

European Intervention.

DESPATCH OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT ON MEDIATION IN AMERICA.

The Paris Moniteur of the 13th ult publishes the following despatch of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs addressed to the Ambassadors of France at London and St. Petersburg:—

“ PARIS, Oct 30, 1862.

“ SIR,—Europe watches with a painful interest the struggle which has been raging for more than a year upon the American continent. The hostilities have provoked sacrifices and efforts certainly of a nature to inspire the highest idea of the perseverance and energy of the two populations; but this spectacle, which does so much honor to their courage, is only given at the price of numberless calamities and at a prodigious effusion of blood. To these results of a civil war, which from the very first assumed vast proportions, there is still to be added the apprehensions of a servile war which would be the culminating point of so many irreparable disasters.

“ The sufferings of a nation towards which we have always professed a sincere friendship would have sufficed to excite the sincere solicitude of the Emperor, even had we ourselves not suffered by the counter-blow of these events.

“ Under the influence of the intimate relations which the extension of intercourse has multiplied between the various regions of the globe, Europe itself has suffered from the consequence of a crisis which dried up one of the most fruitful sources of the public wealth, and which became for the great centres of labour the cause of the most sad trials.

“ As you are aware, Sir, when the conflict commenced we held it our duty to observe the most strict neutrality, in concert with the other maritime Powers, and the Washington Cabine has repeatedly acknowledged the honorable manner in which we adhered to that line of conduct. The sentiments which dictated it to us have undergone no change. But the benevolent character of that neutrality, instead of imposing upon the Powers an attitude which might resemble indifference, ought rather to make them of service to the parties, by helping them out of a position which seems to have no issue.

“ From the commencement of the war an armed force was set on foot by the belligerents, which, since then, has almost constantly been kept up, and, after so much bloodshed, they are now in that respect nearly in the same position. Nothing authorises the presumption that more decisive military operations will shortly occur. According to the last news received in Europe, the two armies, on the contrary, were in a condition that would not allow either party to hope within a brief delay for any decided advantage to turn the balance and accelerate the conclusion of peace.

“ All these circumstances taken together point to the opportunity of an armistice; to which, moreover, under present circumstances no strategic objection can be made. The favorable dispositions towards peace which are beginning to manifest themselves in the North as well as in the South, might, on the other hand, second the steps that might be made to recommend the idea of a truce.

“ The Emperor has, therefore, thought that the occasion has presented itself of offering to the belligerents the support of the good offices of the maritime Powers, and his Majesty has charged me to make the proposition to the Government of her Britannic Majesty, as well as to the Court of Russia. The three Cabinets would exert their influence at Washington, as well as with the Confederate States, to obtain an armistice for six months, during which every act of war, direct or indirect, should provisionally cease on sea as well as on land, and it might be, if necessary, ulteriorly prolonged.

“ These overtures, I need not say, Sir, would not imply on our part any judgment on the origin or issue of the struggle, nor any pressure upon the negotiations which might, it is to be hoped, ensue in favour of an armistice. Our task would consist solely in smoothing down obstacles, and in interfering only in the measure determined upon by the two parties. We should not, in fact, believe ourselves called upon to decide but to prepare the solution of the difficulties which hitherto have opposed a reconciliation between the belligerent parties.

“ Would not, moreover, an agreement between the three Courts respond sufficiently to their intentions? Would it not give to their step the character of evident impartiality? Acting in concert they would combine the conditions best suited to inspire confidence; the Government of the Emperor by the constant tradition of French policy towards the United States; England by the community of race; Russia by the marks of friendship she has never ceased to show to the Washington Cabinet.

“ Should the event not justify the hope of the three Powers, and should the ardour of the struggle overrule the wisdom of their councils, this attempt would not be the less honourable for them. They would have fulfilled a duty of humanity, more especially indicated in a war in which excited passions render all direct attempts at negotiation more difficult. It is the mission which international law assigns to neutrals, at the same time that it prescribes to them a strict impartiality, and they could never make a nobler use of their influence than by endeavouring to put an end to a struggle which causes so much suffering, and compromises such great interests throughout the whole world.

“ Finally, even without immediate results, these overtures would not be entirely useless, for they might encourage public opinion in views of conciliation, and thus contribute to

hasten the moment when the return of peace might become possible.

“ I request you, Sir, in the name of his Majesty, to submit these considerations to Lord Russel [or to Prince Gortschakoff], begging him to state the views of the Government of her Britannic Majesty [or of the Court of Russia].

“ You will also state that I have written in similar terms to the representative of the Emperor at St. Petersburg [or London]—

I am, &c.,
DROUYN DE LHUYS.”

EARL RUSSELL'S REPLY TO THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT.

FOREIGN OFFICE, NOV. 14, 1862.—The following despatch has been addressed by Earl Russell to Earl Cowley, her Majesty's Ambassador at Paris:—

“ My Lord,—The Count de Flahault came to the Foreign Office by appointment, on Monday, the 10th inst., and read to me a despatch from M. Drouyn de Lhuys, relating to the Civil War in North America. [The noble lord then states the substance of the despatch, as given above.] The proposal of the Government of the Emperor of the French, I need hardly say, has attracted the serious attention of her Majesty's Government.—Her Majesty is desirous of acting in concurrence with France upon the great questions now agitating the world, and upon none more than on the contingencies connected with the great struggle now going on in North America. Neither her Majesty the Queen nor the British nation will ever forget the noble and emphatic manner in which the Emperor of the French vindicated the law of nations, and assisted the cause of peace in the instance of the seizure of the Confederate commissioners on board the “ Trent.” Her Majesty's Government recognize with pleasure in the design of arresting the progress of war by friendly measures the benevolent views and humane intentions of the Emperor. They are also of opinion that if the steps proposed were to be taken, the concurrence of Russia would be extremely desirable. Her Majesty's Government have, however, not been informed up to the present time that the Russian Government have agreed to co-operate with England and France on this occasion, although that Government may support the endeavors of England and France to attain the end proposed. But is the end proposed attainable at the present moment by the course suggested by the Government of France? Such is the question which has been anxiously and carefully examined by her Majesty's Government. After weighing all the information which has been received from America, her Majesty's Government are led to the conclusion that there is no ground at the present moment to hope that the Federal Government would accept the proposal suggested, and a refusal from Washington at present would prevent any speedy renewal of the offer. Her Majesty's Government think, therefore, that it would be better to watch carefully the progress of opinion in America, and if, as there appears reason to hope, it may be found to have undergone, or may undergo hereafter, any change, the three Courts might then avail themselves of such change to offer their friendly counsel with a greater prospect than now exists of its being accepted by the two contending parties.—Her Majesty's Government will communicate to that of France any intelligence they may receive from Washington or Richmond bearing on this important subject. Your Excellency may read this despatch to M. Drouyn de Lhuys, and give him a copy of it—I am &c.

(Signed) RUSSELL.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger.

Our Foreign Mission.

Messrs. Editors,—

The following Letter from Rev. Dr. Warren, Secretary of the American Baptist Missionary Union will communicate some information to our brethren with reference to a Resolution passed by the Convention at Moncton. Peradventure the perusal of it may tend to excite in the mind of some suitable young Brother a desire to occupy the inviting field presented.

Yours in gospel bonds,
C. TUPPER, Sec'y

Tremont, Aylesford, Nov 17, 1862.

BOSTON, Oct. 23rd, 1862.

Rev. Dr. Tupper,

My Dear Brother,—I regret that I have not time to respond more fully than I shall now be able to do, to your favor of Sept. 11th, which, for some unknown reason, did not reach me till a week since.

The Executive Committee, to whom I referred the matter at the last meeting, are gratified to know that your people are again looking towards planting a mission among the unevangelised portions of the earth, and would be glad to contribute anything in their power to forward their plans. Till they have a field and laborers of their own, toiling under their supervision, and dependant on them for support and sympathy, it is certain their resources will not be called out as they should be.

The openings for such labor are numerous and inviting, while almost every day of the marvellous times that are passing over us, adds

to their number. Of fields contiguous to those occupied either wholly or in part by the Missionary Union, we can think of none so well suited to your purpose as the Province of Arracan, a province, as you know, formerly occupied by our missionaries, and yielding, under their culture, some of the choicest fruits of modern Missionary labor. The opening of wider fields in Pegu, Toungoo, and other parts of Burmah, together with diminished resources, induced our Committee to transfer their men from Arracan to other localities, so that for five or seven years we have had no one permanently on the ground. To this day, however, it has been a source of regret, that we cannot well occupy it. There are many disciples, as we know, scattered in the towns and in the jungles, who not unfrequently send to our altar brethren at Rangoon and other points for counsel and assistance. The heaven is in the mass, and if not working powerfully, is yet working. I have not a doubt but that a harvest might soon be gathered, both from among Burmans and Karens.

Arracan, you know, is a province by itself, I may say, being a narrow strip of country on the east side of the Bay of Bengal, and separated pretty effectually from the valley of the Irriwaddi by a range of mountains. Though not offering a theatre for large operations, it is still not diminutive in size, and would not conflict with the work of the Missionary Union.

Most affectionately,
J. G. WARREN, Cor. Sec.

For the Christian Messenger.

Prohibition.

MR. EDITOR,—

Having been respectfully solicited by the Halifax Committee of the International Temperance and Prohibition Convention, to prepare a Communication for it, I wrote and forwarded the following Essay. A vote of thanks, with a ticket, was received from Mr. Thomas R. Barker, Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance. I am informed that my Essay was to have been read at a public meeting; but as Judge Marshall was about to read it, he was called away, to meet with a Committee. It is now submitted for insertion in your valuable paper, if in your opinion the publication of it may subserve the interests of the Temperance cause.

Affectionately yours,
CHARLES TUPPER.

Aylesford, Nov. 18, 1862.

PROHIBITION: An Essay for the International Temperance Convention, held in London, G. B. Sept. 1862. By Rev. Charles Tupper, D. D.

That no man has a moral right to injure his fellow man, or to follow an occupation which is injurious to community, is self-evident. That the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating drinks, in other words, the ordinary liquor traffic, is injurious to community, is equally evident and certain. The conclusion inevitably follows, that it ought to be prohibited.

The question, then, naturally arises, By what means can this be most speedily and most effectually accomplished? On this very important point I beg leave most respectfully to offer a few suggestions. In order to the attainment of this exceedingly desirable object:—

1. There must be a majority of the people, from principle, decidedly in favor of Temperance and Prohibition. Where this is not the case, a general prohibitory liquor law can not be obtained. If it were, it would undoubtedly be inoperative and valueless. To ask legislators, in a popular government, to enact a law of this kind in opposition to the known wishes of a majority of their constituents, or of the people at large, is preposterous. Prudent and discerning legislators, how desirous soever they may be of the suppression of the liquor traffic, are aware, that a direct prohibitory enactment passed under such circumstances, would be generally disobeyed with impunity; and would consequently do more harm than good. If, for illustration, the father of a family deem it undesirable for his children to visit some particular house, and he forbid it and prevent it, the effect may be salutary. But if he peremptorily prohibit it, and yet his children continually violate his command with boldness and impunity, the effect of such prohibition will be deleterious. The children will become more demoralized than they otherwise would have been, and more regardless of parental authority in general. Such would obviously be the result of the passing of an absolute prohibitory liquor law, where its advocates have not sufficient strength and decision to have it carried, to a good degree, into operation.

2. Moral suasion must be sedulously employed. It is by means of this that the majority, indispensable in order to success, is to be obtained and retained. Let none supinely fold their

arms, and say, ‘The time for such a law has not yet come; we must wait.’ The time for it has, in reality, arrived long since. Every philanthropist should immediately apply himself, with ardent zeal and indomitable energy, to the task of enlisting recruits, in order that the enemy's castle may be forthwith stormed and demolished.

We must be careful, however, to be able to say with the Apostle, ‘The weapons of our warfare are not carnal.’ The use of harsh and irritating language is not moral suasion. It is detrimental to any good cause. Stubborn facts and convincing arguments, expressed in mild and respectful terms, are adapted to draw over persons from the ranks of opposition, and to augment the numbers of the faithful adherents to total abstinence and prohibition.

Under the influence of a benevolent and kind spirit, evinced by gentleness of manner, all available means should be diligently employed, by discourses from the pulpit, addresses from the platform, communications from the press, private admonitions, and the formation and increase of voluntary organizations, to imbue the public mind with sound temperance principles, and thus ultimately to secure the enactment of an effective prohibitory liquor law. When this is accomplished, the insidious temptation will be happily removed from the unwary. The benefits thence accruing will be incalculably great.

3. The advocates of prohibition must be careful to preserve union. The necessity and importance of this are too apparent to need either argument or illustration. Dissensions among the friends of temperance have notoriously damaged this work of beneficence exceedingly. No man can be consistently required to sacrifice principle conscientiously entertained. But every sacrifice consistent with the discharge of duty toward God and man, should be cheerfully made for the preservation of union among the abettors of a prohibitory liquor law. It is manifestly indispensable in order to the success of this momentous enterprise, in which the honor of the Divine Majesty, and the best interests of men, both for time and eternity, are most deeply concerned. No diversity of religious sentiments, or of political views, no preference for one particular temperance organization, nor any difference of opinion with reference to the most advisable means to be employed for the attainment of the desired object, should ever be suffered to produce division.

To the last particular it may be objected, that if men differ in their opinions respecting the course best adapted to procure an efficient legislative enactment, each party must pursue that which is respectively deemed preferable. They should, however, in this case, strive, by conciliatory discussion, and mutual concessions, to adopt a plan in which all can coincide. If there be not a tolerable degree of concert, especially if there be open and extensive contention among the persons seeking for prohibition, defeat will be inevitable. This would obviously be more injurious than would postponement for a season, in order to the securing of unity of action, and ultimate success.

The influence of party politics is peculiarly disastrous to the cause of prohibition. There are usually two parties, in each of which numbers of prohibitionists are found. It is a lamentable fact, that the political feeling is usually much stronger than that in favor of temperance. Whenever, therefore, the question of prohibition assumes such a phase that either party may hope to make political capital out of it, its abettors become divided; and consequently failure is a moral certainty. This result ordinarily follows where a general and absolute prohibitory enactment is demanded, unless a large majority of the people be decidedly in favor of it. In ordinary cases, therefore, it is obviously the part of prudence to ask for the passage of such a bill as will principally exempt legislators from either praise or blame, by referring it back to the people themselves, in their different localities, for their adoption or rejection. I would, therefore, in conclusion, as one who has been a strenuous advocate of total abstinence upwards of thirty-three years, and of prohibition ever since the subject was first named, beg respectfully to recommend:—

4. That a legislative enactment, similar to a nuisance law, be immediately and urgently requested. If this be obtained, every county, city, town, or district, in which a majority of the voters regard the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating drinks—the usual liquor traffic—as a nuisance, and vote against it, may at once have a stringent and effective prohibitory liquor law. Every friend of temperance will then have a definite object presented di-