

Lexington and Radkin Flag.

VOL. 1.

LEXINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1855.

NO. 18.

Lexington and Radkin Flag.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
JAMES B. SHELTON.
JAMES A. LONG, Editor.
Terms: \$2 a year, in advance;
\$2.50 after six months, and 3.00 after twelve
months, from date of subscription.

Rates of Advertising.
One dollar per square (fourteen lines) for the first
week, and twenty-five cents for every week there-
after. Deductions made in favor of standing ad-
vertisements as follows:

	3 MONTHS.	6 MONTHS.	1 YEAR.
One square,	\$3.50	\$6.50	\$8.00
Two squares,	7.00	13.00	14.00
Three (3 col.)	10.00	18.00	20.00
Half column,	18.00	25.00	25.00

Occasional renewals without additional charge
granted to those who advertise regularly through
the year.
Three dollars for announcing candidates for of-
fice.
Court orders charged 25 per cent higher than the
above rates. Orders for divorce of husband and
wife, \$10 each.
Persons sending advertisements are requested to
state the number of insertions required, or they will
be inserted until forbid; and if it is wished they
should occupy the least space possible, write upon
the back "close." Otherwise they will be put up
in the usual style and charged accordingly.
No discount on these rates.

**PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN
PARTY OF NORTH CAROLINA.**
At a Convention of the American party,
held at Raleigh, on the 10th of October,
1855, the following resolutions were adopted.

Resolved, That, as the causes which
rendered the secrecy of the American organiza-
tion necessary in its infancy, no longer
exist—all the secret ceremonies of the order
whether of initiation, obligations, signs,
constitutions, rituals, or passwords be abol-
ished—that we do constitute ourselves into a
publicly organized party—that we do chal-
lenge our opponents to the public discus-
sion of our principles—and we do hereby
invite and invoke the aid and co-operation
of all the citizens of the State, without re-
gard to their former political affiliations, in
maintaining and carrying out the great aims
principles and objects of the American party.

Resolved, That we do hereby ratify and
endorse the principles enunciated in the
platform of the American party, by the
National Council of the same, begun and
held at Philadelphia, on the 5th day of June,
1855, in relation to the political policy of
the Government—whilst at the same time,
we consider the three great primary prin-
ciples of the organization, which constitute
the basis of our party, as paramount in im-
portance to any issues of mere governmental
policy.

Resolved, That these three great primary
principles are, first, the confinement of the
honors, offices and responsibilities of political
station, under our government, to native-
born Americans, with a due regard, at the
same time, to the protection of the fore-
ign-born in all the civil rights and privileges
guaranteed to freemen by the constitution,
whether Federal or State.

Secondly, Resistance to religious intoler-
ance, and a rigid maintenance of the great
principle of religious freedom—by excluding
from office and power, those who would
persecute for opinion's sake, who would
control the politics of the country through
Church influences or priestly interference;
and who acknowledge an allegiance to any
power on earth, whether civil or ecclesi-
astical, as paramount to that which they owe
to the Constitution.

And, Thirdly, unwavering devotion to the
Union of these States, and resistance to all
factional and sectional attempts to weaken
its bonds.

Resolved, That in all nominations for po-
litical station here after to be made by the
American Party, it is recommended that
the same be done in open public meeting—and
that all those who agree with us in principle,
and who concur in our aims and objects,
shall hereafter be recognized as members of
the American party.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the
American Party in this State to hold a Con-
vention of delegates, to be appointed in pub-
lic primary meetings in the respective coun-
ties, in Greensboro, on Thursday the 10th
day of April next, for the purpose of nomi-
nating a candidate to be run by the Amer-
ican party for Governor at the next election
—that each county appoint as many Dele-
gates as it chooses, and that the mode of
voting in said convention be regulated by
the convention itself.

Resolved, That we consider the 22d day
of February next—the time heretofore se-
lected by the National Council of the Amer-
ican order, for the nomination of candidates
for President and Vice-President, as too
early a day for that purpose, and we do
hereby recommend to our brethren of the
American party throughout the Union, the
propriety of postponing the holding of said
convention, to some time in the month of
June or July.

Resolved, However, least such postpone-
ment may not take place, it is deemed ad-
visable to appoint two delegates to represent
the State at large in such nominating Con-
vention—and it is recommended to the A-
merican party in each Congressional Dis-
trict to hold primary meetings in the respec-
tive counties, and appoint delegates to Dis-
trict Conventions, for the selection of a
delegate from each respective District to
said nominating Convention.

Resolved, That an Executive Cen-
tral Committee of five, be appointed by this body
whose duty it shall be to attend to the
general concerns of the American party in
this State, to carry on the necessary cor-
respondence, and take such necessary steps

as may be deemed necessary for the more
thorough organization of the said executive
committee be authorized and requested to
appoint a County Executive Committee for
each County in the State; and that said
County Executive Committee do further ap-
point a sub-committee for each election pre-
cinct in the county, with a view to a more
thorough and complete organization of the
American party in North Carolina.

**Letter from Colonel Clemens to
General Cass.—No. 2.**
HUNTSVILLE, ALA., Oct. 3, 1855.

DEAR SIR: Other engagements have pre-
vented me from continuing, at an earlier
date, my reply to your anti-American letter.
If in that reply I should at any time use
plain language, I beg you to believe that it
results from no diminution of my regard for
you as a man, or the high estimate I have
always placed upon your abilities as a states-
man. It would be very difficult for me to
address you in any but a kindly spirit.—
These are not times, however, nor is this a
subject, upon which to suppress the utter-
ance of honest sentiments. You, sir, more
than any other man in this republic, are ac-
countable for whatever fate awaits us; be-
cause your influence is wider, your capaci-
ty less questioned, and your character less
accessible to reproach. To your country
you occupy the position of the watchman
mentioned in Ezekiel, and according to the
manner in which the duty of a watchman is
discharged will be your reward or your re-
sponsibility.

"If, when he seeth the sword come upon
the land, he blow the trumpet and warn the
people, then whosoever heareth the sound of
the trumpet, and taketh not warning, if the
sword come, and take him away, his blood
shall be upon his own head.
"But if the watchman see the sword come,
and blow not the trumpet, and the people be
not warned, if the sword come and take any
person from among them, he is taken away
in his iniquity, but his blood will I require
at the watchman's hands."
If, in what I have written, or may write,
I succeed in impressing upon you the great
importance of giving the American move-
ment an honest and careful examination, I
shall not have labored in vain. I have, in-
deed, other objects, and chief among these
is that of refuting unfounded charges, and
repelling unjust assaillments.

In the list of your charges against the
American party is that of "proscription." The
word was no doubt used without reflec-
tion, for you could not have intended to
make the vile accusation its literal meaning
covers. To proscribe means "to censure
capitally—to doom to destruction." It is
something worse than to persecute, and it
would pain me to believe that you could so
forget what is due to truth and common
sense as to make such an allegation against
so considerable a number of your country-
men. It is false even in the sense in which
you intend to employ it. You have been
practising all your life that very same pro-
scription. For fifty years you have called
it patriotism, and I must protest against any
change of name at the present day. I doubt
if you ever voted for a Whig in your life.
I am very sure that you have often voted
for a Democrat when you knew his Whig
competitor was, in all respects, his superior
as a man. Unless you have been more for-
tunate than I have been, you have some-
times voted for a Democratic nominee a-
gainst an independent Democratic candidate,
whom you knew to be his superior. In the
exercise of your rights as a citizen, you pro-
scribed (pardon the use of your own word,) the
whole Whig party, you proscribed that
portion of your own party who would not
submit to caucus dictation. As a Senator of
the United States you assisted in excluding
Abolition members of the same body from
a place on any of its committees; and now,
sir, will you tell me in what respect you are
less liable to the charge of proscription than
I am? I say that I will not vote for a for-
eigner or a Catholic. You say that you will
not vote for a Whig, or a Democrat who
runs against the party nominee; and that
you will not let an Abolitionist serve on a
committee. I have heard it said, "oh yes,
you can vote as you please, you may vote
against a foreigner just as well as against an
Abolitionist, but it is very improper to form
combinations to exclude foreigners from of-
fice."

I have no particular objection to such
reasoning when it comes from some half-
fledged lawyer who knows no more of his
profession as a science, than he does of vol-
canoes in the moon, and who has only a
vague idea that somewhere in the law com-
binations are declared illegal, but when a
man of fair ability utters such things the
conclusion is inevitable that he has very lit-
tle respect for the intelligence of his hearers.
It is impossible for a political party to ex-
ist without combination. All the objects of
a party are effected, through combinations.
You combined with Madison, Monroe,
Jackson, Van Buren, Polk and Pierce—ex-
cuse me for mentioning the last—as I did
the same thing I hope you will acquit me
of malice in the allusion. That man will con-
fer a favor I shall not soon forget who con-
vinces me that it is not just as fair to com-
bine for the purpose of excluding foreigners
from office, as it is for the purpose of ex-
cluding Whigs or rebellious Democrats. You
contented yourself with assertion and made
no attempt at proof. It is well for your re-
putation that you did so. Many persons will
believe what you say without putting them-
selves to the trouble of examination; where-
as, if you had attempted an argument you
would certainly have exposed to the most
indifferent inquirer the weakness of your
position. No learning, and no ingenuity
could have saved you from a mortifying
failure.

You acknowledge and act upon the prin-
ciple that it is right to exclude Mr. Garrison

and his disciples from every office under
the government down to the fourth militia,
because they subscribe to the atrocious sen-
timent that "the Constitution of the United
States is a covenant with death, and an
agreement with Hell."
I claim that it is right to exclude from of-
fice those members of the Catholic church
who deny the supremacy of the constitution,
and acknowledge the power of the Pope to
release them from all obligation to support
it.
You refuse to support a Whig because you
believe his construction of the powers of
Congress under the constitution erroneous.
I refuse to support a foreigner because
(among other things) not one in five thou-
sand has ever read the constitution, and not
one in fifty thousand understands its pro-
visions.
Now, sir, this is an exact statement of
your position and of mine. Both of us,
doubtless, can give many other reasons for
the faith that is in us; but this is the ground-
work upon which the whole superstructure
is reared. If yours is the offspring of patri-
otic devotion to liberty and the constitution,
by what magic does mine become "intoler-
ance," "proscription," and reckless disre-
gard of constitutional duty? It is true you
do not assert that there is anything uncon-
stitutional in the American platform. Your
position is too high, and you could not af-
ford so to trifle with your reputation; but
you give to others with fewer scruples, and
less to lose, the sanction of your silence.—
As long as your opponents confided them-
selves to general denunciations of the Amer-
ican Order as unconstitutional, they got along
smoothly enough. Some people took it for
granted they knew what they were saying,
and believed them. But specifications are
dangerous things when error is to be sus-
tained. Two clauses are relied upon; the
first is—
"But no religious test shall ever be re-
quired as a qualification for any office or
public trust under the United States."
This clause relates entirely to the oath
which must be taken by the public officers.
It places no restriction upon the voter—im-
poses no obligation. The Legislature is de-
nied the right of requiring any religious oath
from an officer after his election by the
people, but the people themselves retain
unlimited discretion, and it is entirely with
them to decide whether a man's religious
opinions shall be any bar to his advance-
ment. This relates to elections by the peo-
ple. The whole Congress cannot require
any test oath which the constituency of the
officer did not require, but in Executive ap-
pointments it is different. The State alone
can reject his nominees, for their religious
opinions, as well as for any other cause,
which, in their judgment renders the nomi-
nations improper. Under the Constitution
the people have the unqualified right to re-
ject any candidate for their suffrages on ac-
count of his religion. The State has the
unqualified right to reject any nomination
sent to them by the President, on account
of the religion of the nominee. We propose
as voters to exercise the right which is se-
cured to us, and we desire the election of
Senators who will exercise the right which
belongs to them. That is all. We are sat-
isfied with the constitution as it is, and
propose no change. The other clause is:
"That Congress shall make no law re-
specting an establishment of religion, or pro-
hibiting the free exercise thereof."
There is scarcely a clause in the consti-
tution with which a Know Nothing would
be more unwilling to part than the very one
which is thus quoted against us. One of
the chief objections to Catholicism is to be
found in its constant struggles to connect
itself with the State. Every other denomi-
nation of Christians look upon all connex-
ion with the government as fatal to the
best interests of Religion. In that Church
alone, a restless longing for power, an insat-
iable thirst for persecution and blood, in-
duces unremitting efforts to obtain posses-
sion of the temporal sword. In guarding a-
gainst that danger, in seeking to keep the
stains of earth far away from the emine of
the Christian Church, the first amendment
to the constitution is an auxiliary no Amer-
ican wishes to lose. The Catholic may
perform the exercise of religion on the pub-
lic highways, or in the market-places, if he
pleases; he may celebrate mass at mid-day
or at mid-night; he may nail a saint or two
over his door, or collect a dozen holy relics
in his cabinet, and no one will interpose
an objection. The American party make no
war upon the Catholic to prevent the free
exercise of his religion, but to prevent the
possibility of his interfering with the free
exercise of our own. Men who have de-
clared that it is unconstitutional to permit
the Bible to be studied in schools, have no
further scruples to overcome before declar-
ing it unconstitutional to attend any but a
Catholic church. When other arguments
fail, it is customary to resort to weak at-
tempts to ridicule the fear of danger from
Catholic influence; and in order to make
this effectual, the census statistics are very
unscrupulously perverted. According to
that document, the Baptists provide church
accommodations for 3,247,028, the Methodists
for 4,333,759, while the Catholics provide
accommodations for only 667,082.

The reason of this disparity is plain.
The Baptists and Methodists do not build
churches for themselves alone; every
church will hold more than double as many
worshippers as actually belong to the church.
Their houses are scattered all over the
country, and the whole neighborhood,
whether they belong to any church or not
are welcomed when they come.

The Catholic Catholics, on the other
hand, are put up on a scale of such regal
magnificence that it is only in the cities
and large towns they can afford to build at
all. They have not yet the right to tax us
for building churches for them, and the con-
sequence is, that such a thing as a Catho-

lic church in the country is never heard of.
They cannot afford to worship God in the
plain, unassuming edifices with which other
denominations have dotted the land.
They seem to estimate the value of prayer
according to the splendor of the temple
from which it ascends, and to fear that log
cabin supplications would never reach the
ears of Saint Peter. Their church accom-
modations, therefore, afford no rule by which
to estimate the number of members. The
actual number of members in the three
Churches is as follows: Baptist, including
eight different sects, 982,003; Methodists,
including four different sects, 1,779,526;
while the Catholics rise to 1,778,700, ac-
cording to the Baptist almanac, or 1,334-
500, according to another estimate made by
the superintendent of the census. This was
in 1850. In 1852, Archbishop Hughes
gave it as his opinion that there were not
less than 3,500,000 Catholics in the United
States, and added—"Emigration has no
doubt contributed much" to this result. Since
1850, the immigration has been immen-
se, and at this day I have little doubt
the Archbishop's estimate is far below the
truth. It must be remembered, also, that
there are no sects, no schisms amongst them.
They have a common object—they obey a
common head.

In all that relates to the advancement of
the church, they have no scruples, no re-
straints, and their capacity for mischief is
thus increased many fold beyond their actu-
al numbers. Yet we are admonished to let
this church alone—to permit it to go on in-
creasing, without opposition, at this fearful
rate. Even Christian ministers have en-
tered the political arena and warned us that
persecution will give it new vitality. The
serpent is among us.—We see it glow day
by day, we watch its scales harden, and
still we must not touch it for fear persecu-
tion will strengthen it. This is one of
those popular errors which have been ac-
cepted from generation to generation, be-
cause no one thought of sufficient impor-
tance to expose it. It is not only false, it is
a libel upon the Protestant faith, and the
American character. It presupposes two
things repugnant alike to the understanding
and the heart. It supposes the Catholic to
be the true religion, and applies to it the
maxim "that the blood of the martyrs is
the seed of the church." The great reformer
Knox held no such opinion, stern, sin-
cere, fearless, unswayed by power, un-
seduced by flattery, he denounced with equal
severity the magistrate who tolerated, and the
citizen who practiced Romish superstitions.
John Wesley was not behind him. The
following extract from one of his letters
speaks for itself. The disciples of the
school he founded would do well to refer to
his writings a little more frequently than
many of them appear to have done:

"Again those who acknowledge the spir-
itual 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 pardon for sins
—present, past and to come—is, and has
been for many centuries, one branch of his
spiritual power. But those who acknowl-
edge him to have this spiritual power can
give no security for their allegiance, since
they believe that the Pope can pardon re-
bellion, high treason and all other sins
whatsoever. The power of dispensing
with any promise, oath, or vow, is another
branch of the spiritual power of the Pope,
and all who acknowledge his spiritual
power must acknowledge this. But who
ever acknowledges the dispensing power of
the Pope can give no security for his allegi-
ance to any government. Oaths and prom-
ises are gone: they are light as air—a dis-
pensation 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 acknowl-
edge this cannot possibly give any allegi-
ance to any government. Oaths are no se-
curity 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 their
government for their allegiance and peace-
able 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 priestly absolution or the
spiritual power of the Pope.
"If any one pleases to answer this, and
sign his name I shall probably reply. But
the productions of any anonymous writers I
do not promise to take any notice of."
I am, sir, your humble servant,
JOHN WESLEY.

"City Road, January 27, 1780."
Knox and Wesley were right. Persecu-
tion (if you call it by that name) never aid-
ed a bad cause. Henry VIII crushed the
power of the Pope in England with scarce-
ly an effort. Bloody Mary revived it.—
When Elizabeth ascended the throne, she
laughed at his Interdicts, and her subjects
followed her example. The law made and
remade Catholicism at pleasure. Ireland
is no exception. There indeed they clung
to the national faith with more tenacity than
elsewhere. But it must be remembered that
the laws to suppress it were not Irish laws.
The priest found his most efficient ally in
the universal hatred of the oppressor. If
their own parliament, unfettered by Eng-
land, had enacted the same statutes, they
would have been received without question,
and enforced without difficulty. Even as
it was, however hateful the source from
which the law sprung, it did much to erip-
ple the cause of Rome. Before England
changed her policy and passed what is called
the "Emanicipation Act," there were
but seventeen Jesuits in Ireland. Since
that act of toleration the number has swell-

ed to four hundred. A fact so full of mean-
ing ought not to be overlooked, and cannot
be misunderstood.
"Another objection to this Popish argu-
ment against persecution is, that it assumes
the depravity of the American people. It
says in so many words that they are ready
to prove recalcant to Heaven if it will ad-
vance a party purpose—that because one
party assails a religion which they believe
to be false and blasphemous, the other
party although equally opposed to it, will
encourage and defend it, in order to prevent
a party injury to themselves, or to inflict
one upon their opponents. I think better
of my countrymen—I hope they think bet-
ter of themselves, and that they will repu-
diate the leaders who, by the use of such
arguments plainly show how low is the es-
timate they place upon popular intelligence,
and popular virtue. If all are not profess-
ing Christians—if many have grievous sins
to atone, there are yet none I trust without
the hope of redemption through the Saviour.
Blot out that hope, and existence becomes
rayless and cheerless. Every flower loses
its perfume, and every star that gems the
Heavens speaks only of eternal torture.—
To barter it away, and for less than a mess
of pottage, is a folly too wild, a sin too in-
expiable to command my belief upon any
human evidence.

Your late letter, General, reminded me of
the course of the school boy, who getting
his lesson skipped the hard places. Allow
me to say, without the least disrespect, that
you did a good deal of skipping. Among
other hard places, was the claim of tempo-
ral power on the part of the Pope. You
could not deny, and you would not admit.
The denial of any such claim on the part
of the Pope was, I think, first made by Mr.
Chandler, in the House of Representatives,
and you recollect the kind of proof he ad-
duced to sustain him. The Catholic cause
was on trial before the Parliament of
Britain, and the Church furnished the evi-
dence for itself. There would be little need
for our criminal courts, if the offender's own
statement was sufficient to justify acquittal.
I prefer to rely upon testimony of a less
equivocal character.

For the first six centuries after the death
of the humble fisherman whom the Popes
profess to take as their model, and the foun-
der of the Church, they made but little pre-
tension to temporal power. But as time
wore on, corruption after corruption and
error after error crept in. They forgot that
Peter himself was a married man, and or-
dained celibacy for the clergy. They forgot
that he travelled about on his mission
in threadbare garments, with his coat off,
and clothed himself "in purple and fine
linen." They forgot his continence, and sur-
rounded themselves with courtizans. They
forgot the humility which induced them to
pray that he might be crucified with his
head downwards, to avoid an appearance,
even in death, of equality with his Lord,
and boldly claimed that they occupied the
place "of the true God." The assertion
of temporal consequence of that claim, and
it has been exercised for a thousand years.
"Pope John VIII obliged Charles the Bald
to confess that he held his empire by the
gift of the Pope." Pope Benedict VIII ex-
acted a like pledge from Henry, Emperor of
Germany, as also promise to obey him "in
everything." "Pope Nicholas" gave Capua
to Richard Guiscard and his brother Robert
all the lands he might conquer in Sicily,
Apulia, and Calabria." Alexander II pro-
claimed William the Bastard rightful King
of England, and sent him a hair from the
head of St. Peter in a Diamond ring.—
Gregory VII excommunicated the Emperor
of Germany, and absolved his subjects from
their allegiance. Alexander III forced
Frederick to hold his stirrup while mount-
ing his horse. Innocent III deposed King
John of England for confiscating the prop-
erty of the clergy, and imprisoning their
conclaves. Henry VIII of England and
Queen Elizabeth were also excommunicated,
and their subjects absolved from their
oaths of fidelity. In 1801, a papal bull was
issued against Bonaparte, and another a-
gainst Switzerland. In 1855, a like bull
has been thundered against the King of Sar-
dinia.

These are but a few cases, selected from
the mass of material at hand, many more
might be given, but more is not needed.—
It is a maxim of the church never to give
up the slightest of its claims—to be silent
when silence is expedient, but never to lose
opportunities. In our own land, such was
the policy for years, but rapidly accumu-
lating numbers have given their organs a
tone of conscious power, and they now
speak out boldly in defence of opposition.
The following extracts are taken mainly
from "The American Text Book." They
have not been denied, and cannot be.
Brownson's Review says:
"Let us dare to assert the truth in the
face of the dying world, and instead of
pleading for our Church at the bar of the
State, summon the State itself to plead at
the bar of the Church, its divinely constituted
judge."
The Rambler says:
"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 en-
tirely depend on circumstances. If it would
benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would
tolerate you—if expedient, he would im-
prison 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."
The Boston Pilot has uttered this Church
and State sentiment:
"No good government can exist without
religion, and there can be no religion with-
out an inquisition, which is wisely design-
ed for the promotion and protection of the
true faith."

Mr. Brownson also asserts that the spir-
itual order is supreme "and temporal sov-
ereigns are subjected to it, and to the Pope
as its supreme visible chief."
Again:
"Is the Church dependent upon and re-
sponsible to public opinion, and therefore is
nothing superior to an ordinary Protestant
sect? We own we had thought it the of-
fice of the Church not to learn from public
opinion, but to instruct and form it—not to
be judged by it, but to judge it—not to con-
form to the maxims of the age, but to lead
all her powers to make the age conform to
her maxims."
"Kings and lords, magistrates and rulers,
sovereigns and subjects, are under it (the
Church) in all things—alike in things tem-
poral and in things spiritual. Who de-
nies this, denies not merely the sovereign
opinion, BUT THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION ITSELF."
Brownson's Review again says:
"Whenever the occasion occurred, the
Church asserted her power, not in empty
words only, but in deeds, to judge sov-
ereigns, kings, and Caesars, to bestow or to
take away crowns, to depose ungodly rulers,
and to absolve their subjects from their oath
of allegiance."
So much for American authority. Let us
see what Daniel O'Connell says:
"I declare my most unqualified submis-
sion to the head of the Church, and to the
hierarchy in its different orders. If the
Bishops would make a declaration on this
bill, I never would be heard speaking against
it. They have only to decide, and they
close my mouth; they have only to deter-
mine, and I obey.—I wish it to be un-
derstood that such is the duty of all Catho-
lics."
It is needless to pile authority upon
authority to prove an assumption of power so
notorious. Mr. Brownson was recently ap-
pealed to by some gentleman in North Car-
olina, probably in the expectation that he
would deny the interpretation put upon his
former writings. I do not propose to fol-
low him through all the involved and com-
plicated reasoning of his reply. The letter
has been widely published, and is accessi-
ble to every one. His conclusion is all that
is important:
"The Pope is the proper authority to de-
cide for me whether the Constitution of this
country is or is not repugnant to the laws of
God."
This was Mr. Brownson's opinion on the
12th of June, 1855, and there I leave him
for the present.

That there are American Catholics who
deny the temporal power of the Pope I
know. But they are not Catholics in his
acceptation of the word. In Spain or Italy
they would be punished as heretics. He
recognizes no divided allegiance—tolerates
no freedom of conscience—and permits no
departure from the orthodox faith. If his
power was once established in this country
they would be in as much danger of the
rack as you or I. The iron boot and red
hot grate would be prepared for all alike.
To you, Sir, I need offer no proofs of the
intolerance of the Roman Church. It has
been the subject of more than one of your
speeches in the Senate; but this letter is
not intended for your eye alone. If read
nowhere else it will be my own friends
and neighbors, and I therefore propose to in-
troduce such testimony as time and space will
allow. I will now go back to "Black St.
Bartolomew's day," and the wholesale
butchery of Protestants, which have stam-
ped it as infamous for all coming time. I
will not dwell upon the fact that the Pope
himself pronounced the eulogy of the assas-
sins of Henry III. Nor recount the history
of the times when infants were tossed into
the flames which were roasting their par-
ents at the stake. There is enough of mod-
ern date for my purpose, and it cannot be
met by saying, that, with the superstition
of by-gone ages, has passed away the old,
relentless cruelty which blackens the an-
nals of the church:
"The absurd idea of roving in defence
of liberty of conscience, is a most portentous
error—a test of all others most to be dreaded
in a State."—Encyclical letter of Pope Pi-
us IX. Aug. 15, 1852.

The Roman Catholic Bishop of St. Louis
says:
"Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in
Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain,
for instance, where all the people are Catho-
lic, and where the Catholic religion is an
essential part of the land, they are punished
as other crimes."
The St. Louis Shepherd of the Valley
says:
"The Church is, of necessity, intolerant.
Heresy 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."
Brownson's Review of October, 1852,
says:
"The liberty of heresy and unbelief is not
a natural right, all the rights the sects have
or can have are derived from the State, and
rest on expediency. As they have, in their
character of sects hostile to the true religion,
no rights under the law of nature or under
the law of God, they are neither wronged
nor deprived of liberty if the State refuses
to grant them any rights at all."
Again, it says, October, 1851:
"The worst sight to us, is a catholic
throwing up his cap and shouting 'all hail
Democracy!'"
I must again refer to the authority of the
great Irish Agitator:
"You should do all in your power to en-
force the intentions of his Holiness the
Pope. When you have the electory fran-
chise, give your votes to none but those who
will assist you in so holy a struggle."
(CONCLUDED IN OUR NEXT)

Mr. Brownson also asserts that the spir-
itual order is supreme "and temporal sov-
ereigns are subjected to it, and to the Pope
as its supreme visible chief."
Again:
"Is the Church dependent upon and re-
sponsible to public opinion, and therefore is
nothing superior to an ordinary Protestant
sect? We own we had thought it the of-
fice of the Church not to learn from public
opinion, but to instruct and form it—not to
be judged by it, but to judge it—not to con-
form to the maxims of the age, but to lead
all her powers to make the age conform to
her maxims."
"Kings and lords, magistrates and rulers,
sovereigns and subjects, are under it (the
Church) in all things—alike in things tem-
poral and in things spiritual. Who de-
nies this, denies not merely the sovereign
opinion, BUT THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION ITSELF."
Brownson's Review again says:
"Whenever the occasion occurred, the
Church asserted her power, not in empty
words only, but in deeds, to judge sov-
ereigns, kings, and Caesars, to bestow or to
take away crowns, to depose ungodly rulers,
and to absolve their subjects from their oath
of allegiance."
So much for American authority. Let us
see what Daniel O'Connell says:
"I declare my most unqualified submis-
sion to the head of the Church, and to the
hierarchy in its different orders. If the
Bishops would make a declaration on this
bill, I never would be heard speaking against
it. They have only to decide, and they
close my mouth; they have only to deter-
mine, and I obey.—I wish it to be un-
derstood that such is the duty of all Catho-
lics."
It is needless to pile authority upon
authority to prove an assumption of power so
notorious. Mr. Brownson was recently ap-
pealed to by some gentleman in North Car-
olina, probably in the expectation that he
would deny the interpretation put upon his
former writings. I do not propose to fol-
low him through all the involved and com-
plicated reasoning of his reply. The letter
has been widely published, and is accessi-
ble to every one. His conclusion is all that
is important:
"The Pope is the proper authority to de-
cide for me whether the Constitution of this
country is or is not repugnant to the laws of
God."
This was Mr. Brownson's opinion on the
12th of June, 1855, and there I leave him
for the present.

That there are American Catholics who
deny the temporal power of the Pope I
know. But they are not Catholics in his
acceptation of the word. In Spain or Italy
they would be punished as heretics. He
recognizes no divided allegiance—tolerates
no freedom of conscience—and permits no
departure from the orthodox faith. If his
power was once established in this country
they would be in as much danger of the
rack as you or I. The iron boot and red
hot grate would be prepared for all alike.
To you, Sir, I need offer no proofs of the
intolerance of the Roman Church. It has
been the subject of more than one of your
speeches in the Senate; but this letter is
not intended for your eye alone. If read
nowhere else it will be my own friends
and neighbors, and I therefore propose to in-
troduce such testimony as time and space will
allow. I will now go back to "Black St.
Bartolomew's day," and the wholesale
butchery of Protestants, which have stam-
ped it as infamous for all coming time. I
will not dwell upon the fact that the Pope
himself pronounced the eulogy of the assas-
sins of Henry III. Nor recount the history
of the times when infants were tossed into
the flames which were roasting their par-
ents at the stake. There is enough of mod-
ern date for my purpose, and it cannot be
met by saying, that, with the superstition
of by-gone ages, has passed away the old,
relentless cruelty which blackens the an-
nals of the church:
"The absurd idea of roving in defence
of liberty of conscience, is a most portentous
error—a test of all others most to be dreaded
in a State."—Encyclical letter of Pope Pi-
us IX. Aug. 15, 1852.

The Roman Catholic Bishop of St. Louis
says:
"Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in
Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain,
for instance, where all the people are Catho-
lic, and where the Catholic religion is an
essential part of the land, they are punished
as other crimes."
The St. Louis Shepherd of the Valley
says:
"The Church is, of necessity, intolerant.
Heresy 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