre of Puritanism. With the ingenuity, which was already a New England trait, they avoided both horns of the dilemma for a time, by declaring there was no royal ensign in the colony. The captains offered to lend or give colors for the occasion. ‘All chance of escape being thus shut out, the magistrates met the question fairly, and returned this reasonable answer to the request of the ship-masters, that, although they were fully persuaded that the cross in the colors was idolatrous, yet as the fort belonged to the king, they were willing that his own flag should fly there.’

The clergy took the matter in hand the same evening, and caused the magistrates to reconsider, and finally to refuse the request of the captains. The governor remained firm, however; and displayed the flag without the authority of the clergy and magistrates; after which act his official relations with the colonial government became more and more discordant, until the opposition finally brought his administration to a close.⁶

Our colonists soon set to work manfully as tillers of the soil; and by dint of industry and good management, they enjoyed a modest prosperity from the first days of their occupation. They soon learned the virtues of Indian corn, among other good things, and improved upon the *hominny* and *pone* of the natives;

⁵ McSherry’s History of Maryland.

⁶ Sparks’s American Biography.

though no culinary art has made the *roasting ear*, from that day to this, any better than it was when the colonists first received it from the hands of their rude but hospitable entertainers.

The colony throve by its own exertions, and also in consequence of the foresight of its founder. 'It was supplied', says McMahon, 'for its establishment by the kind providence of the proprietary, not only with the necessaries, but even with many of the conveniences adapted to an infant settlement. Although many of the first emigrants were gentlemen of fortune, he did not therefore throw the colony on its resources, and leave it dependent for its subsistence upon the casual supplies of an unreclaimed country, and a savage people. At the embarkation of the colony, it was provided at his expense with stores of provisions and clothing, implements of husbandry, and the means of erecting habitations; and for the first two or three years after its establishment, he spared no expense which was necessary to promote its interests. It appears, not only from the petition preferred in 1715, to the English Parliament, by Charles Lord Baltimore; but also from the concurring testimony of all the historians who treat of the settlement of this colony, that, during the first two or three years of its establishment, Cecilius, the proprietary, expended upon it upwards of £40,000. Nor did his care stop there. He governed it with a policy more efficacious than his means would justify, in giving strength and confidence to the colony, and happiness to the settlers. The lands of the province were held up as a premium to emigrants. The freemen were convened in Assembly, and thus made to feel that they were dwelling under their own government. Religious liberty was subject only to the restraints of conscience; courts of justice were established; and the laws of the mother country, securative of the rights of person and property, were introduced in their full operation. The laws of justice and humanity were observed towards the natives. The results of so sagacious a policy were soon perceived. During the first seven years of the colony, its prosperity was wholly uninterrupted; and when the interruption came, it proceeded from causes which no policy could have averted.'

While the colonists were attending to their material interests,

planting, trading with the Indians, &c., their missionary priests were exerting themselves to bring the pagan natives into the Christian fold. Mr. Neill, in his *Terra Mariæ*, assures us that the Quakers were the first people to arouse religious sentiment in Maryland. 'The fair-minded historian', he says, 'can not disguise the fact, that under the influence of these despised people, the first great religious awakening in Maryland occurred.' George Fox, 'one day in 1672', appeared upon the banks of the Patuxent to diffuse Christian truth. Before George Fox commenced his work in America, however, historians, fair-minded or otherwise, agree that Fathers White and Altham, of the Society of Jesus, first, and subsequently others of their faith and order, had not only attended to the spiritual wants of the English settlers, but had made numerous conversions among native princes and people. At a very early day, 'the two priests obtained, by the consent of its owner, one of the Indian huts or wigwams, for their own use; and having fitted it up in the most becoming manner their circumstances allowed, they called it the "*first chapel in Maryland.*" Here they immediately applied themselves to the study of the Indian language, in which they found the difficulties much increased by the number of dialects used among the different tribes.'⁷ The colonies were often spoken of as plantations, and Father Roger Rigbie, catching the word, writes to his superior in 1640, to allow him to go to work in that '*new spiritual plantation*', with others, 'farr better deserving', already in the field. In various quarters, conversions were made of entire towns or tribes. At the Indian town of *Potopaco*, for example, nearly all the native inhabitants embraced Christianity, to the number of 130, including the young queen, and the wife and two children of the former principal chief. We believe that there is at this day a Christian population at *Potopaco*, now Port Tobacco, not less in numbers than at the day of the conversion of the young queen and her adherents.

The missions, considering the paucity of the missionaries, were quite extensive. 'We have seen that up to 1642, the Gospel had been preached to the Indians with success,' continues Camp-

⁷ Early Missions in Maryland. Read before the Maryland Historical Society by B. U. Campbell, Esq.

bell, 'not only at the capital of the province, but at Kent Island in the Chesapeake Bay, at Piscataway and Port Tobacco, on the Maryland side of the Potomac; and at Patowmech town on the Virginia side of that river; at Mattapany and Pawtuxent town, on the Patuxent river; besides in many other places which were visited by the missionaries in their aquatic excursions.'

The just and generous treatment of the Indians in Maryland forms a striking contrast with their treatment in Massachusetts; where, as Bancroft testifies, 'the first planters assumed to themselves a right to treat the Indians on the footing of Canaanites and Amalekites.' The children of the first planters placed them in a still worse condition; for, according to Mr. Upham, they were held to be the devil's own children and agents, whom the saints were in duty bound to exterminate, and send back to the powers of darkness whence they came. (*Salem Witchcraft*, &c., by Charles W. Upham.)

In these primitive days of the colony, most of the colonists were of the faith of the proprietary, but there were also among them some Protestants. The relations between Catholics and Protestants were, for the most part, unusually harmonious; and it seemed to be a prime wish of the proprietary that all should live together, notwithstanding differences in faith or opinion, as one happy family. He exacted an oath of the governor, which bound that official, and the privy councillors also, not to trouble, molest, or discountenance any person whatever, directly or indirectly, professing to believe in Jesus Christ. Every form of Christian faith was perfectly free. At this time, in the words of Bancroft, 'every other country in the world had persecuting laws.' And, pursues this author: 'Under the mild institutions and munificence of Baltimore, the dreary wilderness soon bloomed with the swarming life and activity of prosperous settlements; the Roman Catholics, oppressed by the laws of England, were sure to find a peaceful asylum in the quiet harbors of the Chesapeake, and there, too, Protestants were sheltered from Protestant intolerance.'

It is to be regretted that Lord Baltimore had not taken one step further, and admitted Jews and all other honest worshippers of God to equal rights in his province. It does not appear

however, that even Jews were molested unless they became aggressive. 'A Jew, without peril to his life,' says Mr. Davis, 'could not call the Saviour of the world a "magician", or a "necromancer."' In a foot-note, this author goes on to say: 'In the text I have referred to Dr. Lumbrozo, the well-known Jew, (for he seems to have observed no secrecy,) who lived some time in Maryland, in the usual exercise of his calling, and of the right to institute actions in the civil court. We can not doubt he was also allowed the *quiet* enjoyment of his religion. But he was accused of blaspheming', &c. He said the Saviour was a 'man' who performed his miracles 'by y^e art magic.' He was ordered to remain in 'y^e Sheriff's custody to make answer at y^e next Provincial court',⁸ but in consequence of remote political events, he fortunately escaped a trial.

It was an object with the authorities to tolerate difference of religious opinion, and to promote social harmony. Religious toleration was maintained by the proprietary and the governor from the beginning. Says Mr. Davis, speaking of the first governor: 'His policy included the humblest, as well as the most exalted; and his maxim was, PEACE TO ALL — PROSCRIPTION OF NONE. Religious liberty was a vital part of the earliest common law of the province.' It was deemed advisable to make toleration more than a mere matter of personal benevolence. It may be that the colonists were quickened in their action, as Bancroft and others allege, by the state of affairs in England; but whether so or not, the fact remains as he says, 'in April, 1649, the Roman Catholics of Maryland, with the earnest concurrence of the governor and of the proprietary, determined to place upon their statute-book an act for the religious freedom which has ever been sacred on their soil. "And, whereas the enforcing of conscience in matters of religion"—such was the sublime tenor of a part of the statute—"hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it has been practiced, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province, and the better to preserve mutual love and amity among the inhabitants, no person within this province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall

⁸ Davis' Day-Star of American Freedom.

be in any ways troubled, molested, or discountenanced, for his or her religion, or in the free exercise thereof." Thus did the early star of religious freedom appear as the harbinger of day. But the design of the law of Maryland was undoubtedly to protect freedom of conscience; and the apologist of Lord Baltimore could assert that his government, in conformity with his strict and repeated injunctions, had never given disturbance to any person in Maryland for matter of religion; that the colonists enjoyed freedom of conscience, not less than freedom of person and estate, as amply as ever any people in any place in the world. The disfranchised friends of prelacy from Massachusetts, and the Puritans from Virginia, were welcomed to equal liberty of conscience and political rights in the Roman Catholic province of Maryland.⁹

The Calverts were at all times so anxious to keep the peace between members of the different religious denominations, that they decreed penalties long before the famous act of 1649, for offensive disputations. Mr. Neill narrates the instance of Wm. Lewis, as a case in point, but he seems to have taken a very limited view of the facts. He tells us that 'Thomas Cornwallis, a councillor of the province, had a number of white servants under the care of an overseer, named William Lewis. One day, in the year 1638, these servants were listening to the reading of sermons written by the eloquent Puritan divine, known in England as the "silver-tongued Smith," when the overseer, in a rage, said that the book came from the devil, as all lies did, and that he that wrote it was an instrument of the devil, and that they should not keep nor read such books. Christopher Carroll, and others of the aggrieved, complained of this abuse to the civil authorities, and to the credit of the governor and council, Lewis was found guilty of an offensive and indiscreet speech, and was fined 500 pounds of tobacco.'¹⁰

The sermons of the *silver-tongued* divine were scarcely such as were suitable for reading aloud in a Catholic dwelling, and in the ears of the proprietor, intended as he believed for his hearing, when such passages as—'that the Pope was anti-Christ, and the Jesuits anti-Christian ministers', &c., were specimens of the

⁹ Bancroft's History U. S.

¹⁰ Terra Mariæ.

pious reading. Lewis ordered the servants to stop; and certainly he was not choice in his phrases, nor would a Calvinist probably be, if Calvin were held up to scorn in his hearing under his own roof; so that mutual charges were the result, yet it seems that he alone was punished. He asserted that the servants were getting up a petition, to call in the intervention in their behalf of the authorities of Virginia. 'If the charge was true,' says Bozman, 'that they intended to prefer their petition to the governor of Virginia, it is certain that such conduct wore very much the aspect of the *political* crime called sedition.'¹¹

Notwithstanding all the obvious facts in favor of the early proprietary government, and especially in the matter of that kind of liberty which is most important to the happiness of mankind,—liberty of conscience,—there are parties who give most grudgingly and reluctantly any meed of praise to the founders of Maryland, and its civil and religious liberty; while they make most extraordinary claims for the liberty-loving and liberty-diffusing sentiment of the eastern colonies. This is illustrated in a paper read before the Maryland Historical Society, in May, 1852, entitled, *Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago*, by a resident of Baltimore, then recently from New England. The author appears to make it his aim to give Lord Baltimore and his colonists the least credit possible, without denying the plainest facts of colonial history. Lord Baltimore's representative, Gov. Calvert, issued a proclamation substantially against religious quarrels, rather than arguments; leaving every man at the same time to the enjoyment of his own opinions, provided he did not interfere with those of others.

'If the enforcement of Governor Calvert's proclamation proves toleration, it will be easy to show that the Massachusetts authorities were tolerant in the same way, and on the same principle. Hubbard, an old writer, says, "It was on that account [the disturbance of the civil peace] that men suffered, [in New England] under authority and not for their opinions; for if men that have drunk in any erroneous principles, would also make use of so much prudence as not to publish them in a tumultuous manner, and to the reproach of the worship established in the

¹¹ Bozman, v. 2, p. 85.

place where they live, they would not have occasion to complain of the severity of the civil laws.”’ (Note p. 39.)

The force of this insinuating defence will scarcely convince the reader that the authorities of Massachusetts were as generous as the authorities of Maryland. The former actually passed a law to prevent any but approved members of their own sect from coming into their colony; no colonist could harbor one of dubious theological opinions, nor let to such a one a lot or habitation, ‘and a large fine was also to be levied upon any town which should, without such permission, allow a stranger a residence.’ (Upham.) ‘It has often been remarked’, says Mr. Upham, ‘that our fathers were guilty of great inconsistency in persecuting the followers of Mrs. Hutchinson, the Quakers, and others, inasmuch as they settled the country in order to secure themselves from persecution. They are often reproached as having contended manfully for the rights of conscience when they were themselves sufferers, and as then turning against others, and violating their rights of conscience, so soon as they had the power and the opportunity to do it. But the remark and the reproach are equally founded in error. It was for religious liberty, *in a peculiar sense*, that our fathers contended, and they were faithful to the cause, *as they understood it*. The true principle of religious liberty, in its wide and full comprehension, had never dawned upon their minds, and was never maintained by them.’¹² This, be it remembered, is from an admirer and apologist of the Puritan pilgrims.

Was Roger Williams,—‘godly, zealous, and having precious gifts’,—a tumultuous disturber of the civil peace? To us, he appears to have had an *opinion*, for which he was duly or unduly punished. He maintained that the civil magistrate should restrain crime, but should not control opinion; should punish guilt, but should not violate the freedom of the soul. Massachusetts toleration found such heretical doctrine intolerable. ‘No one’, said Williams, ‘should be bound to worship, or to maintain a worship, against his own consent.’ ‘What,’ exclaimed his antagonists, ‘is not the laborer worthy of his hire?’ ‘Yes,’ replied he, ‘from them that hire him.’ It was, in his

¹² Sparks’s American Biography.

view, a 'yoke of soul-oppression', that magistrates should exercise spiritual powers over the people. 'The evils inseparable on a religious establishment', says Bancroft, 'soon began to be displayed. The ministers got together, and declared any one worthy of banishment who should obstinately assert that the civil magistrate might not intermeddle, even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy.'

Mr. Williams was accordingly driven forth, living sometimes among the Indians, sometimes in midwinter without any shelter but a *hollow tree*, until he got beyond the reach of his persecutors, settling at Rhode Island, A. D., 1636, and getting an Indian deed for a tract there in 1638, whence his colony grew into life and prosperity under his liberal guidance.

The author of *Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago*, endeavors to give Williams precedence over Lord Baltimore, in making Rhode Island the *first* dwelling-place of religious liberty in America. Maryland, he informs us, was the second, but was very near being only the third; as the Plymouth Company *would have been the first*, but for the timidity of the governor, who acted in opposition to the wishes of the people; so that the bill for religious liberty in the Plymouth settlement, instead of being passed, was, unfortunately, never acted upon!

Meantime, what was going on in Maryland? Gov. Calvert, in 1637, wrote a letter to Boston, inviting colonists who were persecuted for conscience' sake, to come to Maryland, assuring to them not only religious freedom, but perfect equality with his own colonists in all civil rights.¹³ The harassed Puritans in Virginia were also invited to find refuge, asylum, and *freedom*, in Maryland. 'Mankind then', says a distinguished authority, 'beheld a scene new, and uncommon, exhibited on colonial theatres; they saw in Massachusetts the Independents persecuting every different sect; the Church retaliating on them in Virginia; the Roman Catholics of Maryland alone, actuated by the generous spirit of Christianity, tolerating and protecting all.'¹⁴

When Gov. Stone, succeeding Calvert, invited persecuted Puritans from Virginia to come to Maryland, making them very liberal offers, they objected to the quantity of lands offered as

¹³ Winthrop's Journal.

¹⁴ Chalmers' Political Annals.

insufficient. Lord Baltimore being appealed to, he changed the grant 'to three thousand acres for every thirty persons; but requiring from each settler, as before, the oath of fidelity, as a condition precedent to taking possession of his land.'

They gratefully and promptly accepted this offer. 'Here they sat down, and joyfully and cheerfully followed their vocations; so that it might be appositely said of them and the proprietary, in the words of Cowper:

"Ample was the boon
He gave them; in its distribution, fair
And equal; and he bade them dwell in peace.
Peace was awhile their care; they ploughed, and sowed,
And reaped their plenty without grudge or strife."¹⁵

The quotation is not entirely apposite; for, as the same authority tells us: 'The Puritans brought the old hatred of Popery, and looked with distrust upon the oath, because it required them to obey a government that was bound to respect the religious convictions of the Roman Catholics in the province. This, in the eyes of the more zealous, was no better than upholding anti-Christ; and although they at first submitted, yet as they gained strength, and their friends in England consolidated their power, they more openly manifested their repugnance, and finally refused to take the oath as it had been prescribed.'¹⁶

They took the ample boon readily enough, but ungraciously enough; showing their teeth, as it were, and yet not by way of smile, to the proprietary government, as they accepted its bounty. They soon, indeed, reaped their plenty in peace, but they did not desire that their generous hosts should long enjoy the same blessings.

The author of *Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago* wrongfully claims that the Assembly, which passed the famous Toleration Act of 1649, was composed principally of Protestants; a mistake most amply corrected by various writers, and especially by Mr. Davis, in the *Day-Star of American Freedom*. The author shows his *animus* still further, by asserting that Lord Baltimore had procured the charter of *Avalon* in almost the same terms as that of Maryland, when he was a Protestant; so that there is no reason in making any claims for Catholic toleration in the foun-

¹⁵ Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago.

¹⁶ Ibid.

dation of Maryland. In reply to this, it may be said that when Lord Baltimore obtained his charter for Avalon, he was already a Catholic, or on the eve of becoming one. He was then casting about for, or projecting, a home to be consecrated to religion in the New World, as the very name of his province indicates.

It appears to us, that in the tone of *Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago*, may be detected a modicum, or more, of that 'old hatred of Popery', which the author speaks of as characterizing a class of persons who evidently enjoyed his sympathies. If Lord Baltimore had been of the New England orthodoxy, there would have been no limits to his praise. He would have been the greatest and best man of his age, if not of all ages. But as a Catholic, he and his works may only be commended with 'faint praise', or, at most, within the limits of a very prudent reserve. Now, the simple fact is, that Lord Baltimore, a Catholic, 'animated', we may say, as Columbus said of himself, 'as by a heavenly fire', decreed toleration in matters of religion, in advance of all the lawgivers of his day. We may readily believe that the same man, with his innate magnanimity, would have done the same thing had he remained a Protestant. Some men are constitutionally bigots, be their religious profession what it may; while others, cast in a nobler mould, are incapable of bigotry. Lord Baltimore was one of the latter class. Perhaps Roger Williams was another. We should certainly class him with such as Baltimore, but for the fact that the first Assembly in his province passed an act discriminating against Catholics. It tolerated them in some sense; that is, it allowed them to dwell in Providence, but it forbade their holding office, or voting at elections. Thus, Mr. Williams's settlement, at least, was not on a footing, in liberality, with Lord Baltimore's.

The early peace of Maryland was much troubled by William Clayborne, commonly called the *evil genius* of the colony. Clayborne had licenses from the king and from the governor of Virginia, to trade with the Indians on the Chesapeake; and under these licenses he established a trading-post on Kent Island, which came within the limits of Lord Baltimore's charter. He took a decided stand against the Marylanders from the first; indeed, he was prominent in driving Lord Baltimore from Vir-

ginia, when that nobleman was desirous of establishing himself in that colony. 'Governor John Pott, Samuel Mathews, Roger Smyth, and William Clayborne, remonstrated with the privy council in behalf of the colony of Virginia, relative to Baltimore's visit. In a communication of November 13, they state: "That about the beginning of October last, Lord Baltimore arrived in Virginia, from his plantation in Newfoundland, with intention, as they are informed, to plant to the southward, but has since seemed willing with his family to reside at this place. He, and some of his followers, being of the Romish religion, utterly refused to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, tendered to them according to instructions received from King James. As they have been made happy in the freedom of their religion, they implore that, as heretofore, no Papists may be suffered to settle among them." (Terra Mariæ p. 47). In these few lines, Mr. Clayborne shows a capacity for both malice and falsehood.

When Lord Baltimore's people took possession of Maryland, Clayborne was what would now be called a *squatter* on Kent Island. He was promptly notified, that if he remained, he would be deemed a subject of the colony. He as promptly refused to submit, and he made an appeal to his friends in Virginia to sustain him, which they were disposed to do; they urged him to resist the Maryland authorities. He needed no urging, but immediately prepared for action. His first scheme was one very likely to bring destruction upon the colony. He began to poison the minds of the Indians against the colonists, telling them that the Maryland settlers were Spaniards, and his and their secret enemies. The natives at first took his counsels, and began to manifest hostility to the settlers. These last were obliged to suspend the works of peace, and to give their energies to finishing a fortification for protection in case of necessity. Meantime, however, they treated the Indians with the uniform justice and kindness which had marked their course from the beginning, until at length it became clear to these children of the forest that Clayborne was using them for his own ends, and not at all for their good or welfare. As soon as this was clear to them, they resumed and perpetuated their friendly relations with the colonists. (McSherry.)

It is needless for us to follow any arguments about Clayborne's 'rights' or his 'wrongs', though these arguments abound in the various authorities. The main force of his claim was, that he established himself in Kent Island as a part of *Virginia*, and that therefore he was not subject to Lord Baltimore; as he had established himself there before the Maryland charter was issued. Some writers justify this claim, but they set aside the most prominent fact against it, to wit: that the charters granted to *Virginia* had been annulled, and the rights conferred by them re-vested in the crown. 'From that period, (1623), *Virginia* became what was termed "a royal government", and as such there was an inherent right in the crown to alter and contract its boundaries, or to carve new and distinct territories or governments out of it at its pleasure; yet, incontestible as this right was, it will be seen that the exercise of it in granting the province of *Maryland*, was the source of much dissatisfaction among the colonists of *Virginia*; and that at one period, attempts were made to assert and maintain the existence of the charter government, notwithstanding the judgment on the *quo warranto*, for the sole purpose of reclaiming the territory of *Maryland* as lying within the old charter limits.' (McMahon).

Clayborne spared neither force nor fraud to obtain the ascendancy, and he intrigued with divers disaffected parties, (Ingle among others), to override the proprietary government; in which he had successes and reverses, alternately, until, after about a quarter of a century of turbulence, he was finally and effectively defeated.

During the ascendancy of the Parliament¹⁷ in England, Clayborne was in active co-operation with the Puritans, who were always ready to repay the benefits received from the proprietary government in a way peculiar to themselves. They were ready to do battle in any form for its overthrow, but were reluctant to enter the lists for its preservation, even against the

¹⁷ 'The Puritans artfully connected political grievances which were real and numerous, with religious principles and ceremonies; and having the main body of the people with them, as to the former, while these were, in consequence of the endless change of creeds, become indifferent as to the latter, they soon became, under the name of "*The Parliament*", the sole rulers of the country; they abolished the Church and the House of Lords, and finally brought, in 1649, during the progress of their "thorough godly reformation", the unfortunate king himself to trial and to the block.'—Wm. Cobbet.

Indians, where themselves were not exposed. Thus, when the Nanticoke Indians assailed the settlers upon the Eastern Shore, burning, ravaging, and slaughtering, and people were filled with terror, an earnest effort was made by the governor to raise a force to protect the frontiers. Every seventh man capable of bearing arms, was ordered to muster into service; boats were prepared, &c. But the Puritans of Anne Arundel refused to make their levies; selfishly alleging as the reason, the hardships of the season, December and January, and the danger to their health from exposure on the bay and rivers in open boats. (Boz-man.)

In 1654, by virtue of the condition of affairs in the mother country, the Puritans were the ruling powers in Maryland. Their guiding spirits were 'Commissioners' Clayborne and Bennett. An assembly was called, which excluded Catholics explicitly. *This body passed a law excluding Catholics and the members of the Church of England from the protection of the government.* The same assembly also passed an act to prevent the taking of the oath of fidelity to the Lord Proprietary. They were willing to take nothing of or from the proprietary but his lands, and these they hoped to get and keep without grants or rents.¹⁸ His lordship, upon receiving tidings of these proceedings, rebuked Gov. Stone for want of vigor, and directed him to regain his lost rights. Stone made the effort, and at first was successful. He then went with 130 men to reduce the refractory parties at Providence, (now Annapolis), but these having superior numbers, and the aid of an armed ship, the *Golden Lyon*, in the harbor, turned the tables upon him, and nearly annihilated his little force. The governor, wounded and a prisoner, and several of his council, were condemned to be shot, although they had surrendered themselves upon the pledge of quarter; several actually were shot in cold blood while prisoners. 'After the skirmish', says Doctor Barber, 'the governor, upon quarter being given him and all his company in the field, yielded to be taken prisoners; but two or three days after, the victors condemned ten to death, and executed foure, and had executed all, had not the incessant petitioning and begging of some good

¹⁸ See Proclamations, &c., in Kilty's Landholder's Assistant.

women saved some, and the souldiers others ; the governor himselfe being condemned by them, and since beg'd by the souldiers ; some being saved, just as they were leading out to execution.' (Bozman.)

We have now seen the origin of religious toleration and of religious intolerance in Maryland. After six years of struggle the proprietary regained his rights, (1658), and appointed Fendall his governor, who soon in turn proved rebellious. He was displaced in favor of Philip Calvert, the proprietary's brother, and to him succeeded Charles Calvert, a son of the proprietary ; both wise and just men, under whom the colony throve apace, both in numbers and in resources.

Things went on peacefully enough until 1689, just after William and Mary were enthroned in England. An opportunity was now offered for neglected politicians to rise in the province, which they did not neglect to use. Mr. John Coode, a prototype 'know-nothing' Christian, got up '*An Association in arms for the defence of the Protestant religion, and for asserting the rights of King William and Queen Mary to the Province of Maryland, and to all the English dominions.*' Coode was a man of thoroughly bad habits and character ; though calling himself a clergyman, he was presented by the grand jury, under the government which he was foremost in establishing, for atheism and blasphemy. He expressed his determination to overthrow the government in Maryland. He was tried and convicted, but pardoned in consideration of services rendered during the revolution of '89. (McMahon.) Mr. Coode's association called a convention, which denounced Lord Baltimore to the king, laying accusations against him, and requesting the King to take the province in his own hands, which he did. It availed nothing that people of high character, Catholic and Protestant, made counter representations to the King. Upon this point the testimony from the Protestant county of Kent, is equally interesting and valuable. The reader will pardon our reproducing a portion of it :

' ADDRESS OF PROTESTANTS OF KENT COUNTY, *November, 1689.*

' *To the King's most Excellent Majesty :*

' We, your Majesty's most loyall and dutyfull subjects, the

ancient Protestant Inhabitants of Kent county, in y^r Majestie's Province of Maryland, who have here enjoyed many halcyon dayes under the immediate government of Charles Lord Baron Baltemore, and his honourable father,' assure his Majesty that they have always enjoyed, to the fullest extent, all rights and privileges, civil and religious, under the proprietary government, and, 'Doe, in prostrate and humble manner testify to your Majesty that we abhor and detest y^e falsehood and unfaithfullness of John Coode, and others his associates and agents, who first by dispersing untrue reports of prodigious armies of Indians and French Papists invading us, did stir up unjust jealousies and dismall apprehensions in y^e less cautious sort of people in this Province, and then having thereby created unnecessary feares, and disposed y^e people to mutiny and tumult, made further insurrection, and extorted the lawfull government from the Lord Proprietary, who was always as ready to redress our grievances as wee to complaine.' Coode's 'Delegates' had given the command of the militia to 'unworthy and infamous persons', and 'many of them have procured themselves to be putt in judiciall places to the terror of your Majesty's more peaceable subjects.' Wherefore the petitioners requested that the government be again restored to Lord Baltimore, 'which will make him and us happy, and give us new occasion to bless God, and to pray for your Majesty's life and happy reign.'¹⁹

'(Signed,) WM. FRISBY,	HENRY COURSEY,
GRIFFITH JONES,	JOSH. WICKES,
ROBERT BURMAN,	JNO. HYNSON,
PHILEMON HEMSLEY,	GEORGE STURTON,
SIMON WILMER,	LAMBERT WILMER,
WILLIAM PECKETT,	GERRARDUS WESSELS,
JOSIAS LANHAM,	RICHARD JONES,
THOMAS RINGGOLD,	PHILIP CONNER.
THO. SMYTH,	

'*Indorsed.*

'Kent County in the Province of Maryland.

'Address to His Maj^{ty}.'

But the '*halcyon days*' of the colony had fled forever. The

¹⁹ Day-Star of Freedom, p. 95.

king appointed a royal governor, Sir Lionel Copley; who called a General Assembly in May, 1692. The first act of this body was the recognition of William and Mary; the next, the abolition of religious equality. The Church of England became the established church of Maryland. The proprietary was reduced to the condition of a mere landlord, entitled to his rents only, which indeed were often collected with difficulty. Catholics, and dissenters of all kinds, were made the subjects of oppressive laws, which endured for the most part until the greater Revolution of 1776. At the expiration of twenty-five years, Benedict Leonard Calvert having become a Protestant, was restored to his proprietary rights, and the colony again prospered more than under the royal government. The legislature passed beneficial laws, but ungenerously enough, 'introduced into Maryland all the test oaths and disabilities which were enforced against conscience in England.' (McSherry.)

The affairs of Maryland henceforth are not very interesting, until we approach the days of that revolution which separated this and the other provinces from the mother country. The trivial Indian wars, the French wars, the boundary disputes with the neighboring provinces, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, are parts of Maryland history of more or less importance, but of no great interest to the general reader. The cities of Baltimore and Annapolis have respectively their special annals. Baltimore was laid out in 1729 on the lands of Charles Carroll, in sixty lots, by commissioners appointed by the legislature; and in 1732 it was increased by the addition of ten acres, east of Jones' Falls, on the lands of Edward Fell, whose name is transmitted in that part of the city known as *Fell's Point*. Elkridge Landing was for a time a spirited rival of Baltimore, but Elkridge yielded gracefully at length, and may yet one day become a suburb of the successful rival.

In 1771, Frederick, the last of the Lords Baltimore, died without legitimate descendants. The rôle of this house was accomplished. He transmitted his estates to an illegitimate son, Henry Harford, Esq., whose name is preserved in Harford county. Frederick was not an honorable scion of a noble house. In the words of Mr. Neill, 'As George was the first, wisest, and

best, so Frederick was the last, weakest, and worst of the Barons of Baltimore.'

We are now approaching the great event of American history, the Revolution of 1776. The colony of Maryland had thriven apace; and, indeed, it had all natural advantages independently of those conferred by kings, lords, or laws. In one respect it had retrograded, and that is, in religious liberty. After the establishment of the Church of England, Catholics and all dissenters were under the ban of proscription. In 1702, the provisions of the English toleration Act were extended to Protestant dissenters, but laws equally cruel and unjust were passed and enforced against the Catholics until the dawn of the new era in '76. 'And thus,' says McMahon, 'in a colony which was established by Catholics, and grew up to power and happiness under the government of a Catholic, the Catholic inhabitant was the only victim of religious intolerance.'

The English government was beginning to bear very heavily upon the American colonies, and the colonists proved refractory. They thought their own burdens enough for their own shoulders, without carrying besides those of the mother country. They resented the introduction of stamped paper, and the tax upon tea, as infringements upon their rights, and the initiation of further wrongs. The people of Maryland acted boldly and without disguise. They drove the stamp agent from the colony in terror and disgrace. And when various articles, as tea, glass, paper, &c., were only allowed to enter the colonies when taxed for the benefit of Great Britain, the people formed 'non-importation societies', and astonished the London merchants by refusing to receive their goods, and sending back vessel and cargo as they came. The taxes were then repealed, except upon tea. This *placebo* was not sufficient for the now aroused colonists. The people destroyed, or caused to be destroyed, 'the detestable weed', wherever it was found. In one case they obliged Mr. Steward, the owner of a brig laden with tea, which came to Annapolis, (October, 1774,) to burn his brig with her cargo, which he did with his own hand. Of course, things were coming to a crisis. War between the colonists and the mother country became inevitable. Maryland, with the other colonies, began to make preparations.

Conventions were held, and acts and resolutions were passed, plainly indicating the popular will. At a meeting of the convention at Annapolis, we find, *inter alia*, the following resolutions. (December 8, 1774.) ‘*Resolved unanimously*, That if the late acts of Parliament, relative to the Massachusetts Bay, shall be attempted to be carried into execution by force in that colony, or if the assumed power of Parliament to tax the colonies shall be attempted to be carried into execution by force, in that or any other colony, that in such case this province will support such colony to the utmost of their power.

‘*Resolved unanimously*, That a well regulated militia, composed of the gentlemen, freeholders, and other freemen, is the natural strength and only stable support of a free government, and that such militia *will relieve our mother country from any expense in our protection and defence*; ²⁰ will obviate the pretense of a necessity for taxing us on that account, and render it unnecessary to keep any standing army (ever dangerous to liberty) in this province; and therefore it is recommended, that such of the said inhabitants as are from sixteen to fifty years of age, should form military companies, &c.

‘*Resolved unanimously*, That contributions from the several counties of this province, for supplying the necessities and alleviating the distress of our brethren at Boston, (whose distressed inhabitants were “cruelly deprived of the means of procuring subsistence for themselves and families, by the operation of the act for blocking up their harbor,” as stated in a previous resolution,) ought to be continued in such manner and so long as their occasions may require, &c.

‘*Resolved unanimously*, That it is recommended to the several colonies and provinces to enter into such or the like resolutions for mutual defence and protection, as are entered into by this province.

‘As our opposition to the settled plan of the British administration to enslave America, will be strengthened by an union of all ranks of men in this province, we do most earnestly recommend that *all former differences about religion or politics*, [*italics*

²⁰ Italics ours: This filial regard for the expenses of the mother country must not be overlooked.

ours] and all private animosities and quarrels of every kind, from henceforth cease and be buried forever in oblivion; and we entreat, we conjure every man, by his duty to God, his country, and his posterity, cordially to unite in defence of our common rights and liberties.’²¹ The general reader is apt to go upon the presumption, that resolutions of conventions in times past are naturally dry and uninteresting; these we have cited present several points of decided interest, however, on which the reader will make his own comments and reflections.

The history of Maryland from the initiation of the State governments until a very recent period, presents nothing of general, though much of special, interest. Mr. McSherry brings his history down to 1848; the other State historians stop at much earlier periods. We will not undertake now to describe the glorious part taken by this State, either in the council, or in the field, during the revolutionary war; though we may say that no troops earned more well merited distinction, in those days of trial, than the famous old Maryland line. The names of Smallwood, Howard, Williams, and many others, will recur to the reader as among the most distinguished of the sons of Maryland on the field of battle; while the names of Samuel Chase and Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, will be held in perpetual honor for their vigorous championship of American freedom in the field of politics. As a signer of the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Carroll brought the heaviest oblation of all his compeers to offer upon the altar of their country.

Civil and religious liberty, prosperity and peace, were the fruits, in Maryland, of the war of Independence. In other words, the resplendent light of the ‘halecyon days’ of the early proprietary government beamed forth again with an effulgence that spread, not over one little colony alone, but over a large portion of a new continent. The post-revolutionary liberties of America had been no where so fully foreshadowed, as in Lord Baltimore’s colony. The Revolution restored lost liberties to the people of Maryland. All former differences about religion and politics were thenceforth honestly buried in oblivion; and in no part

²¹ Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, held at the City of Annapolis, in 1774, 1775, and 1776.

of the world, perhaps, have people of different religious views lived among each other in greater harmony, or with more mutual kindness and good will; some trivial outbursts of a contrary character notwithstanding. Until 1824, the Jews labored under some political disabilities, which were then happily and wisely removed forever.

The act for their relief is the only step in advance of Lord Baltimore's toleration. We do not for a moment believe that his noble soul would have stooped to the persecution of the Jews; and history shows that, practically, his government only required of them not to agitate the differences between themselves and the Christians with whom they were dwelling.

The word *toleration*, by the way, scarcely expresses Lord Baltimore's design in its fulness. Toleration implies inequality: thus Catholics were *tolerated* in Rhode Island, but they were not upon an equal footing with Protestants. In Maryland, all Christians, so far as religion is concerned, were absolutely free and equal. Lord Baltimore had abundant means of making unfavorable discriminations if he had been so disposed, but he was not. The whole evidence goes to show that he was determined to give religious equality a fair trial; or, in short, to initiate it upon a new field, where alone its success in those days could be possible. He might have excluded dissenters with the full approbation of the king who gave the charter; and as to members of the Church of England, if he could not have passed acts against them, he could have kept them (as urged in a letter published on this subject, by Mr. W. M. Addison, of Baltimore,) out of his colony, by refusing to sell them land, 'every inch of which was vested in the proprietary.'

The unquestionable facts of history show that he cordially invited all Christians oppressed for conscience' sake, to come to Maryland as a home, where they should enjoy all the rights and privileges, civil and religious, that his charter and laws enabled him to offer to those of his own faith, and his immediate friends and followers. He invited these strangers into his political household, and never, in any instance, did he violate his pledges or promises. Neither party spirit, nor *odium theologicum*, can change established facts.

A writer who is enlisted in the ranks of Lord Baltimore's detractors, says in a late number of the London *Athenæum*, with the most empty self-complacency, that 'the good people of Baltimore pique themselves on being planted by a lord, while the neighboring States were planted by commoners like Walter Raleigh or William Penn.' To take down the inflation of the Baltimoreans, this writer informs them that Baltimore's title was derived from a mere honorary Irish barony, which gave him no place in the British House of Lords. Upon this an eminent jurist²² of this city justly observes: 'We presume that no man or woman in Maryland ever thought for an instant of any difference between Lord Baltimore and plain George Calvert. . . . Whether Calvert was lord or commoner, or commoner made lord, is to us a matter of profound indifference. We are proud of his name, and of him, only because we are proud of the immortal principles on which his colony was founded, and which place the landing of the pilgrims from the *Dove* and the *Ark*, among the grandest incidents of human history. We are proud of his great charter, as one of the noblest of the works that human hands have ever reared,—the most glorious proclamation ever made of the liberty of thought and worship. Had he been an Irish peasant instead of an Irish baron, we should reverence him perhaps the more, and certainly feel none the less honor of descending from the good, brave men, who made the precepts he bequeathed them a practical and living truth.'

In the last decade of years, Maryland has had, as in the beginning, a peculiar history, which has not yet, however, been subjected to the methodical treatment of the historian. As it is equally curious and interesting, we hope to see it fairly and fully presented, at an early day, by some one competent, both by sentiment and ability, to do justice to the subject.

²² S. T. Wallis.

Mexico and Mexican Affairs.

[SOUTHERN REVIEW, October, 1867.]

1. *Journal of a Residence and Tour in the Republic of Mexico.* By G. F. Lyon, R. N., F. R. S. London: 1828.
2. *The Rambler in Mexico.* By Charles Joseph Latrobe. London: 1836.
3. *Life in Mexico, During a Two Years' Residence in that Country.* By Madame C—— de la B——. (Calderon de la Barca.) Boston: 1842.
4. *Recollections of Mexico.* By Waddy Thompson, Esq., late Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Mexico. New York: 1846.
5. *El Puchero, or a Mixed Dish from Mexico.* By Richard McSherry, M. D., U. S. N., late Surgeon U. S. Marine Battalion. Philadelphia: 1850.
6. *Mitla: A Narrative of a Journey in Mexico, Guatemala, and San Salvador, in the Years 1853 to 1855.* By G. F. von Tempsky. London: 1858.
7. *Archives de la Commission Scientifique du Mexique. Publiées sous les Auspices du Ministère de l'Instruction Publique.* Paris: 1865.
8. *Across Mexico, in 1864-5.* By W. H. Bullock. London: 1866.
9. *Le Mexique, Tel Qu'il Est.* Par Emmanuel Domenech. Paris: 1867.

Tangled indeed is the web of Mexican History. We shall not attempt to consider it in detail, nor shall we consider the natural history of this country, which is, however, in itself full of interest. The variety of soil, climate, and productions, never ceases to strike the investigator with amazement.

It is our present purpose to deal with the social and political condition of the people of Mexico, and especially since the establishment of their independent government. The glowing but bloody romance of the Conquest is sufficiently and beautifully told by Mr. Prescott, and equally well by Don Lucas Alaman, one of the most distinguished literary characters of Mexico. It may be remarked here, by the way, that the most striking passages in their respective works, are either mere transcripts, or direct translations, of original documents now, or recently, preserved in the *Hospital de Jesus*, in the City of Mexico, perpetually endowed by Cortes. Don Lucas Alaman, when the writer had the pleasure of making his acquaintance, was the *Apoderado* of the Cortes estate, and had the documents just mentioned under his charge. He very properly gave the substance of them to the public of his own country, besides sending authentic copies to Mr. Prescott.

After the Conquest, Mexico or New Spain enjoyed a reasonably prosperous career, considering the times and the inevitable disadvantages of the colonial condition. To say nothing of the Indians and the mixed population, all offices of honor and trust were in the hands of native Spaniards, or *Gachupinos*, to the exclusion of the *Criollos*, or the children of Europeans born upon the soil. The Indians and the Mestizos or mixed breeds, after the abolition of Indian slavery, were treated with more leniency than were their brethren at the North. Many Indians rose indeed considerably in the social scale, often intermarrying with the whites. It was a part of the colonial policy to keep up a rivalry of castes among the various mixed races which occupied the soil; but the King had the extraordinary power of *whitening*, or perhaps we should say of *whitewashing*, with all the honors of whiteness, any of his subjects of any color. '*Que se tenga por blanco*,' by a decree of the Audiencia, was an official announcement that such a person, though *Mestizo* or *Sambo* or what not,

by the decree of nature, should be held and recognized as a white man.

The Spanish government of Mexico was not remarkable for gentleness, nor yet for steady firmness; it permitted an abundance of evils, but upon the whole, the progress of civilization was very well maintained. Churches and schools and hospitals were distributed over the land; good roads were made, and, without going into detail, industrial pursuits were generally in honor, and were rewarded with success. The great work of the *Rio del Desagüe* remains as a perpetual memorial of Spanish energy. This is an artificial river made by the Spaniards to divert the waters of the several lakes of the Valley of Mexico from the city, which was frequently inundated to the great loss of life and property. By this artificial river the redundant water of the lakes is taken through a mountain pass, to be carried finally by the way of the *Rio Tampico* to the sea.

Withal there was so much both of good and of evil in the days of colonial dependence, that we may consider that period as the *Brazen Age* of Mexico.

In the early part of this century, the people of Mexico, inspired by two great and then recent political revolutions, began to make an earnest struggle for independence. The short-lived empire of Iturbide was the first effort of independent existence. In a little while, the Republic was inaugurated. In 1824, the Republic was an established fact. The Mexicans believed the *Golden Age* to be at hand, forgetting that this would be a reversal of things in chronological order; involving, in fact, a *retrograde* movement, which all liberal minds hold in detestation. They had no great need to fear *that* retrogression, as the sequel will show.

The Mexican Republic, being fairly launched, had no external enemies to prevent the realization of the most sanguine hopes of the people. It stood side by side with a much greater Republic, which cordially welcomed it to a place among free nations, and which offered it for years an unrivalled example of peace and prosperity under Republican government. For forty years its Congresses, Presidents, and Courts had all opportunities of enjoying and displaying the merits of such government. Their

success, as the world knows, was worse than indifferent. The rulers of Mexico kept no faith with their own people; none with foreigners, or foreign nations. They gave abundant cause for the declaration of war made against them by England, France, and Spain, and for the prosecution of the war by France, when the other powers withdrew.

Never were a people more incompetent for self-government than the Mexicans. All were aware of the fact; such as were honest, did not hesitate to avow it. At the expiration of forty years of war, turmoil, and anarchy, without respite, they looked abroad in their despair for protection. We are told by an eminent member of the Senate of the United States, that leading men and high officials in Mexico sought through Mr. McLane, our minister, the interposition of the United States, and desired this government to establish order and erect a permanent republic, and failing in this, the same parties invited Maximilian to come to Mexico, and establish an empire, assuring him that they represented the voice of the people as expressed by vote.¹ 'Mr. Johnson', says the reporter, 'paid a high tribute to the character of Maximilian, and called attention to his noble and honorable traits; especially referring to the fact that Maximilian could have left Mexico under the protection of the French troops, but refused to do so because he felt it to be his duty to remain and share the fate of his followers.'

On the 28th of May, 1864, Maximilian arrived at Vera Cruz, whence he proceeded to the City of Mexico to assume the reins of government as emperor, in accordance with the expressed wish and solicitation of the Mexican people. He had not sought the imperial crown, but it was tendered to him and urged upon him by a deputation of Mexicans, representing the best people of their native land.

The Mexican assembly of notables had expressed the desire of the people for a limited monarchy by a vote of 231 against 19. The popular vote throughout the country was also largely in favor of the monarchy. This was indeed during the occupation of a French army, and it is alleged that the vote was therefore not free. As a matter of fact, the vote was more free dur-

¹ Speech of Hon. Reverdy Johnson, July 12th, 1867.

ing the French occupation than it would have been under the domination of either the liberal or the conservative party ; for it is certain that neither party ever allowed the free expression of opinion. Maximilian hesitated, nay even declined to accept the proffered throne ; but it was pressed upon him again after both himself and the Mexicans had had due time for reflection, and after he had consulted the most learned jurists of Europe and of England, who concurred in urging his acceptance. It was an inauspicious day for himself, when he abandoned his home and his inheritance in Europe, to build up a new empire upon the American continent. Royal titles are unpopular in America ; and there were people in Mexico who despised *kings* and *emperors*, though they had a pious regard for *dictators* with unlimited authority, perhaps because the last are known to be among the legitimate progeny of republics. The new Emperor, however, entered upon his duties with a large share of popular favor. He had a splendid reception at Guadalupe when about entering his capital, being met by the chief dignitaries of the realm, civil, military, and ecclesiastical ; in addressing whom he said : ‘ I thank you for your felicitations, and salute you with the warmth of one who loves you and who has identified his fate with yours.’ This was prophetic. His fate, like theirs, was a melancholy one. He was undertaking a great work in good faith at the summons of the Mexican people, but he little knew what he had to contend with. He endeavored to conciliate the various factious leaders opposed to him. He wrote a letter with this view to his arch-enemy, Benito Juarez. In the reply of the latter there is a passage equally striking and truthful. ‘ You are a man’, says Juarez, ‘ whose safety reposes in the hands of Mexican traitors.’ Juarez knew his countrymen better than did Maximilian. This was in 1864. In 1867, the Empire, the imperialists, and the Emperor, fell in one common ruin ; and the Emperor owed his fall at last to Mexican treachery. On the 19th of June he was shot by sentence of a court-martial, in company with two of his bravest and most patriotic generals, Miramon and Mejia. He died like a hero. He had done his best to redeem a fallen country, but had failed. His good qualities as a man and as a ruler are generally recognized ;

his good intentions are beyond question. Among his last words was the expressed wish that the shedding of his blood might stop the effusion of blood in his well beloved Mexico. This was a prayer, but not a prophecy. One stronger than he, or than his successful opponent, Juarez, must rise up to redeem that fated land. It can only be done by the strong arm of resistless power, guided withal, by political wisdom. Maximilian was generous, confiding and brave, but he was not the man for Mexico; Juarez is probably brave, but being savage and vindictive, he is still less the man. The old Mexicans look back with pride to the days of Revillagigedo, a viceroy who entered upon authority at a time when monarchical New Spain was in its worst condition; almost as bad as the republic in its best. This functionary restored order in less than a year, so that Mexico was, for the time being, regenerated. Revillagigedo was a severe ruler who made no compromises with criminals of high or low degree. He could neither be bribed nor intimidated. He dealt out stern justice, little tempered with mercy. He knew his men, and they soon learned to know him; and the result was that apparently impossible thing, the restoration of order among the incongruous masses of Mexico. Maximilian took one step in the same direction. For this he has been censured as if he had been guilty of a crime against the spirit of the age. We refer, of course, to his decree of Nov. 3d, 1865, in which, with a preamble asserting that Juarez had left the country, he directs that any of his partisan soldiers roaming at large with arms in their hands, should be put to death by their captors. At the same time an invitation was extended to these guerrillamen to surrender and receive pardon, which many of them thankfully accepted. The Emperor was deceived as to the fact of Juarez having left the country, which is a matter of importance, as there were parties who recognized the validity of Juarez's always doubtful claim to the presidency. His presence might have given his followers some claims to be recognized as prisoners of war. Maximilian was disposed to be generous to his political opponents, and he was always ready to pardon his enemies. When he issued that decree, he had just been making a tour through the country, and he found the people, or the im-

mense majority of them, as he says in good faith in his letter to Velasquez de Leon, Minister of State, 'looking to the empire for the preservation of peace, tranquillity and justice.' There could be none of these while roving bands of liberals were pillaging the country; and these he determined to suppress. 'If our government', he says, 'does respect all political opinions, it can not tolerate criminals who destroy the first liberties it is called on to guarantee — those of person and property.' These bands, whether considered regular soldiers or not, were living by plunder and by plunder only, and they were perfectly reckless or ignorant of all the rules of civilized war. It was the *duty* of the head of the State to exterminate them, if possible. The greatest capital has been made against Maximilian on account of this 'sanguinary', 'atrocious', 'butchering', 'Haynau-like', 'Austrian', decree. Mexican leaders had, however, given abundant precedents for it; and the Emperor, when it was issued, was surrounded by Mexican counsellors, some of whom were professedly liberals.

When General Scott had been in possession of the City of Mexico for some months, he found it necessary to issue a similar order: that 'No quarter will be given to murderers or robbers, whether guerrillas or rancheros, and whether serving under (obsolete) commissions or not.' For this he was severely censured by Mr. Jay, in a review of the Mexican war, but the American general justified himself by saying, that these were men who were roaming about, '*under the instructions of the late Mexican authorities, violating all rules of war, putting to death every American that fell into their hands*', &c., &c.² In fact, General Scott convicted Mr. Jay of ignorance of the premises, when he demanded that these robber soldiers should be treated as honorable prisoners of war. General Scott soon made Mexico a peaceful and comparatively secure and happy country; so much so, that when our army was recalled, Mexican leaders invited him to take the country into his own hands, *as dictator*, and to transfer it, not by piece-meal, but entirely, as soon as practicable, to the United States.³ It is not unreasonable to

² Memoirs of Lieut. Gen. Scott, written by himself.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 581-2.

believe that Maximilian, too, would have restored order in like manner, and have brought tranquillity to that distracted country, but for the 'aid and comfort' given to the internal enemies of the empire, by external enemies of the empire.

Forty years of experiment had proved the Mexican Republic to be a hopeless failure. It was forty years of an 'iron age', in which the people knew no peace nor security; in which neither life, nor property, nor labor, had any assured protection. There were 'Revolutions' without number, (*two hundred and forty*, since 1821,) ⁴ and from 1824 to 1864, there were forty-six changes in the presidential chair! There were at times several contestants for the chief magistracy, each claiming to be the choice of the people. Each one indeed did his share in fleecing the people, aided as he was, by a rabble of bandit soldiery at his heels. They attempted to rise by deeds which would have been justly rewarded by elevation — upon the gallows, or by transportation for life. Honorable exceptions must be admitted, but only as exceptions.

Among other claimants for the presidential office, at the time of the French invasion, was Benito Juarez, a full-blood Indian. His claim, whether valid or invalid, extended with some pretensions of legality to November, 1864, when the time expired by the terms of the Constitution from which he professed to hold his authority. The name of Benito Juarez would not have been remembered among the Mexican presidents, but for the intervention of the United States through the ministry of Mr. McLane. The idea is abroad that upon the United States rests the entire responsibility of the downfall of the empire, of the murder of the Emperor, and, of course, of the success of Juarez and his bloody 'liberals.' Speaking prospectively of the execution of the Emperor, M. Le Baron Dupin said in the French Senate on the 18th of June: 'Il faut espérer que la voix de l'humanité sera assez puissante pour le prévenir. Espérons que les Etats-Unis feront les derniers efforts pour conjurer un semblable malheur; car c'est sur eux surtout qu'en retomberait la responsabilité.' This is a very grave charge: is it a just one? We shall see. In 1860 the Mexican Republic was blessed with

⁴ Domenech.

two presidents; Miramón, conservative, at the capital, and Juárez, liberal, or radical, at Vera Cruz. The latter based his claim upon a clause in the Constitution of 1857, by which he became provisional president in case of the resignation of that functionary. But the Constitution of '57 was abrogated in '58, and few people, in or out of Mexico, knew who was the legitimate president, if any existed. The *foreign legations* in Mexico acknowledged *Miramón*, but the *United States* acknowledged *Juárez*. The United States Minister, Mr. Forsyth, had been trying his hand with the conservative government for the purchase of territories lying upon our borders for the purpose of '*rectifying the frontiers*', and for some other trifling matters not necessary to be mentioned here. Not succeeding, Mr. Forsyth was recalled, and Mr. McLane was sent to take his place. It was left to the discretion of Mr. McLane which government he should recognize; and as a discreet diplomate, he was not slow to recognize the government most ready to come to terms with him. As Juárez consented to the '*rectification of the frontiers*', &c., &c., in consideration of a *loan* of \$4,000,000 from the United States, Mr. McLane discovered in him the real Simon Pure of the Mexican presidency. For certain reasons, the treaty between the high contracting parties did not reach a consummation, but from that day to this, Juárez has been the Americo-Mexican president. The people of the country were not pleased at this bartering away of Mexican territory, and Miramón determined, straitened as he was, to drive Juárez from Vera Cruz, which, with its custom-house, was the very fountain of Mexican revenue — setting aside of course any derived from the sale of territory. Miramón captured Alvarado, and was engaged in besieging Vera Cruz. He despatched two vessels with supplies for his army, but these two vessels were seized by the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, whereupon Miramón returned to the capital, making proposals to Juárez at the same time to have all difficulties settled by peaceful arbitration. His overtures were rejected.

Our great domestic war turned attention from Mexico, and Americans scarcely gave that country a thought until the gallant legions of France were following the footsteps of our army to the '*Halls of the Montezumas.*' The Emperor of the French

was supposed to want a colony where he could raise cotton, &c., without depending upon the blockaded and devastated States of this country. Now few Americans care in the least as to the ruling party in Mexico, whether it be a red Indian like Juarez — *que se tenga por blanco* — or a French marshal, or an American filibuster, or a triumvirate of constitutional citizen presidents, resembling Cerberus except in this, that every presidential head wants to bite off the other two heads; but our politicians try to make us believe that we are all deeply interested, in person, purse, and honor, in the welfare, perpetuity, and glory, of the Mexican Republic. No such republic ever existed except in name: upon this point we join issue with American politicians at large. But to continue. When the Gallican barbarians invaded our dear sister Republic, and threatened to destroy her peace, her liberties, and all her glorious institutions, our republican governors took the alarm, and called all our people to witness their zeal in the cause of freedom,—in Mexico. Mr. Seward's 'little bell' was rung with such violence that its tinklings reached even the astonished ears of the third Napoleon. There is no evidence that this potentate ever contemplated exchanging Fontainebleau for the Halls of the Montezumas; but he found an apparent substitute at the palace of Miramar. The Mexican people did not object to the new-comer, but the American people — that is, their self-constituted spokesmen, did. Mr. Seward was horrified beyond measure. It is not for us to say that in a state of mental alienation caused by his grief, he compromised with the French Emperor to recognize the new Mexican Emperor, provided the Frenchman would prevent his subjects from furnishing ships to Southern rebels. The Southern rebels did not get the ships. We do not know who inspired Mr. Bigelow, United States Minister to France, when he suggested (Oct. 1865) that the United States would recognize Maximilian so soon as the French troops should be withdrawn. President Johnson did not support Mr. Bigelow's suggestion, 'but France was informed that she might rely on our friendship and neutrality, and on April 5th, 1866, M. Drouyn de L'Huys, referring to Mr. Seward's pledge of non-intervention, informed the Marquis de Montholon, Napoleon's representative in Mexico

that the Emperor had decided to withdraw his troops', &c.⁵ Mr. Seward had previously announced that the 'United States wishes to leave the destinies of the people of Mexico in their own keeping', determining not to interfere with their claim of sovereignty and independence.⁶

It would certainly appear that our government should have abstained from any interference between the parties contending for supremacy, to wit: the Emperor Maximilian, conservative, and the dubious President, Juarez, liberal, or more properly, destructive. But while throwing dust in the eyes of the French Emperor, the American government recognized Juarez as President, even after his term of service had expired, and directly and indirectly denounced Maximilian. Men of position in the United States were sent to keep up the failing spirits and forces of the Juarists. Thus Major-General Lewis Wallace, (the *hero* of the Monocacy,) was sent to the Rio Grande, and carried letters to General Carvajal, whom he invited to a conference at Point Isabel to assure him that he had only to come to the United States to get money, and arms, and all the needful resources for carrying on the war. Wallace brought Carvajal to New York and introduced him to a Mr. Woodhouse, a financier of apparently great credit and capital. Woodhouse was, it seems, a sort of small counterpart of M. John Law, the famous projector of the 'Mississippi Scheme', and was to be the factor of the famous *Mexican bonds*, by which the liberal government, and American bondholders, were to be mutually enriched thenceforth and forever. We do not know whether Mr. Woodhouse expected to make any thing by the transaction, but in some way his good intentions came to naught. While General Carvajal was 'raising the wind', General Ochoa was similarly engaged at San Francisco, and with like result, though he dealt principally with General Fremont. But these loans and bonds, 'airy nothings' as they were, served to keep up the spirits of the disheartened liberals.

In the meantime, the military chest of the Juarists was empty, and the Commissariat never took heed of the morrow; but what

⁵ American Annual Cyclopædia, 1866.

⁶ Letter to Mr. Dayton, American Minister to Paris, Oct., 1863.

of that? There were real or *suspected* conservatives all over the country, who had some means; indeed this very fact was enough to throw suspicion upon any one. Why should the defenders of their country want for any thing, while people who were no doubt imperialists at heart, had houses, and money, and corn, and cattle? The *liberals* adopt

‘The simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.’

If the reader wants illustrations of their means of getting supplies, we may refer him to the impartial testimony of Mr. Bullock’s ‘Across Mexico in 1864-5.’ One or two citations may answer the immediate purpose:

‘Although the hacienda of Zipimeo must bring the proprietor an income of at least \$25,000 per annum, his (resident) son was living in a style of which a small farmer in England would have been ashamed. For the air of general neglect and discomfort which characterized the place, and for the miserable deficiency of its resources, our host apologized by explaining that, being constantly exposed to the visits of the “Chinacos”,—one of the various names for liberals or Juarists,—who *invariably made a clean sweep of every thing found on the premises*, it was not worth his while to surround himself by comforts, which would only serve to attract marauders.’ (p. 216.) We have italicised a passage which shows the ordinary habits of these soldiers of the Republic. At the hacienda of Guaracha, Mr. Bullock luckily found the occupants at home. The mansion was a splendid one, but in a ‘naked condition’, which is not surprising, as the larger portion of the time of the occupants was taken up ‘in flying backwards and forwards from the Juarists.’ The ladies of the family dare not visit the haciendas; the proprietors visit them by stealth. ‘In the absence of the proprietor, the estate is managed by the administrador, who has a pretty hard time of it, being periodically carried off by the Chinacos, and dragged about until he is ransomed. This vicarious suffering on the part of his administrador is a great saving to the proprietor; for where they would ask \$10,000 for the ransom of the owner, they will let the administrador free for \$1,000.’ (p. 229.)

At Jiquilpam, on the 23d of November, 1864, a force of 300 Zouaves (French) under Col. Clinchant, routed the united forces of Arteaga and Echiaggaray, numbering at least 3000 strong. 'The immediate result of this victory was most disastrous to the neighborhood. For thenceforth, instead of having an organized force to deal with, the peaceful inhabitants were preyed upon by the numerous smaller bands, into which the Juarist army was broken up.' (p. 231.)

It was a common thing for proprietors to agree to give the Chinacos hovering about, a specified sum to be left undisturbed; but when these robbers were driven off from the neighborhood, they would send bands to collect their 'dues', or seize the proprietors. The administrador received the following note while Mr. Bullock was at the hacienda: 'To Señor don José Guerrero, wherever he may happen to be.' (Don José was often a fugitive — from LIBERAL justice). 'My very good Sir, and dear friend: As quickly as you can, and with the least delay possible, contrive to send me three thousand dollars. For if the *hacienda* refuses to pay this sum for my ransom, I am to be shot, as I am informed by his excellency, Colonel Don Magdaleno Martinez. I pray you to do your utmost for me. Your affectionate friend, who kisses your hand, "Juan J. Gonzalez."' There was not so much money on the estate, and Don Juan might have been now in his 'mansion in the skies', but for assistance from a superior functionary of the Juarist party.

These are but instances of the ordinary courses of the liberals, and they serve to show how the army lived and throve while awaiting material aid from the United States. The poor devils of soldiers can scarcely be blamed for lives of thieving, plunder, and murder, as they had no other means of subsistence while Juarez was perpetuating anarchy. The sympathy of 'the people', as our politicians insisted, was with the liberal soldiers. This is perhaps true of a certain portion of the people. In all countries where bandits thrive, there is a portion of the community in sympathy with them. One more quotation from Bullock, though a little out of place in this connexion, will tend to illustrate the remarkable *Cosas de Méjico*:

In the plains of Appam there was a gang of brigands led by

a most ferocious murderer, known as Juan Osorio. He was caught in a trap by a German resident, 'Don Nestor', who knowing the difficulty of holding so artful a villain, had him shot at once. 'As soon as the life was out of his body, Don Nestor, having seen to its being hung on a tree in a conspicuous place by the roadside *pour encourager les autres*, went his way to get some refreshment in the nearest village.

'On his return in the evening to the place of execution, he was surprised to find the body carefully laid out at the foot of the tree, in an extempore *chappelle ardente*, and an old woman sobbing her heart out over it. Observing Don Nestor approaching, the old woman pointed to the corpse, and exclaimed through her sobs, "This was my son. I know he was a bad one, but he was still my son."'

To come back to the rival parties, and to the non-intervention policy of the United States: Juarez being recognized Chief of State ever since Mr. McLane gave his vote for him, and Maximilian with the assembly of notables and all the honest people of Mexico being held to be mere negotiations, (although all the nations of Europe acknowledged the *de facto* government of Maximilian,) it was deemed necessary that proper diplomatic relations should be kept up with the Indian Chief. In Nov., 1866 — (about a year after the expiration of Juarez's legitimate term, if any there was) — Mr. Campbell and General Sherman were sent by our government to offer the moral support and sympathy of the United States to Juarez, *under the belief that Maximilian would soon retire*, and that Juarez would require such support and sympathy in bringing order out of chaos; and also to offer the military forces of the United States to Juarez,⁷ if necessary, to aid him in the restoration of law, provided they were offered and accepted in such a manner as not to interfere with 'the jurisdiction of Mexico', or 'violate the laws of neutrality'. The plenipotentiaries met the accredited emissaries of Juarez at Tampico, and held a council, the result of which was,

⁷ Was this the first offer of arms? We take the following from one of our daily papers: 'PRESIDENT LINCOLN AND JUAREZ.—The *Revue des Deux Mondes*, of Paris, publishes an article on Mexico, by M. de Heratry, containing a letter said to be addressed by the late Mr. Lincoln to Juarez, in which the President of the United States promises to supply him with arms, money, and men, to combat the French intervention.'

that a definite and joint plan of action was determined on between the United States and Mexico.⁸

President's messages, resolutions in Congress, diplomatic relations, special attentions to Señor Romero, Juarez's Minister, public meetings, and all other signs of the times, informed Juarez and his followers that the United States were taking care of the liberal in opposition to the imperial cause.

Maximilian, who had endeavored to establish a stable government in the land whose destinies had been entrusted to his keeping by her best citizens, finding himself after the departure of the French, surrounded by insuperable difficulties, prepared to leave the country, and abandon the thankless office of trying to redeem it.

He was on the eve of departure — on the way, in fact — when his ministers besought him, (at Orizaba and at Cuernavaca) to remain, as the Mexican people looked to him for the restoration (or rather for the institution) of peace and order. This determined him to stand by his friends and faithful people to the last. A passage in his trial furnishes a point worthy of record. He was called upon to acknowledge that he was responsible for all the inflictions upon Mexico since the departure of the French. His reply was: *'No; the responsibility rests with Juarez. After the departure of the French I sent a message to Juarez and proposed to him to proclaim a general amnesty, and to grant a full pardon to all persons attached to me and to the imperial cause. Juarez refused, and there was nothing left for me, but to remain and to do all in my power for the protection of a large portion of the Mexican people.'*

Noblesse oblige, says the French proverb; and Maximilian illustrated it in his life and in his death. In the month of May, while manfully and successfully defending the city of Querétaro, he was betrayed by a trusted Mexican officer, Lopez, who received for his base crime twenty thousand dollars. If we may believe a newspaper report, his end was a fitting one for such an Iscariot. He is said to have fallen by lawless violence. Could mortal man, or woman, weep over his fate? And what was the scene at the official murder of him whom he had betrayed? The

⁸ American Annual Cyclopædia, 1866.

people were overwhelmed with grief, expressions of disaffection and convulsive sobs were heard throughout the city; and after the deed was done, large numbers of the ladies of Querétaro and San Luis Potosí dressed themselves in mourning! Was this for an abhorred tyrant? No; it was but a sign that the truest and best hearts in the land were attached to the Emperor, and to his cause.

Could the United States government have prevented this foul murder? This is a question not easily answered. The secrets of the conferences held between the agents of the United States and the emissaries of Juarez may perhaps never be unfolded to the public. At the request of all civilization, Mr. Seward sent despatches to Juarez asking him to spare the life of his captive. Mr. Seward had a right to speak in other language than that of supplication to an official who held his power by the aid of the United States government. We beg the reader to give a moment's attention to the following remarks from the *N. Y. Tribune*, July 1:

'We trust we do not speak offensively of Mexico when we say that but for the United States, this (liberal) triumph might have been doubtful. America was always with Juarez. Resolutions of sympathy were popular in our legislative assemblies.'

..... 'To America, therefore, more than any other agency, Mexico owes her freedom. As allies we ventured to implore Mexico to be generous in her triumphs. This voice has not been heeded. Perhaps owing to Mr. Seward's circumlocution, it was never heard. Certain it is, that in spite of the prayers of the American nation for the life of Maximilian, he has been executed.

'We regard this execution as a disaster to Mexico. Whatever may be said of his imperial enterprise, Maximilian was a liberal and enlightened prince. When Austria made him Viceroy of her Italian provinces, he was so generous toward conquered Lombardy and Venice that he was recalled. In Mexico, such a rule as was permitted to him showed a progressive statesmanship. He was an accomplished gentleman. The end of his life shows that he was a brave and self-denying soldier. To take such a man a prisoner in broad day and shoot him, merely be-

cause he had been unfortunate in war, is a blunder. To do so in defiance of the civilized world, is a crime. To America, it is an insult. We merely ask the poor boon of this helpless, unfortunate young man's life, and it is denied. We gave Mexico national triumph, and in return, she spurns even our counsels of mercy.'

The *Tribune* is right in attributing the success of the Juarists to aid from this country 'more than to any other agency.' It is an error, however, to call the triumph of a vicious, blood-thirsty, ignorant, and brutal party, a *national* triumph. Never did *success* bring a *nation* more nearly to its *final extinction*.

It is clear that Mr. Seward had no need to stand upon diplomatic delicacy in treating with Juarez; but did the Secretary urge him to mercy with honest, earnest purpose? Here again a doubtful answer must be given. It is plainly asserted by a Washington correspondent of a highly respectable paper published in the city of Baltimore, that while Mr. Seward was sending his *petition* to Juarez for the preservation of the life of Maximilian, he was at the same time assuring Mr. Romero, the Mexican minister, that the fate of the prince was a matter of indifference to this government. It is also asserted by the same writer, that the despatches sent by Mr. Romero were sent in time to neutralize the request made by Seward! We know not whether this charge be true or not, but most of those who have read it, consider it to be in keeping with the habitually tortuous policy of the American Secretary of State. That the execution made no unpleasant impression upon him, may be inferred from a passage in his *Memorandum* upon relations with our Sister Republic! of July 14: 'Only some great national injury, wrong or offense,' he says, 'would justify this government in suddenly assuming a hostile, or even an *unfriendly attitude* towards the Republic of Mexico.' We have italicised two words to show how forgiving Mr. Seward is when his prayers are rejected.

While upon this special part of our subject, an article taken from the *Esperanza*, a paper published at Querétaro, of the date of June 20th, fell under our observation, from which we take the following passage:

'It is known that the President (Juarez) all along was inclined

to clemency, but our minister at Washington, Señor Romero, had carried the day, and secured the order for his (Maximilian's) execution, although full stress was laid upon the fact of the small majority that had voted in favor of the prisoner's guilt.'

From this it would appear that Juarez was waiting for counsel from Washington, which he got from Minister Romero. Would this individual have urged the execution of Maximilian in the face of an earnest protest from the American Secretary of State?

It does not seem that M. Le Baron Dupin spoke unadvisedly when he implicated the United States with the recent horrors in Mexico.

We have not thought it necessary to adduce any of the proceedings of Congress in regard to Mexican affairs, because there is a want of 'sober second thought' in that body which detracts greatly from the weight of its proceedings. Perhaps its future deliberations may be more respectable. A famous and authentic Roman historian assures us that the ancient Goths of Germany had a wise custom of debating everything of importance to their State twice; that is, once drunk and once sober; drunk, that their councils might not want vigor, and sober that they might not want discretion. Our law-makers of late years seem to be very slow in getting to the second term of their deliberations.

At public meetings, called in New York and elsewhere, for the purpose of getting up a factitious public opinion, it was customary to introduce some Mexican orators, who depicted most graphically the woes of their country under the rule of Maximilian, and its happiness under the rule of Juarez and politicians of his school. These Mexican demagogues, being, if possible, yet worse than our own, find in Juarez the incarnation of enlightened progress, while Maximilian was a demon of destruction. Juarez is another Washington, God save the mark! and another Lincoln! Perhaps it would be right to say that Juarez is a representative Mexican, as Washington was a representative American in his day, and as Lincoln was, also, more recently. Juarez is undoubtedly a representative Mexican. One or two citations from Mr. Bullock's work, the latest in our language upon Mexico, from personal observation, will show Juarez in

his representative character. *El Seminario de Tepic* was a very flourishing school visited by our author, who was astonished at the proficiency of the pupils. 'During Juarez's tenure of office, this school, like many others throughout the country, was closed.' (p. 285.) Juarez was not more favorable to the churches. 'From an American eye-witness, I learnt that during the early part of the year 1861, it was quite common to see President Juarez making his round of the churches, and superintending the work of destruction.' (p. 82.)

He sold the ruins and sites to the highest bidders, and as his liberal friends had no money, and as the conservatives refused to bid, he sold to foreign adventurers, and squandered the proceeds. 'Little of the purchase money found its way into the public treasury.' His apologists asserted that he only wanted to take the property from the priests to put it in better hands, for the greater advantage of the State. 'This', says our author, very justly, 'I could not but consider as an exceedingly lame apology; for the needy adventurers, without capital, to whom much of the property fell, were hardly likely to make a use of it which would be profitable to the country at large.' (p. 84.) The liberals were very willing to speculate in church property, but needed the funds. 'Those who had nothing, belonged to the liberal party, which was really only liberal in the sense of wishing to make free with other people's property.' (p. 83.)

In the Mexican Republic, before it was trodden by the soldiers of France, or by Maximilian, there was a general air of desolation and ruin due to such Mexicans as Juarez, which gives this hero the right to be considered a representative man.

Were things made worse in this happy republic by Maximilian? Our author visited a model charitable establishment at Guadalajara, presided over by French Sisters of Charity, where infants were taken care of, and industrial trades taught to the growing boys and girls. He found a flourishing cotton factory at the same place, but the owner who, in common with the majority of men of substance in the country, had espoused the clerical, reactionary or conservative party, had been driven from the country by the Juarists in 1860. Taking advantage of the French occupation and 'the comparative security of life

and property consequent thereon', this gentleman had returned, and Mr. Bullock found his works in renewed prosperity.

Spending a social evening with a respectable family in the same city, he found 'that, in common with nine-tenths of the well-to-do people throughout Mexico, Señor Gil Romero and his friends were generally favorable to the imperial cause, although the line of conduct which the Emperor was at that moment pursuing towards the clerical party had given them temporary umbrage. Hitherto — unhappily for the general well-being of the country — the landed and moneyed aristocracy has held itself almost entirely aloof from politics, which have been a monopoly of lawyers and unscrupulous adventurers. . . . However, now that a respectable government has been established, it is to be hoped that they (merchants, manufacturers, land-owners) will come forward and lend it an active support.' (p. 276.)

The British Consul-General in Mexico called upon the various vice-consuls in regard to the growth, &c., of cotton. From the return of the vice-consul at Mazatlan, 'it will be seen there *was more than eight times as much land under cotton in that district* in the year 1864, as in 1863. This increase is, no doubt, mainly to be attributed to the increased feeling of security occasioned throughout the country by the establishment of what the Americans speak of as "the so-called empire."' (p. 320.)

The evidence borne by this author corresponds with the passages cited throughout his entire work, and there is no indication from beginning to end of any partialities or prejudices for or against the rival claimants to authority. The conclusion then is inevitable that Maximilian was in the way of *restoring* order and civilization in Mexico, while Juarez was but perpetuating anarchy and disorder. Schools, churches, agriculture, manufactures and commerce, were reviving and prospering wherever the Emperor had sway; and each and all of them were brought to ruin, whenever and wherever Juarez and his Chinacos were masters.

We may now recur to the Republic before the days of Napoleon III. and Maximilian; to the time when Mexico was independent and free, and making progress, as the demagogues tell

us, in the glorious way of modern civilization. We will take the reader to the Elysian fields so vaunted by the liberal orators of Mexico. In 1824 the Republic was fairly established, and in 1864, as has been said, the records showed *forty-six changes* in the presidential chair! If the reader has any familiarity with the newspaper publications of the age, he will remember that he scarcely ever saw a record of foreign affairs without a notice of a pending or a progressing 'revolution in Mexico.' Let him look over an article on Mexico in any journal at hand, British, French, Spanish, or American, and he will always find the old story repeated. The war was for the most part between the conservatives and the radicals under various appellations, the conservatives being otherwise clericals, *Atrasados*, &c., while the radicals were liberals, *Progresistas*, &c.

Some very respectable periodicals charge all the wars upon the conservative, or church party. The amount of it seems to be that this party generally held a large portion of the property of the country, and would not voluntarily share with the liberals. It can not be denied that the church property should be at least as sacred as any other. This seems to be admitted among all civilized nations. The radicals may think they could make better use of such property if it were in their hands, but this does not exactly justify their appropriating it by force. It is a most important question at the present day how far there should be any union between Church and State: for ourselves we prefer to see them respectively upon an independent footing, but there are great difficulties in the way of violent severance. It is according to the custom of nations, ancient and modern, Christian and Pagan, Catholic and Protestant, to keep up a close association or union. Nations infinitely more enlightened and prosperous than Mexico, do now maintain and always have maintained it. The radicals wish to break up this connexion, and they care not with what violence, nor at what cost. We have seen Juarez zealously demolishing churches with this intention. The liberals, in fact, have drawn their inspirations from the French philosophers of the last century, who were by no means safe guides in such matters. But even if Church and State dissolve all connexion, which in Mexico they must do if that coun-

try ever comes into the possession of the United States — an event *maxime defendendus* for us,— church property, as all other *property*, must remain sacred ; that is, must remain in the hands of those who possess the proper titles.

If the clergy have any undue privileges, these privileges may be curtailed without depriving the individuals themselves of life, liberty, or property. No one can blame them for not throwing themselves and their possessions into the arms of their liberal enemies, whatever other causes of blame may rest upon them.

It is much more rational to believe that the radicals are the perpetual agitators and disturbers of the peace, than that the clergy and their political friends are. Men of property are always pacifically inclined in the very nature of things, and the conservative party, which includes, with the higher clergy, nearly all the men of capital, land-owners, merchants and manufacturers in the country, can not be revolutionary.

The liberals, having as a rule nothing to lose, are very willing to perpetuate war and discord upon any pretext, that they may rise to the surface, and float thereupon as they often do temporarily, to the destruction of all honest and stable interests.

We are far from asserting that the conservative party has been always blameless: we mean to assert nothing more than that it is infinitely more favorable to the preservation of order than is the liberal party.

It must be evident to the reader, and to all acquainted with Mexican affairs, that the Church has lost its influence over a large portion of the most active spirits of Mexico — many of whom, erroneously enough, identify the Church with the Church party. The *esprits forts* on the liberal side have drawn their inspirations, as we have already said, from the French philosophers. They are therefore hostile to the Church, in the very broadest sense; that is, to the whole theory and practice of Christianity.

It might be supposed that as the Church cannot unite the Mexican leaders in any bond of unity, some *more progressive* body, as a powerful secret society, might have a better influence. This too has been duly tried. Two of the most violent parties that

ever ravaged the land were rival masonic bodies, known respectively as the *Escoceses*, and the *Yorkinos*. 'The prospect of tranquillity which was held out by the complete liberation of the country (from Spain) and organization of the government, (A. D. 1824-5) was soon interrupted by the violence of parties. The animosities of the *Escoceses* and *Yorkinos* resulted in acts of outrage and bloodshed, and the land has been distracted with civil war.'⁹

Now if neither the Church, nor the Church party, nor the liberals or *progresistas*, nor secret associations, nor presidents, nor armies, can keep the peace in Mexico for two or three consecutive years under any circumstances,—it is a clear case of 'something rotten' in that country. It is surely not the rottenness of age, but *pourriture avant maturité*. Some of our newspapers have suggested that an enlightened Protestantism was the one thing necessary for the successful construction and preservation of the Mexican republic. The suggestion does not find its support in historical facts. Catholicity, freemasonry, free thinking and its political philosophy, have failed, indeed, in making a *Republic* out of the materials in Mexico, where eight or nine-tenths of the population are of pure or mixed Indian blood; but it is not apparent in what country Protestantism, with all its vast resources, has reared a fabric of Christian civilization, of a republican or any other form of government, from the base of a barbarous or savage people. Some other factor is yet required.

The republic is undoubtedly rotten: was it ever ripe? Is it worthy of American intelligence to be keeping up a perpetual outcry about the preservation of the *Mexican Republic*? The writer ventures the assertion that he can adduce, from the various works mentioned at the head of this article, a thousand instances, from authors of all shades of political proclivities, to show that Mexico never was a *Republic* except in name. Mr. Waddy Thompson found among the people a devoted attachment to the word 'Republic', 'but I greatly fear', he says 'they are not altogether capable of laying wisely the broad and deep foundations of such a government as would be suited for

⁹ Encyclopædia Americana. Art. Mexico.

their peculiar circumstances.¹⁰ 'Public opinion in Mexico to all practical purposes, means the opinion of the army . . . the army has never done anything else than to make revolutions.' It required reduction: 'Let the army be reduced to not more than 5000 men (then 40,000 strong); the privates would be rejoiced to be released from a service into which they were carried by force, and let the officers be disbanded, and go to work of some sort, and for the first insurrectionary word or act, be garroted, not shot, that would be too good for them. The army of the vice-regal government did not exceed 10,000 men; can it be that a despotism is less a government of force than a republic?' 'The destiny of Mexico is in her own hands; the present state of things can not last much longer. No people can endure such misrule, tumult, and anarchy.' In those days, too, the church was robbed for the good of the state: 'The large estates and possessions of the banished Jesuits have supplied the government with very large sums, but these with the mine of Fresnillo, have all been sold, and the money wasted.' Large estates had been plundered with the same patriotic motives under the pretext that the proprietors were usually favorable to the old monarchical government. 'The maxim of Juvenal,' says Mr. Thompson, 'Quantum quisquis habet in urbe, tantum habet et fidei,' is as true now as when the line was written. A new ruler, or prince, according to Machiavel, ought to advance the poor and impoverish the rich, and what is said of David may be said of him, 'he filled the hungry with good things and the rich he sent away empty.'¹¹ The Mexican revolutionists resembled David in one half of what is said of him — but only in that half.

Other instances may be cited to prove that Mexico did not take her first lessons in grief and desolation when Maximilian transformed the Republic into an empire.

The following passages present facts derived from personal observation: 'The Mexican government sits like an incubus upon the people, doing nothing for their welfare, and the elders

¹⁰ Recollections of Mexico.

¹¹ We must correct the derivation of the quotation which is taken from the *Magnificat*: 'Esurientes implevit bonis; et divites dimisit inanes.' (St. Luke I, 53) The application, however, as Mr. Thompson makes it, can not be corrected.)

of the people look back with regret to the old *régime*. They say it is a mockery to speak of the Mexican Republic; that they have the burdens of monarchy without its stability. That abuses abounded during the time of the vice-regal sway is admitted, yet in those days it appears there was greater security for life and property. The scientific establishments planted and fostered then, have now dwindled into insignificance; the great highways and bridges are in the state in which the Republic found them, except for the ravages of time and war. It matters little what a government is called, the *spirit* of a Republic exists not here. . . . Mexico to become a Republic wants regeneration, wants a *People*, for there is nothing in the land deserving that appellation. The middle classes (that body politic that gives strength and stability to States) are but fragmentary; great land-holders and princely merchants represent the aristocracy. The army, the church, shopkeepers, artisans, &c., and adventurers, and place-seekers of all kinds, fill up the space between the *ricos hombres*, and the *peons* of the soil.¹² And again: 'The better classes of this city are by no means very desirous of peace. They dread the day of the evacuation by the American troops. They would gladly pay the expenses of our army to keep it among them. They have no respect for their own government, declaring they only know it by its extortions, and not by any protection it gives them. The rulers are but too commonly unprincipled adventurers, pushing their own fortunes at the expense of the honor and welfare of the nation. Many of the best citizens decline all connexion with the government rather than sanction evils they could not control. Demagogues fill the high places, and fatten on the suffering State. To drive them off is to invite another swarm yet more hungry. "We all feel and know this," said an intelligent gentleman to me, "and we devise remedies simple enough in design, but difficult of execution. Like the rats who agreed to protect themselves from the stealthy incursions of puss by putting a bell around her neck, the plans are unexceptionable, but *¿ Quien va poner el cascabel al gato?* Who is to bell the cat?" There is the difficulty. The army belongs to the government or faction in power; the

¹² El Puchero. By Richard McSherry, M. D., &c.

people can do nothing but bear the fleece for the shearers. Thus industry is paralyzed and honest labor contemned; for who will go to the pains to accumulate, to be marked for plunder by professional robbers, or robbers by virtue of their government commissions? Misrule enjoys a perpetual ascendancy, with rare exceptions, from the highest to the lowest functionaries.' Special instances then follow, showing the ascendancy of robbers over the police; violations of common honesty on the part of justices of the Supreme Court; defrauding of proprietors by overseers; plundering estates by military companies, &c., &c. 'Many good, nay, the best, citizens desire annexation, or connexion with our government on any terms. They declare they see no prospect, near or remote, of peace, law, and order under their own rulers. The instances I have given of bad laws and the worse administrations of them are precisely as I have them from the most reliable sources among this unhappy people.'¹³

Prescott, in a critical review of Mad. Calderon's *Life in Mexico*, which he considered the most entertaining work ever written upon that country, in speaking of its many peculiarities, says: 'Its swarms of *Léperos*, the lazzaroni of the land; its hordes of almost legalized banditti who stalk openly in the streets and render the presence of an armed escort necessary to secure a safe drive into the environs of the capital; its whole structure of society, in which a Republican form is thrown over institutions as aristocratic, and castes as nicely defined, as in any monarchy in Europe; in short its marvellous inconsistencies and contrasts in climate, character of the people and face of the land, undoubtedly make modern Mexico one of the most prolific, original, and difficult themes for the study of the traveler.' Thus we hear of banditti — legalized or not — from all quarters. Mad. Calderon informs us that a veteran *administrador*, who had had divers conflicts with the robbers, sent a special message to the government authorities that he, too, intended to join a band of robbers, as they were the only class of people whom the government protected!

While writing this portion of this article, and observing, day by day, what is said in our most respectable papers upon Mex-

ican affairs, we fell upon an interview between Mr. Romero, the Mexican Minister, and certain other persons, from the report of which we cite the following: 'Washington, July 29. A committee of "Post No. 1, of the Grand Army of the Republic" Association this afternoon presented Señor Romero with a set of resolutions congratulatory of Mexican Liberal successes. The Mexican Minister replied at some length, coinciding with the committee in the sentiment that French intervention in Mexico was but one incident in the attempt to overthrow popular government and free institutions on this continent.' If the Mexican government illustrates to these gentlemen, the Minister and the committee of 'Post No. 1,' the workings of 'popular government and free institutions,' we can only say that we would leave them in the full enjoyment of such content as they might derive from them, but we would, ourselves, beg to be excused from any participation therein. Any book of travels in Mexico will give ample illustrations of the results of such so-called popular government and free institutions. Let us take instances from the work of Mr. Latrobe, an English traveler.

Parties are always warring over the *Constitution*, altering, amending, abolishing, revising, &c. 'The instant that the struggle is at an end by the defeat of one party, the other takes advantage of its victory to crush their humbled adversary by confiscation, exile, and domestic oppression.

'Unhappy Mexico! No sooner has a government seemed to be fairly seated and felt itself called to exercise authority, and to enforce the laws, but some discontented partizan runs off to a distance from the capital, gets a band of malcontents together, sets up a "*grito*", or bark, to give warning that something is brewing; follows it up in due time by a *pronunciamento* against the existing rulers; proposes a modification of the constitution, and collecting an army, makes a dash at the metropolis. . . . It would fill a volume, and be a perfect jest-book, to give a history of all the changes experienced by this country since the expulsion of the Spaniards, and the real intentions, ends, and characters of those by whom they have been brought about.'¹¹

A jest-book! *Caramba!* The 'changes' are *no jest* to the

¹¹ Rambler in Mexico.

capitalists and to the working classes, whatever they may be to the factious leaders. As to the state of the country during Mr. Latrobe's sojourn, the President and Vice-President were at *couteau tiré* with each other, and several generals were issuing independent *pronunciamentos* against the government in general, and each other in particular, all, to be sure, in the interest of popular government and free institutions!

'Among other signs of the weakness of the existing government, the neglect and decay of many of the public institutions is not to be overlooked.

'The importance of the mint to the revenues of the country, renders its maintenance an object of state policy, but the university, the museum, the public library, the splendid *mineria*, or schools of the mines; many of the noble hospitals of Spanish foundation, and the academy of arts, were at the time of our visit in a state of general neglect shameful to the government and people. To go into the details of these matters would be to write a book instead of a letter.'¹⁵

The Mexicans love music. An Italian opera troupe had been invited to entertain the people of the capital, with an assurance of a certain sum from the government, if the receipts from the regular patronage fell short of that sum. They did fall short, and the government was called upon to fulfil its contract. It sent only passports to every member of the company, with advice to move off immediately. 'This was poor satisfaction; but singers are proverbially unfortunate in Mexico. There was, for example, Garcia, who, while travelling, was set upon by banditti and pillaged, even to his snuff box, diamond ring, and pantaloons; after which, the robbers insisted that he should sing for them. He did so — and was hissed most obstreperously by his lawless auditory! It is said that he had borne the pillaging with becoming temper, but the hissing he never forgot or forgave.'¹⁶

Shall we bring forward more witnesses? They all give the same kind of evidence of the glories of the Mexican republic. Robbers are always the head men. Mr. Robertson was about leaving Perote for the capital, when 'a tall, dirty, assassin-look-

¹⁵ Rambler in Mexico.

¹⁶ Ibid.

ing fellow' offered the services of self and squad as a guard for the *diligencia* in its dangerous course. The offer was accepted by an intelligent foreigner who was conversant with the *cosas de Méjico*. 'I have engaged these men, you see, Mr. Robertson', said he, *en route*, 'for although they take the title of national guards, they are, in reality, gentlemen of the road, and I think on the whole it is best to pay them in their former capacity'. (p. 309.) A Mexican general, travelling in company with his wife and family, could not disguise his terrors.¹⁷

Capt. Lyon, whose visit was made in the earliest days of the republic, found less general demoralization perhaps than subsequent travelers, though his accounts are far from flattering. He calls the *Rancheros* the 'honest yeomen of the country'; and he always found the *arrieros*, or muleteers, obliging, honest and brave. These two classes seem yet to maintain their good character. Otherwise, Captain Lyon tells us, that during the wars of independence, 'law and justice gave place to the dictates of the various leaders of the prevailing parties, and almost all trace of that distributive justice which was strictly attended to by the Spaniards had disappeared when Mexico found herself free'.¹⁸ The Mexican congress made efforts to effect reforms, but, as the world knows, without success.

Yet, while we maintain that the government is but a caricature of a republic, we freely admit that there are many people in that country, of high and low degree, worthy of our respect and sympathy. But in the general demoralization which has attended the 'triumph' of the republic from the first day of its history to this hour, these people, that is, the honest and meritorious, have been excluded, as the rule, from all places of political power and influence. There are good people in Mexico, — but there is no MEXICAN PEOPLE; there is no MEXICAN NATION; there is no MEXICAN REPUBLIC. The component elements are too heterogeneous for a republican form of government. Let it be remembered that a vast majority of the population is composed of Indians; *Indios mansos*, civilized, and *Indios bravos*, savage, the best of whom are as unfit to form a civilized government as the negroes of our Southern States; and

¹⁷ Visit to Mexico.

¹⁸ Journal, &c.

the fact will explain itself, why Mexico is not, and can not be, a prosperous and orderly republic. The mixed races there require a strong arm over them, not to crush, but to protect them. If the most enlightened people, as the French, can not maintain and live under a republican government, how can it be expected of semi-barbarous Mexico? Our own republic started into existence under the most favorable circumstances known in history, but while not yet as old as some of its citizens, it seems as unstable as the house built upon the sand. It amounts then to a pure absurdity to make an American outcry about the preservation of the Mexican republic, which is, and ever has been, a political fiction. It is of importance to the welfare of the United States that so near a neighbor as Mexico should have a stable and orderly government; the name by which it may be known is a matter of no importance to us whatever.

A strong government in Mexico which would punish revolutionists, traitors, and robbers, commissioned or non-commissioned, not in a spirit of vengeance, but in a spirit of even-handed justice, for the protection of the weak against the strong, of the industrious against the plundering, of the peaceful against the violent, would with a very small but well disciplined military force, be able to restore, or institute order there in less than five years. There is much good material among the people of that country if rightly developed. Travelers too frequently are led to superficial and erroneous judgments, as if all Mexicans were represented by the most lawless and ignorant portions of them. These last only represent the evils resulting from a wrong form, or if the reader prefer, misapplied form, of government.

There are large bodies of men in Mexico who would give in their adhesion to *any form of government* having a commanding show of power and stability. The *Rancharos*, whom Capt. Lyon calls the 'honest yeomanry', might be made immediate supporters of any good government. We know not what Juarez has made of them, but up to his term of anarchy, they made the most favorable impression upon travelers. When M. Von Tempsky was wounded in an encounter with robbers, he found refuge at a 'cluster of houses inhabited by *rancheros* with their families. We were most kindly received, as is always the case

when the traveller goes to ask the hospitality of the real rancheros'.¹⁹ He thought them the most honest and most estimable people in Mexico. These men with the capitalists of the country, the higher clergy, and all the intelligent and industrious classes, would rally upon any strong government that would preserve order and protect life and property.

All the *hombres de bien* want a strong-handed and firm government. It has been fully shown that the republic has brought and perpetuated nothing but anarchy. Until the whole mass of the population is changed, there is no possibility of its bringing any thing better. Maximilian, if let alone, would have improved matters; he could not have made them worse. It was a cruel thing on the part of the United States to deprive the Mexicans of their only hope. What had they to fear from the success of the Emperor? Nothing. If their superior government by its humane and enlightened policy binds its people together in the bonds of a true and cordial union, they could easily afford to defy not only imperial Mexico but imperial France, and imperial Austria, for that matter, all combined. But the fact is, not one American had the least apprehension of any *aggression* from that quarter. The only apprehension was, that with good strong government on the borders (which is what the United States should chiefly desire) the whole boundless continent 'might *not* be ours.' The design of successful filibustering in a neighboring country, which is to be kept in a state of disorganization for the accomplishment of their purposes, is neither creditable to the United States, nor is it promising for the welfare of their citizens.

We may say withal, that while the mixed races of Mexico are incapable of forming any stable government, they might easily be formed into an orderly and well governed people. Can mixed races ever thrive with an equal division of political power in the same state? It is very doubtful. The negroes of Liberia have not unwisely made it a part of their organic law, that no whites shall have political power among them. There was order in New Spain while the European Spaniard had exclusive domination; there has been no order since. It may be said that

¹⁹ Mitla.

the Spaniard was a tyrant; but the intelligence of the world admits that the tyranny of one is better than the tyranny of the many, and that the most tyrannical government is better than anarchy.

An able chief of state, under any title, with twenty thousand well disciplined and well paid troops at his command, could bring order out of chaos. The robbers could be suppressed, and thus the landed proprietors could return in peace and security to their *haciendas*, forming a body of respectable and influential rural gentry, with the greatest advantage to themselves and to the state. Industry would spring up every where, under protection, for it would meet with a ready reward. The dilapidated churches, and the closed schools, would be again open for worship and instruction. The clergy are probably as ready as the other best citizens to enter upon reforms. It may be observed that while the priests are spoken of, in general, in terms of depreciation by travelers, yet wherever there is acquaintance made and personal intercourse established, the impression made by the higher clergy, at least, is almost uniformly favorable.

All classes have their good points. Waddy Thompson, in speaking of the ladies, says they are not remarkable for beauty, but 'their manners are perfect; and in the great attributes of the heart, affection, kindness, and benevolence, they have no superiors. . . . I think that in another, and the most important point in the character of woman, they are much slandered. I am quite sure there is no city in Europe of the same size where there is less immorality.' (p. 162.)

Among the lower orders, however, there is a large amount of marrying, *detras de la Iglesia*, without the sanction of the church.

Mr. Thompson testifies to honest dealing generally on the part of shopkeepers, &c., and to a more diffused education than he expected to find among the common people. He often saw the ragged *Léperos* reading in the streets—and 'I had not a servant during my residence in Mexico who did not read and write—neither very well, it is true, but quite as well, or better than the same class in this country.' (p. 182.) Although a very partial friend to the Texan prisoners in Mexico at the time of his mission, Mr. T. bears spontaneous testimony to the kindness

with which they were treated by the Mexican people — not by their government. When the prisoners were released, the people gave them money, clothes, food, and words of kindness ‘instead of jeers and insults. . . . I could not refrain from asking myself whether if the people of any other country had invaded ours and been made prisoners, they would under like circumstances have passed through such a crowd, not only without insult, but with such demonstrations of kindness and sympathy.’ (p. 93.)

Have we not said enough to show that the Mexican Republic is a *caput mortuum*, which may be galvanized into making hideous features, indeed, but which can never be brought to life? And have we not also shown that there is good material in Mexico, if well handled? To such a neighbor every honest man in America should wish the United States to be generous, even to letting the better classes invite some potent stranger in to rule all, and to give order to all.

Beyond foreign intervention of a direct kind, there may be one other hope for Mexico, also from foreign intervention indirectly; and that is, in a gradual immigration from the world abroad, so that the immigrants, or their children, may take the governing power in their own hands. This desirable result may occur in a life-time, or in the lapse of ages, or never; and speculation upon it we may leave now among the many other misty, dubious, indicable, *cosas de Méjico!*

A Mexican Campaign Sketch.

[THE NEW ECLECTIC, November, 1868.]

MY practical acquaintance with Mexico began with the Mexican war,—that is, with our war upon that distracted and miserable country. Like most Americans, I had a general acquaintance with the romance of the Conquest, and I had some idea of the splendor of the ‘Halls of the Montezumas’; as well defined, at least, as that of a home-bred youth who, in migrating Westward, came to a town called Jericho, which amazed him greatly, as he said he always thought that was one of the old *fabulous* places of the Bible. In fact, in my mind, Mexican history was in a kind of hazy twilight, occupying a middle place between dream-land and reality. From hard service, however, during the war, at first on the Pacific Coast, and afterwards from Vera Cruz to the Capital, stern reality made familiar and enduring impressions. Some reminiscences of a stirring campaign, taken principally from my daily records, may prove interesting, it is hoped, to the general reader.

On the 3d of July, 1847, I landed with a body of some four hundred U. S. marines at Camp Vergara, on the beach near Vera Cruz, where the gallant Franklin Pierce, since President of the United States, was forming a brigade for service with General Scott’s army, then awaiting reinforcements at the city of Puebla. Our first night on the shore was not propitious. The camp was on a narrow sand-beach, between a low range of sandhills and the sea. During the night a furious Northern vented its wrath upon us, attended with a deluge of rain. Our canvas city, which looked so bright with the setting sun, was

soon reduced to a wide-spread ruin. It was typical of saucy and prosperous America under the light of day, and equally of ruined and devastated Mexico in the gloom of another *noche triste*, whose darkness was a fit mantle for that unhappy land. The sea, the wind, and the rain made a wild revel upon the sloping beach; and men and horses, wading and plunging amid floating canvas and poles, and the various *disjecta membra* of the wreck, might reasonably have expected an encounter with monsters of the deep, on this now common ground, or common water.

Chaos ruled the night; but when the morning sun shone upon us, and sent its sheen over the deep blue sea, there was no sign of commotion in the elements, and nothing but our fallen canvas and water-soaked bedding and clothes bore witness to the work of the storm.

Northers are not common on the coast during the summer, but we had a presage of this from one of Nature's barometers. As we were nearing the coast, the famous peak of Orizaba was descried in its glory. Its lofty snow-crowned head is eighteen thousand feet above the level of the sea, and it appeared not unlike a huge liberty cap of frosted silver, glittering in the sunbeams and dazzling with its radiance. There was no visible base or pedestal, but towering aloft from a girdle of clouds it seemed suspended in the middle air, like Michael Angelo's conception in regard to the Pantheon. The spectacle was altogether surpassingly sublime and beautiful. This magnificent sight is not pleasing to the mariner; for its full exhibition always foretells a storm, as we, indeed, experienced. Among the original inhabitants, Orizaba was known as *Citlaltepeltl*, or the *starry mountain*, from luminous exhalations which formerly played over its summit.

After a brief sojourn on the beach, our extemporized brigade started for the interior. The first night on the march was another *noche triste*. We slept in the mud, without tents and almost without food. This was due to confusion in the immense wagon train with which we were encumbered—for we were escorting to Scott's army a renovating supply of the munitions of war. On the following day we were regaled with fresh beef,

shot by our marksmen, and skinned and cooked and eaten while the beef was almost quivering with the last vibrations of life. The cattle, though running wild, were said to belong to Santa Anna. When our cooks were consigning this nearly living beef to the flesh pots, we might have expected the omens which startled the hungry crew of Ulysses when they slaughtered the sacred beeves of the Island of the Sun. 'The skins crept on the ground, and the joints of meat lowed on the spits while roasting.' No wonder the crew all perished; whereas of our men, a half, a third, or a fourth at least, returned to their homes in due time to fight their battles 'o'er again,' to, or with, Penelope and the children.

We made strenuous efforts to get out of the low and hot region known as the *tierras calientes*, a region of death, independently of the attentions of mounted guerrilla rangers, who poured volleys into our column at all hours of the day, concealing themselves in the dense *chaparral* on the sides of the highroad. Every day some of our men were stricken down by the heavy balls of the Mexican *escopetas*, but many more fell from heat, weariness, and disease, dysentery principally. We fortunately escaped the *Vomito*, (yellow fever,) though it was raging in the walled town of Vera Cruz while we were in camp on the beach at Vergara, three miles distant.

The *Vomito* was a recognized ally of the Mexicans, and they expected furthermore, that the lethal heats of the *tierras calientes* would be as fatal to our troops as the cold of Russia was to the troops of Napoleon.

We made such haste as we could, (not exceeding the maxim, *festina lente!*) to get to the salubrious and picturesque highlands of the interior. The first night among the hills inspired a new life into our sick, foot-sore, and weary brigade. Just think of twenty-four hundred men suffering each twenty-four times a day, at least, with the pangs of *tormina* and *tenesmus*, with too little to eat, and too much to wear or to carry, bug-bitten all night, and shot, or shot at, every day by invisible guerrillamen, as we marched in midsummer under a tropical sun, and the reader may suppose, upon reflection, that we were not a very cheerful party. Some of us, without knowing the amount of indebtedness due from Mexico to the United States, would willingly

have given up any individual interest in it to be at inglorious ease at home.

And yet the first night in the pure air of the hills seemed to vitalize the whole command. We were at the poor hamlet of Tolomé, which looked quite beautiful under the cozening rays of the moon, nestling, as it does, in the midst of a beautiful landscape. Tents were pitched, fires were lighted, there was music by a band, with a sort of anvil chorus kept up cheerily by smiths mending tires and traces, and from the long line of transparent dwellings, catches of song, very unlike the lamentations of the prophet, and peals of laughter, resounded. I began to think my interest in Mexico worth looking after.

From this time we moved slowly on, dragging our wagon train and heavy artillery up the long ascent towards the *tierras templadas*, the temperate zone of Mexico, a healthy and fertile region. Mules and horses had been stricken down as well as men in the lowlands, and we had no small difficulty in ascending the hills. Sometimes the mountain road would be skirting along by a deep ravine, looking like a bottomless abyss, while adjacent mountain tops would be towering toward the regions of perpetual snow. We could realize Virgil's lines,

' O'er us perpetual glows the exalted pole,
There gloomy Styx, and Hell's deep shadows roll.'

In the mountain gorges of *Cerro Gordo* we expected something worse than the daily skirmishes to which we were now accustomed. A few hundred good men could make another Thermopylæ at more passes than one in these mountains. But we had only the usual fire and run from the guerrillas, who commonly welcomed the van of our little army with a volley when we came to a halt for the night, and sent a parting shot after the rear as we marched away in the light of the early morning. When we reached the picturesque city of Jalapa, it seemed as if we had found another paradise. It was on a Sunday, and the *Jalapeños* turned out in full costume, to see and be seen. The people came into the camp to trade with us, bringing the fruits and vegetables of the torrid and temperate zones, to say nothing of hogskins full of *pulque*.¹ They brought apples, pears, peaches,

¹ The famous and favorite national beverage.

bananas, plantains, zapotes, the *aguacate* or alligator pears, cactus berries, and many other fruits, gathered by one person in one vicinity. Of these fruits, the *aguacate* (*Laurus Persea*) is to me the most grateful, but the banana is the most useful. It is to the inhabitants of the torrid zone what the cereal grasses, wheat, barley and rye, are to our country, and to Europe. There is no other plant which can produce an equal amount of nutriment on the same space of ground. Humboldt says that the produce is to that of wheat as 133 to 1, and to that of potatoes as 44 to 1. 'It is calculated,' he says, 'that the same extent of ground in Mexico on which the banana is raised, is capable of maintaining fifty individuals; whereas in Europe, under wheat, it would not furnish subsistence for two.'

The *Jalapeños* were probably not averse to us. At all events, they sold us supplies, and were honestly paid for them. Our army thus made a strong contrast with their own, for the guerilla men levy upon them at will, and take what they please, without compensation. One man who came to my tent to trade, offered more than its value for a piece of sperm candle, and desired to have more. When he found I was a *Medico*, he explained to me that he wanted spermaceti for its remedial virtues in pulmonary affections. These virtues, as the reader will remember, are commemorated in Shakspeare, and my new friend certainly concurred in the belief that,

'The sovereignest thing on earth,
Was parmaceti for an inward bruise.'

After minor adventures, day by day, we reached at length the city of *Puebla*, then occupied by Gen. Scott and his army. The Commander-in-Chief was awaiting us, and he soon distributed our brigade among the four divisions of his army, commanded respectively by Generals Twiggs, Pillow, Worth, and Quitman. The marines, constituting a very soldierly and well disciplined body, were assigned to the last named. Our forces were soon set in motion for the capital. We passed through a fine country beyond *Puebla*, having constantly in sight the great volcano *Popocatepetl*, the *smoke mountain*, and *Istacihuatl*, a colossal neighbor, whose name signifies the *white woman*, from some fancied resemblance to a reclining female figure, its rugged spine rising

high in the region of perpetual snow. Popocatepetl is almost a rival of Orizaba. Some of my companions had no difficulty in discerning a wreath of circling vapor arising from its summit, but I must admit to seeing only spotless snow at the summit, which, sparkling and glittering in the sunbeams, extended for 3000 feet down its mighty sides.

From San Martin, an antiquated village, we began the ascent of the porphyritic mountain wall, which stood between us and 'the happy valley.' We soon rose fairly into the *tierras frias*, the frozen zone, or literally, the cold lands of this remarkable country. High on the mountain side we encamped at *Rio Frio* (cold stream). Before dawn, I was forced by the cold to leave my simple camp bed to seek the early camp fires. On the march of the day, we crossed the highest point of the mountain road, at an elevation of about 11,000 feet above the level of the sea. In making the descent, the valley of Mexico was exposed to us by glimpses, or bird's-eye views, of entrancing beauty. In the language of my notes: 'The valley or basin of Mexico lay spread out like a panorama of fairy-land, opening, closing, and shifting, according to the changing positions of the observers. At times, nothing would be visible but dark recesses in the mountain, or the grim forest that shaded the road; when in a moment a sudden turn would unfold, as if by magic, a scene that looked too lovely to be real. It was an enchantment in nature; for knowing as we did that we beheld *bona fide* lakes and mountains, plains and villages, chapels and hamlets, all so bright, so clear, and so beautiful, it still seemed an illusion of the senses, a dream, or a perfection of art,—nay, in the mountain circle we could see the very picture frame.' There is a peculiar clearness in this rare and elevated atmosphere which gives to remote objects a delusive idea of their proximity. I cannot at all describe the beauty of a snow storm we saw above us in the mountains, while the sun was shining brightly over the surrounding country below.

We are now about to pass from marching and skirmishing, to conflicts which have become memorable in history. Before proceeding to speak of them, however, I may be excused for reproducing a passage from Humboldt on the physical geography to

which I have already called attention, under the names of the *tierras calientes*, or hot regions, the *tierras templadas*, or temperate regions, and the *tierras frias*, or cold regions. These three regions lying together in the same latitude, are capable of producing, he says, all that commerce brings together from every part of the globe,—sugar, cochineal, cacao, cotton, coffee, wheat, hemp, flax, silk, oil, and wine. They furnish every metal; not even excepting mercury, and are supplied with the finest timber.

‘The western part of the State of Vera Cruz forms the declivity of the Cordilleras of Anahuac, from whence, amid the regions of perpetual snow, the inhabitants descend in a day to the burning plains of the coast. In this district are displayed in a remarkable manner the gradations of vegetation, from the level of the sea to those elevated summits which are visited with perennial frost. In ascending, the traveler sees the physiognomy of the country, the aspect of the sky, the form of the plants, the figures of animals, the manners of the inhabitants, and the kind of cultivation followed by them, assuming a different appearance at every step. Leaving the lower districts covered with a beautiful and luxuriant vegetation, he first enters that in which the oak appears, where he has no longer cause to dread the yellow fever, so fatal on the coast. Forests of liquid-amber, near Jalapa, announce by their freshness the elevation at which the strata of clouds, suspended over the ocean, come in contact with the basaltic summits of the Cordilleras. A little higher, the banana ceases to yield fruit. At the height of San Miguel, pines begin to mingle with the oaks, which continue as far as the plains of Perote, where the cereal vegetation of Europe is seen. Beyond this, the former alone cover the rocks, the tops of which enter the region of perpetual frigidity.’ (*Humboldt’s Travels, &c.*)

A single passage like the above gives some idea of the resources of Mexico, if in good hands.

As we fairly entered the valley, we expected to face ‘grim-visaged war’ in earnest, and we were not disappointed. The Mexican commander, Santa Anna, was awaiting us with a heavy force at *El Peñon*, a rugged hill, or rock, a sort of Gibraltar, ten miles from the capital city, on the main road thereto. Guns

were planted in tiers on the hill-side, and breast-works were carefully constructed to protect the Mexican troops. The road is but a causeway through a swampy country. Ditches and barricades made the road impassable, except as they were captured and leveled under the fire from the hill; so that our army, under a raking fire, was likely to be cut to pieces before reaching the principal point of defence. It was generally agreed in the army that the capture of this fortification would be at the cost of at least half of our force. As we were nearly three hundred miles from the coast, the survivors in possession would have innumerable difficulties in holding their position until reinforced. The attack seemed inevitable, however, and every man was prepared to do his duty.

The troops with whom I was serving moved steadily on, in full expectation of a bloody day's work, when an order came to halt as we stood on the road. It seemed like a moment of rest to prepare for action. But shortly an order for a counter-march took us by surprise. We retraced our steps, and turned to take a fork in the road which led by a rough and narrow causeway to the town of Chalco. We were, in short, traveling by a road supposed by the Mexicans to be impassable for wagons and artillery, so as to turn *El Peñon*. This was a part of General Scott's strategy, which rendered that stronghold entirely useless. Following slowly and painfully our winding course, removing obstructions, as trees hastily thrown over the road by guerrillas, &c., to say nothing of skirmishing and guerrilla battles, we reached the very pretty town of San Augustin. During a skirmish,² I joined a party of officers on one of the numerous volcanic knolls around whose base we had to wind, for observation. There are many of these knolls or mounds in the valley, of various heights, which are extinct craters. They remind the observer that the whole of this placid and beautiful valley or basin was once a huge cauldron, boiling over in all directions. Imagination can scarcely depict the awful sight of hundreds of these Cyclopean chimneys belching forth fire and smoke, and sending

²In this action, in which we could only distinguish the positions of the contending parties by the rising smoke, Capt. Thornton, of the 2d Dragoons, a highly meritorious and gallant young officer, was killed by a cannon ball while making a bold reconnoissance.

down torrents of liquid lava to deluge the trembling plains below. I made some endeavor to compare, or contrast, in thought, the roar of artillery then ringing in my ears with the bellowings of this raging Gehenna when these huge mountains were upheaved to their present wondrous height. How utterly insignificant appeared the work of war by contrast!

Our great fights began from San Augustin. The old war god of the valley, *Huitzilpochtli*, must have been fairly aroused by the battle of Contreras on the 19th and 20th of August, which was the first of the great battles in the valley. It may prove interesting to lady readers, by the way, to know that *Huitzilpochtli* had a help-meet. The goddess of war is not often seen by mortal eyes, at least of our race, but her well-preserved image cut in stone shows her as a being of composite order. She surpasses the well known Mississippi ideal, being composed of a deformed female figure, a tiger and a rattlesnake; not an attractive personage, certainly, though not an unfit type of her vocation.

On the evening of the 19th, the fortune of war was against us at Contreras. The Mexicans were in their entrenched camp with an abundance of artillery, well served, which they used effectively upon our men, who had to toil over the *Pedregal*, a great field of broken volcanic stone and lava, rent in chasms and fissures, which was with difficulty traversed even by light infantry. The Americans were severely handled, while the Mexicans were as yet unscathed and intangible. Our spent and hungry men lay upon the rocks in the night under a pelting storm of rain, which chilled them to the marrow, after the heat and the fruitless exposure of a hard-fought day. On their rough and cold beds, they could hear the *vivas* of the Mexicans at their unwonted success, and the stirring strains of their martial music. The U. S. Marines, with a few other troops, had been left in San Augustin as a reserve, to protect the military stores, &c., which it was supposed would be attacked; but at dawn, as the times were critical, the whole army was put in motion. As we joined our main body, however, their roaring huzzas informed us that the tide had already turned. The engineers, Lee, and Beauregard, and Tower, and others, had been reconnoitering

and the last named had found a difficult pass in the rear of Contreras, which was made use of by General Persifer Smith, aided by General Cadwalader and Colonel Riley, to attack the Mexicans in the rear of their works, the troops being led by Lieutenant Tower, by way of a rough and obscure ravine, in the darkness of the night. The astonished Mexicans, lately so jubilant, fled in the utmost confusion before the 'cold iron' of this storming party, and left their stronghold in possession of the victors.

The taking of Contreras was but the beginning of a series of victories won by our troops on the same day; or there was one great victory divided into five brilliant parts, the acts of the drama being performed at Contreras, San Antonio, Churubusco, *Tête du Pont*, and San Pablo, names rendered historical by the successes of American arms.

The Commander-in-Chief summed up the general results of the day as follows: 'Our army has, in a single day, in many battles defeated 32,000 men, made about 3,000 prisoners, including eight generals, (two of them ex-presidents,) and 205 other officers; killed or wounded 4,000 of all ranks — besides entire corps dispersed and dissolved; captured 37 pieces of ordnance — more than trebling our field train and siege batteries, with a large number of small arms, a full supply of ammunition, &c. These great results have overwhelmed the enemy. Our loss amounts to 1,053, killed and wounded. Those under treatment, thanks to our very able medical officers, are generally doing well.' (*General Scott's Report.*) Our whole army consisted of about 10,000 men, of all arms.

These marvellous results admit of some explanation. The mongrel races of Mexico have no sense of honor, no pride of character. Their generals are not wanting in ability, but their *matériel* for armies is hopelessly bad. Protracted civil wars have disorganized and demoralized the people to such an extent, that they care very little what general or party is in the ascendant, and they are little more concerned at foreign invasion, provided the invaders treat them with leniency. My subsequent intercourse with various classes made me perfectly familiar with their sentiments and their hopes, or rather I should say, their despair. What we would call *the people*, is a body unknown in Mexico.

There is an aristocracy of wealth and family, of *sangre azul*, possessed of fair intelligence ; and there are the poor Indian and the *Mestizo*, or hybrid man, who is for the most part an unpromising subject in all countries. The two last mentioned form the masses, and they are always overridden and degraded, either by oppressors from the highest class, or by upstarts and adventurers arising among themselves. None of them have a valid idea of the blessings resulting from the combined influences of peace, industry and prosperity. Every government or party in power, and every army, engage in the one common cause of plundering the people, if such they may be called. These last were astonished to find that our army did not live among them by plunder. Supplies taken from them were paid for at a full valuation. We reaped the benefit of this policy ; for droves of cattle, for example, would be driven out of reach of Santa Anna's foraging parties to be sold to ours. But for this, our army would have been in danger of perishing for want of supplies.

From my knowledge of Mexico, I will assert that there will be no improvement there until it is effected by some bold and resolute foreign power.

After the battles mentioned, we had an armistice which lasted to Sept. 7, when it was manifest that the enemy was engaged in violating its terms. Our next work then was to capture the city. The army was again put in motion ; skirmishing was resumed, and in a few days the bloody battle of *Motino del Rey* was fought, which gave us a dearly bought victory. Shortly after that we made a night march, and when the morning dawned we saw the formidable castle of Chapultepec, the key to the city, frowning down upon us from the rugged hill which it crowns.

One day was given to bombarding the castle. This was slow work ; and the Mexicans bore artillery fighting very creditably. The next day the castle was taken by storm after a desperate fight, in the early part of which the gallant Major Twiggs, of the Marines, was killed while leading a storming party, under his command. From a temporary hospital arranged for the occasion, I could see distinctly every movement made on the side of the hill facing towards us. Many Americans, not engaged, though we were all fully under the range of the castle guns, were

perched in trees, and on house tops, gazing intently upon the fearful spectacle. There were untold thousands of Mexican spectators. I looked at the city, where the domes and towers of the Cathedral, the churches and convents, were blackened with myriads of people; — on the house-tops, and upon every elevation were dense clusters of human beings. We surgeons were soon overwhelmed with the wounded, who required all of our attention; but some of us were shortly summoned to the castle, which was now in the hands of our successful warriors. Heaps of dead and wounded blocked the approaches to the castle as we entered. The wounded were carried in as fast as possible for attention, Mexicans as well as Americans. The losses on the part of the former largely preponderated. Their mangled bodies lay heaped in masses; some among them indeed were not yet dead, but were gasping in the last agonies, with their dark faces upturned to the sun, writhing and struggling in death, like fish thrown on shore by the angler. Crushed heads, shattered limbs, torn up bodies, with brains, hearts, and lungs exposed, and eyes torn from their sockets, were among the horrible visions that first arrested attention. Meantime, the army pushed on for the city, and after some hours, I followed along the causeway, which was then strewed with the dead. The Mexicans had made another stand, and were raking the causeway with their artillery. I was advised to dismount, and take my course on foot under the shelter of the arches of the aqueduct, which extended along the road. Its projecting abutments gave no little protection to our soldiers on foot, who took advantage of them to save themselves, to a great extent, from the sweeping fire of the Mexicans. I took the advice, and succeeded in joining our brigade near the city gates. During the night, (Sep. 13,) preparations were made for bombarding the city. On the morning of the 14th, however, it was ascertained that the Mexican troops had vacated, so that our army entered in triumph, but not without a final skirmish, for Santa Anna had opened the prisons, and hosts of liberated felons fired upon our troops as they entered, from the house-tops. These, it will be remembered, are flat, and are protected by parapets. It required a couple of days to reduce this army of villains, but our riflemen also went to the house-tops, and Worth's Division

surprised them as at Monterey, by perforating the walls of the houses and ascending upon them from below. Mountain howitzers were also placed in lofty towers, which dismayed and dispersed the felon army.

The war was now practically ended. We had nothing more to do than to garrison the city, and to take care of the sick and wounded. The brigade to which I was attached had lost all its superior officers; so that Lieutenant-Colonel Watson, of the Marines, came into command. General Shields, the brigadier, was laid up, disabled by a formidable wound in the arm; Colonel Burnett, of the New York regiment, was disabled by a desperate wound in the foot, which nearly proved fatal by tetanus, and Colonel Butler, of the South Carolina regiment, (*Palmettos*,) had been killed in action. These two regiments, with which the Marines had been constantly associated, had been eminently and equally conspicuous for their gallantry upon many a hard-fought field; and surely neither thought then that their successors would ever imbrue their hands in each other's blood. Many of the gallant men who there fought shoulder to shoulder, afterwards unhappily turned their well-tested prowess against each other. From the highest to the lowest places in the army, this unhappy fact was realized. At head-quarters, the two prominent figures were Winfield Scott and Robert E. Lee, the latter the confidential friend and adviser of the former. As it stood with them, the subsequent commanders-in-chief of the respective Federal and Confederate forces, so with many others, the differences being only matters of degree.

Our army, during the eight or nine months of occupation of the city, gave the people a sense of security and protection hitherto, and since, unknown to them. Their greatest happiness would have been in a permanent occupation. The army interfered with none of the industrial pursuits of the people, but it afforded a market for their supplies, and encouraged their lawful employments. It is said that when Belisarius invaded Africa, his army made friends among the people by traffic conducted with fairness and honesty, and that 'no outrage was committed on private property, but the people and the very land rejoiced in the sense of full protection.' With a single conspicu-

ous exception, the same could be truly said of our army. The lawless spirits of the country were awed into complete submission, and the better classes, who live in a perennial reign of terror, enjoyed a respite from their terrors. They could sleep in peace before going to that long sleep which, hitherto, was alone exempted from ruthless violence.

Instead of being a day of rejoicing, it was a time of mourning, when our departing army left the people once more to their former rulers, their presidents, dictators, soldiers and robbers. On our homeward march, as on going inland, we observed numerous wayside crosses, erected by the country people over spots where travelers had been murdered: sad memorials of life and death in a land, which as a true *Aceldama*, is purple with the blood of its children. The lines of the poet, though applied to another country, are in Mexico, words of literal truth:

‘For whereso’er the shrieking victim hath
Poured forth his blood beneath the assassin’s knife,
Some hand erects a cross of mouldering lathe;
And grove and glen with thousand such are rife,
Throughout this purple land where law secures not life.’

Returning from Mexico to a well ordered and well governed country seemed like returning to a happier and a better world. Would to God all Americans could appreciate the blessings of a good government, now so sadly imperiled! With them, if life has many cares and sorrows it has its compensations also; but without them it may indeed be said:

‘That Life protracted is protracted woe.’

An Epistle on Homœopathy.

[THE RICHMOND MEDICAL JOURNAL, August, 1867.]

A highly intelligent gentleman recently handed to me for perusal, a series of Essays on Homœopathy, by a Dr. Sharp, an Englishman, alleging that they were in the highest repute among the partisans of that system. Acknowledging the soundness of the maxim, *audi alteram partem*, I engaged at once to read them.

Medicine, in theory and practice, is full of intricacies and obscurities, and this must be so while life and death are ineffable mysteries; but now and then we get a gleam of light that helps us in our labors, and enables us to work more intelligently and more beneficially in the service of suffering humanity. Every such gleam we must accept with grateful hearts from whatever source it may come. No true physician can disdain or reject any item, or even an atom, of useful professional knowledge. If Hahnemann had more lights than his predecessors, let us have the benefit of them. If Dr. Sharp has yet more lights than his master, let us profit by them also. Imbued with this spirit, I read Dr. Sharp's essays with the fair design of acquiring useful knowledge. If your readers will bear with me, I will lay the results before them, somewhat at length.

There are now in my possession eight of twelve 'Tracts on Homœopathy,' written by William Sharp, M. D., F. R. S., an experienced practitioner of the old school, as he informs us, before his conversion. The tracts are entitled, 'The Small Dose of Homœopathy,' Tract No. 4; 'The Advantages of Homœopathy,' Tract No. 6; 'The Principle of Homœopathy,' Tract

No. 7; 'The Controversy on Homœopathy,' Tract No. 8; 'The Remedies of Homœopathy,' Tract No. 9; 'The Provings of Homœopathy,' Tract No. 10; 'The Single Medicine of Homœopathy,' Tract No. 11; and finally, 'The Common Sense of Homœopathy,' Tract No. 12.

In Tract No. 4, three leading questions are proposed and answered. The questions are, '1. Are we acquainted with any facts which render it probable that infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter *may* act upon the living animal body? In other words, what does *analogy* teach us? 2. Are there any facts which show the action of infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter on the *healthy* body? 3. What are the actual proofs in support of the assertion that such minute quantities of ponderable matter act remedially on the *diseased* body?'

These pertinent questions are followed by several pages of facts or assertions from the domains of chemical and mechanical philosophy; a dissertation upon the minutiae of sound and sight, &c.; upon oxygen and hydrogen, &c.; with divers questions as to ultimate facts, which so far admit of no answers from philosophers of any school.

In the midst of this array of learning, we find the following paragraph:

'The small dose of the Homœopathist, viewed in the light of this double limit, may be thus considered: Chemical tests follow the grain of medicinal substance to the third trituration, that is, till it has been divided into a million of parts; and a good eye, assisted by a powerful microscope, can follow it to the fourth or fifth trituration; beyond this it is absolutely lost to the perception of our sight. The sense of smell can detect musk to the fifth or sixth dilution. Everything that we know, forbids us to conclude that the division of matter stops here, but our senses cannot follow it further. On the other hand, our power of observing the effects produced by these doses, has no limit but the sliding scale. Admitting for the moment, which I think I shall afterwards prove, that effects are produced, it is evidently as easy for us to observe them after a dose of the thirtieth as after one of the third, or of the first trituration. The same cautions are necessary, but nothing more.'

It may be remarked, *en passant*, that the first trituration gives the 1-100 part of a grain, which is an appreciable and admissible dose with some medicines or poisons, according to regular or *old* practice, as *e.g.* aconitia; while the third trituration gives the 1-1,000,000 part of a grain, and the thirtieth a decillionth, it is said, which cannot be conveniently expressed in figures, and of which, indeed, the mind can scarcely take cognizance. The sons of *Æsculapius*, of other descents than through *Hahnemann*, do not believe that a grain, or drop of any known medicine, has any remedial power in the third trituration or dilution, and consequently, still less do they believe it to be effective in the thirtieth trituration or dilution.

This point of difference may pass for the present.

Our author then propounds again, question No. 1, and opens his reply in the following magniloquent terms: 'Look at that bright star! so remote that the astronomer, with his telescope, cannot calculate its distance, and yet its brilliant beams of light strike upon the eye and convince the merest child of its existence. What a vivid flash that was, and how loud the thunder! see yonder oak riven to its centre — what an irresistible force, and yet the chemist, with his most delicate balance, cannot perceive its weight. . . . What is light? . . . For our present purpose it is unimportant which theory (of the nature or phenomena of light) is regarded as the true one, inasmuch as both assume that matter, in some form, is concerned in producing the various impressions of light and color upon the living animal body. The effects are produced by imponderable, but not by immaterial agents. To convey some faint notion of excessive minuteness, it may be mentioned that the length of an undulation of the extreme violet ray of light is 0.0000167 of an inch; the number of undulations in an inch is 59,750; and the number of undulations in a second, is 727,000,000,000,000, (727 trillions); while the corresponding numbers for the indigo ray are, length, 0.0000185 of an inch; 54,070 undulations in an inch, and 658,000,000,000,000 (658 trillions) in a second. The other rays differ in similar proportions.'

What plausible or valid objection can *Allopathy* make to all this? I know of none.

‘That space is occupied by minute particles of matter, admits of being proved in another manner, quite independent of these observations on light. . . . Thus, by another series of observations, we arrive at the same conclusion, that there exists a rare, subtle and imponderable form of minutely divided matter. Infinitesimal quantities of this imponderable matter, are capable of acting energetically, and they *do so act* habitually, producing such impressions as those of light, as upon the living animal body.’ It would be difficult to find a disputant to argue that light and heat, &c., do not act appreciably upon the animal organism; though it is rather where they ‘cover it all over as with a mantle,’ than when admitted in invisible and insensible proportions.

It would not be surprising if the reader were impressed like honest Dr. Primrose at the fair, when his learned friend and admirer — the same who bought his horse — treated him to a brief discourse on cosmogony, until, suddenly interrupting himself, he had to admit he was straying from the question. ‘That he actually was; nor could I for my life,’ says the Vicar, ‘see how the creation of the world had any thing to do with the business I was talking of, but it was sufficient to show me that he was a man of learning, and I revered him the more.’

Our author, however, has no difficulty in finding the application of the philosophical facts stated, and from them he answers question No. 1 summarily as follows:

‘Reasoning then from analogy, we may conclude it to be probable that other forms of matter, even though reduced by the successive triturations into *similarly small dimensions*, may also act, and act powerfully, upon the living body.’

Question No. 2 is again propounded. We are then told of the mechanical division of gold, which ‘in gilding,’ may be divided into particles, at least one thousand four hundred millions of a square inch in size, and yet possess the color and all the other characters of the largest mass. . . . The perfection of modern chemistry is such, that a quantity of silver equal to the billionth of a cubic line, can be readily detected. That particles become divided into less proportions than is shown in these examples, is evident from the daily observations of the

sense of smell. The violet fills even a royal apartment with its sweet odor, which is thus readily perceived, but which absolutely evades every other mode of observation. How inconceivably small must be the particles of all odors! And yet how obviously material they are.'

'These are instances of infinitesimal quantities of matter acting upon the *healthy* body.'

There appears to be some little confusion in these instances. An infinitesimal particle of gold may, indeed, cover an infinitesimal particle of wood, under the unconscious hand of the gilder, but if *one* of the same particles gets into his mouth or stomach, he is not appreciably any the better or any the worse for its misapplication. The odor of a violet may fill no doubt 'even a royal apartment,' and royal lungs and royal nostrils at the same time, but as in the case of light there is an infinitesimal application to infinitesimal surface, or a wide-spread application to a great area, as one may please to consider it. We cannot explain how the air is perfumed with imponderable matter, but we know, as a matter of fact, that odors do not become *more potent*, like homœopathic remedies, in proportion to their *greater dilution*. They are clearly more potent according to their concentration, as every man, woman and child knows from experience.

The following ingenious proposition by our author, though not new, is confessedly plausible:

'A clergyman visits a patient in scarlet fever, but does not touch him; he afterwards calls upon a friend and shakes the hand of one of the children as he passes her on the staircase. The next day this child sickens with the scarlet fever, and her brothers and sisters take it from her; no other connection can be traced. This is no uncommon occurrence, and no one doubts the communication of infection in such a manner, neither is it doubted that the infection itself is something material. What is the *weight* of the particle of matter thus conveyed? Is it heavier than the millionth of a grain of belladonna, which, it is asserted by homœopaths, is sufficient, when given at short intervals, to arrest the progress of such a case?'

Notwithstanding a degree of looseness and inaccuracy in the

above paragraph, (as, *e. g.*, 'the next day, after contact with the clergyman, the child sickens,' &c., a proof in itself, to the *old school* physician, that the child took the disease not from the clergyman, but from some other source,) there is not in all of Dr. Sharp's essays a more ingenious point made for his favorite system. But when the matter is brought to the crucible, what is the result? There is something about the nature and workings of contagious diseases that has sorely tried the medical philosophy of all ages. No medical *Œdipus* has yet come forward to solve the riddle. But there is a well sustained theory that contagious diseases for the most part, as some others, are spread by certain germs which are wafted or carried in various ways so as to find admission into the animal system, where, finding material to act upon, they act as leaven, and we have it upon older authority than Hahnemann, that 'a little leaven leaveneth the whole mass.' There is nothing better than this theory broached or known. Now to find a parallel between the minute germ which spreads disease by a process akin to fermentation, and the action of an infinitesimal remedy, it should be shown that a millionth of a grain of belladonna has some power of self-multiplication and propagation.

The emanation from powdered ipecacuanha is very distressing to some subjects, producing asthmatic or other suffering. The author finds in this fact a proof of the efficiency of the small dose of homœopathy. Here, however, as in the case of the odor of the violet, the floating particles, infinitesimal as each may be, find their way to a large surface of sensitive mucous membrane, and by their acrimony they occasionally cause dyspnœa. Many impurities in the air have a similar influence, but they all impinge at once upon a very large surface. Withal, but few persons, comparatively, are so affected by ipecacuanha, and no more inference can be drawn from an exceptional fact of this kind, than from the fact that some one person, from idiosyncrasy, is made sick by the smell of a cat in a room, which smell is not appreciated by ninety-nine out of one hundred persons in the same room. Many persons are made sick by the mere recollection of an offensive taste or odor. I have known a gentleman to be made sick from the swinging of a lantern aboard ship,

which he took to be due to the pitching of the vessel, and to be cured upon learning that the lantern was swinging from an accidental collision, while the ship was riding quietly at anchor. An infinitude of such facts is familiar in the records of medical experience.

Our author having answered questions No. 1 and No. 2, to his own entire satisfaction, and having adduced 'undeniable proofs,' the chief of which have just been brought forward, proceeds to the consideration of question No. 3, which is almost conclusively answered by the findings in Nos. 1 and 2. 'It now, therefore, only remains, that by the evidence of facts I prove, generally, that they (infinitesimal doses) do act, and particularly that their action is beneficial in disease.' The same proofs, it is asserted, show the efficacy of infinitesimal doses that show the efficacy of large doses of medicine. 'A patient is cured of a violent headache by a dozen leeches,' (not a very happy illustration, by the way, of *doses of medicine*.) 'Another has a similarly violent headache; the millionth, or the billionth of a drop of the juice of the deadly night-shade is given; relief quickly follows,' therefore the millionth or billionth of a drop of this medicine is equal to the influence of a dozen leeches upon the system.

The author then gives us, very briefly, accounts of his triumphs over various formidable diseases, including, *inter alia*, croup, and erysipelas, as follows:

'*Croup*.—I have stated in another of these tracts, that several cases of croup have been treated after the new method. I have only to add here, that the medicines were given in infinitesimal doses, and to assure my readers that the relief afforded, without any other treatment, not even a warm bath, or a mustard poultice, was in every instance, most obvious, rapid and complete.'

Here is then the *experimentum crucis*: one of the most dangerous of our ordinary diseases is cured always, rapidly and completely, by infinitesimal doses—the millionth or billionth of a grain or drop, while the mortality is confessedly large, according to the records of regular practice. But did ever regular practitioner, in support of his arguments, use such summary assertions, with the hope of carrying conviction to the minds of his

professional brethren? If put through a course of cross-questioning by members of the profession, he would probably have to make some damaging admissions. In short, the statement above, resting merely upon the *ipse dixit* of a special advocate, which makes no distinctions as to the various forms of disease spoken of under the common name of croup, which ignores exact diagnosis and pathology, and gives not one word as to the detail of treatment, is not one whit better than tinkling cymbals and sounding brass.

‘*Erysipelas*.—This is always a serious, and often a fatal complaint; it affords a good example of the confusion and inconsistency of allopathic medicine.’ Our author then quotes Mr. Nunnally as a witness concerning the contradictory modes of practice used by regular physicians.

It is not so with the homœopathic treatment of *erysipelas*. ‘With minute doses of belladonna, rhus and lachesis, the usual remedies for this peculiar inflammation, I have succeeded in all the cases I have met with — among them were four severe ones — beyond my expectations. In one case, on the second day of the attack, the inflammation had spread over the face, ears, and most of the scalp, and part of the neck, with a large blister on each cheek, very severe headache, and a pulse of 150; this was entirely well at the end of a week.’

We may admit the truthfulness of this statement, without giving any more credit to the infinitesimal doses of the medicines, than to the water or the sugar of milk with which they were administered. *Erysipelas* is not ordinarily a fatal, or even a dangerous disease. Like most other diseases, it may be treated advantageously by opposite measures — by depletion or stimulation, according to the character of the attack, or the condition of the subject. But very many cases require *nothing* in the way of medicine. ‘On going around the wards of the Hotel Dieu, in May, 1851, with M. Louis,’ says Prof. Bennett, ‘I saw several cases of *erysipelas* of the scalp, which, I was told, were under no treatment whatever; because, as M. Louis informed me, according to his experience, *erysipelas* of the scalp was *never* fatal, unless it occurred in individuals of bad constitutions, or was associated with some complication.’ If M. Louis, one of the

greatest physicians in the world, had been a homœopath, he would have given the billionth of a grain of belladonna, or a granule of sugar of milk, which would have answered quite as well under some other name, with the same result, and he would have cried out with a loud voice, 'Behold the efficacy of infinitesimal doses!' But M. Louis, though deep in the science of medicine, is not an adept in the *art* of homœopathy.

The illustrations of successful treatment by infinitesimal doses above cited, are as striking as any adduced by Dr. Sharp, and may pass for what they are worth. While they are intended to show the value of the treatment in acute disease, there are others equally convincing as to the treatment of chronic disease. But one example is cited in this paper, and it is selected only for the merit of its brevity.

'*Warts.*—In three cases out of four, I have succeeded in clearing the hands of ugly warts. In all by internal treatment alone, and with infinitesimal doses of the medicines employed.' We are not enlightened as to the nature of the remedies, nor *as to the time required*; a matter of some importance in medical investigations, particularly as other physicians have often observed warts to appear unbidden, and disappear suddenly, without any treatment whatever.

I have now given your readers a fair summary of one of the cleverest tracts of one of the cleverest professional advocates of Homœopathy. Dr. Sharp considers his proofs conclusive as to the efficacy of infinitesimal medication. 'It is credible that the small dose can effect a "safe, speedy and permanent cure" whenever a cure is possible, *when it is found practicable to do so.*' The Doctor's small dose most frequently used, is the third dilution, 'in which the grain or the drop is divided into a million of parts.' This is rather a *large dose* in his school of practice; but it may be as efficacious quite as the thirtieth dilution — the decillionth of a grain or drop — which he has seen to have beneficial effects! The Doctor invites physicians to try these doses before they declare them to be worthless. There is something in this which seems fair, and any reader of the Journal can very readily, and with little pains, pour — gallons of water upon a drop of tincture of belladonna in a large tub or barrel, and try one drop

of this third dilution upon any of his patients whom he desires to bring under belladonna influence. But he must not content himself with *purchasing* the medicine *already diluted*, for fear of some slight error in quantity. I urge this the more particularly, as very large doses, thanks to modern chemistry, may now be condensed into very small bulks. To say nothing of aconitia, digitalin, atropia, &c., whereof the regular dose ranges from the 1-20 to the 1-100 of a grain, there are many remedies in common use, in what the homœopaths are pleased to call the allopathic school, in which ordinary doses vary from 1-4 grain to 1-20 grain, as morphia, arsenious acid, strychnia, &c. Now if the millionth, or billionth, or decillionth of a grain of any of these drugs will suffice to cure disease, it is singular that homœopaths should ever resort to what regular physicians consider full doses. There is abundant evidence that they do so. Full doses of morphia (1-4 grain and more) have been found in medicines used by them for the cure of dysentery in this city. Full doses of strychnia, and even very large doses, have been detected by analysis in packets *given*, (not *prescribed*,) by homœopaths.

I had intended to give a passing notice to each of Dr. Sharp's tracts, but such notice would require more space than they merit. Sophistry and bold assertion are, throughout, made to bolster up experiences that are, at best, very equivocal; that in short, have nothing of the true tone of science about them.

I will now only make a few discursive remarks upon various points urged in these tracts, supposed to be among the best exponents of infinitesimal medicine. Our author, in divers places, rejoices greatly over the contradictions which are unfortunately somewhat common, both in theory and practice, among regular physicians; but he seems to be often quite opposed in both to many of his own brethren, and even to his Magnus Apollo, Hahnemann. When John Chinaman thinks his idol *Josh* has done him a good turn, he falls down and worships him; but when *Josh* has allowed trouble, evil instead of good, to fall upon his worshipper, John does not hesitate to recompense him with a drubbing. Dr. Sharp pursues a not dissimilar course with Hahnemann.

Hahnemann's formal definition of this law of Homœopathy (like cures like) in the organism, is as follows:

‘A weaker dynamic affection is permanently extinguished in the living organism by a stronger one, if the latter (whilst differing in kind) is similar to the former in its manifestations.’

This paragraph, instead of announcing a natural fact, which he had discovered, says Dr. Sharp, states a fiction which he had imagined. He gives us no sufficient evidence to prove that the artificial disease induced by the remedy, is a stronger one than the previously existing natural disease. Analogy does not make it probable that this should be the case, especially with an infinitesimal dose of the remedy; and if it were so, it would be still less probable that such a mode of proceeding could restore any one to health. ‘I am constrained, therefore, to reject this definition, and venture to propose the following as a substitute:

‘Every material poison gaining admission into the healthy body, has a tendency to produce a diseased condition, induced by symptoms or physical signs, more or less peculiar to itself; and every such poison is the most appropriate remedy for a similar diseased condition which has arisen from other causes.’ (Vide Homœopathic Action of Drugs, Tract 9, page 20, 21.)

Here we find a law, based upon observation (!) in place of Hahnemann’s ‘fictions,’ which teaches that in a case, *e. g.*, of acute gastritis, the true remedy would be arsenic or corrosive sublimate. An allopathic remedy in such case would be *ice*, and there is probably none in nature or art which would be equal to this, judiciously administered.

Our author frequently speaks of the unwarranted assumptions and assertions of his master. ‘For example, he assumes that “spiritual power is hid in the inner nature of medicines;” that “homœopathic dynamizations” (rubbing the solid in a mortar, and shaking the liquid in a vial) “are real awakenings” of this power, and hence, he at one time asserts that there must be ten shakes; at another, only two.”’ (Tract 8, p. 21.) Our author then proceeds to castigate his Josh with something very like ridicule, and not without good reason. Indeed, it would be difficult ever to settle the right number of shakes, according to the Hahnemann theory, that increased dilution adds to the potency of medicines, and that every shake adds to the ‘dynam-

zation' or 'spiritualization' of the remedy. According to common report, several cases of dangerous narcotism have occurred in this city from the use of some remedy given by homœopaths, which acted like excessive doses of morphia. The question then occurs, did the danger arise from the excessive 'dynamization' of an infinitesimal dose, or from the injudicious or fraudulent use of a really large dose? If medicines have their potency magnified in proportion to their attenuation, and again increased by shakes or trituration, it would seem to be much safer for physicians to adhere to some standard dose, whose potency is understood and uniform. But does not every dose, great or small, undergo the shakes of peristaltic action?

The fact is, there is abundant reason to believe, that when homœopaths give efficacious doses, they give those remedies which may be given in *large dose* and in *small bulk* at the same time. Modern chemistry, by separating active principles from inert matter, gives facilities for a kind of practice which is legitimate in the hands of the regular practitioner, but fraudulent in the hands of one who pretends to give the billionth of a grain, when he gives the 1-4 or 1-2 of a grain, as of morphia, or the 1-50 of a grain, as of digitalin.

The infinitesimal dose then, so far from being proved to be efficacious, is a mere mockery. Hahnemann's theory about it and the 'dynamization,' &c., is treated with contempt by many of the homœopaths; but they profess to adhere to the cardinal rule, *similia similibus curantur*. This is the prime distinction of *Homœopathy*, as the very name implies. Allow me to present the definition from a standard authority, with the brief comment which follows:

'Homœopathy. A fanciful doctrine, which maintains that disordered actions in the human body are to be cured by inducing other disordered actions of the same kind, and this to be accomplished by infinitesimally small doses, often of apparently inert agents; the decillionth part of a grain of charcoal, for example, is an authorized dose.

'So long ago as in the writings of Gregory the Great, there is the following remark: "Mos medicinæ est ut aliquando similia similibus, aliquando contraria contrariis curet, nam sæpe calida

calidis, frigida frigidis, sæpe autem frigida calidis, calida frigidis sanare consuevit.”’ (Dunglison’s Dictionary.)

The reader will please notice particularly the sagacious summary of practice as stated by the great Pontiff, as I mean to recur to it.

How do homœopaths come at the true remedies in accordance with this one-sided theory of theirs, upon which their whole system rests, *similia similibus curantur*?

By observations based, as they tell us, on the action of drugs, or poisons, upon the healthy organism. This seems to be pretty fair, but the results are not free from perplexity, when we come to find that such a medicine as the carbonate of lime, in such a dose as the decillionth of a grain, produces 1,090 symptoms, among which are itching on the border of the eyelids (after five days), and great heat at the extremity of the big toe (after twenty-one days.) It required the genius of Hahnemann to trace cause and effect between the dose and the symptoms. No *old school* physician, from Hippocrates to Sydenham or Louis, could have done as much.

The first principle, however, as well as the infinitesimal dose of Homœopathy, is being assailed by the doctors of this school. M. Rapon, historian of the Homœopathic doctrine, who seems to treat Hahnemann, as does Dr. Sharp, with alternate blows and caresses, uses the following language :

‘The law of similars is positive, but it does not constitute the general law of therapeutics. Medicamental substances may operate by the law of contraries; enantiopathy is as often in play as homœopathy — both are secondary and accessory modes. The great principle is the specificity, and the most important problem is not to seek the similarity between the remedy and the disease, but to find directly the specific appropriate to each morbid state. Dynamization does not exist even where by many its importance has been greatly exaggerated. . . . Infinitesimal doses have no marked action; . . . our medicines may be administered without inconvenience in the ordinary pharmaceutical preparations, and the various allopathic remedies may be employed conveniently with them.’ (Histoire de la Doctrine Homœopathique — quoted from Renouard’s History of Medicine.)

So far as this gentleman's views are concerned, it may be said there is not a physician in the world who would not be glad to have and to use specifics for all diseases; the one great difficulty is to find them. But it will be observed that this distinguished *Homœopath* fairly abandons *Homœopathy*!

'The ignorance of allopathy is darkness which may be *felt*—and it *is* felt, witness the confessions of its most eminent professors.' (Dr. Sharp, Tract No. 6.) What must we think of the confessions of his professors? His own statements, as well as those of M. Rapon and many others, go to show that the founder of Homœopathy was either a conscious impostor, or a self-deluded visionary and dupe! 'Like master, like man,' is not unlike the great maxim of Homœopathy; and it seems to find abundant application among professors of Homœopathic art.

I find this article growing upon my hands beyond reasonable proportions. The only apology is, that I am but giving the result of a search for light, where none is to be found, in a series of essays said to be of high character, upon one of the most important subjects that can occupy the mind of man, *i. e.*, the treatment of his maladies. I have found but sophistry, bold assertions, and puerilities, set off with philosophic platitudes, which, for the most part, have no bearing whatever upon the matter under discussion. These last seemed merely intended to dazzle ignorant readers, who had never learned, or had forgotten, the elementary lessons of the natural sciences.

The cases given in illustration prove nothing, even if stated in good faith. How utterly trivial, for instance, is the following example: A daughter of the doctor's complained of feeling sick one morning, whereupon he gave her some globules of ipecacuanha. Before breakfast was finished by the family, she came forward and ate heartily, saying, 'I feel quite well.' Her mamma asked her what she thought cured her. Her reply was this: 'If I thought that such medicine could do me good, I should think it was the medicine; but I suppose it was the breakfast,' having forgotten that before she had taken the medicine, she was not able to take the breakfast. This is the opening of Tract No. 12, on *The Common Sense of Homœopathy*. Other kinds of common sense have known children, in

instances beyond number, to complain of feeling sick and to eat a hearty meal immediately after, without the aid of medicine—homœopathic or allopathic.

But enough of this. Let me say in conclusion, that by the broad principles of medicine, in its fulness, there is nothing to prevent any physician from using remedies upon the homœopathic principle, or in infinitesimal doses, when and where these may be proved to be of proper application and utility. If the billionth of a grain of quinine will cure intermittent fever, let all the doctors rejoice and be glad, for then there will be no danger, as at present, of exhaustion of the supply. That such a dose ever has cured such a disease, remains to be proved. But there are very wonderful things in nature and in art; as *e. g.*, in procuring a speedy action upon a man's bowels by poking a piece of iron at him. Speaking of the magnet, the touch of which produces 900 symptoms according to Hahnemann, Dr. Sharp, in opposition to his master, makes the following statement: 'I have tried them (magnets) upon my own person, and on that of others. It is true that in one instance, in an individual of a highly nervous and susceptible temperament, I did get some symptoms, such as rumbling of the abdomen, a feeling of faintness, and a speedy action of the bowels; but then, on repeating the experiment with the same person a few days afterwards, with a similar bar of unmagnetised steel, I got precisely the same effects; clearly proving that the results of the previous trial were due to the force of imagination, and not to that of magnetism.' (Tract 9, p. 18.)

It is not improbable that patients in Tartary and Thibet are often cured by swallowing a piece of paper with the name of the proper medicine written thereon, which, as we are informed by the Abbé Huc, is in accordance with the practice in those regions; and it is not unreasonable to suppose, that 'a billionth of a grain of charcoal,' inscribed upon a piece of paper and swallowed, would prove, in any case, as remedial as the dose itself.

A billionth of a grain of quinine might arrest a chill, if given with due form and gravity, but a billionth of a drop of aqua fontana, would probably, upon the same, or a like individual, have the same or a like effect, and yet aqua fontana, notwith-

standing the distrust of some very cautious people, who will not take it without the addition of certain *adjuvantia* and *corrigentia*, may be taken in large doses, say a half pint or more, several times a day, without any danger whatever, except under extraordinary conditions or circumstances.

I have but recently, withal, heard a homœopathic patient complain of the bitterness of the medicine given him by his doctor to cure chills. Is quinine bitter to the third or thirtieth dilution, or, in practice, does the doctor adopt the allopathic heresy of giving ponderable and sensible doses?

Now a word on allopathy. Physicians should reject this term which homœopathy affects to confer upon regular practice. Do they admit any uniform or universal rule by which they, too, are bound to a one-sided theory? Who has the right to pledge us to the one axiom, *contraria contrariis curantur*? No one. The true physician endeavors to know the essential nature of disease, its various characters, and the best mode and remedies for the treatment of disease. It is no leading consideration with him as to whether remedies act by any rule of similars or contraries, such things being very often mere empty speculation. The apophthegm of Gregory was just when expressed 1200 years ago, is now, and will be to the end of time. Homœopathy expresses a sectarian limitation, which governs, or is supposed to govern, its followers; there is no rival sect of allopathy, although physicians may, and do upon proper occasions, use remedies upon that principle, as when they oppose ice or cold water to inflammation. But does this application of ice ever prevent a physician from applying hot fomentations, for example, to such forms of inflammation as may be benefited by them? Certainly not. Away then with allopathy! If there be exclusive allopathists, they are not much better than exclusive homœopathists.

Please allow me still the privilege of one or two more observations.

Homœopathic science rather avoids giving name to diseases, but sometimes condescends to name them, to show the advantage of homœopathy over what is ignorantly, or impertinently, called allopathy. I had a case in point some time ago. A gentleman called upon me to attend his wife who was ill, he informed me,

with peritonitis. The lady, he said, preferred a homœopathic practitioner, as one of them had cured her of this formidable disease upon two separate occasions previously, by the infinitesimal doses. The husband, however, prevailed upon her to see me, as a personal friend of his, &c. I went accordingly, and found upon examination, that in the first place there was not a trace of fever, and in the second place, that the lady flinched and cried out with a nervous shriek as soon as the abdomen was touched, and before any pressure was made whatever. I soon had the pleasure of assuring the husband that his wife was as free from peritonitis as himself, and that she would shortly be relieved, as indeed she was. Thus we see, that false names, as well as false doses, are used to bolster up false science.

Finally, I have only to say that every man living is always taking what, according to the homœopaths, are medicines, or poisons, in the form of phosphorus, sulphur, iron, lime, and many other elements or compounds, every day during the whole term of life, from birth to death ; and the constant reception of these things in infinitesimal or considerable doses, is utterly unavoidable. If homœopathy were anything like the expression of a universal truth, we would be constantly charging our systems with potential poisons, and their reactions among each other, as we take them in our daily food and drink, would be fearful to contemplate ; but happily nature, or nature's God, is wiser than Hahnemann and his followers, so that these alleged poisons, in infinite dilutions and triturations, are but innocent, and for the most part, essential elements of nutrition.

It may be said of the system of homœopathy, that 'whatever is in it that is true is not new, and that whatever is new is not true,' with perfect justice.

Hygiene :

A RECAPITULATORY LECTURE ON HYGIENE, DELIVERED BEFORE THE MEDICAL CLASS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND.

GENTLEMEN :

Having in preceding lectures passed over the principal subjects pertaining to Hygiene in some detail, we may now take a summary view of the laws of health in general. There is no overrating the importance of these laws ; and happily, they are for the most part readily intelligible, and, under favorable circumstances, easy of application.

I have already asserted that human maladies result to a great extent from violations of hygienic laws, and that, on the other hand, a just observance of these laws would either prevent nearly all of our ailments, or modify and mitigate them most advantageously.

Men are frequently urged by necessity to violate the laws of health ; they also violate them frequently through ignorance ; and not uncommonly through wilful disregard of them, taking present pleasure at the risk of future suffering. But no small part of the value of life depends upon the enjoyment of health. Now even under the most untoward circumstances, well informed men may secure to themselves a certain amount of protection which would be lost to the ignorant. For example, a man exposed to malaria may protect himself by spending a night to windward rather than to leeward of the source of the poison ; otherwise, he may interpose some screen which will make him comparatively safe, though it be but the canvas wall of a tent ; or in a dwelling house, he may close windows and doors, and other

avenues on the exposed side of the house, while he admits a sufficiency of pure air on the safer side of the house. In a malarious region, it becomes known as the result of common experience that the poison is most active at night, or perhaps in the early part of the night, and in the early morning; and people who are wise, at such times seek shelter. But if necessarily exposed, something may yet be done by way of prevention; thus the cinchona barks and their preparations may, to a greater or less extent, neutralize the influence of malaria; though medicines taken under such circumstances belong rather to prophylaxis than to hygiene.

In winter, the poor suffer from cold and vicissitudes of weather from want of warm clothing; this is their necessity; but during the same inclement season many of the rich expose themselves through ignorance, or a most unwise devotion to fashion and appearances. A fine lady, for example, will load herself with silk and furs about the person, while her feet are incased in shoes so thin that habit alone saves her from immediate illness; but meantime, if she be not taken ill with inflammatory disease, she at least prepares the way for remote and probably fatal disease.

Gluttons, wine-bibbers, and sensualists of every class, lay up for themselves a store of evils with wilful recklessness. Every man of common intelligence knows that excesses bring penalties, but many are not restrained by this knowledge. 'Eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow ye die,' is a maxim which was only uttered to be reprobated.

A man may, indeed, eat, and drink, and be merry, in bounds, with a good stomach and a good conscience; but that merriment which comes of revelling will bring sorrow with interest; that is to say, it will, if habitual, break down a man's health and energies; it will make him old before his time, and probably bring him to a premature grave.

It has been satirically said, 'Immortal man is but a shuttlecock, and wine and women the battle-doors that keep him moving.'

This is, unfortunately, too nearly true of at least vast numbers of our race, and such are the sources whence they willingly or wilfully derive a large proportion of their numerous destructive maladies.

Thus necessity, ignorance, and wilfulness conspire, as it were, against human health, operating sometimes singly, and sometimes in combination. It is the duty of the physician to seek out all the perturbing sources which make man, with all his higher gifts and faculties, so much more liable to disease and untimely death than the lower animals, governed as they are only by the simple instincts of nature. The poet, you may remember, says that these are always true, because they are always directed by the great Creator.

GENTLEMEN :

In the summary view which we are now about to take of Hygiene, we will consider first what is health, and then, the causes which disturb it, with the means of correcting these causes, or at least, of diminishing their influence to the minimum.

Health consists in a proper adjustment of all the organs and functions of the living body ; disease results from a disturbance of this adjustment. The equilibrium is rarely kept with perfect precision in our artificial condition of society ; consequently, there are but few men in the enjoyment of the highest attainable degree of health. Large numbers of men have but a valetudinarian existence, while they are not considered to be diseased. Some persistent functional disorder clings to the majority of people, especially in cities, evincing itself perhaps rather by languor, occasional attacks of indigestion, or more or less fugitive pains, than by that obvious degree of disease which brings a patient to bed, or otherwise arrests his ordinary pursuits in life.

'*Health*', says Dr. Williams, 'consists in a natural and proper condition and proportion in the functions and structures of the several parts of which the body is composed. From physiology, we learn that there are certain relations of these functions and structures to each other, and to external agents, which are most conducive to their well-being and permanency ; these constitute the condition of health. But this knowledge implies that function and structure may be in states not conducive to permanency and well-being : states which are deviations from the due balance between the several properties or parts of the animal frame ; these states constitute *disease*. For example,

physiology as well as experience teaches us, that in health, the digestion of food is easily performed, and attended by sensations of comfort. But when, after food is taken, there is pain, uneasiness, sickness, eructation, flatulence, or the like, we know that the *function* of digestion is changed from the healthy standard, — is *diseased*; and if this diseased function continue long in spite of the employment of remedies which usually serve to correct it, and if on examining the abdomen we find at or near the epigastrium a hard tumor, which anatomy teaches us is not there in health, we know that there is also diseased structure.'

According to Dr. Chambers, health is *ease*, and the want of it is *disease*, and with these general ideas of health, or *ease*, and the want of it, or *dis-ease*, we may pass on to consider the ordinary causes which impair the one and promote the other. We may consider the causes of disease as *prediposing* and *exciting*; and with the causes, we must bring forward the means of prevention, rather than of cure; as curative measures belong to therapeutics, rather than to hygiene. The laws of the latter are often, however, truly curative; and the physician necessarily endeavors to enforce them in the treatment of disease.

Among predisposing causes may be enumerated all of those which impair the vital forces. Thus a man may spend his days in a close workshop, and his nights in a close bedroom; he may be overworked in mind or body, or he may not sufficiently exert the faculties of mind or body; he may be tried by undue excitement, or by the depressing passions; he may live too luxuriously, or he may live too poorly; he may fire his blood with wine or spirits, or he may suffer from their sudden abstraction; he may inherit infirmities, or the tendency thereto, or he may invite them by his habits of life; his age may and does give predispositions, thus infancy has its proper maladies, as advanced life has also its own; and man rises in vigor from childhood to a certain meridian, perhaps to just half the term allotted in the Scriptures, whence he begins unconsciously, it may be, but not less surely, to travel down the hill of life, and to feel the pressure of years and the want of his former vigor to bear it. Sex predisposes also; thus woman during her child-bearing term, especially, is liable to many and peculiar inflictions which are unknown

to her stronger companion, who, for the most part, has but few maladies in which she does not also participate.

Of the *exciting causes of disease*, there are some which are readily appreciable, and others which are in their nature very obscure; in other words, some of the agents producing disease are said to be *cognizable*, and others *non-cognizable*. We may understand how mechanical or chemical irritants disturb the balance of health and excite disease; we may understand how bad food, or strong liquors, or retained secretions or excretions, or vitiated air, or draughts, or excessive cold, or heat, or rapid transitions from one to the other, may light up disease, for all of these and many more are cognizable agents, appreciable to the senses. But there are more subtle causes of disease always in action, which we only recognize by their effects. Medical authorities now extensively, perhaps generally, recognize a large class of diseases as *zymotic*, or if preferred, as diseases arising from some ferment in the blood. It may be that some day the term and the theory will be rejected together. The diseases, however, will not change their nature, whatever theory or term may be applied to them. Suffice it to say here, that epidemic, endemic, and contagious disorders generally, are supposed to be due to some morbid principle acting on the organism in the manner of a ferment, and that such are now commonly recognized as *zymotic diseases*. But the exciting causes of these diseases are so obscure as to justify their being called *non-cognizable agents*.

When a man has an attack of *ague*, we infer previous exposure to *malaria*, but we do not understand how malaria produces this disease, whatever may be said of the influence of cryptogamic vegetation, although we may know very well from experience where malaria has its abiding place.

Such diseases as cholera and influenza travel over the world. We may understand that certain agents predispose individuals to the attacks of these diseases, or give them increased activity, but we do not understand the nature of the absolute cause of these diseases.

We do not know how emanations from a patient suffering with small-pox, or measles, or scarlet fever, for example, trans-

mit or communicate the same disease to a person in health. The exciting cause in such cases is *non-cognizable*. What we may know, in the premises, is some method of preventing the cause from having access to those under our care, or of removing all of those cognizable causes which so often give to zymotic diseases an increased dangerous or fatal tendency.

I have spoken of predisposing and of exciting causes of disease as distinct, but they are not always so; being sometimes absolutely identical, and frequently co-operative. This will explain how in treating of them hygienically, they may often be considered together in the common capacity of causes of disease.

What are the great requisites for the preservation of health? We may say briefly, pure air; good food, including water; good clothing; and well-regulated habits of life. The man who can command these in their combination may expect rationally to live through the allotted term, accidents of course excepted, and to enjoy the blessing of health during his long career.

Now these are all more or less attainable by all men, and all classes of men. They are not the perquisites of any favored few; they are at the command of the rich, and they are quite within the reach of the industrious poor.

PURE AIR.

Atmospheric air is, as you know, a mixture of oxygen and nitrogen, in the proportions of about one part of the former to four of the latter. The air always contains a small portion of carbonic acid, more or less watery vapor, and various emanations from the earth, or the various animals and plants on the face of the earth.

When these additions exist in very limited quantity, as is usual under favorable circumstances, they do not act unfavorably upon human health; but exceeding certain limits, they become sources of disease. Carbonic acid gas may afford an illustration. It exists uniformly, to a small extent, in the atmosphere, and we then derive no harm from it whatever. But carbonic acid gas, when largely inhaled, will speedily induce disease or death. It is exhaled by animals during expiration, and it is absorbed from the air by vegetables. Thus a balance is preserved

mutually advantageous to animal and vegetable life. In the open air, or in an airy chamber, the carbonic acid exhaled from the lungs is speedily removed, and the animal will not be troubled by inspiring it. But if shut up in a close apartment, it is again inspired by the animal, to the serious detriment of his blood and the organs which it supplies. It is estimated that in a sleeping apartment, the *least* allowance of air should be a thousand cubic feet for each occupant; that is, there should be a clear space of ten feet in every direction for each individual. This is no extraordinary allowance. On the contrary, it is a small allowance, supposing the room to be moderately close. Now if there be two sleepers in a close room having ten feet in all directions, both of those sleepers will probably find a state of decided *malaise* interfering with their physical condition. Headache, indigestion, or other disturbance will manifest itself. Each sleeper will throw off during the night into the air of the room, ten or twelve ounces of carbonic acid, and by the loss from the two, the air is rendered sufficiently tainted to produce pernicious influences. There are indeed other exhalations proceeding from the animal body, which contaminate the air also, but the carbonic acid is the principal contaminating agent.

More sleepers in the same apartment would greatly aggravate the evil, and the effects upon them would be proportionately more injurious. About the middle of the last century, an Eastern nabob had 146 British prisoners shut up in a small prison in Calcutta, which had only two little windows for the admission of fresh air. Of these prisoners, 123 perished during the night. They perished from the want of oxygen on the one hand, and the excess of carbonic acid and animal exhalations which they were forced to inspire, on the other. The *Black Hole of Calcutta*, as the prison is commonly called, is now famous in history; but unfortunately, it does not stand alone. Passengers have died on emigrant ships in a similar manner, from having been confined below in large numbers, when fresh air had been shut off by the orders of ignorant officers on deck.

A brazier of burning coals introduced into a close bed-room for the purpose of warming it, has often proved fatal to the inmates. In these cases, the irrespirable carbonic acid gas has been almost the sole cause of death.

Now, in every close room with living tenants, this gas is thrown out to be inspired and re-inspired, so that some great deterioration of health will be a necessary consequence. In every dwelling-house, but especially in the sick-room and in hospitals, this gas accumulates, and proves more or less pernicious. If the physician does not then direct a well-regulated system of ventilation, he will be doing injustice both to himself and to those under his care.

Wherever crowds assemble, in churches, theatres, or other places of business, duty, or amusement, the air becomes more or less contaminated with the exhaled carbonic acid gas, as well as with many other emanations from the living mass, and from the artificial sources of light and heat so commonly in use at the same time.

The air of cities is always more or less tainted with numerous impurities. It is loaded necessarily with the effluvium of organic decay. If we do not constantly observe it, it is because habit has blunted our senses. Dr. Barker, of London, exposed dogs and other animals to the emanations from cess-pools in that city, and the inhalations poisoned them. 'The dogs subjected to the cess-pool air,' he says, 'were all more or less affected. The symptoms were those of intestinal derangement, followed by prostration, heat of the surface of the body, distaste for food, and those general signs which mark the milder forms of continued fever, common to the dirty and ill-ventilated homes of the lower orders of men.'

The emanations from these sinks are largely impregnated with sulphuretted hydrogen, and this gas becomes generally diffused, though diluted of course, and less innocuous in proportion to the distance from its sources.

'The symptoms arising from sulphuretted hydrogen,' says Dr. Barker, 'are well marked, and may be considered specific. Vomiting and diarrhoea are the first and most prominent symptoms. The latter is painful, the vomiting is difficult and exhausting, and eventually there is insensibility and entire prostration.'

The inhalation of sulphuretted hydrogen then produces as a direct result, the symptoms of a malady exceedingly common

among children in our cities; *i. e.*, *cholera infantum*, or summer complaint. There is no doubt in my mind that the sensitive organism of infantile life is affected by these inhalations so as to produce a disease which is exceedingly intractable, even with the best of diet and the best of medicinal remedies. Thus it is that frequently relief for children so affected during the summer season, when these emanations are most rife, can only be obtained by sending them to breathe the purer air of the country.

As a matter of hygiene, the importance of keeping all sinks, sewers, &c., as clean as possible, is strikingly obvious. In addition to cleanliness, disinfectants should be liberally used; such, for example, as charcoal and chloride of lime. The Parisian Council of Health recommends especially those disinfectants which have as their bases the sulphates of iron, copper, or zinc. (*Hygiène Publique*, p. 24.) In the absence of more effective chemicals, wood and coal-ashes may be used as disinfectants.

Many artisans are subject to poisonous inhalations in pursuing their occupations. Speaking of men working under ground in mines, a British writer says, that in the low galleries, 'the collier lives his life of toilsome constraint, knotting himself until an erect position is toilsome to him. Foul air surrounds him; fire-damp blasts him to a cinder, or choke-damp noiselessly blots out his life. A single blow of the pick may let in upon the collier an invasion of either of these damp, and the pit-mouth may be crowded with a "wailing multitude of newly made widows and orphans." Thus 1500 lives and 10,000 accidents annually attest the dangerous nature of their occupation.' (*Edinburgh Review*, Jan., 1860.)

The same writer, after treating of the influence of trades upon the health of the millions, called properly enough 'the slaves of civilization,' showing, *inter alia*, how the inhalations of dust, flour, smoke, gases, &c., carry untold hecatombs to premature graves, says in a brief but expressive paragraph, 'A large contingent to the army of death is furnished by tailors, bakers, and milliners, in large cities. They are mostly killed by want of fresh air, which does not reach them in their constrained position, or in their confined or heated rooms. The story of sewing women need not be told here. Their sufferings are elements of

our advanced civilization, as well as that of England. And from the very nature of the case, their wants and perils are most familiarly known, but known only to be pitied or disregarded.' (*Ibid.*)

Even in these lamentable cases, the physician can do something for the common good, by recommending at least some improvement in the way of ventilation. Several persons crowded into one room or workshop may often be benefited by changing, for example, a close stove for an open fire-place. Or otherwise, some other beneficial changes may be readily suggested by the hygiest, or any person moderately well informed upon the subject of the laws of health.

I need not again treat of certain subtle but wide-spread impurities in the air, which make themselves felt by their effects as malaria. You know that this ancient source of disease is often engendered by swamps and low grounds, from which it may frequently be removed by a system of drainage and cultivation. Otherwise, people may protect themselves from its influence by removal from the source; or by interposing some natural or artificial screen to intercept its invasions; or by heat, as by fires; or finally, by prophylactics, as by the use of Peruvian bark.

Briefly, upon the subject of air, we want it for health in its purity. This is obtained in dwelling-houses, in the sick-room, &c., by well-directed ventilation, so that the air of the apartments will be frequently changed while the inmates will not be subjected at the same time to rapid and partial draughts. Exposure to a gale of wind, out of doors, may be safe and is often beneficial; but small rapid draughts passing through a room and striking the occupants unequally and partially, are generally dangerous; and to the sick or infirm, they are sometimes fatal. In malarious regions, or when the air is loaded with moisture, or perhaps with ozone, or often when pure though simply raw, or even apparently refreshing, it is well to recall to mind the Italian proverb, which says, 'the air of a window is the stroke of a cross-bow.'

FOOD AND DRINK.

It is the common experience that our race thrives most on a

diversity of food. A man may indeed live on meat, or on bread and water, but he has an instinctive craving for combining or alternating these substances; and by comparative anatomy, we find that this craving is in accordance with his natural constitution. It has been already shown that certain elements necessarily enter into our food in combination. We have seen that *milk* represents five great types of food, viz: 1st, the aqueous; 2d, the albuminous; 3d, the saccharine; 4th, the oleaginous; and 5th, the saline. Nature has in this combination taught us an instructive lesson. The young animal lives upon milk alone, which suffices for all its nutritive wants; but if any element were stricken out, it would be at the expense of the health, if not of the life, of the animal. Various experiments have been made, indeed, upon animals with the various elements, singly, or in partial combinations, but with this invariable result, viz: the animals wasted away so as to die of starvation.

In our ordinary food, bread contains gluten which is of the albuminous type, and starch of the saccharine, besides inorganic matters, as phosphate of lime. Meat contains albumen, and oil or fat, also with organic ingredients, and thus bread and meat contain all the essentials of nutrition. Bread and butter, in their perfection, contain all the elements. As I have repeatedly said before, however, we do not always get bread possessing its proper nutritive qualities. When too fine, there is a loss of gluten, and a loss of inorganic matters, while starch is comparatively in excess. A dog fed on pure white bread lived only fifty days, while another fed with the coarsest brown bread was adequately nourished without any appearance of suffering from want of additional food. (*Williams' Principles of Medicine*, p. 59.) Boiled wheat, allow me to remind you, is a most nutritious article of food.

We need not here again consider the numerous meats and vegetables used by man as food. I may repeat, however, that the white meat of chicken is considered to be about the mildest form of animal nourishment, and therefore often best adapted to the use of the invalid; while beef and pork are best for the robust. Veal is generally indigestible, but may be improved by being stewed with rice. Beef essence, beef extract, and such

preparations, contain a large amount of nutriment in a form which is sometimes best adapted to nourish a patient prostrate from fever. Salt meat is usually less wholesome and nutritious than fresh meat. When long used, in the absence of acids or fresh vegetables, salt meat produces scurvy.

Water is the first drink demanding our consideration. Like air, it should be pure, or rather it should be free from impurities, for it usually contains elements besides the necessary hydrogen and oxygen, which in small quantities are not harmful. The water, as the air, of cities is apt to be contaminated with many impurities. But the cities are improving their water supplies, which improvement has been rendered necessary both in regard to quantity and quality. The pump-water of large towns is little fit for use, for obvious reasons. It must contain organic impurities, which may be only offensive, but which may also be deleterious or even poisonous. During cholera-epidemics in London, people using water from neighboring pumps have been especially stricken as victims. Dr. Snow reported to the Epidemiological Society, seventy-three deaths in two days of cholera among persons near a certain pump. It was afterwards ascertained that the water from this pump was contaminated by a neighboring cess-pool. The people of London were formerly supplied with water from the river, where it was polluted with the sewerage of the city. A water company changed its source of supply to a higher point, when there was speedily observed a difference between the sanitary condition of persons using water from the old and the new source. A rival company then, also, took its supply from a point above the city, and in that very quarter the mortality in that part of London fell lower than it had ever been; and the good effect was permanent. The mortality from diarrhoea and typhus was especially diminished.

Water may be contaminated with the miasm which produces intermittent or remittent fevers. The fact has been illustrated on board of ships, where a portion of the passengers drank water from marshy regions, and others from better sources of supply. The drinkers of the marsh-water have suffered with fever, while their fellow-passengers have been entirely free from it.

I do not deem it necessary here to consider in how many ways, or by how many agents, water may be contaminated; suffice it to say, that no contaminated water should be used for drinking purposes, or in cookery. The most common deleterious impurity in drinking water is a portion of lead, derived from the leaden tubes or cisterns still in common use, notwithstanding the known risk which their use involves. The mode of correcting this evil is obvious.

A few remarks only will be made on the use of wines and liquors. In health, they are but luxuries, or superfluities; in disease, they are useful as remedies. A man may take wine moderately at dinner for years, without perceptible bad or good effect; but a slight excess, sooner or later, deranges all the functions, and ends in producing organic disease. Of wines, good sherry is considered to be the safest we have in use; that is, it is more free from excess either of acid or of saccharine matter than are most other wines, in which one or the other predominates. It is this peculiarity which causes sherry to be considered eminently a *dry* wine. It is the *sack* — or sherries-sack — of old English writers.

Wines and liquors are apt to stimulate a fictitious appetite; but the natural results, secondarily, are loss of appetite and impaired digestion. Strong liquors, especially, tend to produce organic diseases of the liver and kidneys. Disease of the heart and apoplexy are among the usual results of the habitual use, or abuse of strong liquors. Other afflictions are a general poisoning of the blood, attended upon depraved digestion and assimilation; various nervous diseases; gout, &c., &c. A man of active habits, who takes much exercise in the open air, bears excesses with greater impunity than one of sedentary habits.

‘The most disastrous consequences of intemperance,’ says Dr. Williams, ‘are exhibited in the habitual drunkard, who, in proportion as he indulges in liquor, loses his appetite for food, and his power of digesting it. He thus drinks and starves at the same time; and the disease which ensues comprises the exhaustion of inanition together with the more direct effects of the alcoholic poison. Thus in delirium tremens, the drunkard’s disease, besides the permanent restless excitement of the irritated

nervous system, which adds more and more to the exhaustion, there is fearful weakness of mind and body, and in bad cases even the organic functions are affected, so that the pulse is very weak and frequent, the excretions are scanty and depraved, and the respiration is so imperfectly performed by the involuntary muscles that sleep cannot ensue. This exhaustion soon terminates in death, unless the result is prevented by appropriate treatment; and this must comprise, besides opium, (the common remedy,) ammonia and other stimulants to the circulation and respiration, purgatives and diuretics to free the blood from the excrementitious matter that has accumulated in it, and fluid nourishment to repair its waste. Without these adjuncts, opium will not only fail to procure sleep, but if given in large doses, may even paralyze the remaining powers of life.'

It is a question how far alcohol may be considered as food. What seems certain is, that in moderate quantities, like tea and coffee, it restrains waste of tissues, and thence it is inferred that a person may live on a smaller amount of solid food by the use of such ingesta. This theory does not command my confidence, for reasons given in a preceding lecture.

I may, once more, remark that alcoholic drinks are not protective, as they are supposed to be, against the effects of cold. I have adduced facts from Arctic explorers, and from French trappers who go almost to the poles in search of furs, which are conclusive. You all remember how Napoleon's army was destroyed by cold on the famous retreat from Moscow. One of the incidents of that disastrous retreat is worthy of record in this connection. 'After the pillage of Kowno, eight hundred intoxicated men slept in the snow, and never woke again.' (Stillé I. 270 fr. Moricheau Beaupré—*Effets du Froid.*)

The man who has to undergo fatigue or exposure, should never attempt to fortify himself by alcoholic drink. The error is often ignorantly committed, but in point of fact, premature fatigue and exhaustion are the usual result.

We may briefly recur to the subject of clothes. Wool, cotton, silk, and linen, are the fabrics of which our garments are usually made, and their value is in the order just stated. Wool

may be used at all seasons, fine for summer, and coarse for winter. It has great hygienic advantages over the other materials. It protects the person remarkably from vicissitudes of weather. It absorbs a certain portion of moisture from the body, and renders it latent, or hygrometric, so that the body is protected from sudden change and sudden chill. Linen, on the contrary, abstracts heat and moisture, and transmits them rapidly to the surrounding air; so that, except in midsummer, it is not an eligible material for dress; or at least for so much of the dress as comes in contact with the person. Cotton and silk are intermediate in value, hygienically; they are safer than linen, but give less protection than wool.

There is nothing more important in dress, than giving due protection to the feet. Stout leather shoes, and woolen or cotton stockings, are necessary in winter. To keep the feet dry, many persons use gum shoes, but these are objectionable except for transient purposes, as they retain the natural moisture exhaled from the foot, and thus cause the very evil which the wearer is seeking to avoid. Gum soles, fastened to the sole of the shoe or boot, give admirable protection. I have often broken up a tendency to cold with ladies by inducing them to wear false, or cork soles, inside of their gaiter boots. These soles may be inserted into any loose-fitting boot, and removed at pleasure. Withal, the shoe should be longer than the foot, as there is an elongation of not less than one half-inch at every step that a man takes in the foot that bears the pressure.

In summer, the head must be protected from the rays of the sun, otherwise there is danger of sun-stroke, which is akin to apoplexy. A silk handkerchief, worn in the straw or other hat, gives sufficient protection. In winter, the head requires moderate protection from cold. The head bears cold for the most part better than the feet and lower extremities, on account of the great quantity of blood which it receives.

THE GENERAL HABITS OF LIFE.

The enjoyment of the perfection of health demands an active life largely pursued in the open air; labor without exhaustion, alternated with rest, or sleep, and wholesome recreations. Too

much labor and too much rest are both great evils. Good and abundant food and drink are necessary to health; while excessive eating, and insufficient food, are almost equally destructive. The stomach requires very careful treatment, and it will not bear wrongs with impunity. Don Quixote counselled the governor-elect of Baratavia to 'eat little at dinner, and *less at supper*,' for, said he, 'the health of the whole body is tempered in the laboratory of the stomach.' If the stomach be overloaded, it will break down; and this is the more common form of ruining it in our country, especially among the easy classes. Our refined and elegant dishes tempt men to excess, and the excess certainly brings on disorder or disease, to such an extent as to interfere, not only with health and comfort, but with longevity. 'By a simpler course of life and diet,' says the learned Frederick Schlegel, 'than the very artificial, unnatural, and over-refined modes we follow, there are even at the present day numerous examples of a longevity far beyond the ordinary duration of human life.' (*Philosophy of History*.) He goes on to prove this statement by showing how some of the Brahmins in India, and peasants in Russia, enjoy not only life, but health and vigor when over 100 years of age.

Intemperance in eating is at the bottom of a large proportion of the diseases ever prevailing among us. It is a fashion now to recommend full living as protective against, or curative of, many chronic ailments, as anemia, scrofulosis, and tuberculosis. Certainly, insufficient supplies are conducive to these disorders; but just as certainly, excessive use or abuse of food will bring them on also, or other disturbances not less pernicious. Thus excessive eating brings on indigestion and mal-assimilation; these in their turn prepare the way for other and more formidable chronic maladies.

Intemperance in strong drinks is yet more disastrous. The alcoholic beverages seem competent, when abused, to bring functional or organic disease, or both, upon nearly all parts of the animal frame.

Good clothing and proper shelter are among the demands for the preservation of health. Clothing should be adapted to the climate or season. As to shelter, we want houses to protect us

from the inclemencies of the weather, but not so close as to shut out the pure air of heaven. Thus in winter and summer, our dwellings must be suitably aired, while we see that the occupants are not subjected to powerful or partial draughts during the airing.

Cleanliness is a necessity, whether in regard to clothes, to dwelling, or to the person. There is a constant decay of organic matter going on about us, and its removal is necessary for health. Well regulated bathing keeps the skin clean and the emunctories free. Like everything else, this hygienic measure is subject to much abuse. Thus delicate persons are often injured by cold baths in winter, or even on cold days in the summer season.

The mind, as the body, wants labor alternated with rest. It is invigorated by proper exercise, impaired by excessive labor, especially if this be confined to some one absorbing object.

In short, in all the relations of life we should cultivate that *juste milieu* which keeps all the faculties of body and mind in full action, without admitting excesses in any direction. A sound physical frame and well balanced mind are in the reach of nearly all men, who will use the proper measures to secure them. The laws of Hygiene, which I have to some extent brought before you, indicate the means of obtaining these inestimable blessings.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DR. RICHARD McSHERRY, JR.

Dear Sir:—In compliance with a resolution adopted at the last meeting of the Catholic Institute, held Monday evening, February 13th, I have to request the favor of you to furnish a copy of the Lecture delivered by you on that occasion.

I wish to state also, that the gratification which your Lecture afforded to all the members present has induced them, with your consent, to have it published in pamphlet form for the use of the Institute.

Very respectfully yours,

AMBROSE A. WHITE.

Baltimore, February 17th, 1860.

AMBROSE A. WHITE, Esq., *President Catholic Institute.*

My dear Sir:—My Lecture was prepared for the gratification of the members of the Institute, and is therefore subject to their disposal. I am sincerely pleased that it met with their approbation; and I can but regret that circumstances did not allow me to make it fuller, more methodical, and more worthy of their kind reception.

Yours, with sincere esteem,

RICHARD McSHERRY, JR.

Baltimore, February 18th, 1860.

A Lecture on Health and Happiness.

1860

GENTLEMEN :

Amid many interruptions I have gathered up some little material, which, in its nature, is interesting to all of us ; if presented somewhat indifferently, the fault will be mine, for the field is wide and varied enough to gratify minds and tastes of every degree. I speak of *Health and Happiness*, and I might well adopt for my text, the following lines of Pope :

‘ Reason’s whole pleasure, all the joys of sense,
Lie in three words — health, peace, and competence
But health consists with temperance alone ;
And peace, O, virtue ! peace is all thy own.’ (*Essay on Man.*)

Let us pass at once in *medias res*. We will go upon the presumption that all want health and peace, and doubtless, many agreeing with the poet, would admit competence among desirable objects. We will not gainsay it ; peace and competence are elements of happiness, if indeed they do not fully constitute it. I want to show this evening how health and happiness are intertwined together, and to point out certain measures useful for obtaining and maintaining them, and I shall concur very much with the general terms of the poet except in this, that I shall use virtue in a more absolute sense than he does.

What is health ? It is that admirable balance preserved by sound organs among all the functions of life, without excess here or deficiency there ; without any *plus or minus*. This perfect balance, as we all know but too well, is not long preserved. The beautiful mechanism that goes to make up the mortal part of man, is easily disturbed. With this disturbance the charm of perfect health is broken. One feels morbidly excited or depressed, and if he has ever heard of Brown’s *Scale of Life*, he be-

gins to measure himself by it. Brown, a clever but visionary Scotch pathologist, the founder of the famous Brunonian System, 'traced a scale of life like that of a thermometer,—health in the centre, death at each extremity; one scale ascending from health was graduated according to stimulating agency, the other to debilitating causes.' Now in passing through this world's vicissitudes, it is no easy matter to keep to the happy centre, and sometimes we will be jostled off in spite of our best endeavors.

From this definition of health, we will turn for a moment to happiness. What is it—and where? Unlike health, in perfection and fulness, it has no existence, unless sometimes perhaps for one fleeting moment. Bonaparte was able from his sea-prison to indicate which was the happiest day of his life, yet the mighty conqueror could not claim one whole day of happiness. He spoke by comparison. There are glimpses of happiness allowed to man, which fall like heavenly rays upon his course, and tell him of something better hereafter; but for these he would be worse off than the Prisoner of Chillon, who 'learned to love despair.' The best of our terrestrial happiness is a modicum of mental peace, nourished by a little present blessing and enlivened by hope for the future. We can never command nor touch it as we will, but it seems to hover around us as a guardian angel, sometimes throwing a halo over us, and sometimes departing, never quite subject to us, and yet never, except as a merited punishment, departing from us wholly.

Now these two delicate elements of human existence, health and happiness, respond more or less to our treatment of them. We are not masters, nor they slaves, but to a very great extent it lies within us to secure their ministry. How?—let us examine.

Of late years the science of Physiology has made great progress; and that kindred science called Hygiene has moved with it, *pari passu*. The laws of these sciences are wonderfully conservative of health, and consequently of so much happiness as belongs to health. Strict and true science is not the fiction that many clever men suppose it to be; it is something as certain as nature, as certain as God. We must distinguish between science and its votaries. The one in its elements is immutable, the other

variable as the winds. But the investigation of science is the investigation of the works of God. The philosopher studies laws and facts, and puts them in order, but when he comes to the final cause his wisdom fails him. The astronomer, the chemist, the physiologist, studies the facts of his proper science, and then deduces the laws which govern it. In this he does well. Observation expands his mind, and he favors the world by communicating his observations. Taking advantage of the works of his predecessors, he obtains many facts unknown to them; his successors will do likewise by him. Sometimes it happens, however, that a great scientific fabric, reared upon too slight a foundation, topples over like an inverted pyramid. Then the world exclaims against the folly of science. But the world is mistaken in this as in other cases; there is not, there can not be folly in science, in true science, although there may be much in its votaries. You will all agree with me that it is great folly to try, as some scientific men do, to make the works of God falsify the word of God; where there is any apparent discrepancy, we may depend it is owing to our finite knowledge only.

In that profession devoted to the preservation and restoration of human health — a profession which I reverence beyond all that is not divine — we have an affiliation of many sciences, and among them much of truth and much of fiction. This will be so undoubtedly to the end, though the labors of many great minds are constantly engaged, with more or less success, in eliminating truth from error. We have enough of truth to help us in our practical duties, and enough of error to make us walk warily. The responsibility of life and death is very onerous and very fearful; and no thinking man should venture upon it without the trust that he will have sufficient lights to mitigate human sufferings, and that he will be protected from the folly, presumption, and ignorance, so ready to rush in, and so powerful for evil only.

We have our sciences, and what is true in them always concurs with the laws of God. And it is remarkable how much there is in the laws of God, conservative of the temporal blessings now under discussion. Our children are taught among their first lessons, that Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Tem-

perance, are cardinal virtues. They are taught that Pride, Covetousness, Lust, Wrath, Gluttony, Envy, and Sloth, are deadly sins; and that the contrary virtues are, Humility, Liberality, Chastity, Meekness, Temperance, Brotherly Love, and Diligence.

I have enumerated these things in full, because they are pertinent to my subject. A code of health-laws might be made out from them. The poet has told us that there is no health without temperance; no peace without virtue. This is truth, not poetic fiction. The Apostle says, 'Be temperate in all things.' So says the physician, and so the modern physiologist. In ancient times, when people were more robust than they are now, there were some who broke themselves down by immoderate vigils and fasting. Nature requires for her functions a proper amount of food and rest, for some individuals more, for some, less, but there is so much necessary for each person. Insufficiency of food has its evils, as well as perpetual sameness of diet, for each is competent to act injuriously on both body and mind, a fact abundantly attested by subsequent manifestations of disease, including even insanity. And yet rigid diet is less destructive than gluttony. An English medical writer judiciously observes, 'that the habit of comparative starvation is less injurious to health than gross indulgence, appears from the ages to which many fasting enthusiasts have attained. St. Anthony lived to the age of one hundred and five years, and St. Paphinus to ninety, on dry bread and water; St. Paul, the hermit, arrived at the extreme age of one hundred and nine, on dates alone.' (*Body and Mind*, by G. Moore, M. D.) No drunkard, nor glutton, nor grossly sensual man can attain to an age bearing any comparison with the above.

I am not advocating, as you understand, rigid and excessive fasts, yet I freely concur with the views of the English physician. Such violations of the law as gluttony and sloth, 'have destroyed more than the sword;'—you know the proverb: *Plures occidit gula quam gladius*—but they have destroyed a hundred to ten more than voluntary and involuntary fasting put together.

Your immoderate eater—a glutton let us call him, is building

for himself the foundation walls of future disease with every excessive meal ; he is impairing the vital fluid by which he lives ; he is undermining the tripod of life,— the brain, the heart, and the lungs ; he is damaging the stomach ; and though you caution him, he heeds you not, until some fine day a slight attack of disease, remedial enough under other circumstances, runs soon to a fatal issue with him. Before it comes to this he has been keeping his rebellious stomach in subjection by the aid of wines, cordials and spices, which he firmly believes are indispensable to his health. The danger of excessive voluntary fasting is nothing compared to his. The man who eats habitually more than nature requires, will certainly become a valetudinarian ; or perhaps, instead of prolonged bad health, he will be cut off suddenly by apoplexy or disease of the heart. Sudden deaths from seizures like these, take place most commonly after excessive meals. The free liver, however, may frequently save himself from premature infirmity by following certain simple laws, which are in strict accordance at once with the teachings of hygiene, of physiology, and with the more certain teachings of Christian morality. In confirmation of this, I will adduce the most famous instance in history.

Some three centuries ago there lived at Venice, a nobleman, named Louis Cornaro. He was what now would be called a *very fast man*, so fast, that at the age of thirty-five he was a confirmed invalid, suffering complicated evils from gout and dyspepsia. For five years, by the aid of the doctors, he managed to live along wretchedly enough, indeed, passing his time between sensual enjoyment and sensual suffering. Getting steadily worse, life became a prolonged torture, a living but profitless martyrdom. ‘ Finally, his physician told him that there was only one resource left, and that was to renounce his habits of intemperance, and adopt a course of life extremely sober, from which he must never vary. Cornaro took a firm resolution and held it. In the first place he studied the various species of aliment which suited his stomach, and the quantity to take in order not to be incommoded. After some experiments, he fixed on twelve ounces of solid food, composed of bread, yolk of egg, meat, fish, &c., and fourteen ounces of liquid. Every morning

he weighed out his rations for the day. This regimen suited him so well, that at the end of a year he was freed from all his afflictions. At the same time his appetite returned; he recovered his former gaiety, equanimity of humor, aptitude for mental efforts, and bodily exercises. In short, he lived without infirmities to the age of one hundred years.'

Here you see an illustration not only of the laws of Hygiene, but the effects of reducing to practice three of the four cardinal virtues, to wit: Prudence, Fortitude, and Temperance.

A French physician commenting on the life of Cornaro, expressed himself in a paragraph worthy of your attention:

'The whole life of Cornaro offers a striking example of the salutary effects of sobriety; but there is one trait in it which shows the power of habit. At the age of seventy-eight, overcome by the solicitations of his friends and kinsfolk, who pressed him to relax a little the severity of his diet, he consented to add to it two ounces of solids and two ounces of liquid each day. His stomach was very soon deranged; he lost gradually his appetite, and his manner became taciturn; in fine, he soon fell into a severe fever, which lasted thirty days, and nearly destroyed him. He was not re-established until he resumed his former way of living. He states that he composed in his eightieth year a comedy, *characterised by refined and pointed wit, and written in a lively style.* At this age, he mounted his horse easily, and climbed the steepest hills, and was always in a good humor. On one occasion, he was obliged to sustain a severe law-suit, which caused the death of his brother from chagrin; but though the suit concerned himself especially, his health was not altered, nor his courage shaken, and he came out of it victorious in every respect. Nevertheless, the enthusiasm of the old man did not go so far as to believe that the same diet would suit everybody; he only asserted that if men never went beyond the limit of need in eating and drinking, they would avoid a great many infirmities, and prolong their days much beyond the period usually attained.' (*Renouard's History of Medicine, translated by Dr. Comegys, p. 301-2.*)

Please to observe this old gentleman's steady good humor, the fruit of his temperance. Bad health makes people oftentimes

peevish, fretful, and unhappy, and a depraved digestion sometimes not only sets a man against his neighbors and his neighbors against him, but nation against nation. 'The Prime Minister has declared war because of an indigestion,' has been asserted with probable truth.

If people would take Cornaro as a model, not rigidly, but approximately, we would hear very little of dyspepsia, disease of the heart, or apoplexy.

Excesses at table are disastrous enough, and in this they are worse than over devotion to Bacchus; namely, that they undermine more slowly and more insidiously; but otherwise, strong drinks are vastly worse. There are persons who think wines and liquors essential to health, but as the rule, they are useless at best; and at worst, destructive to soul, and body, and mind. Strict total abstinence is generally, I might say universally, safe, while even temperate indulgence is rarely safe or salutary. We all know of a venerable couple who lived much longer than Cornaro, in perfect health, imbibing nothing stronger than the innocent fluid, popularly known as Adam's ale.

It is not for me to tell you of the moral degradation brought on by the immoderate use of strong potations; of the ruin of individuals and of families; nor will I dwell even upon the destruction of health this vice induces, but I may point out a fact derived from a local illustration. In the last report from the Mount Hope Asylum, by the attending physician, Dr. Stokes, it is stated that of three hundred patients treated during the year, twenty-three (23) labored under mania-a-potu, and nineteen (19) under oinomania; or in all, forty-two insane individuals were treated, whose insanity sprang directly from the immoderate use of wine and spirits. Now this excellent Asylum rather excludes than seeks such cases, so that even this large number falls short of an average *per centage*. Every intoxicated man is insane for the time being, but worse than this, his habits often predispose to or induce insanity, and beyond that transmits a hereditary tendency to both drunkenness and insanity among his children.

Real drunkards happily are few, but men who drink more than is salutary are very abundant. The old excuses for drink-

ing are always ready ; the weather is sure to be very hot or very cold, or an indigestion requires a corrective, as in fact very often it does. As to the last, I can only say, take your remedy, but remember hereafter that prevention is better than cure. Strong drinks afford very indifferent protection against great heat. I have served, myself, for years in the tropics, in peace and in war, in the East and West Indies, in Florida, and in Mexico, and according to my personal experience, and observations upon others, the strictly temperate always bore the climate best. But this matter has been brought in the East Indies to the *experimentum crucis*. Whole regiments in the British service have adopted the total abstinence principle, have taken coffee in the morning as an antidote to morning fogs instead of the spirit ration, while other regiments have adhered to the ancient custom. It is scarcely necessary to add that the temperance regiments have uniformly surpassed, by great odds, the others in health and efficiency. I would have predicated this upon my own experience.

But great cold is different. A glass of brandy may burn a man already suffering with heat ; but it only warms one up comfortably who is suffering with cold. I have entertained some such idea myself, but Dr. Hayes, surgeon to Kane's Arctic Expedition, dispels this illusion. I will quote him :

'In Arctic countries, alcohol is in almost any shape not only completely useless, but positively injurious ; and in this view I am fully sustained by the well qualified judgment and experience of our enterprising and indefatigable friend, Dr. Ray, R. N., whom we had the pleasure not long since of welcoming to the Academy. So well am I convinced of this fact, that in the expedition now organizing to the Arctic seas, I shall not only not give it habitually, but will carefully guard against taking any one with me who is addicted to its use. Circumstances may occur under which its administration seems necessary ; such for instance, as great prostration from long continued exposure and exertion, or from getting wet, but then it should be avoided if possible ; for the succeeding reaction is always to be dreaded ; and if a place of safety is not near at hand, the immediate danger is only temporarily guarded against, and becomes finally

greatly augmented by reason of decreased vitality. If given at all, it should be in very small quantities, frequently repeated, and continued until a place of safety is reached. I have known most unpleasant consequences to result from the injudicious use of whiskey, for the purpose of temporary stimulation, and have also known strong able-bodied men to have become utterly incapable of resisting cold, in consequence of the long continued use of alcoholic drinks. I do not believe that it has a single useful property, not possessed in a ten-fold degree by other stimulants, and under this head I rank tea and coffee.' (*Am. Jour. Med. Sc.*, July, 1859.)

This is taking a feather out of the cap of king Whiskey, and goes to show that his field for usefulness is almost confined to Utopia, a word which literally interpreted, means *no place*.

Having taken our grog together, we may now pass to other things. Tobacco deserves the next place. It is most marvellous how this nauseous weed has taken hold upon the affections of man. It surely is of no benefit to health, but I dare not say it conduces nothing to happiness. When I see an old friend take his pipe, or cigar, after the labors of the day, and the evening meal; when his good honest face beams beneath the fragrant smoke which rises like incense, making a wreath around his gray hairs; when his heart expands, and he becomes genially social and confidential, I can hardly ask Hygeia to rob him of his simple pleasure. A good cigar is almost akin to the 'cup that cheers, yet not inebriates.' But honestly, tobacco is pernicious in all its forms; not like whiskey indeed, but still pernicious. Bulwer somewhere goes off in a rhapsody on tobacco, saying, whoever loves it not, hath not known great sorrows; and oh! Jupiter, he says, by way of apostrophe, if ever Juno breaketh the peace of thy empyrean home, turn to the weed! Bulwer and Jupiter would doubtless get the thanks of every terrestrial Juno, of every mistress of a family, if they would take the weed between them for the exclusive solace of their own domestic troubles.

I have now dealt with three of the greatest enemies to human health and happiness against which we mortal pilgrims have to contend. With the Apostle, I urge temperance in all things.

Perhaps you think I have gone too far, and wish to oppose lawful gratifications. But gentlemen will please remember that while I contend for the absolute right of my positions, I do not contend that every man is morally bound by them. There is no criminality in eating a piece of plum pudding after dinner, nor in taking a glass of egg-nogg at Christmas, nor in smoking a cigar after your meals. But it is better and safer to let these luxuries alone, and I say that you will actually enjoy more of health by abstaining from them.

Those who become well acquainted with *Abstinence*, as Cornaro did, learn to love her, and she is by no means hard featured or unsocial. The good Pastor, who visited the science of salvation, was extremely pleased with the sweet countenances of Penance and Mortification, and to use his own words: 'I desired to be informed what sustenance these holy persons had taken for some preceding days. Abstinence, who was the provider of that house, a woman of good health, sound, strong, of a fresh and sanguine complexion, told me that they had lived upon some herbs, with a little bread and water, and found themselves as well satisfied as if they had feasted upon the most delicate food the whole earth was able to afford.' (*Christmas Nights' Entertainment.*) A more just conception than this of Abstinence, would be difficult to find. The habits which she encourages are certainly favorable to personal comeliness. How is it on the other hand? You know very well that a 'jolly red nose,' though emblematic of profusion, is no ornament to the human physiognomy.

The author of 'A Year in Spain,' gives a very graphic picture of the influence of abstemious habits on the members of a religious community he visited in that country. After describing their costume, he says, speaking of the principal, or *hermano mayor*, 'as he now stood before me, in addition to the effect of his apostolic garment, his complexion and his eye had a clearness that no one can conceive, who is not familiar with the aspect of those who have practiced a long and rigid abstinence from animal food, and every exciting aliment. It gives a lustre, a spiritual intelligence to the countenance that has something saint-like and divine; and the adventurous artist, who would essay to

trace the lineaments of his Saviour, should seek a model in some convent of Trappists or Carthusians, or in the ethereal region of the desert of Cordova.'

The facts and illustrations above adduced, go to prove the truth of the Latin motto: '*Non misere vivit, qui parce vivit.*'—Not wretchedly does he live, who lives sparingly.

And to approve the lines of Horace, thus rendered by the translator:

'To frugal treats and humble cells,
With grateful change the wealthy fly;
Where health preserving plainness dwells,
Far from the carpet's gaudy dye.
Such scenes have charmed the pangs of care,
And smoothed the clouded forehead of despair.'

We will pay our respects briefly to Dan Cupid, and then I shall try your patience no longer. I would willingly let him pass, but he makes and mars the affairs of health and happiness to no small extent; he meddles at times with everybody, assails everybody, and he used to boast in ancient times, it is said, that he conquered all, gods and mortals, excepting only Minerva and the Muses. He is one of those meddling busy-bodies of whom sailors would say, as of a pet monkey, or other restless and unprofitable shipmate, he is in everybody's mess and in nobody's watch. Theologians tell us to run from him, and even Ovid says:

'I procul et longas carpere perge vias,
———Sed fuge, tutus eris.'

Take a long journey, your only safety is in flight. You may fly, but he sends his arrows after you, and you will have to travel far to get out of their reach.

I will not dwell on the dangers of a consuming passion, which in its irregularities brings so much affliction upon the human race, being fruitful among other evils of mental disease, ending often, very often, in total insanity and premature death. Here again the physician must proclaim that the laws of God are man's best protection. Allow me to quote a few words from an eminent theologian, appropriate in this place:

'What plan', says Balme, 'should be adopted to restrain this passion, to confine it within just limits, and prevent its bringing

misfortune to individuals, disorder to families, and confusion to society? The invariable rule of Catholicity, the morality which she teaches, as well as in the institutions she establishes, is *repression*. The Church does not allow a desire she declares to be culpable in the eyes of God: even a look, when accompanied by an impure thought.'

There is a growing tendency in this country to relax the marriage tie, and as a people, we are threatened, by the facility of obtaining divorces, with a degree of social disorganization, which would most materially impair public health and happiness, with all other sound interests. Upon this subject, I will introduce another paragraph from the same author:

'Give then', he says, 'the reins to the passions of man; allow him in any way to entertain the illusion that he can make himself any new ties; permit him to believe that he is not attached forever, and without recall, to the companion of his life; and you will see that disgust will soon take possession of him; that discord will be more violent and striking; that the ties will begin to wear out before they are contracted, and will break at the first shock. Proclaim, on the contrary, a law which makes no exception of poor or rich, weak or powerful, vassals or kings; which makes no allowance for difference of situation, of character, health, or any of those numberless motives, which, in the hands of passions, and especially those of powerful men, are easily changed into pretexts; proclaim that this law is from heaven, show a divine seal on the marriage tie, tell the murmuring passions that if they will gratify themselves, they must do so by immorality; tell them that the power which is charged with the preservation of this divine law will never make criminal compliances, that it will never consent to the infraction of the divine law, and that the crime will never be without remorse; you will then see the passions become calm and resigned; the law will be diffused and strengthened, will take root in customs; you will have secured the good order and tranquility of families forever, and society will be indebted to you for an immense benefit.' (*Balmes' European Civilization*, p. 144-5.)

This author has thus given us, in a few words, something worthy of the spirit of religion, and applicable to the condition of

the married and unmarried. The physician must endorse what he says, viewed simply in reference to its application to the *health and happiness* of man.

In short, and finally, gentlemen, for the enjoyment of these common and transient blessings, it is incumbent on us all to exercise a masterly self-control over those impulses, wants, desires, and passions, which beset us in some form or other, at almost every moment of our existence. I would say summarily, in eating, exceed not the limit of need; take no strong drink, unless as a medical prescription; make a great bonfire of your tobacco,—in honor of Jupiter if you please,—and as to the most seductive of the passions, keep it in strict subjection to the divine precepts. The observance of these things will not only add to the length of your days, but it will give you additional happiness, peace, and competence. The earlier you begin the better, and bear in mind the saying: he who would live to be old must begin early.

I have recommended to you in all things touched upon the highest standard; perhaps you may think I have urged too much. Even an approximation to the standard will do you a service; and at all events, I can say to each and every one of you,

Qui monet, amat, ave et cave —

which is expressively, if not elegantly translated:

'He who addresses you is your friend.
Farewell, and to your health attend.'

