

DC

BROWNLOW

AMERICANISM
CONTRASTED WITH
FOREIGNISM, ROMANISM,
AND BOGUS DEMOCRACY
IN THE LIGHT OF REASON,
HISTORY, AND SCRIPTURE;

William Brownlow

**Americanism Contrasted with
Foreignism, Romanism, and
Bogus Democracy in the Light of
Reason, History, and Scripture;**

«Public Domain»

Brownlow W.

Americanism Contrasted with Foreignism, Romanism, and Bogus
Democracy in the Light of Reason, History, and Scripture; /
W. Brownlow — «Public Domain»,

Содержание

Dedication.	6
PREFACE	7
INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER	9
TO REV. A. B. LONGSTREET,	22
TO THE RIGHT REVEREND AARON V. BROWN, M. S	31
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	43

William Gannaway Brownlow
Americanism Contrasted with Foreignism,
Romanism, and Bogus Democracy in the
Light of Reason, History, and Scripture; / In
which Certain Demagogues in Tennessee, and
Elsewhere, / are Shown Up in Their True Colors

*" – Go to your bloody rites again:
Preach – perpetuate damnation in your den;
Then let your altars, ye blasphemers, peal
With thanks to Heaven, that let you loose again,
To practice deeds with torturing fire and steel,
No eye may search, no tongue may challenge or reveal!"*

Thomas Campbell.

Dedication.

TO THE YOUNG MEN OF AMERICA

Young Gentlemen: – Almighty God has conferred on you the peculiar honor and the eminent responsibility of preserving and perpetuating the liberties of this country, both civil and religious. That the American people are on the eve of an eventful period, will not be doubted by any sane man, who can discern the "signs of the times." Indeed, it is an every-day remark, that, as a nation, we are in the midst of a crisis. If, however, a crisis ever did exist in the affairs of this Nation, since its independence was first achieved, which called upon the native and legal voters of the country to watch with sleepless vigilance over their blood-bought liberties, that crisis must be dated in the year of our Lord, ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX! The great Commonwealth of Humanity, in behalf of the momentous interests of Truth, Liberty, and Religion, calls upon the present generation of Young Men, who will have the issues of a coming revolution to meet, to qualify themselves for the task.

There never was a time known, since the dark days of the Revolution, when the civil and religious liberties of this country were so much endangered as at the present time. This danger we are threatened with from *Foreign influence*, and the rapid strides of *Romanism*, to which we may add *Native treachery*, connived at, as they are, by certain leading demagogues of the country, and a powerful and influential political party, falsely called *Democrats*, who seek the Foreign and Catholic vote, and are willing to obtain it at the expense of Liberty, and the sacrifice of the Protestant Religion!

The great criminal of the nineteenth century, the Papal Hierarchy, is now on trial before the bar of public opinion, having been arraigned by the American Party. You are called on to decide, Young Men, as you wield the balance of power, whether this Criminal, arraigned for treason against God, and hostility to the human race, deserves the execrations of all honest and patriotic men, and avenging judgments of a righteous God! In order to decide this grave question, Young *Gentlemen of the Nineteenth Century*, you are to consider the inevitable tendency of the principles of the Church of Rome – the actual results of these tendencies as embodied in history – the indictment brought in by the American Party, and the testimony of the witnesses. When you have intelligently considered the part the self-styled *Democratic Party* has acted in this infamous drama, you will feel it to be your duty to indict the corporation claiming the right to be called the Great Democratic Party, as *accessory* to the treason, crimes, and infamy, of the aforesaid Papal Hierarchy!

To you, then, Gentlemen, is this brief work most affectionately inscribed by

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE

For the last twenty-five years, the writer of this work has employed much of his time in the reading and study of the controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants. And those who have been subscribers to the paper he has edited and published for the last seventeen years, will bear him witness that he has kept up a fierce and unceasing fire against that dangerous and immoral *Corporation*, claiming the right to be called the Holy Catholic Church. This he has done, and still continues to do, because he believes firmly that the system of Popery, as taught in the standards of the Church of Rome, as enforced by her Bishops and Priests, and as believed and practised by the great body of Romanists, both in Europe and America, is at war with the true religion taught in the Bible, and is injurious to the public and private morals of the civilized world; and, if unchecked, will overturn the civil and religious liberties of the United States. Such, he believes, is its tendency and the design of its leaders.

Popery is deceitful in its character; and the design of this brief work is, in part, to drag it forward into the light of the middle of the nineteenth century, to strip the flimsy vizard off its face, and to bring it, with all its abuses, corruptions, and hypocritical Protestant advocates, before the bar of enlightened public opinion, for judgment in the case. Roman Catholics misrepresent their own creed, their Church, and its corrupt institutions. The most revolting, wicked, and immoral features of their *holy and immutable system*, are kept out of sight by its corrupt Clergy, and Jesuitical teachers; while, with a purpose to *deceive*, a *Protestant sense* is attached to most of their doctrines and peculiarities. By this vile means, they designedly *misrepresent themselves*, and impose on the public, by inducing charitable and uninformed persons to believe that they are not as profligate as they are represented to be. This game has been played with a bold hand in *Knoxville*, for the last twelve months, and it is being played in every city and town in the South and West, where Romanism is being planted. One object, then, of this *epitomized* work, setting forth the boastings, threats, and disclosures of leading Catholic organs and Bishops, as to their real principles and designs upon this country, suffered to go forth in their more excited moments, or unguarded hours, is, to spread before the people, in a cheap form, true Popery, and to strip it of its *Protestant garb*, which it has for the time being assumed.

An additional reason for bringing out this publication, at this particular time, is, to expose a corrupt bargain entered into by the leaders of the Catholic Church, and the leaders of a corrupt and designing political party, falsely called the Democratic party. One of the most alarming "signs of the times" is, that while Protestant ministers, of different persuasions, only two brief years ago, could preach with power and eloquence against the dogmas and corrupting tendencies of *Romanism*, and pass out of the doors of their churches, receiving the compliments and extravagant praises of their entire congregations, let one of them now dare to hold up this Corporation as a dangerous foreign enemy – let him warn his charge against the influence of Popery, or but only designate the Catholic Hierarchy as the "man of sin" described in the Scriptures, and one half of his congregation are grossly insulted: they charge him with meddling in politics; and, by way of resentment, they will either not hear him again, or they will starve him out, by refusing to contribute to his support!

The hypocritical and profligate portion of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Episcopal membership in this country, are not so much misled by Popery, as they are influenced by *party politics*, and are in love with the *loose moral code* of Romanism. It lays no restraints on their lusts, and gives a loose rein to all their unsanctified passions and desires. Backslidden, unconverted, or unprincipled members of Protestant Churches, find in Popery a *sympathizing irreligion*, adapted to their vicious lives; and hence they fall in with its disgusting superstitions and insulting claims. They are, therefore, ensnared with the delusions of Popery, of *choice*. In other words, Popery is a system of mere human policy; altogether of Foreign origin; Foreign in its support; importing Foreign vassals and paupers by multiplied thousands; and sending into every State and Territory in this Union, a most baneful

Foreign and anti-Republican influence. Its old *goutified*, immoral, and drunken Pope, his Bishops and Priests, are *politicians*; men of the world, earthly, sensual, and devilish, and mere men of pleasure. Associated with them for the purpose, in great State and National contests, of securing the Catholic vote, are the worst class of American politicians, designing demagogues, selfish office-seekers, and bad men, calling themselves *Democrats* and "Old-Line Whigs!" These politicians know that Popery, as a system, is in the hands of a Foreign despotism, precisely what the Koran is in the hands of the Grand Turk and his partisans. But corrupt and ambitious politicians in this country, are willing to act the part of traitors to our laws and Constitution, for the sake of profitable offices; and they are willing to sacrifice the Protestant Religion, on the ancient and profligate altar at Rome, if they may but rise to distinction on its ruins!

The great Democratic party of this country, which has degenerated into a *Semi-Papal Organization*, for the base purposes of power and plunder, now fully partakes of the intolerant spirit of Rome, and is acting it out in all the departments of our State and General Governments. What Romanism has been to the Old World, this Papal and Anti-American organization seeks and promises to be to this country. What is Popery in Roman Catholic Europe? It is as intolerant in politics as in religion: it taxes and oppresses the subjects and citizens of every country; it interdicts nations; dethrones governors, chief magistrates, and kings; dissolves civil governments; suspends commerce; annuls civil laws; and, to gratify its unsanctified lust of ambition, it has overrun whole nations with bloodshed, and thrown them into confusion. So it is with this "*Bogus*" Democracy: it wages a war of extermination against the freedom of the press, and against the liberty of speech, the rights of human conscience, and the liberties of man: hence its indiscriminate proscription of all who dare to unite with the American Party, or openly espouse their cause. Popery aims at universal power over the bodies and souls of all men; and history proclaims that its weapons have been dungeons, racks, chains, fire, and sword! The *bastard* Democracy of the present age has united with the Prelates, Priests, Monks, and Nuns of Romanism, and is daily affiliating with hundreds of thousands of the very off-scourings of the European Catholic population – stimulating them to deeds of violence, and to the shedding of blood! To-day, they sustain a *Baker* in the foul murder of a *Poole*, in New York, because he was a member of the so-called Know-Nothing party, which had just routed, in an election, this Foreign Locofoco party! To-morrow, we find this same vile party, its editors and orators, sustaining a Foreign Catholic Mob in Louisville, Ky.; and the members of the same party, in surrounding States, exulting over the murder of Protestant Americans! And in the next breath, as it were, we find these sons of Belial, falsely called *Democrats*, after reaching the power they lusted after in Philadelphia, sending up shouts over the lawless deeds of a Foreign Catholic riot, which made the ears of every American citizen to tingle!

Under the guidance of an All-wise Providence, the Protector of our Republic, and of the Protestant Religion, it is in the power of the free and independent voters of these United States to cause this enemy's long "*arm to be clean dried up, and his right eye to be utterly darkened,*" by elevating to the two first offices within the gift of the world, Millard Fillmore and Andrew J. Donelson!

*I am, candid Reader, your fellow-citizen,
W. G. BROWNLOW.
Knoxville, July, 1856.*

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER

The Creed of the American Party – The Platform misrepresented by Mr. Watkins – Official Vote on the adoption of the new Platform – What the Abolitionists and Democrats say of the Platform – Seceders from the Nominating Convention, and their Address

Lord Byron, just as the war of Greece approached, said: "It is not one man, nor a million, but the *spirit of liberty* which must be spread;" and, carrying out the same bold idea of liberty, he continues, "It is time to act;" or, in the language of the Know Nothing salutation, "It is time for work;" for "what signifies *self*, if a single spark of that genius of liberty worthy of the past, can be bequeathed unquenchably to the future?" In the language of a fair poetess:

– "Our country is a whole,
Of which we all are parts; nor should a citizen
Regard his interests as distinct from hers:
No hopes or fears should touch his patriot soul,
But what affects her honor or her shame."

The civilization – the nationality – the institutions, civil and religious – and the mission of the United States, are all eminently American. Mental light and personal independence, constitutional union, national supremacy, submission to law and rules of order, homogeneous population, and instinctive patriotism, are all vital elements of American liberty, nationality, and upward and onward progress. Foreign immigration, foreign Catholic influence, and sectional factions nourished by them – and breeding demagogues in the name of *Democracy*, by a prostitution of the elective franchise – have already corrupted our nationality, degraded our councils, both State and National, weakened the bonds of union, disturbed our country's peace, and awakened apprehensions of insecurity and *progressive deterioration*, threatening ultimate ruin! To rescue and restore American institutions – to maintain American nationality, and to secure American birthrights, is the mission and the sole purpose of the American Party – composed of conservative, patriotic, Protestant, Union-loving, native-born citizens of every section, and of every Christian denomination – self-sacrificing patriots, who prefer their country, and the religion of their fathers, and of the Bible, to a factious name, a plundering political organization, and an infamous Papal hierarchy!

The paramount and ultimate object of our American Organization is to save and exalt the Union, and to preserve and perpetuate the rights and blessings of the Protestant religion. We contend that American principles should mould American policy; that American mind should rule American destiny; that all sectional parties, such as a party *North*, or a party *South*, should be renounced; that all sectional agitations, such as are kept up by Abolitionists, Free Soilers, and Black Republicans, should be resisted; that Congress should never agitate the subject of domestic slavery, in any form or for any purpose, but leave it where the Constitution fixes it; that as the destiny of the country depends on the mind of the country, intelligence should rule; that the ballot-box should be purified, and corrupt Romanism and foreign influence checked; that any allegiance "to any foreign prince, potentate, or power" – to any power, regal or pontifical, should be rebuked as the most fatal canker of the germ of American independence; that every citizen should be encouraged to exercise freely his own conscience; and that the popular mind should be enlightened, and the popular heart rectified,

by proper and universal Christian education. This is the essence of the American creed; and when methodized into a Political Decalogue, it constitutes the *Ten Commandments* of the American party.

In this connection, and at this point, we will give the much-abused Platform of the American party, adopted at the session of the National Council, February 21, 1856. Examine the Platform, and answer to your conscience the question: What true American head can disapprove – what pure American heart can revolt? Can men taking their stand on this Platform be the enemies of civil and religious liberties? Can either civil or religious liberties rest secure on any other grounds? And must not those "Bogus" Democrats and Anti-Americans, therefore, who wage war against this citadel of American birthrights, act as enemies to the Federal Constitution, enemies to the Union, to the mental independence of American citizens – enemies to the Protestant religion, and enemies, consequently, "to civil and religious liberty?"

PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN PARTY

1st. An humble acknowledgment to the Supreme Being for his protecting care vouchsafed to our fathers in their successful Revolutionary struggle, and hitherto manifested to us, their descendants, in the preservation of the liberties, the independence, and the union of these States.

2d. The perpetuation of the Federal Union, as the palladium of our civil and religious liberties, and the only sure bulwark of American Independence.

3d. *Americans must rule America*, and to this end, *native-born* citizens should be selected for all State, Federal, and municipal offices, or government employment, in preference to all others: nevertheless,

4th. Persons born of American parents residing temporarily abroad, should be entitled to all the rights of native-born citizens; but,

5th. No person should be selected for political station, (whether of native or foreign birth,) who recognizes any allegiance or obligation of any description, to any foreign prince, potentate, or power, or who refuses to recognize the Federal and State constitutions (each within its sphere) as paramount to all other laws, as rules of political action.

6th. The unqualified recognition and maintenance of the reserved rights of the several States, and the cultivation of harmony and fraternal good-will between the citizens of the several States; and to this end, non-interference by Congress with questions appertaining solely to the individual States, and non-intervention by each State with the affairs of any other State.

7th. The recognition of the right of the native-born and naturalized citizens of the United States, permanently residing in any Territory thereof, to frame their constitution and laws, and to regulate their domestic and social affairs in their own mode, subject only to the provisions of the Federal Constitution, with the privilege of admission into the Union whenever they have the requisite population for one Representative in Congress. *Provided always*, that none but those who are citizens of the United States, under the constitution and laws thereof, and who have a fixed residence in any such Territory, ought to participate in the formation of the constitution, or in the enactment of laws for said Territory or State.

8th. An enforcement of the principle that no State or Territory ought to admit others than citizens of the United States to the right of suffrage, or of holding political office.

9th. A change in the laws of naturalization, making a continued residence of twenty-one years, of all not hereinbefore provided for, an indispensable requisite for citizenship hereafter, and excluding all paupers, and persons convicted of crime, from landing upon our shores; but no interference with the vested rights of foreigners.

10th. Opposition to any union between Church and State: no interference with religious faith or worship, and no test-oaths for office.

11th. Free and thorough investigation into any and all alleged abuses of public functionaries, and a strict economy in public expenditures.

12th. The maintenance and enforcement of all laws constitutionally enacted, until said laws shall be repealed, or shall be declared null and void by competent judicial authority.

13th. Opposition to the reckless and unwise policy of the present administration in the general management of our national affairs, and more especially as shown in removing "Americans" (by designation) and conservatives in principle, from office, and placing foreigners and ultraists in their places: as shown in a truckling subserviency to the stronger, and an insolent and cowardly bravado toward the weaker powers: as shown in re-opening sectional agitation, by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise: as shown in granting to unnaturalized foreigners the right of suffrage in Kansas and Nebraska: as shown in its vacillating course on the Kansas and Nebraska question: as shown in the corruptions which pervade some of the departments of the government: as shown in disgracing meritorious naval officers through prejudice or caprice; and as shown in the blundering mismanagement of our foreign relations.

14th. Therefore, to remedy existing evils, and prevent the disastrous consequences otherwise resulting therefrom, we would build up the "American party" upon the principles hereinbefore stated.

15th. That each State Council shall have authority to amend their several constitutions, so as to abolish the several degrees, and institute a pledge of honor, instead of other obligations, for fellowship and admission into the party.

16th. A free and open discussion of all political principles embraced in our platform.

The Hon. Mr. Watkins, a renegade from the American ranks, in East Tennessee, delivered a speech in Congress on the 6th of May, 1856; which speech we find reported in the *Washington Union*—a speech which betrays an utter ignorance of the point he undertook to discuss. It is due to *his betrayed constituents* that we should expose his ignorance, and the blundering fallacy of his attempts to justify his turning *Locofoco Cataline Judas Sag-Nicht!* He says, as reported by his political organ-grinder:

"But, sir, the platform recently adopted by the Philadelphia Convention cannot receive my approbation. I cannot support Mr. Fillmore, or any other distinguished Whig, upon that platform. The only solitary plank in the Philadelphia platform of June, 1855, was the twelfth section – that section which denied to Congress the right to interfere with slavery in the Territories, declaring the doctrine of non-intervention, and of popular sovereignty in the Territories. But, sir, that plank in the platform was stricken out by the convention recently held, and the sixth resolution of the platform then adopted substituted in its place. And what does that resolution endorse? Is there any non-intervention in the sixth resolution of the Philadelphia

platform? Is there any denial of the right of Congress to interfere upon the subject of slavery in the sixth resolution of the Philadelphia platform? Certainly not."

In lieu of the *June* platform, we have this *February* platform. The June platform contained *no such denial to Congress*, as is here alleged by Mr. Watkins, of the right to interfere with slavery in the Territories! And it is marvellous, indeed, that a grave Member of Congress should undertake to discuss Platforms, which he had either never read, or the purport of which, if he had ever read them, he had either wholly forgotten, or lacked the sense to comprehend! The twelfth section of the June Platform says:

"And expressly *pretermittting any expression of opinion* upon the power of Congress to establish or prohibit slavery in any Territory, it is the sense of this National Council, that Congress ought not to legislate upon the subject of slavery within the Territories of the United States."

Thus, instead of *denying* to Congress the right to interfere with slavery in the Territories, as erroneously and recklessly charged by this new-born Democrat, all opinion on that subject was "*expressly pretermitted*" in the June Platform! Mr. Watkins was in such a hurry to join the Forney, Pierce, and Catholic Democracy, that he did not stop to examine even the Platform which most disgusted him! But this is not the worst blunder which he committed in that speech. He turned to the new Platform, and asked, with an air of triumph:

"Is there any non-intervention in the sixth resolution of the (new) Philadelphia platform? Is there any denial of the right of Congress to interfere with the subject of slavery in the sixth resolution of the (new) Philadelphia platform?"

And he answers, "*Certainly not!*" The ignorant man, it would seem, only read as far as to the sixth section of the new Platform; and even *that* section contains a direct affirmative answer to his question; which, in order to place the American party in a false position, he answers, "*Certainly not!*"

Now, we ask such as may have noticed his *misrepresentations*, to read a *little further on*, at least to the end of the 7th section of this new Platform, and see where it leaves Mr. Watkins! Turn back to the 7th section, and it will be seen that this section, instead of "*pretermittting any opinion*" on the question, announces the doctrine that the citizens of the United States permanently residing in the Territories, have a "*right*" to frame their Constitution and laws, and to regulate their domestic affairs in their own mode, subject only to the provisions of the Federal Constitution!

The *New York Evening Post*, a Pierce and foreign Democratic organ, thus alludes to the action of the Convention which nominated Fillmore and Donelson: —

"The 12th section of the June Platform, it is true, had been abrogated; BUT IT HAD BEEN REPLACED BY ANOTHER, MEANING PRECISELY THE SAME THING!"

The *Cincinnati Gazette*, an Abolition, Anti-American Foreign sheet, came out in opposition to the American nominees, in its issue of Feb. 29th, 1856, on account of the *Pro-slavery* character of the new Platform. The Gazette says: —

"We are glad that the action of the Convention *proved so decided as to leave no doubt as to the character of the Platform*. The latter is clearly and decidedly Pro-slavery and Nebraska, *and in this respect corresponds precisely with the principles of the Pierce Democracy!* *Fillmore and Donelson* are therefore presented to the American people as candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, ON A THOROUGH AND DECIDED NEBRASKA PRO-SLAVERY PLATFORM, and the citizens of Northern States are asked to vote for them!"

The *New York Tribune*, whose editor was a prominent member of the Pittsburgh Black Republican Convention, and who is violent in his opposition to Fillmore and Donelson, says:

"The object of the Know Nothings has dwindled down to this – TO DEFEAT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY! That is to say, this is the object of those who have managed the Philadelphia Convention, and nominated Mr. Fillmore. I have diligently inquired for a member who voted for *Banks* for Speaker, and now supports *Fillmore*; but up to this time – more than three days after the nomination – I have not heard of one. That sort must be scarce!"

The following is the official vote on the adoption of the new Platform by the National Council, which met four days previous to the Nominating Convention:

New Hampshire —*Nays*– Messrs. Colby and Emery.

Massachusetts —*Yeas*– Messrs. Ely, Weith, Brewster, Robinson, and Arnold. *Nays*– Messrs. Richmond, Wheelwright, Temple, Thurston, Sumner, Allen, Sawin, and Hawkes.

Connecticut —*Nays*– Messrs. Sperry, Dunbar, Peck, Booth, Holley, and Perkins.

Rhode Island —*Yeas*– Messrs. Chase and Knight. *Nays*– Messrs. Simons and Nightingale.

New York —*Yeas*– Messrs. Walker, Oakley, Morgan, Woodward, Reynolds, Chester, Owens, Sanders, Whiston, Nichols, Van Dusen, Westbrook, Parsons, Picket, Campbell, Lowell, Sammons, Oakes, Seymour, Squire, Cooper, Burr, Bennett, Marvine, Midler, Stephens, Johnson, Wetmore, Hammond, and S. Seymour. *Nay*– Mr. Barker.

Delaware —*Yeas*– Messrs. Clement and Smithers.

Maryland —*Yeas*– Messrs. Codet, Alexander, Winchester, Stephens, and Wilmot. *Nays*– Messrs. Purnell, Ricaud, Pinkney, and Kramer.

Virginia —*Nays*– Messrs. Bolling, McHugh, Cochran, Boteler, Preston, and Maupin.

Florida —*Yea*– Mr. Call.

New Jersey —*Yeas*– Messrs. Deshler, Weeks, Lyon, and McClellan.

Pennsylvania —*Yeas*– Messrs. Freeman, Nelclede, Gossler, Smith, Gillinham, Hammond, Wood, Gilford, Pyle, Farrand, and Williamson. *Nays*– Messrs. Johnson, Sewell, Jones, Parker, Heistand, Kase, Kinkaid, Coffee, Carlisle, Crovode, Edie, Sewell, and Power.

Louisiana —*Yeas*– Messrs. Lathrop and Elam. *Nays*– Messrs. Harman and Hardy.

California —*Yeas*– Messrs. Wood and Stanley.

Arkansas —*Yea*– Mr. Logan. *Nay*– Mr. Fowler.

Tennessee —*Yeas*– Messrs. Brownlow, Bankhead, Zollicoffer, Burton, Campbell, Donelson, Harris, Bilbo, and Belloat. *Nays*– Messrs. Nelson, Reedy, and Picket.

Kentucky —*Yeas*– Messrs. Stowers, Campbell, Raphael, Todd, Clay, Goodloe, and Bartlett. *Nays*– Messrs. Shanklin, Jones, Carpenter, Gist, and Underwood.

Ohio —*Yeas*– Messrs. White, Nash, Simpson, and Lippett. *Nays*– Messrs. Gabriel, Olds, Ford, Barker, Potter, Stanbaugh, Rodgers, Spooner, Hodges, Kyle, Lees, Swigart, Allison, Fishback, Thomas, Corwine, Chapman, Ayres, and Johnson.

Indiana —*Yeas*– Messrs. Sheets and Phelps. *Nay*– Mr. Meredith.

Missouri —*Yeas*– Messrs. Edward, Fletcher, and Hockaday. *Nay*– Mr. Breckenridge.

Michigan —*Yea*– Mr. Wood.

Wisconsin —*Yeas*– Messrs. Lockwood, Cook, Chandler, and Gillies.

District of Columbia —*Yeas*– Messrs. Ellis and Evans.

Illinois —*Yeas*– Messrs. Danenhower and Allen. *Nays*– Messrs. Jennings and Gear.

Iowa —*Nays*– Messrs. Webster and Thorrington.

Yeas– 108. *Nays*– 77.

We will close this chapter by giving the delegates who seceded from the Nominating Convention, with the Address published by them on the occasion. That recession was a more inconsiderable affair than has been represented by the foreign party of this country. The author of this work was the Chairman of the large Committee on Credentials, and reported two hundred and seventy-seven delegates, which report was received without opposition, as to numbers. Of these, *forty-two* only seceded, viz.: 13 out of 28 from Ohio; *one* of two from New Hampshire; 6 – all – from Connecticut; 2 out of 13 from Massachusetts; *one* out of 3 from Illinois; 7 out of 27 from Pennsylvania; *one* out of 4 from Rhode Island; 5 – all – from Michigan; 5 – all – from Wisconsin; *one* – all – from Iowa; 42 out of 277 – not a *sixth*, and but little over a *seventh* of the whole!

ADDRESS

The seceders or "bolters" made the following address, to which they appended their States and names. What they say of the *Louisiana* delegates, we have explained in another portion of this work:

"The undersigned, delegates to the nominating Convention now in session at Philadelphia, find themselves compelled to dissent from the principles avowed by that body; and holding opinions, as they do, that the restoration of the Missouri Compromise, as demanded by a majority of the whole people, is a redress of an undeniable wrong, and the execution of it, in spirit at least, indispensable to the repose of the country, they have regarded the refusal of that Convention to recognize the well-defined opinion of the country, and of the Americans of the free States, upon this question, as a denial of their rights and a rebuke to their sentiments; and they hold that the admission into the National Council and nominating Convention, of delegates from Louisiana, representing a Roman Catholic Constituency, absolved every true American from all obligations to sustain the action of either of the said bodies.

"They have therefore withdrawn from the nominating Convention, refusing to participate in the proposed nomination, and now address themselves to the Americans of the country, and especially of the States they represent, to justify and approve of their action; and to the end that a nomination conforming to the overruling sentiment of the country in the great issue may be regularly and auspiciously made, the undersigned propose to the Americans in all the States to assemble in their several State organizations, and elect delegates to a Convention to meet in the city of New York, on Thursday, the 12th day of June next, for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States."

Ohio – Thos. H. Ford, J. H. Baker, B. S. Kyle, W. H. C. Mitchell, E. T. Sturtevant, O. T. Fishback, Jacob Ebbert, Wm. B. Allison, H. C. Hodges, L. H. Olds, W. B. Chapman, Thos. McYees, Charles Nichols.

New Hampshire – Anthony Colby.
Connecticut – Lucius G. Peck, Jas. E. Dunham, Hezekiah Griswold, Austin Baldwin, Edmund Perkins, David Booth.
Massachusetts – Wild. S. Thurston, Z. R. Pangborn.
Illinois – Henry S. Jennings.
Pennsylvania – Wm. F. Johnston, S. C. Kase, R. M. Riddle, T. J. Coffey, John Williamson, J. Harrison, S. Ewell.
Rhode Island – E. J. Nightingale.
Michigan – S. T. Lyon, W. Fuller, W. S. Wood, P. P. Meddler, J. Hamilton.
Wisconsin – D. A. Gillis, John Lockwood, Robt. Chandler, G. Burdick, C. W. Cook.
Iowa – L. H. Webster.

THE ELECTION OF BANKS – THE SLAVERY QUESTION

One of the issues in the Presidential contest now going on, is the *slavery question*. A. O. P. X. Y. Z. Nicholson, of the Washington Union, who canvassed this State in opposition to Scott, and shed his *crocodile* tears before every crowd he addressed, because so good a man as Fillmore, who had stood firm for the *rights of the South*, had been set aside by an ungrateful Convention at Baltimore, to give place to Scott, the favorite of *Seward*— this miserable hypocrite, we say, now comes out and says, "Fillmore's abolitionism will suit the North."

The Central Democratic Committee for East Tennessee, in a call for a District Convention at Clinton, in May last, through the *Knoxville Standard*, conclude said call in this language:

"The time has again arrived when the national Democracy must rally to their country's call and preserve the Constitution as it is in its purity, and perpetuate the union of the States from the rain which the *Black Republican Party of the North*, aided by THEIR KNOW-NOTHING ALLIES OF THE SOUTH, would bring upon them. By order of the
"CENTRAL COMMITTEE."

The *Sag-Nicht Convention* held at Somerville, on Thursday the 8th of May, and which selected D. M. Currin as their Electoral candidate, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we have been appointed by the Democracy of this Electoral District to organize to fight, in the coming Presidential election, the Black Republicans and Know-Nothings. Resolved, That we *can* beat them, and we *will* do it. Resolved, That we will cordially receive the *co-operation of all Old-Line Whigs* who will assist us in carrying out these resolutions."

Now, the charge is here made that the Know-Nothings of the South are the allies of the Black Republicans of the North. This is the impression intended to be made, first by these *concealed calumniators* at Knoxville, and afterwards by the *open and avowed slanderers* of the same party at Somerville! With such *wholesale lying* as is displayed in both of these cases, we have but little patience: we only give their language, to show their recklessness in making such an issue. And although this Foreign party claim to be the guardians of Southern interests, we propose to show, before we conclude this chapter, that they are themselves the "allies of the Black Republicans of the North," and are giving them more "aid and comfort" than all the other parties in the country!

FRANCIS P. BLAIR, former editor of Gen. Jackson's organ at Washington, was the President of the Black Republican Convention at Pittsburg, in February last! *John M. Niles*; Democratic Senator in Congress, was President of the Black Republican Convention held in Connecticut! In the Pittsburg

Convention, over which Blair presided, PRESTON KING, ABIJAH MANN, DAVID WILMOT, and JACOB BRINKERHOFF, Old-Line Democrats, figured conspicuously.

For two long and cold winter months, the Democrats, both North and South, voted for *Richardson*, of Illinois, for Speaker, a violent *anti-slavery man*, whose speeches *against* slavery, and in *favor* of Abolitionism, were matters of record in the Congressional Globe, and were delivered on the floor of Congress so late as 1850! The *immortal* 75 Democrats did not cease to vote for this man *Richardson*, until Gen. Zollicoffer, of Tennessee, read his speeches upon him, in the presence of his friends!

On the 2d of February, SAMUEL A. SMITH, of Tennessee, a Democratic Representative in Congress, *renewed* his motion to adopt the plurality rule. His proposition, which it was evident would elect *Banks*, was carried by Black Republican votes, who went for it in a body. This would still not have elected *Banks*, but for the fact that the following *Democrats* voted for the odious plurality rule: *Clingman, Herbert, Hickman, Jewett, Kelley, Barclay, Bayard, Wells, Williams*, and Samuel A. Smith! Mr. Clarke was the only American who voted for the odious rule!

Mr. Carlile, a national American, of Virginia, before the vote was taken upon this plurality rule, offered the following substitute for it:

"*Resolved*, That the Hon. Wm. Aiken, a Representative from the State of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby declared Speaker of the Thirty-Fourth Congress."

Gov. Aiken is a sound Southern Democrat – never was any thing else – but Col. Smith *objected*, and demanded the *previous question*, which cut off Mr. Carlile's resolution, and which was to prevent its adoption! The candidate of the Democratic party, at that time, Mr. Orr, immediately *withdrew in favor of* Gov. Aiken, upon the introduction of Mr. Carlile's resolution; and to *prevent Aiken's election*, SAMUEL A. SMITH cut off said resolution by a call of the previous question!

Banks was elected by *one* vote, and this could not be accomplished until SEVEN DEMOCRATS got *behind the bar*, and refused to vote at all! These were HICKMAN, PARKER, and BARCLAY, of Pennsylvania; CRAIG, of North Carolina; TAYLOR, of Louisiana; RICHARDSON, of Illinois; and SEWARD, of Georgia! Any *two* of these *Southern* Democrats could have made Aiken Speaker, but they did not want him – they knew *Banks* to be a *Democrat*, if he were a Black Republican – and to elect him, they believed would give them the strength of that odious party in the coming contest.

We have before us the *Washington Union* of Sept. 27th, 1853, giving, editorially, a glowing account of the Massachusetts Democratic State Convention, reporting the speech of Nathaniel P. Banks, of Waltham, concluding that report in these words:

"Mr. Banks emphatically and decidedly, on his own part, and on that of the *Democrats of Massachusetts*, disclaimed the truth of the rumors in certain newspapers that an arrangement had been entered into with another political party in the Commonwealth concerning the distribution of State offices. It was his and this Convention's and all true Democrats' desire, belief, and determination, that Henry W. Bishop should be elected governor of Massachusetts, and that the other Democratic State officers should also be elected. He was not afraid of defeat, and less afraid of *Whig success*, which, to judge by its recent effects, was simply equivalent to a defeat. [Applause.]"

It may be said, and doubtless will be, that *Banks* has allied himself with the Republicans. But *Banks* says he has *always been a Democrat*, and that he was *nominated as a Democrat in his district*. And certain it is, that he was elected Speaker by DEMOCRATS, under the *compulsion* of an odious plurality rule, and the *gag* of the previous question!

It will be said, and said truthfully too, that SIX AMERICANS FROM THE NORTH voted for Mr. Fuller, of Pennsylvania. So they did; and in doing so, they voted for a sound national and

conservative man. But did this justify *Southern* Democrats in *dodging* the question, and thereby electing a Black Republican Speaker? Gov. Aiken was the candidate of the *seven* Democrats – he was not the candidate of the *six* Americans! Democracy, moreover, had refused to vote for an American under any circumstances, and had, on the first day of the meeting of Congress, passed a resolution insulting the whole American party, in caucus! We would have seen them banished to the farthest verge of astronomical imagination, before we would have voted for any man that favored that insulting resolution!

In 1847, by a *unanimous vote*, both branches of the Legislature of New Hampshire adopted resolutions denunciatory of the institution of slavery, and approving of the Wilmot Proviso. These resolutions were reported to the House, by the Representative from Hillsboro, the native town of *Gen. Pierce*, and were in the *handwriting* of Pierce!

On the 2d of October, 1847, the Democratic Soft-Shells, who are now the supporters of Pierce's administration, and fill the offices he has to dispose of in New York, held a State Convention, and declared their "*uncompromising hostility to slavery*" in a string of resolutions they adopted and ordered to be published.

On the 16th of February, 1848, a Democratic State Convention for New York convened at Utica, to appoint Delegates to the National Convention to nominate candidates for President and Vice President, at which a string of anti-Southern resolutions were adopted, denouncing "*slavery or involuntary servitude*," as repugnant to the genius of Republicanism.

On the 18th of July, 1848, the Democratic Soft-Shells held a mass-meeting in the park of New York, and, by way of making perfect their organization against General Cass, declared, by resolutions, their "*uncompromising hostility to slavery or involuntary servitude!*"

On the 13th of September, 1848, a Democratic mass-meeting convened at Buffalo, in New York, and, in a general Abolition jubilee, adopted resolutions condemning and denouncing the institution of slavery!

In 1852, while the contest was going on between Pierce and Scott, the *Washington Union* said, editorially:

"THE FREE-SOIL DEMOCRATIC LEADERS OF THE NORTH, ARE A REGULAR PORTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY; AND GENERAL PIERCE, IF ELECTED, WILL MAKE NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN THEM AND THE REST OF THE DEMOCRACY IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICIAL PATRONAGE, AND IN THE SELECTION OF AGENTS FOR ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT!"

The Black Republicans recently held a meeting in New York, at which *Benjamin F. Butler*, of "pious memory," and Van Buren Swartwout notoriety, presided! On his right hand sat, as Vice President of the meeting, *Moses H. Grinnell*, one of the Democratic "pipe-layers" of 1840, whom this Van Buren Attorney-General Butler made efforts to send to the State prison! Another Vice President, gravely looking on, and arranged in dignified grandeur upon the stand, was John W. Edmonds, ex-"blanket contractor" in a large swindle, and a practical spiritual-rapper! A third and last Vice President was the notorious *Dr. Townsend*, the sarsaparilla man, who has not yet wound up his controversy with a man of the same name, as to who is the greatest rascal in the way of manufacturing this medicine!

Among the other officers, secretaries, and prominent men in the meeting, was *C. A. Dana*, of the Tribune office, a *Fourierist*, who, at a public meeting on a former occasion, toasted "Horace Greeley, Charles Fourier, and Jesus Christ!" Prominent in the meeting was *C. A. Stetson*, of the Astor House, an *Amalgamationist*. Henry J. Raymond, the Abolition editor of the Times, and *Rudolph Garrigue*, a noisy German Abolitionist, looked and acted as though they believed the salvation of the Union depended upon the success of the Republicans! A fellow who made frequent motions, an

Irishman by the name of *McMorrow*, had served an apprenticeship of twelve months in the State prison, for breaking open a store after night! The principal speaker, who spoke for two hours on the subject of slavery, was the notorious *Bingham*, an itinerant Abolitionist from Ohio. It was a queer medley of men, parties, principles, and characters – two-thirds of all the active partisans in the meeting having held offices in the ranks of Democracy! And still, that party boasts of its Northern wing being sound upon the slavery question.

And here is the resolution of the 8th of January *Democratic* Convention in Ohio, appointing delegates to the Cincinnati Pow-wow:

"*Resolved*, That the people of Ohio now, as they have always done, look upon slavery as an evil, and unfavorable to the development of the spirit and practical benefits of free institutions; and that, entertaining these sentiments, they will at all times feel it to be their duty to use all power clearly given by the terms of the national compact, to prevent its increase, to mitigate, *and finally eradicate the evil.*"

To show, just here, where Tennessee Democrats stand upon the infamous Wilmot Proviso question, we give the following extract from a recent number of the *Nashville Patriot*:

JAMES K. POLK,

who, in 1847, approved the Oregon bill, which contained this odious and unconstitutional clause: next in order is

CAVE JOHNSON,

now President of the Bank of Tennessee, who voted for the same bill which Mr. Polk sanctioned: next we have

AARON V. BROWN,

an aspirant before the Cincinnati Convention, who did likewise: then comes

JULIUS W. BLACKWELL,

a star whose light has been quenched in obscurity, but who voted with his colleagues for the Oregon bill in '47: next in the procession of Southern men "dangerous to the South" is

BARCLAY MARTIN,

President Pierce's U. S. Mail Agent, who cast a similar vote: following him we have

LUCIEN B. CHASE,

author of the History of the Polk Administration, at present a resident of New York city, but at the time he exhibited himself as "a dangerous man to the South," a representative in Congress from this State: he is succeeded by

FRED. P. STANTON,

for ten years a Democratic Congressman from the Memphis district: he voted for the Oregon bill, with the Wilmot Proviso annexed: behind him in the march is

ALVAN CULLOM,

a Democratic Congressman, who has squatted on the *other* side of one of his native mountains in the fourth district, and been quiescent for some years: he was one of the Tennessee "dangerous men: " he voted twice for the Wilmot Proviso: in the same category is

GEORGE W. JONES,

in the language of another, the "goose which cackles at the door of the Treasury vault: " notorious as a Southern supporter of the Squatter Sovereignty doctrine, with two votes on record in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. He may be reckoned as *very* "dangerous to the South: " last, but not least in this dread array of "dangerous men," is

ANDREW JOHNSON,

the present Governor of Tennessee, and Cincinnati aspirant: he voted *three* times for the Wilmot Proviso, and so doubtful are his doctrines on the slavery question, that many slaveholding members of his own party regard him as *extremely* "dangerous to the South."

By the way, in 1842, this same *Gov. Johnson* was a Senator in our State Legislature, and introduced the following *Abolition* resolutions, commonly called his *White Basis System*:

"*Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, That the basis to be observed in laying the State off into Congressional districts shall be the voting population, without any regard to three-fifths of the negro population.*

"*Resolved, That the 120,083 qualified voters shall be divided by eleven, and that each eleventh of the 120,083 of qualified voters shall be entitled to elect one member in the Congress of the United States, or so near as may be practicable without a division of counties.*"

The position of Gov. Johnson is this: he wishes the State entitled to her slave representation *as a State*, but *in her own borders* the representative districts are to be made according to her white

population! In other words, he desires the State to retain her *ten* Congressmen, representing both her white and slave population, but wishes them appointed throughout the State without regard to the slave population: so that the county containing ten thousand white inhabitants, and double that number of slaves, should be entitled to no more representation than the county containing *ten* thousand white inhabitants and no slaves!

We heard Johnson last summer, in his debate with Gentry, in Campbell county, contend that the county of Campbell should have the same representation in Congress as the county of Shelby, which he stated had FIFTEEN THOUSAND NEGROES! He appealed to the prejudices and passions of the poor – inquired of the hard working-men of that county how they liked to see their wives and daughters *offset*, in enumerating the strength of the county, by the "*greasy negro wenches of Shelby, Davidson, Fayette, Sumner and Rutherford counties.*" He made a real, stirring abolition appeal to the poor, and non-slaveholding portion of the crowd, which was in the proportion of *ten to one* of that county, to array them against the rich, and especially against the owners of large numbers of slaves. He told them that these Negro wenches belonged to the lordly slaveholders of Middle and West Tennessee, and that as our Constitution now is, these wenches were placed on an *equality* with the fair daughters and virtuous wives of laboring men. On this ground he advocated his infamous amendment to the Constitution, which would incorporate his "White Basis" scheme!

This is a rank Abolition measure, and fraught with more danger to the South than any thing proposed by the whole brood of Abolitionists, Free Soilers, and Black Republicans at the North. Already the South is weak enough, and not at all able to vote with the North in our National Legislature. The effect of this scheme is to deprive the South of one-third of her strength in Congress. Not only is this the effect, but it is the design of the mover. We hold that Johnson is a Free Soiler, and has been for years. It is stated by his Northern Democratic friends, that when he quit Congress, he came home to run for Governor – with a determination, if defeated, to remove to some of the Northwestern States, and take a new start! Had he been defeated by Maj. Henry in 1853, he would now be a Black Republican in one of the Free States, running for office! And yet the propagator of this infamous Abolition doctrine of a "White Basis" representation – this demagogue who arrays the poor against slaveholders, is the man for the ultra guardians of the slave interests of the South! A man who would not own negroes when he could, but loaned his money out at interest, and left his wife and daughters to do their own work – a man who is at heart and in his doctrines a rank Free Soiler – a man who has only remained in the South to *experiment* upon office-seeking! This is the man that Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, Mississippi, and Carolinas, rejoiced to see elected Governor of a Southern slave State!

It was seeing the position of Johnson on this question that induced the "*Democratic Herald*" in Ohio, in June, 1855, thus to notice our race for Governor:

"Tennessee. – An animated contest is going on in this good old Democratic State for Governor, and the largest crowds flock to hear the candidates that ever attended political meetings since the Hero of New Orleans used to address the masses in person. The present incumbent, Andrew Johnson, is the Democratic candidate, and a *Mr. Gentry*, a *pro-slavery* renegade from the Federal Whig ranks, is the opposing candidate, brought out by a Know Nothing conclave. This man is on the stump abusing the Catholics, and denouncing them for their tyranny, while he openly advocates the *slavery doctrines of Southern Niggerdom*! On the other hand, his competitor, Gov. Johnson, well and favorably known to our leading Democrats of Ohio, HAS NO SYMPATHIES WITH SLAVERY, and is the advocate of such amendments to the Federal Constitution as will give all power to the people, and EFFECTUALLY PUT DOWN THE INSTITUTION OF SLAVERY!"

Now, this showing up of Democracy, on the Slavery question, may look *shabby* to many ultra Southern men, and it may induce them to charge that the Democratic party are *inconsistent*. We defend them against the charge of *inconsistency*, and maintain that what would be called *inconsistency* here, is nothing but *Democracy*. For instance, A. O. P. Q. X. Y. Z. Nicholson, the editor of the great official organ of Democracy at Washington, said, editorially, and "by authority," so late as 1855:

"IT IS NO PART OF THE CREED OF A DEMOCRAT, AS SUCH, TO
ADVOCATE OR OPPOSE THE EXTENSION OF SLAVERY. HE MAY DO
THE ONE OR THE OTHER, IN THE EXERCISE OF HIS RIGHTS AS A
CITIZEN, AND NOT OFFEND AGAINST HIS DEMOCRATIC FEALTY!"

Precisely so! A man may advocate the *abolition* of slavery where it exists; he may, as a Black Republican, arm himself with Sharpe's rifle, and go into Kansas, and shoot down pro-slavery men, and still be a consistent Democrat, if he vote for the party, and stand by the nominees of the party conventions! Hence, all the factions at home and from abroad – all religions – all the ends and odds of God's creation are now associated together, and are battling in the same unholy cause, in the name of *Democracy*!

And further to exhibit the inconsistency of this Democratic and Foreign party, it will be recollected that, in 1844, they nominated Silas Wright, of New York, for Vice-President, to run on the ticket with Col. Polk – a position he declined, because he would not agree to be *second best* on the ticket. In a letter to James H. Titus, Esq., bearing date April 15, 1847, Mr. Wright says:

"If the question had been propounded to me at any period of my public life,
Shall the arms of the Union be employed to conquer, or the money of the Union
be used to purchase Territory now constitutionally free, for the purpose of planting
Slavery upon it, I should have answered, No! And this answer to this question is the
Wilmot Proviso, as I understand it. *I am surprised that any one should suppose me
capable of entertaining any other opinion, or giving any other answer as to such a
proposition.*"

Now, if Silas Wright, one of the great "Northern lights" of Democracy, held these sentiments in 1847, what must they have been in 1844, when that party sought to elevate him to the second office within the gift of the nation? But we are just reminded of what is said in "the law and the prophets," that is to say, "*It is no part of the creed of a Democrat, as such, to advocate or oppose the extension of slavery!*" What a party!

[From the Knoxville Whig for Sept. 22, 1855.]

TO REV. A. B. LONGSTREET,

PROFESSOR OF METHODISM, ROMANISM, AND LOCOFOCOISM

Reverend Sir: – I see a *pastoral address* of yours, to "Methodist Know-Nothing Preachers," going the rounds of the Locofoco Foreign Sag Nicht papers of the South, occupying from four to six columns, according to the dimensions of the papers copying. I have waded through your learned address, and find it to be one of more ponderous magnitude than the Report made to the British House of Commons, by Lord North, on a subject of far greater interest! And as I am one of the class of men you address, notwithstanding your great advantage over me in point of age and experience; and as no one has made a *formal* response to your *pious warnings*, it will not be deemed insolent in me to take you up.

My first acquaintance with you was in 1847, at an Annual Meeting of the Georgia Conference, held in Madison; and although the impressions made upon my mind by you, on that occasion, were any thing but favorable to you, as a man, still, I am capable, as I believe, of doing you justice. I supposed you then to be the rise of sixty years, certainly in your *dotage* and among the *vainest* old gentlemen I had ever met with. You obtained leave, as I understand, by your own seeking, to deliver a lecture to the Conference, upon the subject of *correctly reading and pronouncing the Scriptures*. I was in attendance, and listened to you with all the attention and impartiality I was capable of exercising. I thought it a little *presumptuous* for any one man to assume to teach more than one hundred able ministers how to read and pronounce the inspired writings; and the more so, when I knew that several of the number were presidents and professors in different male and female colleges, and that many others of them were graduates of the best literary institutions in the South. Still, my apology for you was, that you was a vain old gentleman, and that to listen to you, respectfully, was to obey the Divine teaching of one who has taught us to "bear the infirmities of the weak." Your *samples*, both of reading and pronunciation, were amusing and novel to me. And so far as I could gather the prevailing sentiment, it was, that to adopt your style would render the reading of the Scriptures perfectly ridiculous.

In your address to "Methodist Know-Nothing Preachers," I discover that you are still the man you were at Madison, in 1847: you have a great deal to say about *yourself*, and make free use of the personal pronoun I! I advise —I believe —I am satisfied —I will not agree —I warn and caution —I fear, or I apprehend, etc. To parse the different sentences in your partisan harangue syntactically, little else is necessary but to understand the *first person singular*, and to repeat the rule as often as it occurs: a peculiarity which characterizes every paragraph in your labored address. Beside, the frequent use of the pronouns *I, me, my, mine*, etc., too frequently occur to be worth estimating. And it will be seen, upon examination, that not merely the verbiage, but the sentiment, is thus egotistic throughout, exhibiting a degree of arrogance and self-importance, only to be met with in a *Clerical Locofoco*, used by bad men for ignoble purposes. To carry out the idea of your *vanity*, you say in the winding up of your address:

"And now, brethren, have *I* or Mr. Wesley hit upon one good reason why you should not have joined the Know-Nothings? If either of *us* have, then *I* beseech you to come from among them. If *we* have not, there is yet another in reserve which, if it does not prevail will show – or prove to my satisfaction at least – that if *an angel from heaven* were to denounce your order, you would cleave to it still."

Any other man but yourself would, from considerations of *modesty*, have given John Wesley the preference, in this connection, and come in as *second best*. But no, you are *first in place*, and, in your own estimation, in *importance* likewise, as a religious teacher.

I have no doubt you consider yourself a much greater man than John Wesley ever was; and in proof of this, I need only cite what you have said in reference to Mr. Wesley's opposition to Romanism:

"Even good old John Wesley caught the spirit of the times, and wrote that letter, from which it appears he thought if the Catholics got into power, they would abuse Protestants. What abuse they could have heaped on them, greater than they heaped on Catholics, short of cutting their throats, I cannot conceive."

The only superior you acknowledge is Cardinal Wiseman, a bigoted Roman Catholic, and you seem to knock under to him quite reluctantly, and not without informing the public that you have been a laborious student for forty years, and "*a profound thinker*." Here is your praise:

"I have been a pretty severe student for near forty years, and a laborious, if not *profound thinker* for a long time; but when I compare myself in intellectual stature with that man, I shrink in my own estimation to the insignificance of a mite."

So much by way of noticing vanity. You are a literary and theological star of the first magnitude! You are an encyclopedia of the learning, science, patriotism, and religion of the country! Sir, if you possessed a little more *sheep-faced modesty*, and could exhibit a little less of *lion-headed impudence* than you do, you would be a much more useful, not to say successful minister of the New Testament!

Sir, you have taken the field in opposition to Know-Nothingism, *professedly* through your deep and abiding concern for Christianity, and the interests of Methodism. You say:

"You cannot surely be so weak as to suppose you can crush Romanism by Know-Nothing agencies; but you have almost ruined Methodism by them already.

"Now the ruler of this nation is spoken evil of by your party continually, and therefore, in the judgment of Wesley, I might stand up in the pulpit and defend him."

The truth is, you are influenced alone by partisan political feelings; and occupying a position in a Mississippi College, in the midst of Fire-eating Disunion Progressive Democracy, you desire to please them, rather than serve the interests of your country or Church. To take the stump, or the pulpit, in defence of *Frank Pierce* and his corrupt administration, would be a pleasant talk to you, who have been, all your life-time, an inveterate Locofoco in politics, and "a profound thinker" in favor of its iniquitous measures and principles. In your early political training, you have been swayed by interest and popular favor, and in most cases at the expense of truth, just as you now are, in your mad vindication of Romanism. A tool for others to work with, till you have found yourself in a condition to use such tools as you yourself have been, you are now a trimmer and weathercock, leading on men of less sense than yourself, to such distinction as interest and ambition may dictate!

Sir, you take the ground, throughout, that there is no danger of Catholics in this country, and that they do not seek to establish their religion. Here is a specimen of your logic:

"Thank God no religious sect can tyrannize over another in this country, so long as they all respect the Federal Constitution. Until we see, then, the Catholics treating that instrument with disrespect, it is madness to entertain fears of them and worse than madness to form combinations against them."

Now, sir, the foregoing statement is untrue, and in making it you could not have been sincere. You are a man of too much sense, and of too much information, to believe what you are wickedly trying to palm upon others. Brownson's Quarterly Review, the most able, as well as the most authentic organ of Catholicism in the United States, employs the following language to the American people – mark it:

"*Are your free institutions infallible? Are they founded on Divine right? This you deny. Is not the proper question for you to discuss, then, not whether the Papacy*

be or be not compatible with republican government, but whether *it be or be not founded in Divine right?* If the Papacy be founded in Divine right, it is supreme over whatever is founded only in human right, and then your institutions should be made to harmonize with it: not it with your institutions!!! The real question, then, is not the compatibility or the incompatibility of the Catholic Church with *democratic institutions*, but, *Is the Catholic Church the Church of God?*

"Settle this question first. But in point of fact, *democracy is a mischievous dream, wherever the Catholic Church does not predominate*, to inspire the people with reverence, and to teach and accustom them to obedience to authority."

Here is still plainer language from the Roman Catholic Bishop of St. Louis:

"Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes."

Here is what the *Boston Pilot* says, a Catholic paper of high standing:

"*No good government can exist without religion, and there can be no religion without an inquisition, which is wisely designed for the promotion and protection of the true faith.*"

Here is the *Shepherd of the Valley*, published under the eye and with the approbation of the Bishop of St. Louis:

"The Church is, of necessity, intolerant. Heresy she endures when and where she *must*; but she hates it, and directs all her energies to its destruction. If Catholics ever gain an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country is *at an end*: so say our enemies —*so say we.*"

And here is what the *Rambler* says, a devoted Catholic periodical, high in the confidence of the Bishops and Priests of that Church:

"You ask if he (the Pope) were lord in the land, and you were in the minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend on circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you – if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you, probably he might even hang you; but, be assured of one thing, he would never tolerate you for the sake of the 'glorious principles' of civil and religious liberty."

I could give other quotations of this character, which have met your eye long since, but I forbear, as they would extend my letter beyond the limit I have prescribed for myself. These are the publications which, in part at least, have given rise to the Know-Nothing organization, so cordially hated by you.

You say there is no danger of injury to our institutions from the rapid strides of Romanism. Allow me to ask your attention to the following remarkable political prediction by the Duke of Richmond, late Governor-General of Canada, and a British noble, who declared himself hostile to the United States on all occasions. Speaking of our Government, this deadly enemy said:

"It will be destroyed; it ought not, it will not be permitted to exist." "The curse of the French revolution, and subsequent wars and commotions in Europe, are to be attributed to its example; and so long as it exists, no prince will be safe upon his throne; and the *sovereigns of Europe are aware of it*; and they have *determined upon its destruction, and have come to an understanding upon this subject, and have decided on the means to accomplish it*; and they will eventually succeed by *SUBVERSION rather than conquest.*" "All the low and surplus population of the different nations

of Europe will be carried into that country. It is and will be a receptacle for the bad and disaffected population of Europe, when they are not wanted for soldiers, or to supply the navies; *and the governments of Europe will favor such a course.* This will create a surplus and majority of low population, who are so very easily excited; and they will *bring with them their principles;* and in nine cases out of ten adhere to their ancient and former governments, laws, manners, customs, and religion; and will transmit them to their posterity; and in many cases propagate them among the natives. These men will become citizens, and, by the constitution and laws, will be invested with the right of suffrage." "Hence, *discord, dissension, anarchy and civil war will ensue;* and some popular individual will assume the government, and restore order, and the sovereigns of Europe, the emigrants, and many of the natives will sustain him." "The Church of Rome has a design upon that country; and it will in time be the established religion, and will aid in the destruction of that Republic." "I have *conversed with many of the sovereigns and princes of Europe, and they have unanimously expressed these opinions relative to the government of the United States, and their determination to subvert it.*"

But, sir, after eulogizing Catholics for their devotion to religious toleration in this country, you make two assertions, touching the Methodist Church, for which I wish to arraign you, and for which the authorities of said Church ought to arraign you, under that section of our Discipline which forbids *railing out against our Doctrines and Discipline.* You say:

"And if I were to take the stump against you, I would say to the honest yeomanry of the country. 'Good people, if you think your liberties will be *any safer in the hands of Methodists than Catholics, you are vastly mistaken.*'"

"I would add, in humiliation but in candor, 'You have ten thousand times more to fear, just at this time, from Methodists, than Catholics; simply because the first are more numerous than the last, because the first are actually in the field for office, while the last are not.'"

If you have this opinion of the Methodist Church, you cannot be an honest man and remain within her jurisdiction. You ought to leave her communion forthwith, and go over to Rome; and in doing this, you would *not have far to go!* Occupying the position you do, and holding the sentiments you do, I would not send a child to any school or college over which you might preside. Nor do I think any Protestant parent or guardian ought to patronize any school under your care. Your influence, whatever you may possess, is against the Protestant faith, and in favor of Catholicism. In a word, you are a dangerous man in a Republican government.

Upon the subject of religious toleration by the Catholics, you seem to have fallen into the same error adopted by the Hon. Mr. Stephens, of Georgia – a man for whom you have great regard now, but who, in the days of *Clay Whiggery,* was a stench in your Locofoco nostrils! Mr. Stephens made the assertion, in a public speech in Augusta, that "the Catholic Colony of Maryland, under Lord Baltimore, was the first to *establish* the principle of free toleration in religious worship." The Colony of Maryland was a Catholic Colony, and the "Toleration Act" was written by Lord Baltimore himself. That Act is dated 21st April, 1649, when Lord Baltimore was in the zenith of his glory. Here is the language of that "Act" of religious toleration:

"Denying the Holy *Trinity* is to be punished with *death,* and confiscation of land and goods to the Lord Proprietary, (Lord Baltimore himself!). Persons using any reproachful words concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary, or the Holy Apostles or Evangelists, to be fined £5, or in default of payment to be publicly whipped and *imprisoned, at the pleasure* of his Lordship, (Lord Baltimore himself!) or of his

Lieutenant-General." *See Laws of Maryland, at large, by T. Bacon, A. D. 1765. 16 and 17 Cecilius's Lord Baltimore.*

God deliver us from such toleration! *Death* was the penalty for expressing certain religious opinions, not acceptable to Lord Baltimore and the Holy Catholic Church! *Fines and whipping at the post* was the penalty for speaking against the image-worship of the Catholic Church. But I need not pursue this subject further: the *onus propandi* is on your side.

Speaking of Mr. Wesley, you say:

"If Wesley were alive, what would he think of your midnight plots, and open tirades against Papists? But a letter of his has been going the rounds of the newspapers, which the Know Nothings obviously think gives the sanction of that good man to their movement. Not so. Mr. Wesley was not the man to write as inconsistently as their version of this letter makes him write."

Why, sir, Mr. Wesley goes much further in his political opposition to Roman Catholics than the American party have ever proposed to go. The American party say only that they will not vote for Catholics, or put them in office, because their principles are antagonistic to the spirit of Republican institutions. Mr. Wesley lays down the comprehensive, but *true doctrine*, in this very letter, that "*no government not Roman Catholic ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.*" And to show how fully and clearly he sustains this position, I quote from his letter at length. You will find the letter in Vol. 5, page 817, of Wesley's Miscellaneous Works, dated January 12th, 1780. It was originally addressed to the Dublin Freeman's Journal. Here is what Mr. Wesley says, in the very letter you seek to *deny out of*:

"I consider not whether the Romish religion is true or false: build nothing on one or the other supposition. Therefore, away with all your common-place declamation about intolerance and persecution for religion! Suppose every word of Pope Pius's creed to be true! Suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible; yet I insist upon it that no government not Roman Catholic ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.

"I prove this by a plain argument – let him answer it that can – that no Roman Catholic does or can give security for his allegiance or peaceable behavior. I prove it thus: It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established not by private men, but by public council, that 'No faith is to be kept with heretics.' This has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance; but it has never been openly disclaimed. Whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the Church of Rome. But as long as it is so, nothing can be more plain than that the members of that Church can give no reasonable security to any government for their allegiance and peaceable behavior. Therefore, they ought not to be tolerated by any government, Protestant, Mohammedan, or Pagan. You say, 'Nay, but they take an oath of allegiance.' True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, 'No faith is to be kept with heretics,' sweeps them all away as a spider's web. So that still no governors that are not Roman Catholics can have any security of their allegiance.

"Again, those who acknowledge the spiritual power of the Pope can give no security of their allegiance to any government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this: therefore they can give no security for their allegiance. The power of granting pardons for all sins – past, present, and to come – is, and has been for many centuries, one branch of his spiritual power. But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power can give no security for their allegiance, since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellion, high treason, and all other sins whatever. The power of dispensing with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the spiritual power

of the Pope: all who acknowledge his spiritual power must acknowledge this. But whoever acknowledges the dispensing power of the Pope, can give no security for his allegiance to any government. Oaths and promises are none: they are as light as air – a dispensation makes them null and void. Nay, not only the Pope, but even a priest has power to pardon sins! This is an essential doctrine of the Church of Rome. But they that acknowledge this, cannot possibly give any security for their allegiance to any government. Oaths are no security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason. Setting their religion aside, it is plain that, upon principles of reason, no government ought to tolerate men who cannot give any security to that government for their allegiance and peaceful behavior. But this, no Romanist can do; not only while he holds that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics,' but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution, or the spiritual power of the Pope.

"If any one pleases to answer this, and set his name, I shall probably reply. But the productions of anonymous writers I do not promise to take any notice of.

"I am, sir, your humble servant,

"JOHN WESLEY.

"City Road, January 12, 1780."

But, sir, you know as well as any living man that the history of the Church, from the days of the first Pope down to the iniquitous reign of Pius IX., sustains Mr. Wesley in his views on this subject, and justifies the steps taken by the American party. Notwithstanding the oft-repeated profession of Catholic liberality and Romish toleration, so triumphantly paraded by you, and other interested aspirants and unprincipled demagogues, the Catholic Church has invariably shown herself to be destitute of both, whenever she had the opportunity of using them. Sir, *intolerance* is an element of her faith, and *persecution* a specimen of her piety; and no man knows it better than you do. In taking upon herself the obligation of "true obedience to the Pope," the Catholic Church imposes upon herself a task that proves beyond all doubt she cannot, under any circumstances, remain faithful to that obligation, and yet maintain "allegiance" to such a government as ours!

Sir, I have no patience with a Protestant minister who stands forth as the apologist of Catholicism; nor have I any confidence in one who does it, provided he is a man of *intelligence*, as I admit you to be. The only excuse I can render for your strange and inconsistent conduct is, that you are in your dotage; that you are a violent old partisan; and that you are the tool of designing demagogues, infamous disunionists, and unmitigated repudiators. I shall not be at all surprised to hear that you have apostatized from the Methodist Church, and gone over to the Roman Catholics. I learn from the Little Rock Gazette, a Democratic paper, that but the other day, Gov. E. N. Carway, of Arkansas, a member of the Methodist Church, had actually apostatized from Methodism, and the Protestant faith, and united with the Roman Catholics. And what makes his defection from the faith of his fathers still more notorious, his organ is down upon the Protestant clergy in bitter and unrelenting denunciations! I believe that *you* are preparing to go over to the Roman Catholics; and to justify your change, when the time comes, you now assert, "in humiliation but in candor," you say, that the people "have *ten thousand times more* to fear from Methodists than from Catholics." If you believe this, you ought to leave the Methodist Church *instantly*, even without the formalities of a withdrawal or expulsion – even though you should be denied admittance into the Catholic Church! I deny that we have "*ten thousand times more to fear*" from the *Devil* than we have from the Catholics; and according to your argument, *the Methodists are worse than the Devil!* This, their most bitter revilers and enemies do not believe; and for obvious reasons. The Methodist Church has no St. Bartholomew's Day, with its rivers of blood staining her garments: she never indiscriminately slaughtered the Albigenses, or Waldenses, or Huguenots: she never established an infernal Inquisition: she never lit up the fires of Smithfield: never burned the Holy Bible, and prohibited, upon pain of eternal death, the printing and circulating of God's word; and last, but not least, she has not sought to keep the people in ignorance. Wherever

Methodism has been planted, the people have become great and happy. If you please, wherever *Protestantism* has prevailed, the people have been prosperous and happy. But look to Old Spain, Italy, the German Confederacies, Sardinia, Naples, Austria, Belgium, Portugal, Bavaria, Baden, South America, and Mexico, where Romanism is the established religion, and the places of her influence are a hissing and a by-word in the eyes of the civilized world! Protestantism has done more for the world in the last hundred years than the Roman Catholic Church has for the *eighteen hundred years!*

Sir, the Puritans, of New England; the Hollanders, of New York; the Quakers, Lutherans, and German Reformed, of Pennsylvania; the Baptists, of Rhode Island; the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, of Virginia; the Lutherans and followers of Wesley and Whitefield, of Georgia; the Huguenots and Episcopalians, of the Carolinas; and the Seceders in several of the States, who were the religious pioneers of these States, were all Protestants and Know Nothings; and if they were living, they would be ashamed of you and your teachings. They selected this wilderness country as their home, in order that they might enjoy those religious privileges from which they had been debarred in the old world, by the very Church and people you are seeking to vindicate.

But you will say, as you have done in substance, that this is no longer the characteristic of Romanism. Why is it not? Has she ever changed for the better? When did she renounce her doctrines and practices? Never! Rome is the same tyrannical system now, where she has the power, that she ever has been, and for ever must be. Wo to this land of ours, if ever Rome gets the ascendancy here! Her creed is the same here and now, in this respect, that it has everywhere been, and must always be. It is her boast that she is always right, and knows no change. She practices her unholy inquisitorial and Jesuitical doctrines in this country, as far as she can and dare act them out. Her whole system is adverse to our republican institutions and she hesitates not to declare it. She has publicly burned our Bible in different States in this Union, and recently, in New York and Pennsylvania. Archbishop Hughes, the Head of the Catholic Church in this country, has taken an oath, administered by the Pope of Rome, of which this is a part:

"Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord (the Pope) or his aforesaid successors, I will, to my utmost power, *persecute and wage war with.*"

The Church of Rome declares all who are not its members to be heretics. It is painful, in view of all these things, to see an old Protestant minister, whose head has been withered by the frosts of seventy winters, openly in the field advocating a Church whose Bishops, Priests, and members are "drunken with the blood of saints."

There is but one remaining feature of your singular address to Know Nothing Methodist Preachers to be replied to, and I am through. You assail the new party on the score of its *secrecy*, and of its *concealment* of its acts from the public. Had this objection come from any one but a Methodist Preacher, and a known advocate of *Class-meetings being held with closed doors*, I would now dispose of it without occupying as much space as I shall do in my concluding remarks!

Notwithstanding all the *secrecy* in the new Order of Know Nothings has been set aside by the act of the National Council which created it; and notwithstanding our members tell all about their Councils, where and when they meet, and our orators read out and publish to the world our obligations, rules, and principles, it is still objected that ours is a secret Order, liable to be used for bad purposes; that we travel about with dark lanterns; that our proceedings are not restrained by the wholesome check of public opinion!

Now, this, the great objection to our Order, comes from men who belong to Lodges of Free Masons and Odd Fellows, and who have taken all the *binding* oaths attached to the different *degrees* of these respective Orders! The same objection is urged against the American party, by men who belong to the Order of Sons of Temperance, who have deemed a *rigid secret organization* necessary to combat successfully a *domestic* evil! It is urged in bitterness against the Order, by demagogues and partisans, who have acted for years with the *secret political conclaves* of their respective parties,

who have held their meetings with *closed doors*— kept their *places* of meeting a profound secret — and when they have adjourned, they have enjoined *secrecy* upon all present! Last, but not least, this *secret feature* is urged against the American organization by the vile apologists for the Catholic Church, and its corrupt Priesthood and membership, in this country. These demagogues know that the Roman Catholic Church is a *secret society*, directed by a talented, designing, and villainous HIERARCHY — absolutely controlled by an *anti-Republican* Priesthood, to a degree which has never been exercised by any political party in the known world! The *Confessional* is a secret tribunal, before which every member of that Church is required to make known, not only *immoral* actions, but every thought and purpose of the heart, and upon pain of incurring the anathema of the Church, which is equivalent to a sentence of eternal damnation! The corrupt order of Jesuits, the infamous society of San Fedesti, and the infinitely infernal society of Irish Ribbon Men — these are all oath-bound societies of the Catholic Church, connected directly with the horrid operations of the "*Holy Inquisition*."

Now, I put the question to any man of reason and common sense, if Roman Catholics and their *patriotic Democratic* admirers and advocates, in this country, are not the last men on earth who should object to the *secret* doings of the order of Know Nothings, even if their secrecy were kept up? Every Roman Catholic in the known world is under the absolute control of a secret society, by considerations not only of a *temporal*, but of an eternal weight!

But I am not done with these *Democratic* opposers of secrecy. The Convention which formed the Constitution of the United States, sat in the old State House in Philadelphia, *with closed doors, from the 25th of May to the 17th of September*, wanting only eight days of four months. That body of men had a Doorkeeper and Sergeant-at-arms, both under oath, to keep their doors barred, and all their proceedings a secret. So says Mr. Jefferson's biography! And such men as Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Harrison, Hancock, Hopkins, and others, composed that body! During the war of the Revolution, General Washington, Generals Lee, Wayne, Marion, and others, organized a *secret American Society*, with its branches extending from North to South, having their *passwords, signs, and grips*, and writing to each other in figures, and "an unknown tongue," as the Know Nothings have been doing, and all, too, with a view to oppose Foreign intrigues and oppressions! It is as well known as any political truth, that General Washington, at the time of his death, was the *President* of the Cincinnati Society, a secret political society, in which, we see it stated on unquestionable authority, no man was eligible to membership unless he was a *native American*. The *Columbian Order*, known as the "*Tammany Society*," was a secret political society, and highly influential, and maintains its existence to this day, and without danger to the liberties of the country. Gen. Sam Houston publishes to the world that himself and Gen. Jackson were members of this Society. What say the *anti-Americans* to all these facts? Do they believe that Gen. Washington, or Jackson, would have united with any association or order not purely American? Would either have entered into any political league, when *secrecy* was enjoined, if he had not approved of the principle of secrecy in political associations? Never! From the characters of Washington and Jackson — the sacrifices they made for their country, united with their fervid patriotism, and their known preference for every thing *American*, I do not doubt for one moment, that if they were both now living, they would unite with the veritable Order of Know Nothings!

I believe the hand of God to be in this very movement, and as much in the *secrecy* of it, in the outset, as in any other feature. I regard the movement as one growing out of a great crisis in the affairs of our country, and a precursor of a sound, healthful, and vigorous nationality, and which will ultimately prevent the liberties of this country from being destroyed, by the machinations of such demagogues and factionists as now seek to *excuse* Romanism, and fellowship Foreign Pauperism. Secret societies are only dangerous to despots and tyrants, and history shows that these above all others have made war upon them. They have denounced and proscribed Masonry in every quarter of the globe, where they have had the power. The Pope, with the aid of his Cardinals, has crushed the ancient order of Free Masons in his dominions. There is not a Masonic Lodge in Italy. In our

own country, not a single Catholic is to be found associated with the order of Free Masons; and why? Masonry is founded upon the Bible, and requires the reading of the Protestant Bible in all its Lodges, and this don't suit Romanism. We state these general and historical facts, without knowing any thing of our own knowledge of Masonry.

In the young and growing city of Knoxville, it is within our own knowledge, that many of the Irish Catholics attached themselves to the Order of the Sons of Temperance, with a view, as they said, of throwing around them the wholesome restraints of the Order. On the first visit of a priest to the city, commonly called "Father Brown," these Irish Catholics began to drop off one by one, until not one of them is now in the Order, and most of those who were, are daily seen drunk in our streets. Indeed, some of them in withdrawing had the candor to acknowledge that the priest required them to do so! And why? Because, in all the Divisions of the Sons of Temperance here, we have the Protestant Scriptures read, and have Protestant prayers offered up. This don't suit the Church of Rome!

*I have the honor to be, very truly and frankly,
W. G. Brownlow.*

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND AARON V. BROWN, M. S

Sir: – I have received by mail a pamphlet copy of your "Letter to the Bishops, Elders, and *other* Ministers, Itinerant and *Local*, of the Methodist Episcopal Church South," covering twenty-eight octavo pages. I thank you for a copy of your *Pastoral* address; and I am happy to be able to *infer* from its teachings that you have made a profession of religion, before taking upon yourself "Holy Orders." I suppose the *time* of your conversion, you date back to the memorable period when you "saw sights" on Mount Pisgah, and had conferred on you the degree of *Modern Seer*, and entered upon the duties of "High Priest" of Democracy! As I am one of the parties addressed, and the customs of the Church and the country require a response to so grave a document, I have felt it incumbent upon me to perform the task. I may style this the *Last* epistle of Aaron, the Priest, and illustrious Chief of Foreign Catholic Sag Nicht Locofocoism!

My first impulses were, upon reading your address, to call for your *credentials*, and to examine into your *authority* for assuming to dictate to the entire Ministry of the Southern portion of the Methodist Church. You must either enter the Ecclesiastical ring under the *imposition of the hands* of Bishop Soule or *Andy Johnson*. If Bishop Soule ordained you for the Ministry, and set you apart as the Lieutenant-General of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, the presumption is that he examined you on doctrinal points, and upon all questions affecting the government of the Church, as was his duty, and is our custom, and that he found you orthodox! It follows, as a matter of course, that you renounced your heresy you advocated in the Hartford Convention, held at Nashville, and that you obtained forgiveness for that and numerous other "sins of omission and commission" – aye, for the whole catalogue of your inward and outward iniquities, which so *eminently* disqualified you for the work of the Ministry! But if *Andy Johnson* ordained you for the work, of which there is no sort of doubt, the Church South, through me, protests against your authority, and utterly refuses to submit to your teachings. Our Church does not agree with Johnson on the "White Basis" issue, or the great question of slavery; and in proof of this, I cite to the fact of her separation from the North, in 1844, upon this very question. She has within her bounds of communion, rich men and poor, educated and uneducated, and is unwilling to unite with him in arraying the poor against the rich, or the unlearned against the learned. Nor does our Church believe that Jesus Christ was a Locofoco, as Johnson asserts in his Inaugural, and held that Christianity and Democracy, in converging lines, led to the foot of Jacob's Ladder, and thence to heaven, *via* Mount Pisgah, from whose lofty summit you first beheld the promised land!

It therefore follows, that, in presenting yourself as a spiritual leader in the Church, called to the work, as you have been, by *Andy Johnson*, your case is fully met by a quotation from Job:

"Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and *Satan* came also among them."

A second passage, from the Book of Jeremiah, meets your case, and leaves no doubt that the inspired Prophet had you in his eye:

"We have heard the pride of Moab, (he is exceedingly proud,) his loftiness, and his *arrogance*, and his pride, and his haughtiness of heart.

"I know his wrath, saith the Lord; but it shall not be so; his *lies* shall not so effect it."

To be candid with you, Gov. Brown, I regard your address, under all the circumstances, as a display of the most brazen-faced assurance and the most unmitigated impudence I ever met with in my life! I have known for years that you were capable of great presumption, but in this insolent and dictatorial address you surpass *yourself*— you positively out-Herod Herod! In the whole history of the

country, and of parties, I venture the assertion, that a parallel piece of impudence, and downright bold-faced assurance, cannot be pointed to, as the act of any partisan. It is really past all belief, if I had not your production before me. But more of this hereafter.

Copies of your pamphlet were distributed through the aisles and seats of the Annual Conference room in Nashville, and have been sent all over the South, to members of other Conferences. Your *proof-sheet* was seen ten days before the meeting of the Middle Tennessee Conference, and your "work of faith and labor of love" was ready for distribution when the Conference first convened, but you held it back till the Conference was ready to adjourn, and to a period so late, that a reply, if one had been deemed necessary, could not be made. This was *cowardly*, and in keeping with your political tactics and code of morals. In saying that this was in keeping with your code of morals, I allude to the *Woodberry affair*.

I shall now take up your address, Governor, and wade through its twenty-eight pages of double-distilled Sag Nichtism, sublimated impudence, and concealed advocacy of *Romanism*, mixed up with contradictions, false assertions, and glaring absurdities, as it is, from beginning to end. In the opening paragraph, you predicate your right to instruct the "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers" of the entire Church, South, upon the real or assumed fact, that you are "The son of a now sainted father, who for forty years ministered at your altars, the co-laborer of that noble band of Christian ministers, who, under Asbury and Coke, founded your Church in America!"

Alas, that any "sainted Father" should be represented by so degenerate a son – an irreligious son – not a member of any Church – but having the hardihood, in the face of those who know the facts, to disguise himself in the priestly robes of a "sainted Father" – like an ass in a lion's skin, to *bray out* against better men than himself, or, like a wolf in sheep's clothing, to *steal into the fold*, where that Father was accustomed to minister in holy things, and with soft and honeyed words, and hypocritical teachings, and Satan-like misrepresentations, seek whom he may devour! You tell the "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers," that you really "approve" their "creed," and, what is still more soul-cheering, you have "witnessed their growth and progress for years, with the highest satisfaction." This is very *condescending* in the "son of a now sainted father!" It is quite flattering! But these "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers," would receive all this with a greater degree of allowance, if they did not believe that your generous patronage, so lavishly bestowed upon them and their "creed," was prompted by a principle of which *selfishness* is the soul! They believe, and so express themselves in conversation, that your forced smile of approbation, your reluctant eulogy, have both been wrung from you, because you are a sycophantic partisan suitor for patronage, in the way of votes for your party. These Clergymen whom you address, think it a great pity that the "son of a now sainted father" should exhibit so much "satisfaction" at witnessing their prosperity, in *theory*, and manifest not one particle in *practice*. They think that you would be in your proper place, to be found among the *mourners*, instead of the *teachers* in their Church; and that it is high time, considering your age in life, and the extent of your iniquities, that you should be found upon your knees, in an altar full of fresh straw, at an old-fashioned Camp-Meeting, asking the pious to pray for you, and God, for the sake of the forty years labors of "a now sainted father," to have mercy upon you, and save your sinful old soul from that death that never dies.

Why, Sir, the Devil himself would blush to perpetrate such an act of arrogance as you have done, in thus volunteering your advice to the "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers," of the Methodist Church. An old political party hack, who is not now, and never was, a member of any Church – an intriguing old sinner, who never even attends Church, and who, in this respect, shows that he neither fears God, respects the Christian Sabbath, nor "approves the creed" of any orthodox denomination, to be lecturing a numerous body of Clergymen, as to what they ought or ought not to do, it is the culmination of all that is called effrontery! The "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers" of the Methodist Church, wish the *evidence* of your conversion to God, before they consent to obey you, as "having the rule over them." Your approval of their "creed," and the "satisfaction" with which

you have witnessed their progress, is not sufficient to satisfy their doubting minds, as long as you continue to ride into Nashville on Sabbath, and retail political slang at the Inn, or read Sag Nicht papers at the *Union Office*, to the neglect of the house of God, and the evil example set before young men, against the statute in such cases made and provided! We must, as Ministers, hear you relate your experience, in a regular class-meeting. Nay, more, knowing your *raising*, and your ability to "deceive, even the very elect," we must see you down upon your marrow-bones, surrounded by noisy and zealous officials, pounding you on the back, and exclaiming, as in the days of your "sainted father," *Pray on, Aaron!* We must hear you *groan*— we must see your sinful old bosom *heave*— we must witness the falling of *big tears*, as you publicly confess and manfully repent of your misdeeds — of the whole catalogue, of all the inward and outward iniquities of your past life — your sins of omission and commission, which God knows are more numerous than the hairs upon your old sinful head! I say we must see all this, and even more, before we can have faith in your teachings, as big as even a grain of mustard seed!

But you are the "son of a now sainted father" — you derive great "satisfaction" from the "growth and progress" of Methodism — you "approve" the Methodist "creed" — and hence, a glorious future awaits the Methodist Church: *provided* always, that her "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers" hearken to and obey your teachings, a thing they are very certain not to do, in the matter under consideration. It is a melancholy fact, that many of the sons of Methodist, and other Ministers, are very wicked and unpromising men; and it is equally true, and certainly notorious, that where they turn out to be sinners, they are sinners above all offenders, dwelling either at Jerusalem or elsewhere! I have no hesitancy in pronouncing you as *hard a case*, in a moral point of view, as ever came before the Church, and the only appropriate reply her ecclesiastical dignitaries can make to your address, is to appoint a day of fasting and prayer to God, for your conversion, to be observed throughout her borders. I now, as the appointed organ of the Church, set apart the first day of January, 1856, and I pray you, as one desiring the salvation of your soul, to be in the spirit and in a proper frame of mind on that day! Humble yourself before God — tell him that you were in error in stealing the livery of Heaven to serve the Devil in! Tell him that you are an old worn-out political hack — that you have grown gray in the service of sin — that during the whole of a somewhat eventful life, your labors have been in the dirtiest pools of party politics — that you have been insincere and unscrupulous in all your teachings and acts — that you stand before the people of Tennessee publicly branded by *eight* respectable and reliable citizens of Wilson county, as a *falsifier* in the Know Nothing controversy of the past summer — and that you are sorry for having come forth steeped to the nose and chin in political profligacy, to lecture grave Clergymen upon subjects you ought to set at their feet and learn lessons about! Tell your God, what he doubtless knows, that though the "son of a now sainted father," you are as full of devils as ever Mary Magdalene was — that like the "Imps of Sin," in Milton, these "yelp all around" you — that this is no reflection upon a "now sainted father," whose seeming neglect of your early training grew out of his continual absence from home, as is the case with most Methodist Preachers, — aye, tell your God, that once out of this scrape, you will never be caught in another of the kind! You say,

"From the foundation of our government, it has been a conceded and settled doctrine, that the various religious denominations should not, as such, intermeddle with the political contests of the day. No instance is now remembered where they have done so!"

This is a remarkable sentence, and partakes of the nature of your Wilson county assertions! The history of the Church, and of the world, contradicts every word of the foregoing, and demonstrates that the "settled doctrine" of the Catholic Church, has ever been, as it still is, to "intermeddle with the political contests of the day." I will trouble you with two instances in which "religious denominations, as such," have been guilty of what you deny. The Albany (N. Y.) State Register, a paper which usually does not say what it cannot maintain, states that Archbishop Hughes has issued a mandate,

commanding all Catholics in the Albany District, in the exciting State election now coming off, to cast their votes for Mr. Crosby for the Senate. But Roman Catholics, you falsely tell us, never "intermeddle with the political contests of the day: " O no!

The other "instance now remembered," is the one in which you were a candidate for a seat in the Legislature of Tennessee, in the county of Giles: this was, according to my recollection, in 1831, or a quarter of a century ago. At that time, there was a small Manual Labor School in Giles, which had been incorporated by the Legislature, and at the head of which was a *Presbyterian*. The gentleman who ran against you, if not a member of the Presbyterian Church, "approved" their "creed," and "witnessed their growth and progress for years with the highest satisfaction." *You* charged upon the stump that the Presbyterians were seeking to establish their religion by law, to unite Church and State – appealed to the Methodist and Baptist to put them down by electing you, with a promise that you would check their march by counter-legislation – and you were elected upon this issue. At the same time, as the oldest inhabitants of Giles know, there were not fifty Presbyterians in the county! But "no instance is remembered" in which one sect has intermeddled with another – O no! You say:

"In the mutations of parties in this country, a new one has lately arisen, to which, I apprehend, more of the Methodist ministers have attached themselves, at least in the State of Tennessee, than might have been expected. This party, known as the Know Nothings, is so *peculiar* in its organization, that it seems strange to me that any minister or professor of religion should be willing longer to continue in it."

Your apprehensions are well-founded, when you suppose that a very large proportion of the Methodist ministers in Tennessee are either members of this new party or sympathize with it. And, sir, more of the ministers of other denominations than you seem to be aware of, have either attached themselves to this party, "in the mutations of parties," or act with it, and endorse its aims and objects, than you have yet dreamed of! And "it seems strange" to these ministers, and thousands of the purest and best laymen in the Protestant ranks, "that any minister or professor of religion should be willing longer" to oppose the principles of this party, or array themselves under the black flag of Papal Rome, and of the pauper emigrants with whom she is flooding our land! But, sir, the object of your Address is, to persuade if you can, and if not, *to drive*, by motives of fear, the Clergy of the Methodist Church from their position on this great American and Protestant question. Alas, how little does the "son of a sainted father" understand the material he attempts to work upon! Methodist ministers are free men, the equals of other moral and upright men in heroic virtues, and far in advance of that of politicians in Tennessee who believe parties in religion, as in politics, are only "held together by the cohesive power of public plunder," and who assume to direct public opinion from a principle, of which *selfishness* is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end! Sir, the violence, bitterness, and the very inflammatory tone, not to say language, of your Gallatin, Lebanon, and Columbia speeches, are enough, it seems to me, to *nauseate* every good and conservative citizen, and to disgust every "Bishop, Elder, and other Ministers, Itinerant and Local, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South." Even in this Address, you insult these ministers on every page. I see not how any preacher, with a true Protestant and American heart in him, can read this address of yours through, without rising up from his seat and saying: "I have voted with this Anti-Protestant and Anti-American party for the last time."

In warning Methodist ministers to withdraw their sanction and approbation of Know Nothingism, you say:

"I therefore call upon them this day to come out of these lodges, and never return to them: at all events, never return to them until all *secrecy*, all their bits of red paper, (indicating *blood*, even by the selection of color,) all their signs and signals, are utterly abolished and dispensed with. I call upon them to do this, and to do it forthwith – by their hopes of heaven – by their obedience to the word of God – by

their allegiance to the Constitution and laws of their country – to come out from any party which has adopted a mode and plan of organization so fatal to the peace of society, and the progress of true religion."

What egotism! *You* call upon them! You make a freer use of the personal pronoun *I*, than even old Parson Longstreet, the Know Nothing slayer of Mississippi. To parse your different sentences syntactically, nothing else is necessary but to understand the first person singular, and to repeat the rule. Not only your verbiage but your sentiment is thus egotistic throughout!

Your appeal to the ministers to come out of this organization, on the ground of its *secrecy*, is a species of demagoguism, the more disgusting when it is considered that you are a *Free Mason*, and have, by all the arts and blandishment of your nature, sought to induce ministers to go into that organization. But, then, there is no violation of law or the Constitution in *Masonry*– "fatal to the peace of society and to the progress of true religion" – no, nothing! Understand me: I am not opposed to Masonry.

On this subject of the Romish creed, which you excuse, and even *advocate*, you admit that there are "*alleged* abuses," which have prompted the Protestant Churches to unite themselves with this new Order! Then you insultingly tell these Churches this tale:

"But they ought to have remembered, that even a virtuous indignation can never justify *proscription and persecution*: these bring no remedy to the real or supposed evils, but are sure to increase and aggravate them. These errors in faith, and abominations in practice, if they really exist, were known to the Wesleys, and Cokes, and Asburys, who founded your Church: to the Lees, the Bruces, the Capers, the Logan Douglasses, the Summerfields, and the Bascoms, who subsequently extended and adorned it. But they never proposed to kindle, in this enlightened age of Christianity, the consuming fires of religious persecution."

Now, sir, every distinguished "founder" of the Methodist Church you have named, from Wesley to Bascom, has written and preached against the "errors in faith, and abominations in practice," of the Romish Church, and they each and all have taken this very ground upon the religious issues. I have heard *three* of these men preach, and I am familiar with the writings of the rest, and know whereof I speak.

You *intentionally* deceive and misrepresent the American party, when you charge that they seek to proscribe one class of our citizens – that they desire to interfere with the rights of conscience – and to say *how* men should worship God. Why don't you inform your readers that Archbishop Hughes, and other Catholic Bishops, were the first to introduce religion into political discussion in this country? This would not suit your purposes – it suits your objects, taste, and inclination better, to slander the American party by wholesale, and to charge upon its members the atrocities committed by your foreign and pauper allies. We only choose to vote against them, and to vote for American-born citizens and Protestants: which is as much our *right*, as it is the right of these foreign Catholics to vote against and proscribe American Protestants. For this, you and your villainous associates exhaust the whole vocabulary of Billingsgate upon the American party. What is their offence? Why, they simply place certain questions before persons desiring to act with them, which they think, at least, may affect the national welfare, and before the people of the Union, and ask their opinion of these questions at the ballot-box. The American party has always denied, and I again reiterate the denial, that we do, at all proscribe, or in any way interfere with, any class of our foreign citizens, save that we propose to send *convicts* from European prisons back to their own native and infamous dens, as fast as they land here – but these are not *citizens* of ours. I appeal to our Platform, and our Book of Constitutions, and I offer to any man a handsome reward – any man who will produce in either a statement containing the proscription you falsely charge against us. I now say, Gov. Brown, either do this, or cease your empty vapping against the *proscriptive* features of our system, as you are pleased

to style it. You declaim most lustily in favor of religious liberty for Catholics, which you know we do not propose as a party to interfere with; and this you plead for at the altar of Methodist "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers," who know there is no religious liberty for Protestants where Catholics have the power to prevent it! You plead in the most plaintive tones for the rights of foreign Catholics to be sworn into good citizens in less than *one year* after they land here, but do not seem to remember the American Protestant wives and children, who have to subsist on charity during our severe winters, in consequence of their husbands and fathers being elbowed out of employment by the competition of foreign pauper laborers!

Sir, the American party, if in power, would put a stop to that proscription from office that has always characterized the party with which you act, and which has made the present Administration so very and so justly odious to the country. Proscription, indeed! Was there ever such *glaring* and *actual* proscription for the sake of religious and political creeds committed as by the present Administration? The infamous Sag Nicht party with which you act, and of which you are a leader and a High Priest, though the "son of a now sainted father," has applied the political guillotine to almost every man in office who has dared to differ with them in their high estimate of foreign paupers and Catholic vagabonds, in many instances turning out native-born Protestants, and filling their places with foreign Catholics. And yet, with a degree of effrontery that throws the Devil far into the shade, you turn round and charge the American party with proscription, and ask the "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers," of the Methodist Church, "by their hopes of heaven – by their obedience to the word of God – and by their allegiance to the Constitution and laws of their country," to come out from a party so proscriptive! Why, sir, you out-Herod old Herod himself! Your teachings contrasted with your practice, would cause a crimsoned negative to settle on the cheeks of old Pilate! And still you are the "son of a now sainted father" – you "approve" the "creed" of Methodism, and have "witnessed its growth and prosperity for years, with the highest satisfaction!"

You quote from the Declaration of Independence, to show that toleration should be extended to Catholics and foreigners, and then insultingly add, as if you supposed no Methodist minister had ever perused the writings of Mr. Jefferson:

"These are the words of Mr. Jefferson, but the immortal sentiment springs directly from the word of the living and true God. No: persecution at the stake, or by exclusion of Catholics from office, is not the weapon to be wielded by the Protestant Churches."

You know that the notes of warning given to his countrymen by the sage of Monticello, and the great APOSTLE of American Democracy, are in harmony with the doctrines of the Know Nothing party. But you choose to conceal this fact from the "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers" of the Methodist Church, in the vain hope that their numerous pressing and official engagements will not allow them time to look up the documents. In Mr. Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, written in 1781, and published in 1794, pages 124-5, I find the following *Know Nothing doctrine*:

"But are there no inconveniences to be thrown into the scale against the advantage expected from a multiplication of numbers by the importation of foreigners? It is for the happiness of those united in society to harmonize, as much as possible, in matters which they must of necessity transact together. Civil government being the sole object of forming societies, its administration must be conducted by common consent. Every species of government has specific principles. Ours, perhaps, are more peculiar than those of any other in the universe. It is a composition of the freest principles of the English constitution, with others derived from natural right and natural reason. To these nothing can be more opposed than the maxims of absolute monarchs. Yet *from such we are to expect the greatest number of immigrants*. They will bring with them the *principles of the government they leave, imbibed in*

early youth: or, if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing, as is usual, from one extreme to another. It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty. These principles, with their language, they will transmit to their children. In proportion with their numbers, they will share with us the legislation. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp and bias its directions, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass. *I may appeal to experience during the present contest for a verification of these conjectures.* But if they be not certain in event, are they not possible? are they not probable? Is it not safer to wait with patience twenty-seven years and three months longer for the attainment of every degree of population desired or expected? May not our government be more homogeneous, more peaceable, more durable?"

Again, Mr. Jefferson, whilst our Minister to the Court of St. Cloud, addressed a letter to John Jay, dated November 14, 1788, in which he uses this language:

"With respect to the *Consular* appointments, it is a duty on me to add some observations, which my situation here has enabled me to make. I think it was in the spring of 1784, that Congress (harassed by multiplied applications from foreigners, of whom nothing was known but on their information, or on that of others as unknown as themselves) came to the resolution that the interest of America would not permit the naming of any person, not a citizen, to the office of Consul, or Agent, or Commissary. *Native citizens, on several valuable accounts, are preferable to aliens, or citizens alien-born.* Native citizens possess our language, know our laws, customs and commerce, have general acquaintance in the United States, give better satisfaction, *and are more to be relied on in a point of fidelity.* To avail ourselves of our native citizens, it appears to me advisable to *declare, by standing law,* that no person but a native citizen shall be capable of the office of Consul. This was the rule of 1784, restraining the office of Consul to native citizens."

In 1797, Mr. Jefferson drafted a petition to the Legislature of Virginia, on behalf of the citizens of Amherst, Albemarle, Fluvana, and Gouchland Bounties, in which he uses the following language:

"Your petitioners further submit to the two Houses of Assembly, whether the safety of the citizens of this Commonwealth, in their persons, their property, their laws and government, does not require that the capacity to act in the important office of *Juror, Grand or Petty, civil or criminal,* should not be restrained in future to native citizens, or such as were citizens at the date of the Treaty of Peace which closed our revolutionary war; and whether ignorance of our laws, and natural partiality to the countries of their birth, are not reasonable causes for declaring this to be one of their rights incommunicable in future to adopted citizens." —*Jefferson's Writings, Vol. IX., page 453.*

Now, Sir, answer me in candor, are you not ashamed of having quoted Mr. Jefferson, and of having so basely misrepresented his position on this great American question? Did not Mr. Jefferson propose to carry his opposition to foreigners much farther than the American party now do?

But, you vile old demagogue, though "son of a now sainted father," I am determined you shall not escape the indignant powers of those "Bishops, Elders, and other Ministers," whom you have wickedly sought to deceive. It is known to you, and to the world, in what veneration all American Democrats hold the Virginia Resolutions of 1798 and '99, and the fame of Mr. Madison, who was the ruling spirit of that session of the Legislature. That Legislature passed the following Resolution, which you may find by consulting Henning's Statutes at Large, Vol. 2, New Series, page 194:

"That the General Assembly, nevertheless, concurring in opinion with the Legislature of Massachusetts that every Constitutional barrier should be opposed to the introduction of foreign influence into our National Councils, —*Resolved*, That the Constitution ought to be so amended that *no foreigner, who shall have acquired the right, under our Constitution and laws, at the time of making the amendment, shall hereafter be eligible to the office of Senator or Representative*, in Congress of the United States, nor to *any office in the Judiciary or Executive*. Agreed to by the Senate, Jan. 16, 1799."

I shall next consider two extracts from your Address, under one general head, relating to the *temporal* power of the Pope. You say:

"But the genius of sophistry may fly to the rescue of Know-Nothingism, by pretending that it is not on account of *his religion* that the Catholic is to be excluded from office, but because he is subjected, not merely to the spiritual but the *temporal dominion* or jurisdiction of the Pope. No error has been wider spread than this."

Again:

"A late distinguished Senator from Georgia, (Mr. Berrien,) in a recent address to the public, has copied a letter of Mr. Wesley, which may require a few observations. That letter was dated in January, 1780. All its conclusions were founded on the assumed and popular opinion of that day, that the Pope *did* claim a civil jurisdiction beyond his own dominions – that he *could* absolve the subjects of other governments from their oaths of allegiance, and *that there was* a principle in one of the tenets of that Church, that Catholics were justified in not keeping faith with heretics. Against these assumed and popular opinions, the Catholics of England in that day, as they now do in this country, were solemnly protesting."

This is a modest way of giving Mr. Wesley the *lie*, but it is nevertheless quite *direct*, and is the more surprising, as it comes from the "son of a now sainted father," who was a follower of Wesley, a "co-laborer of that noble band of Christian ministers" he was instrumental in starting out into the world – aye, the son of a "father who, for forty years, ministered at the altars" this same Wesley erected! In holding up John Wesley as the *vile calumniator* of the Catholic Church in England, it is well enough, Governor, to be modest about it, and cautious in the selection of your words, as you are addressing a class of men who believe in John Wesley, as a faithful man of God, and one incapable of misrepresenting the Catholics of England, the Pope of Rome, or any other sect or individual! John Wesley ministered at the sacred altars of religion for more than sixty years; he had with him the power of God, and the witness that he pleased Him; and the last words he uttered, with his hands clasped, and his eyes raised toward heaven, were these: "*The best of all is, God is with us!*" And yet the sons and grandsons in the gospel, of this venerated and sainted man of God, are insulted in Tennessee, by being told by an *impertinent old sinner*, and a *vile old party hack*, that he was A LIAR, while living, and the *slanderer of the Catholic Church*, now that he is no more! If Mr. Wesley "*assumed*" falsehoods in reference to the Romish Church in England, he either did it in *ignorance*, or with a *guilty knowledge* of the fact. He was a man of too much learning and information for his friends to get him out of such an indictment under a plea of ignorance. He is therefore, though dead, a wilful liar, according to "Ex-Gov. A. V. Brown," for the Governor goes on to argue the cause against him, and, on page 19 of his address, quotes *Catholic* authority to *prove* him a liar! Shame on the "son of a now sainted father," and on the *holy seer of Pisgah*! O! Aaron, thou priest of corrupt Democracy, you need not endeavor to gull "bishops, elders, and other ministers," with your *whining cant*, while you thus traduce their great spiritual head, who, under God, taught them the lessons of salvation!

Gov. Brown, go with me, as one of the admirers of John Wesley, to the humble dwellings of the miners of Cornwall, to the homely tents of the colliers of Kingswood and Newcastle, and to the equally humble workshops of the manufacturers of Yorkshire, in England, who are rejoicing in God their Saviour that a Wesley was ever born into the world, and ask them if they believe him capable of slandering the Catholics! Go with me among the backwoodsmen of North America, and examine them in their lone tents – go among the honest and virtuous settlers on our Western frontiers, amid the interminable forests of the far off West, whose thousands are brought into the fold of Christ, through the instrumentality of Wesleyan ministers, and ask them if they think the founder of their Church was *a wilful liar!*

Go with me to the rich pastures and luxuriant harvest-fields of your own native Middle Tennessee: enter the neat cottages and stately mansions of that glorious division of our State, and ask the intelligent and educated females, who are rejoicing in God, in hope of future and eternal life, through the prayers and sermons of Wesleyan ministers, as instruments in the hands of God, if they believe the founder of their Church was *a wicked calumniator!* Go to the islands of the sea, to the burning sands of Africa, and ask the benighted converts from heathenism, through the instrumentality of Wesleyan ministers, if they believe the venerable founder of their Church was a man of truth!

Enter the dwellings of the rich and fashionable planters of the South – ride around their sugar and cotton plantations, among the sable sons and daughters of Africa, and witness the blessed fruits of the pious life, Christian integrity, and triumphant death of John Wesley! Come over to East Tennessee, Governor, and enter the log-cabins of the virtuous, happy peasantry of the "hill country," and ask them whether they believe Mr. Wesley or your Catholic authorities, touching the temporal power of the Pope of Rome!

Alas! Gov. Brown, the Reformation dawned with Luther in Germany, but the sun of its glory rose with Methodism in England; the first streaks of *Protestant* light were seen on the horizon of the sixteenth century, but the meridian sun of the Reformation dawned in all his brightness on the Wesleys and Whitefield! But America has been the land of the glory and triumph of the doctrines of the man you labor to convict of the awful sin of lying!

But you deny that the Pope of Rome, in *temporal* matters, claims what Mr. Wesley attributed to him in the letter copied by Senator Berrien. You also deny that the Popes claim and have exercised the right to interfere with matters of government, and the right to absolve their followers in other countries, and under other governments, from their allegiance to such rulers and governments. I will proceed to vindicate Mr. Wesley, and, by the proof, saddle the lie on you! Whilst John was King of England, he had the "Magna Charta," the great charter securing, among other things, the right of trial by jury, wrung from him at the point of the bayonet. This great charter was annulled by Pope Innocent. Here is the proof:

"While the king was employed in the siege of Rochester, he received the pleasing intelligence, that according to his request the charter had been annulled by the pontiff. Innocent, enumerating the grounds of his judgment, insists strongly on the violence employed by the barons. If they really felt themselves aggrieved, they ought, he observes, to have accepted the offer of redress by due course of law. They had preferred, however, to break the oath of fealty, which they had taken, and had appointed themselves judges to sit upon their lord. They knew, moreover, that John had enrolled himself among the crusaders; and yet they had not scrupled to violate the privileges which all Christian nations had granted to the champions of the cross. Lastly, England was become the fief of the holy see; and they could not be ignorant that if the king had the will, he had not at least the power, to give away the rights of the crown, without the consent of his feudal superior. He was therefore bound to annul the concessions which had been extorted from John, as having been obtained in contempt of the holy see, to the degradation of royalty, the disgrace of the nation,

and to the impediment of the crusade. At the same time he wrote to the barons, restating his reasons, exhorting them to submit, requesting them to lay their claims before him in the council to be held at Rome; and promising that he would induce the king to consent to whatever might be deemed just or reasonable, to take care that all grievances should be abolished, that the crown should be content with its just rights, and the clergy and people should enjoy their ancient liberties." —*Lingard's History of England*, vol. ii., page 71.

Will it be said that this was not interfering with *temporal* matters? Will it be said that the right of trial by jury was a *spiritual* matter? Will it be said that the tyranny of King John, and his oppressions, of which the barons justly complained, were *spiritual* matters? No sensible advocate of Romanism will say this!

The next instance of an interference by the Pope in temporal affairs, to which I shall call your attention, Governor, is his excommunication of Elizabeth, Queen of England. She was immediately preceded on that throne by her sister Mary, who was a Catholic. For no other reason than that Elizabeth was a *Protestant*, and would not submit her rights and kingdom to the control of the Pope, Pius V. thundered forth at her devoted head the following anathema, from his throne at the Vatican, situated at the foot of one of the seven hills upon which Rome is built:

EXCOMMUNICATION AND DEPOSITION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH OF ENGLAND

"Pius, etc., for a future memorial of the matter. He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and on earth, committed one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, *out of which there is no salvation*, to one alone upon the earth, Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Bishop of Rome, to be governed in *fulness of power*. Him alone he made prince over all people, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant and build, etc. But the number of the ungodly hath gotten such power, that there is now no place left in the whole world which they have not essayed to corrupt with their most wicked doctrines. Amongst others, Elizabeth, *the pretended Queen of England, a slave of wickedness*, lending thereunto her helping hand, with whom, as in a sanctuary, the most pernicious of all men have found a refuge; this very woman having seized upon the kingdom, and monstrously usurping the place of the supreme Head of the Church in all England, and the chief authority and jurisdiction thereof, hath again brought back the same kingdom to miserable destruction, which was then newly reduced to the faith, and to good order. For having by strong hand inhibited the true religion, which Mary, the lawful queen, of famous memory, had, by the help of this See, restored, after it had been formerly overthrown by King Henry VIII., a revolter therefrom, and following and embracing the errors of *heretics*, she hath removed the royal council, consisting of the English nobility, and filled it with obscure men, being heretics; hath oppressed the embracers of the Roman faith, hath placed impious preachers, ministers of iniquity, and abolished the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, distinction of meats, a single life, and the rites and ceremonies; hath commanded books to be read in the whole realm, containing manifest heresy, etc. She hath not only contemned the godly requests and admonitions of princes concerning her healing and conversion, but also hath not so much as permitted the Nuncios of the See to cross the seas into England, etc. We do, therefore, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being heretic, and

a favorer of heretics, and her adherents in the matter aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others which have in any sort sworn unto her, to be for ever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty or dominion, allegiance and obedience; as we also do, by the authority of these presents, absolve them, and do deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things aforesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every one of the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her admonitions, mandates, and laws; and those who shall do the contrary, we do innodate with the like sentence of ANATHEMA.

"Given at St. Peter's at Rome, in the year 1569, and the fifth of our pontificate." —*Dowling's History of Romanism*, p. 564.

One more: Sixtus V. thunders his bull of excommunication at this same Queen of England – incites Philip of Catholic Spain to make war against her country – and graciously *gives* the British Isles to Philip! Here is the bull of Pope Sixtus:

"We, Sixtus the Fifth, the universal shepherd of the flock of Christ, the supreme chief, to whom the government of the whole world appertains, considering that the people of England and Ireland, after having been so long celebrated for their virtues, their religion, and their submission to our see, have become putrid members, infected, and capable of corrupting the whole Christian body, and on account of their subjection to the impious, tyrannical, and sanguinary government of Elizabeth, the bastard queen, and by the influence of her adherents, who equal her in wickedness; and who refuse, like her, to recognize the power of the Roman Church: regarding that Henry VIII. formerly, for motives of debauchery, commenced all these disorders by revolting against the submission which he owed to the Pope, the sole and true sovereign of England; considering that the usurper Elizabeth has followed the path of this infamous king, we declare that there exists but one mode of remedying these evils, of restoring peace, tranquillity, and union to Christendom, of re-establishing religion, and of leading back the people to obedience to us, which is, to depose from the throne that execrable Elizabeth, who falsely arrogates to herself the title of Queen of the British Isles. Being then inspired by the Holy Spirit for the general good of the Church, we renew, by the virtue of our apostolic power, the sentence pronounced by our predecessor, Pius the Fifth and Gregory the Thirteenth, against the modern Jezebel: we proclaim her deprived of her royal authority, of the rights, titles, or pretensions to which she may lay claim over the kingdoms of Ireland and England, affirming that she possesses them unlawfully and by usurpation. We relieve all her subjects from the oaths they may have taken to her, and we prohibit them from rendering any kind of service to this execrable woman; it is our will, that she be driven from door to door like one possessed of a devil, and that all human aid be refused her; we declare, moreover, that foreigners or Englishmen are permitted, as a meritorious work, to seize the person of Elizabeth and surrender her, living or dead, to the tribunals of the inquisition. We promise to those who shall accomplish this glorious mission, infinite recompenses, not only in the life eternal, but even in this world. Finally, we grant plenary indulgence to the faithful who shall willingly unite with the Catholic army which is going to combat the impious Elizabeth, under the orders of our dear son Philip the Second, to whom we give the British Isles in

full sovereignty, as a recompense for the zeal he has always shown toward our see, and for the particular affection he has shown for the Catholics of the Low Country."
—*De Cormenin's History of the Popes*

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.

Текст предоставлен ООО «ЛитРес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на ЛитРес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.