msa_sc2901_scm2354-0152 ©Maryland State Archives

The Kent News.

DEVOTED TO AGRICULTURE, POLITICS, GENERAL NEWS, &c.

Vol. 16. CHESTER TOWN, MD., SEPTEMBER 8, 1855. No. 19.

THE KENT NEWS,

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

Devoted to Agriculture, Literature, Politics, and General News.

EDWARD MANSFIELD,

PROPRIETOR.

TERMS:

$1.50 payable in advance—$2 at the expiration of the first six months, or $2.50 at the end of the year. To CLUBS—5 copies for $6—10 copies for $10. No subscription received for a shorter period than six months, and no paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid.

Single papers 5 cents.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

Advertisements not exceeding ten lines will be inserted three times for $1 and 25 cts. for every insertion thereafter—larger ones in proportion. A liberal deduction made to yearly advertisers. Advertisements must have the number of times marked, or they will be published till forbid and charged accordingly.

SPECIAL NOTICES.—All Communications of a personal nature will be charged for at the rates of fifty cents a square for the first insertion, and twenty-five cents for every subsequent insertion.

Obituary notices, when they exceed six lines, will be charged at the rate of fifty cents a square.

Proceedings of public meetings, except those of a religious or charitable nature, will be charged for at the usual rates, those handing them in will be held responsible.

POETRY.

TELL ME, YE WINGED-WINDS.

BY CHARLES MACKEY.

Tell me ye winged winds,
That round my pathway roar,
Do you not know some spot
Where mortals weep no more?
Some lone and pleasant dell,
Some valley in the West,
Where, free from toil and pain,
The weary soul may rest?
The loud wind softened to a whisper low,
And sighed for pity as it answered—"No!"

Tell me, thou mighty deep,
Whose billows round me play,
Know'st thou some favored spot,
Some island far away,
Where weary man may find
The bliss for which he sighs,
Where sorrow never lives
And friendship never dies?
The loud waves rolling in perpetual flow,
Stopped for awhile, and sighed to answert 'No!'

And thou serenest moon,
That with such holy face
Dost look upon the earth,
Asleep in night's embrace,
Tell me, in all thy round
Hast thou not seen some spot,
Where miserable man
Might find a happier lot?
Behind a cloud the moon withdrew in wo,
And a voice sweet but sad, responded—"No!"

Tell me, my secret soul,
Oh! tell me, Hope and Faith,
Is there no resting place
From sorrow, sin and death?
Is there no happy spot,
Where mortals may be blessed,
Where grief may find a balm,
And weariness a rest?
Faith, Hope, and Love—best boons to mortals given,
Waved their bright wings, and whispered—
"*Yes, in Heaven!*"

POLITICAL.

For the Kent News.

MR. EDITOR:—In looking over the last production of your erratic contributor, I perceive that he has pitched into Prof. F. B. Morse, of New York, charging him with perpetrating a forgery, in giving circulation to a sentiment, which for more than a quarter of a century, has been attributed to Lafayette—"If ever the liberties of this country are destroyed they will be by Romish Priests." "The orator" says "that the forgery was started last fall by Prof. Morse and was fully exposed by Bishop Spalding in one of the most able letters ever published in this country." In making such an assertion, "the orator" shows almost inexcusable ignorance, as for the last twenty years the sentiment has been widely diffused, its paternity incontestably established, and it has been stereotyped as an historical fact.

In regard to the letter of Bishop Spalding being "one of the most able ever ever published in this country," the writer of this would say, that it may appear so to those who only view one side of a question. It is one of the "old school"—more suitable to the age of the "Inquisition" than the present—abounding in gratuitous assertions, hypothetical reasoning and *negative* conclusions, the true elements of papal logic. There is no *positive* ability displayed in the letter; it is all *negative*.

In answer to "one of the ablest letters ever published" I will let Prof. Morse speak for himself. Enclosed you will find his reply, which is a most masterly vindication of himself and a most complete annihilation of Bishop Spalding.

Prof. Morse needs no eulogy from the hands of any one. His moral worth and high-toned patriotism endear him to every American heart and render ridiculous the impotent charges of social scavengers and pusillanimous politicians, who would destroy that greatness, which they are incapable of appreciating.

The charge is, therefore, unworthy the notice of any one acquainted with Prof. Morse, and deserving only of contempt—the momentum of the accusation is lost in the insignificance of the accuser.

I deem the writing of this communication a work of supererogation; and only do it for the purpose of correcting any erroneous impressions which may have been made upon those who are unacquainted with his character; for it is too pure, too patriotic to suffer even a momentary stain, from the putrid eructations of Beale H. Richardson, "the oraor," "et is omne genus."

"The orator," may consume his time unnoticed, in expatiating upon the beauties and consistencies of "democracy," and the hideousness of "Americanism," for he is then pursuing his legitimate vocation: but he must not presume to think, that he can assail the characters of private individuals without subjecting himself to the severest reprehension. There is a great difference between the apotheosis of demagogueism and personal defamation.

With respect, yours,

"AMATOR VERITATIS."

From the Louisville Courier.

PROFESSOR MORSE'S REPLY TO BISHOP SPALDING.

POUGHKEEPSIE, (N. Y.) May 2, '55.

"If ever the liberties of the United States are destroyed they will be by Romish Priests."—LAFAYETTE.

To Bishop M. J. Spalding—Sir:—Your remarks in the Courier of April 14th have been sent to me. You will excuse the delay and my apparent negligence in noticing them, which, however, will be of no damage to the cause of truth, since, in the interim, I have neither been unmindful of you nor remiss, nor unsuccessful in my search for the means of gratifying your important inquiries. In common with the rest of the intelligent public, whose object is to arrive at the knowledge of an *historical truth*, I am under great obligations to you, sir, for bringing this subject so prominently and distinctly before the American people.

The motto of Lafayette, which stands at the head of this letter, has been quoted to them for some twenty years without its authenticity having been questioned, unless, indeed, your assertion be correct that "some time ago" (which is somewhat an indefinite date) it was called in question by the Freeman's Journal. If so, it has never till now been brought to my knowledge, and is now confined solely to your assertion of the fact. Whatever may be the nature of that notice in the Freeman's Journal is a matter, at present of very little consequence, since your denial of the authenticity of the motto has been distinctly brought to my knowledge, and I can settle the question with you, once for all, and forever.

My letter from Poughkeepsie of March 19th, was not, and could not be, the intended answer to your "appeal," published in Louisville March 19th. Still, for reasons best known to yourself, you choose to assume it to be my reply to your appeal. The public will see, if you cannot, that a letter of 19th March, written and mailed four days distant from Louisville, could not be a consequent of an article published in Louisville on the self-same day, what ever may have been the accidental order of its publication. They will also duly appreciate this artifice by which you assume a triumph from my presumed default. I can, however, well afford to you this brief season of self-gratulation, of which the apparent success of this Jesuitic ruse, enables you to avail yourself.

My own self-respect, as well as the respect due to the shrewd and reflecting minds by which you are surrounded, will restrain me from any mere personal retort, which the indecent personalities in which you have indulged, would seem to provoke. A far more important question than the comparative skill in disparagement is involved in this discussion.

The question whether the illustrious companion of Washington, the consistent, long tried, ever vigilant friend of the Republican liberties of the United States, ever gave this significant, faithful, just, and most important warning to the American people is the point in dispute.

After twenty years circulation of this pregnant warning, no one, to my knowledge, in all that time presuming to call it in question, after being familiarly quoted in books and pamphlets, and placed in capitals as the perpetual motto of some journals you, sir, at this late day, have ventured to deny its authenticity.

In your denial you have chosen to assail my testimony in its favor, to cast a suspicion on my veracity, and unequivocally to pronounce my statement *unreliable*. I am, therefore, no volunteer in this contest, but am called out by you to defend my position against your attacks. I do not complain of this, sir; I most cheerfully accept your challenge.

I have for more than twenty years been personally knowing to the fact that the sentiment of the motto are the sentiments of Lafayette, and when I first met with it in print, I could vouch for its truth, because it perfectly embodies the *sentiments* of the illustrious man, as often expressed to me.

And pray, sir, what is your authority for denying the authenticity of the motto? That strict justice may be done you, I quote your remarks from your pamphlet called "Intolerant Spirit of the Times." At page 31, you say:

"To awaken suspicion against the Catholic priesthood, the public prints have long been circulating among the people the extraordinary assertion that Lafayette warned American patriots against priestly influence in the following language:

"If ever the liberty of the United States is destroyed it will be by Romish priests."

"The fact of such a declaration coming from one who was a Catholic himself, if he was anything, bears the stamp of improbability, if not of down right absurdity on its very face; yet it passed current for truth and was, we think, generally believed by the masses, who are prepared to devour any absurdity, provided it militates against Catholics! Now what will the impartial public think, when it is ascertained that this charge, like most others, which has been lately circulated in the country to our disadvantage, is not only utterly groundless, but is directly the reverse of the truth!

"It makes the French patriot say, in fact, directly the opposite of what he did say! Here is the extract from his letter to the Protestant gentleman in New York, written from Paris in 1829, shortly after his return from his visit to the United States, which letter no doubt gave occasion for concocting the calumny:

"'The friendly expressions of regard for my health and happiness conveyed in your kind letter to me of the 15th ultimo, I beg you to be assured, are grateful to my feeling; and I shall cherish the recollection of the many services and kindnesses towards me, on the part of both yourself and lady, while I was your guest in America, as among the most pleasing reminiscences connected with my late visit to the United States. * * * I cannot but admire your noble sentiments of devotion and attachment to your country and institutions. But I must be permitted to assure you that the fears which, in your patriotic zeal, you seem to entertain, *that if ever the liberty of the United States is destroyed it will be by Romish priests*, are certainly without any shadow of foundation whatever. An intimate acquaintance of more than half a century with the prominent and influential priests and members of that church, both in England and America, warrants me in assuring you that you need entertain no apprehension of danger to your republican institutions from that quarter.'"

You here, sir, not merely deny that General Lafayette ever *uttered* such a sentiment, but as I have said, you assert that he *wrote a letter*, which letter you quote, a letter in which this very sentiment and motto is *recorded*, and recorded for the very express purpose of *repudiating* them. This, sir, you charge upon Lafayette. You quote that letter as *genuine;* you rely upon it as *genuine;* you hint not the slightest peradventure of its spuriousness; you even persist in adopting it without doubt; you deliberately announce that you "have republished it in a second edition of your Miscellanea," and this after being apprized that its authenticity is more than doubted; even when the charge of *forgery* is made against it from many respectable quarters. On the strength of that letter alone, you affirm that Lafayette actually said "directly what he did say." You pronounce the motto a "calumny;" you profsss to have "no doubt" that this letter "gave occasion for "concocting it," that is, of *inventing the motto.*

It is not necessary, sir, to charge upon *you* the *forgery* of that spurious letter. It is sufficient for me that you have endorsed the counterfeit as an historical fact, and passed it off on the community as genuine. You have made yourself *parti ceps criminis*, by giving it your *imprimatur*, and this, after a warning that should have induced caution, that the letter was more than suspicious. You would evade the responsibility of such an act, because, forsooth, you could cite a *Protestant source* for that letter. I shall follow you into your retreat for your "Protestant authority." You have *not* quoted that letter from the editorial columns of a Protestant paper, but from one who conceals himself under the mask of "OLD LINE," writing in a Protestant paper. I hazzard little in saying he is *no Protestant*. Are you sure, sir, he is not a *Jesuit*, who has taken advantage of an election excitement to abuse the confidence of a Protestant editor, the more easily to deceive a Protestant public? Can the public be fully assured, when they know the principles of allowed equivocation and purjury on which your entire corporation is known and proved to be based, and the systematized fraud and falsehood authorized by it, that there has not been a *convenient collusion* between you, sir, and this same Mr. "OLD LINE?" Acts of this complexions, in the annals of your corporation, are not so uncommon as to make it impossible. May he not be a *Jesuit?* Listen to his style of defence of this apocryphal letter, after being called upon to produce his authority for that letter; let him give it in his own style, (for even *he* has an authority to fall back upon, such as it is.) He had been gently told that his letter had the suspicious look of forgery about it. He replies:

"But even upon the supposition that they *are* capable of proving the letter which my authority attributes to Lafayette to be a forgery, (but which is a moral impossibility,) and that no falsification has been perpetrated; still, *if they are at the same time unable to show a genuine source whence they obtained it*, and can nowhere find it in the writings of Lafayette, they will then, in that case, only have acquitted themselves of the charge of *falsification* to prove upon themselves the more damnable crime of *forgery*.

"In the excitement consequent upon the discovery of the stupendous fraud, at the time I prepared the article for your press, the proper credit was inadvertently omitted. The work was obtained from the private library of a French gentleman residing near this city, and is entitled *Essai sur la Republique des Etats Unis d'Amerique*, par M. Jeane Bap. Marchande, a Paris, 1835, 12mo., pp. 245,* being an essay on republican government, with his correspondence, &c; which he published on his return to Paris, for the benefit of his friends, the Liberals and Republicans of France. The work, I presume, has never been translated and published in this country, for the reason that it does possess sufficient merit to justify it.

"The author was a private, retired gentleman, and lived some years in New York city, but was not, perhaps, very generally known as an author in the literary circles of either this country or Europe. The significant fact that the work is rare may, in all probability, have been the very circumstances which first suggested the idea of perpetrating the falsification; for if the sentence had occurred in the published writings of Lafayette, now in general circulation in this country, it is reasonable to be presumed that the certainty of the speedy detection of such unhallowed and damnable decrecation of the fair fame and sacred reputation of the name and memory of the honored dead would have deterred the base and villainous falsifier from his diabolical machinations, and the impartial historian would have been spared the painful and humiliating necessity of handing down to posterity the record of a species of political perfidy and moral turpitude in the nineteenth century, the development of which exceeds in enormity the infamous frauds, forgeries, falsifications, and interpolations which disgraced the dark ages.

OLD LINE."

The italics are his, sir, and I have omitted his declamatory preamble swollen with the verbiage of the same bombastic and scurrillous phraseology which a disturbed conscience would be apt to select to vent in character epithets, the torment of persistent guilt. Its dialect betrays the Jesuit in every line as sure as the brogue betrays a native of the Emerald Isle.

Now, sir, either your judgement or your honesty suffers from your upholding of this double attempt to deceive the public—the attempt to palm off upon an intelligent community such a miserable apology of an authority for the support of anything, and the attempt to practise upon the credulity of the public with such a letter as Lafayette. Your judgement suffers if you did not suspect the fabrication, your honesty if you did.

You are near the source whence you say you have derived your facts. A single day would suffice to verify "the book in the library of the French gentleman residing near Cincinnati," in which the pretended letter is said to be recorded.—You have been called on for months to produce that books, and the call has been in vain. And, let me say, sir, it is likely to be in vain, since *no book can be found in Paris!* nor is there any evidence that such a book was ever published there; on the contrary the evidence amounts almost to certainty that *no such work is in existence*, and was never published.

Presuming, sir, from my knowledge derived from years of careful study and observation of the governing principles of your *clerical corporation*, (not from bigoted prejudice against the Catholic Church as you had charged,) I had good reason to suspect that a *pious fraud* was in process of being perpetrated by you and your accomplices upon the American public.—To what extent you would presume to think yourself safe in concocting and sustaining it, in the enlightened community which surrounds you, I did not know. I only knew you had gone to the length of quoting a *forged* letter.

For myself I needed no other evidence of its forgery than the letter itself affords as quoted by you, especially as it is made manifest in the light of my own personal intercourse with General Lafayette. My first expectation, indeed, was that I should actually find such a letter as you quote in the alleged book, and in such connexion as would afford some clue to the culprit, and so I sent to Paris to procure the work. To my surprise I learned from my correspondent that the most eminent bibliopolists of Paris after diligent search, *know of no such work*, and they write me with one accord that "*no such work is to be found in Paris!*" I could hardly bring myself to believe, notwithstanding the well known and avowed principles of your corporation warranted the extremest distrust, that the bold fraud had extended not only to the *forgery* of a letter of Lafayette, but to the *forgery* of a *false* title to a book, a *false* author, a *false* place of publication, a *false* date, a *false* size, a *false* number of pages, and in connexion with these, a *purely fictitious* account of the imaginary author, and all the other *fabulous* circumstances of its ideal existence! But to this extent, in the present state of the research, this pious fraud seems already to have reached.

Since writing to Paris, I find that it was not necessary for me to have written there, in order to ascertain whether such a work had been published even in any part of France. In the Astor Library of New York, is the "*Bibliographie de la France, ou Journal General de l'Imprimerie, et de la Libraire*," which is a weekly periodical, containing a complete catalogue of all the works published in Paris, or in the departments, arranged in three tables—1st, an *alphabetical* table of the *works:* 2d, an alphabetical table of the *authors*, and, 3d, a *systematic* table of the works.

This catalogue is so comprehensive as to include everything that is published in Paris, down to a *four-paged* ephemeral election address.

In company with the accomplished librarian of the Astor Library, I carefully examined this catalouge and tables for the year 1834–'35–'36, and no such work nor anything that could have been mistaken for it, is therein to be found. The most insignificant four-paged pamplet is not omitted, and yet a work of so much political pretension as to occupy 245 pages *is omitted!* With the facts before you, sir, you can draw your own conclusions, and the public will also draw theirs.

With this exposure of the "*stupendous fraud*," in which your own reputation, sir, is compromised, as well as that of your accomplice "Old Line," I might safely leave the motto of Lafayette to stand (unscathed as it is by your attacks) in history as a truth; for the very means you have so unscrupulously used to destroy its influence, as manifesting the sentiments of the illustrious man who uttered it, have but reacted to its more complete confirmation.

I have as yet, however, only exposed the essential baselessness of the negative side of the question. I am yet to bring out the positive proofs of the authentity of the motto.

I can glance only at the sophism which you have gravely and earnestly exalted as an argument, that "Lafayette, being a Catholic, (which you assume in a sense of your own,) it was, therefore, impossible that he should have thus spoken of Romish priests." It is at best a flimsy gloss which the sequel will expose.

The *positive probabilities* are now already so strong in favor of the motto as Lafayette's, that my own evidence, from my personal knowledge of the sentiments of Lafayette, might be disregarded in this position of the case, and so also might the evidence of the converted Catholic priest who quoted it in 1836. This latter authority, by the by, no one who is acquainted with the genius of your corporation would be so simple as to suppose, would have any weight with you. I did not enact the folly of presenting it to the public, through my correspondent, with any expectation of convincing you, sir. That Catholic priest you say, was "an apostate." That word embodies folios of argument with your corporation. Your argument in such cases is concise: He that is *for us is right, and always to be believed:* he that is *against us is wrong*, and *never to be believed*. It is a convenient rule, and saves a world of investigation, but it is not the rule that guides the opinions or judgement of the American public. From certain ambigitous hintings in your article you are preparing to apply this rule to Lafayette, should you discover, as you certainly will, that he was not "*for you*." Take care how you presume on such an experiment as that with the American people.

You have made a peremptory call upon me for a "retraction," on the assumption that I am responsible for the first using and circulation of the motto. You say:

"As he (I) first published and gave currency to the *calumnious* statement regarding Lafayette, he owes (I owe) it to the country and to himself (myself) either to prove its truth or to *retract* it, like an honorable man."

Were your premises correct, sir, (which happens not to be the case,) I should prefer of the two courses you have so kindly marked out for me "*to prove the truth*," since I am not in the habit, at least designedly, of *saying*, much less of *writing*, anything to be *retracted*.

Your premises, I have said, sir, are not true. I was not the first who published and gave currency to the motto in question. The first publication of it in which I was engaged is in the work of the Confessions of a Catholic Priest, published in 1837. The motto was published long previous to this in several newspapers.—It was current in 1835. You will find it, sir, in the Somerset Whig, published in Somerville, New Jersey, of the date August 4th, 1835. It is also in the Protestant Vindicator, of New York, August 26, 1835; and in other papers of the same year. Whence the writers derived the motto is not for me to say; it is sufficient for me that they did not get it from me, neither could they have got it from the work of the Converted Priest. I am, therefore, sir, quite as much interested as you can be, in discovering how the *sentiments* of Lafayette, in *the shape* in which they are quoted *in the motto*, got into public use, and before I have done I shall be able to give you the result of my discoveries in this respect.

That the motto embodied the *sentiments* of Lafayette, I needed none to testify to me, as I have already said I had ample evidence of that fact in my personal intercourse with him. At what time they first assumed the shape of the motto, I have nowhere *as yet* pretended to say.

You have been very importunate for the production of "the *letter* which General Lafayette wrote to me at Havre," in which he "alluded to the whole subject of the interview," of which I had spoken, and you call for the "*exhibition of the* ORIGINAL *letter*" with the courtuous insinuation that *I never received such a letter*. You charge upon me that I have taken "SPECIAL CARE NOT TO PUBLISH IT." (The capitals are yours, sir,) and these calls thus emblazoned in staring capitals to attract a marked attention, are flaunted before the public as if the insinuation and charge were both *true* and *significant*. They are neither the one nor the other.

The *original* letter I hold in my possession. I have been in the habit of showing it to my friends and visiters for more than twenty years. Thousands have seen it, and as many more are free to see it any time. This letter, sir, which I have taken "*special care not to publish*" was published extensively in the newspapers throughout the country in 1832 and 1833. Since General Lafayette, in his letter to me dated Paris, February 28, 1833, expresses himself "highly obliged to me for publishing it," it must have been published before the date of this letter of thanks. Why you should deem the production and exhibition of that letter of so much importance, (since it has never been pretended that the *motto* is in it,) you may be able to show. I cannot be expected to forecast your reasons.

Among your other capital calls, sir, there is another to which I have paid a respectful attention. You have called upon me to PRODUCE THE TESTIMONY OF SEVEN ONE to the declaration of Lafayette in the *motto*. You have made a call which I am under no obligation to answer further than I have already answered it by testifying that *the sentiments* of the motto were, of my own personal knowledge, Lafayette's. I have nevertheless taken some pains, for the sake of historic truth, to trace it in its quoted shape. That *motto* was uttered by Lafayette, as I shall presently prove, more than *thirty years ago;* it has been quoted, without question, for more than twenty years. A period of twenty years, sir, is ordinarily sufficient to scatter beyond the most diligent search *living witnesses* to a *saying* uttered even in the presence of a large audience; so that its authenticity is not so much dependent on such a *living witness*, as on "*its being conformidable to all we know of the character and sentiments*" of the person of whom the saying is affirmed. By this rule, sir, (one of your own proposing,) it could equally well be proved to be Lafayette's. A living witness to the uttering of that sentiment by Lafayette is, indeed, fatal to you, but the absence of such a living witness is not fatal to me.

While in New York, some days since, and in the hope to find a living witness in the person of a military officer to whom, I learned, twenty years ago, that Lafayette had used the words of the motto, I casually learned that a venerable, and excellent minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, the Rev. Dr. P. J. Vanpelt, still living and in vigorous health of body and mind, although in his eightieth year, could probably tell me something of interest on the subject of my inquiry. I accordingly addressed him a note on my return home on the 24th ult., asking him if he had any recollection of conversation he had with General Lafayette, when he visited this country in 1824, and if so, I requested him to furnish me with his recollections. In his letter to me in reply, dated New York, April 30, 1855, after detailing the conversation at two special interviews with Lafayette, one on the day of the arrival on Staten Island, before he went to Boston, and the other after his return from Boston, he gives graphically many interesting incidents of revolutionary history as related by Lafayette. I omit them as irrelevant in this place, but give an extract from the close of Dr. Vanpelt's letter, as to the point, sir, between you and me. In speaking of the interviews, he says:

"Of the conversation at both interviews my recollection is vivid and distinct. * * 'On the next interview and conversation with Lafayette,' says the venerable Dr. Venpelt, 'after his visit and return from Boston,' he said to me, 'my dear friend, I must tell you something that occurred when I was in Boston. I received a polite invitation from the chief Catholic priest or Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in Boston to attend his church on the Sabbath. I wrote him one apology, saying,

[*Concluded on Fourth Page.*]

* It will be seen that no publisher is ventured to be named.