msa_sc2901_scm2354-0169 ©Maryland State Archives


# The Kent News.

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

Vol. 16. CHESTER TOWN, MD., OCTOBER 6, 1855. No. 23.



**VALUABLE FARMS**
***For Sale.***

THE undersigned will sell at private e all that FARM OR PLANTATION ng in the Upper District of Kent coun- adjoining the lands of Jas. F. Wood- d, Esq., and others, containing

**162 Acres, more or less.**

his Farm lies on the stage road from ster Town to George Town X Roads, t 11 miles from the former and 4 s from the latter place. A school e is within 100 yards of the farm; a ie landing is within 1½ miles of the , where boats ply regularly between landing and Philadelphia and Balti- e. The situation is healthy, and the susceptible of the highest improve- nt. The neighborhood a most excel- one. The BUILD-

GS consist of a Frame elling House, and Out- lding in ordinary repair.

he Terms will be made liberal, and one desirous of purchasing are re- ted to examine the premises. Mr. ell, who lives on the Farm, will show any one who may wish to examine it.

LSO, will be sold at private sale, the n near the above, containing

147 ACRES,

ning the Freeman Farm and the reth Farm. This farm is also a de- le one, being convenient to Schools, , Churches, Stores, &c.

e fencing is good, with a sufficiency of

WOOD & TIMBER

for the use of the farm. THE BUILDINGS are in ordinary repair; the land kind and can easily proved.

e Terms will be made easy. Any ishing to purchase, will call on the rsigned, who will show them the ises.

JAMES W. HURTT.

orgetown X Roads P. O., ent o., M d., Aug. 7, 1855.

**University of Maryland.**
**School of Medicine.**

HE FORTY EIGHTH SESSION egin on Monday October 8th, 1855, nd on the 1st of March, 1856.

iples and Practice of Surgery—Prof. R. Smith.

istry and Pharmacy—Prof. W. E. A. kin.

iples and Practice of Medicine—of. Samuel Chew.

omy and General Physiology—Prof. eph Roby.

tics—Prof. Richard S. Thomas.

ia Medica, Therapeutics and Pa- logical Anatomy—Prof. G. W. Mil- berger.

imental Physiology and Microscopy hristopher Johnston, M. D.

cal Anatomy—Berwick B. Smith, D.

ical instruction in Medicine and y, is given at the Baltimore Infir- an Institution of thirty four year's g. belonging to the University, sit- in its immediate neighbornood, and o all matriculates of the school with- harge, throughout the year.

s for the full course $95; Martricu- $5; Practical Anatomy 10; Gradua- 20.

GEO. W. MILTENBERGER, imore, Sept. 15—1m. Dean.

**ATTENTION!**

*the time to obtain a nice Boot!!*

THE undersigned returns his thanks to his friends and a generous public, for the liberal patronage heretofore upon him, and respectfully in- em that in consequence of the e of leather—which is a *cash* ar- will hereafter conduct his busi- the CASH PRINCIPLE, and endeavor to keep on hand a good *Fashionable* BOOTS & SHOES. n and ladies wishing to aid him, e give him a call at his old stand him with their patronage and t of their full purses.

JAS. E. JOURNEY.

, 1854.

NOTICE

*Payers of 2d Election District.*

book is now ready, and those indebt- s would save cons derable by making ment, a, follows: 5 per cent off State during the month of August—4 per tember, 3 do. do. in October.

THOS. LUSBY, Col, 2d E. D. of K. C.

1855—tf.

*WANTED:*

ive honest man in each section of the e, to take orders by 'Sample' for VEL- AGNETIC AGENTS. A salary of $800 per a small commission will be paid.— ayable Monthly." For particulars . M. VELPEAU, 422½ Broadway, New losing stamp to prepay answer.

1855.—4t.

NG.—The undersigned has just re- d a large quantity of good Matting, will sell cheap.

55. W. N. E. WICKES.



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.

### EDITORS AND PRINTERS.

With lively heart and joyous brow
The happy farmer speeds the plow,
And while he sleeps, both flock and fields,
Their ample pay for labor yields.
'Tis not so with the noble craft,
Which moves the world with iron shaft,
But when their daily labor's done
The hardest toil is just begun.
The weary "Typo" stributes "pi,"
And while the rich sport with the fair,
His heavy eye-lids hang with care;
Long sleepless nights and sluggish days,
Contentedly at work he stays,
And tries to live on honest life,
Amid the wordly scenes of strife.
Like statue, firm he stands "at case"
And "spaces out" with magic grace—
He locks the forms" and planes them down,
And starts the "Devil" round the town.
For "outs" and "doub's" he "spaces them,"
To get some trifling sentence in,
And when he thinks the "copy's done"
The Edi.or has just begun
To scratch his head and skin his brains
To 'nounce a death or want of rains;
And when the last bad manuscript
Is done, there's something else been skip'd,
And must go in or "Jacob Brown
Will come and tear the office down."
Oft o'er a "case of pi'd Brevier"
I've seen Henry drop a tear,
And George and Tom and Bill and Dick
Take half a night to "fill a stick."
And then they'd raise a mighty squall
And swear that they had done it all."
Of all the lots that men can mourn
No harder one can o'er be borne—
No worse a life in fortune's wheel
Than Editors and Printers feel.

## POLITICAL.

*(For the Kent News.)*

Mr. Editor:—Will you be so kind as to publish the enclosed letter of Prof. Morse to Bishop Spalding?

The Bishop, in his last effusion, with a dexterity characteristic of his 'Hebernian' prototype when worsted in a contest, has introduced new and entirely irrelevant issues, and endeavored to hide his "cloven foot" by discharging at his antagonist, volleys of personality and abuse; and to 'cap the climax" he turns Pro. Morse over to the editors of the "Enquirer," and assumes the position of a spectator, in the controversy. This is reasoning by proxy or substitution, and may appear very well in the eyes of his Jesuitic associates; but an intelligent community will know how to appreciate such unfair cavillings and tergiversations.

It is gratifying to every unprejudiced mind, to view the ability with which Prof. Morse has handled the militant Bishop, who, in his unholy career, would blot out from history the passage which marks Lafayetts as an advocate of religious liberty.

The Bishop has exerted all his powers to out-general his antagonist in this controversy. He has used misrepresentation, abuse, sophistry, and invoked passages from books which exist only in his imagination: but Professor Morse, appareled in the impenetrable armor of truth, has marched to the attack; demolished the fortifications behind which he entrenched himself; and, in the altiloquent language of an illustrious cotemporary, has "scaled the walls of an *ecclesiastical* Babylon and planted the *Flag of our Union* on its towering battlements."

With respect, yours,

"Amator Veritatis."

*(From the Louisville Courier.)*

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

Poughkeepsie, June 8, 1855.

*To Bishop M. J. Spalding: Sir:*—The *Courier*, with your remarks of the 28th of May, is before me. I was arrested for a moment in admiring the apposite selection you have made of a text from Moliere: "*Si je me defends, ce n'est qu'en reculant.*" Although literally translated "If I defend myself, it is only in backing out," the sentiment of it is significantly expressed in the well known ancient lines:

"He that fights and runs away,
May live to fight another day."

And so, sir, you think you have cleverly *backed out* of the controversy, by dubbing it "a very pretty buarrel as it stands," between *Protestant* outside barbarians, with which you have nothing to do but to stand by and as a spectator, to rub your hands and watch the vicissitudes of the contest. This ruse might perhaps have had some chance of success (so far merely as relieving yourself from responsibility in the *forgery* part of the controversy is concerned,) but that you have, unfortunately for yourself, put the *main issue* on *another* and *distinct basis*—a basis on which I meet you with pleasure.

Whether it be necessary or not for me to have any controversy with the editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer is a question in this new aspect of the case altogether premature, and indeed irrelevant.—That question, moreover, is obviously to be settled between you and your accomplices on the one side, concocting a tissue of invisible and intangible authorities of most suspicious seeming, and the public on the other—its credulity imposed upon by means of these same pretended authorities. It is a question, so far as I am concerned, sir, which may be better answered when you and I have settled accounts. It is for you and your authority, "Old Line," not for me, sir, to clear up the hourly-increasing conviction, strengthed by the delay to produce that book, that a great fraud and forgery have been perpetrated by your side of the house, and for you, not for me, to show, if you can, how many, if any, of his alledged facts are true.

You denied, and still deny, that *Lafayette could ever have entertained such disparaging opinions of Romish priests* as are indicated in the sentiments of the motto in question. I have already met and defeated you on the question of fact, whether he uttered or not the words of that motto. You challenged me to produce *the testimony of even one American* as to his having expressed such a sentiment. Have you forgotten, sir, this challenge, twice repeated by you in staring capitals, to draw it to a special attention? I met your challenge promptly. I produced the witness; I gave his name (not a man in a mask, with only my assurance that his statement might be relied on)—a veritable name subscribed to his testimony—a name venerated, honored for all that is upright and honest; well known, long known; the name of one so highly respected for his probity and piety as to be offered by President Madison the chief chaplaincy of the army of the United States—a man whose word would no more be doubted in this community than other men's oaths. I gave you the *time* when Lafayette uttered these words, and the circumstances under which he uttered them. And what, sir, is your reply? you have not made the slighest attempt to invaliate this testimony. The motto stands proved on my part, uncontradicted on your. But you are loth to lose the benefit of Mr. Old Line's "diggings," and so you would still cling to the hope of making the public believe that if Lafayette *said* it, he also *unsaid* it.

There are facts enough already before the public for them to determine whether the evidence of a forgery on an extended scale, by your side of the house, justifies or not the suspicions that your manœuvring has raised; whether the fraud includes the forgery of a book alledged to be published in Paris in 1835, yet neither to be found there by the most eminent bibliopolists, Hector Bosange at their head, nor is name in the the authentic catalogues that professedly includes all words published not only in Paris but in any part of France; or whether the forger, entends only to the alledged letter of Lafayette. The public can put their own construction upon those epithetical manifestations of anguish from your authority, "Old Line," when a sight of *that book* is requested. They can judge whether that book is of public existence in the "library of the French gentleman near Cincinnati," or whether, under the circumstances surrounding the matter, "the library," and even the "French gentleman" may not also be but fictions of Old Line's imagination. The public can draw their own conclusions from the nonproduction of the work after eight months' call for it! They can estimate at their value the various shifts to avoid its exhibition and to escape from responsibility. They can determine whether all this shuffling is is not a trick to gain time for further experiments on their credulity. They can estimate the character of the betting proposed "for the good of the orphans!" They can estimate the reliability of your anonymous voucher for the *existence* of a book and letter, (not to say their authority, if in existence,) which can be produced only at the risk on the part of him who asks it of a thousand dollars, and "*the acknowledment of being a base falsifier!*" Seriously, sir, is this the kind of authority on which you rely for your historical data? If so there are those of your own faith, high-minded, honorable men, (at least among the laity) whose sense of honor and justice will class your miscellanea where they belong, in the index of repudiated and worthless works. I wait with patience the consummation of these suspicious manœuverings, and hasten now to meet you on the basis you propose. You have requested *plain* and *explicit* answers to eight questions, which, as they contain, in your view, "the *gist* of this discussion," I have examined with attention. Your main argument, then, against the motto, as containing the sentiments of Lafayette, which I gather from your questions, is clearly this: You maintain that Lafayette, being a Catholic, passing for a Catholic in France, praising the Catholic piety of his wife, and having a Catholic chapel in his chateau at Lagrange, therefore he could not say anything so derogatory to the character of Catholic priests as the motto sets forth; for if he had the priests would not have officiated in his chapel nor have assisted in such large numbers at his funeral.—This is your argument. I waive for the present any inquiry as to the sense in which you use the word *Catholic*, (for you are not ignorant that it is used in various senses;) your conclusion, from your premises, is a non-sequitur, in whatever sense you use that term, if I can but show that Lafayette, in his public and published speeches, *did denounce Catholic Priests in terms as strong as any contained in the motto.* If but this one fact is established, it will lead to the irresistible conclusion, according to your own showing, that Lafayette was not a Catholic in any such sense; that he was not also a Protestant in the genuine sense of the term. I have no difficulty, sir, in reconciling his hostility to Roman Catholic priests, and his uniform antagonism to your whole system, with all the incidents which constitute your premises, without charging upon him, as you seem to do, either inconsistency or hypocrisy. This is not now the point at issue.

All the side issues, sir, which you have proposed, on none of which is there any difficulty in answering you, may be safely kept to be engulphed in the overthrow of your concentrated and distinctly proposed argument. Whether my name is or is not mentioned in the printed Memoir of Lafayette; whether I was or was not remiss in complying with his injunctions; whether the motto in so many words is or is not recorded in his writings; whether I shall or shall not have any dispute with the editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer, are all questions, the discussion of which may at the present be waived.

I shall gather from the acknowledged published writings of Lafayette the sentiments he was known to entertain towards Protestantism, and expressly towards Romish priests.

If he exulted in the temporal overthrow of your clerical corporation, because of its disastrious influence on all the best interests of society; because of its insatiable avarice and extortion; because of its outrageous intolerance; because of its brutal disregard of all the natural and benevolent instincts of humanity, and so perseveringly labored for the destruction of your corporation; if against this bitter and sanguinary intolerance of Romanism, he urged, and with success, in a country where your corporation for centuries had uncontrolled sway, the rights of Protestant to a civil equality with Catholic priests; if it can be shown that he commended to France the superiority of the Protestant religion, as displayed in its benign influence in the United States, and as in contrast with the Romish religion; if, in short, he denounced Romish priests in terms as severe as those contained in the motto; then, sir, will the conclusion which you have drawn against the genuineness of the motto, because you have chosen to call Lafayette a Catholic, *be proved utterly fallacious.*

Turn then, sir, to the volumns of the Memoirs of Lafayette, and (if your edition is the same with that which I consulted in the Astor Library,) you will find the original of the following translation in vol. 2, p. 536. In a speech delivered in 1821 in the Chambers, animadverting on the conduct of the old government, whose overthrow some members had affected to regret, Lafayette says in answering the self-proposed question, What have we to regret? "Then disappeared that *clerical corporation*, which, while it exercised every species of influence, and refused to pay any share of public contributions, was incessantly increased. No part of its immense wealth was ever alienated, but all was *distributed in its own class*, in an inverse ratio to labor. The law was a party in the *exaction of vows* too often compulsory, and France was covered with *monastic orders devoted to foreign chiefs.* The *clergy* levied at once contributions from the rich and the poor, and in its secular organization *was so wholly given over to wordly indolence* that the laboring ministers were but an insignificent portion of *what was called the first order of the state.* * * * * *

What then are we to regret? Have we to regret the *religious intolerance* which doomed a *great portion* of the population to a state of *legal concubinage*, to *bastardism* and disinheritance; or that violation of all the laws of nature and morality, † which Louis XIV. established, and which the illustrious prelate Bossuet styled the work worthy of his reign, the most assured sign as well as the finest enactment of authority? *The bishops* in 1751 and 1752 demanded its execution by the judgment of the commandant or intendant, *without the form or semblance of a trial.* Such was the legal doctrine from the period of the decree of the Council of 1684, *which debarred all private persons from receiving into their houses any sick person of the Protestant religion, under the pretext of charity*, down to the decision of the Council of Louis XVI., when, in opposition to the advice of Turgot and Malsherbes, the oath was taken to *exterminate the heretics.* The condition of the *Protestants* was ameliorated by the edict of the King in 1788. I remember it the more distinctly because, in the preceding year, *I had the honor of seeing adopted in the committee*, at which the brother of the King presided, *the first official admission of their civil rights*, but even this *half tolerance* was considered a revolutionary innovation."

Thus, sir, as early as 1788 Lafayette incurred the enmity of your corporation, while obtaining the proud distinction of striking the first blow for religious liberty in France. For him was reserved the noble gratification of concocting the measures for rescuing Protestant Christianity from the bloody proscription and brutal rule of an overbearing and corrupt priesthood. In resisting the "intolerant spirit of the times," sir, do you find Lafayette in league with your corporation, or in open hostility to it? Was he *Catholic* (in your application of the term) or Protestant in the best sense of that term?

Let us pass over a period of forty years and see if the illustrious man had become less Protestant in his feelinga and views at that time.

You will find, sir, at page 400, vol. 2 of his Memoirs, his speech delivered June 22d, 1828, from which I make the following extract:

"Amidst the attacks of pretended friends of the altar, I am sorry to observe *that* fanaticism which represents as hostile to the rights and sentiments of nations the *Christianity of which social equality is the principal basis;* thus provoking a sort of reprisal of animadversion against opinions and practices, which, in themselves, have nothing in common with worldly ambition. If I seek a solution of this most perplexing combination of the duties of the *priest*, speaking both *in the name of Heaven*, and as the *paid officer of the State*, I shall find it (at least in my opinion) only in a country where religious sentiment is more general than in France; where *the ministers of the Gospel receive more respect;* where *all sects live in peace;* where *their rites and ceremonies inspire no alarm*, but where they are total strangers to the civil government, and where religious societies freely formed have ministers of their own choice."

And what, sir, was the Christianity he here commends to France? Was it that misnamed Christianity which knows not the name of equality; a Christianity monopolized in a close corporation and despotically organized in the interest of the most insatiable avarice and worldly ambition of the few against the many? Or was it the expansive Protestant Christianity of the United States, founded truly on the primitive basis of *social equality*, and of whose benevolent effects he had had such recent experience in his intercourse with Washington; an experience which, as he said to the venerable Dr. Vanpelt, "*opened his eyes*," not only to the inherent bigotry of that system of religion in which he was educated, but to the contrasted tolerance and humanizing influence of that which prevailed here?

It appears then, that from 1788 to 1828 a period of forty years, to within a few months at farthest (be it remarked) of the general date 1829, (the date of that pretended letter of Lafayette which you have quoted from Mr. *Old Line*,) General Lafayette maintained, uniformly and consistently, sentiments of opposition and a course of action in accord with them, against the Romish priesthood, as a class dangerous to the peace and welfare of society. And you, sir, seriously contend that in 1829 he wrote a letter in direct and marked contrast to the sentiments and action he had till then maintained; that he then changed his views of determined opposition to the Papacy, and all of a sudden became its defender and apologist!

Well, sir, let us see then how long he remained a convert to the harmless and beneficent influence of Romish priests.—Only two years after 1829, that is to say, on the 20th of September, 1831, in a speech before the Chambers, he says:—"Italy aspires to its regeneration in full integrity. This is the object our armies sought to accomplish, and they successfully accomplished it. The formation of the Cisalpine Republic, and subsequently of the kingdom of Italy, was its result. * * * Behold the success with which we abolished *the system of robbery*, which has since been resumed with more audacity than ever. *Robbery, in fact, will always subsist in a country governed by* PRIESTS AND ARISTOCRATS, *enemies of every liberal sentiment.*"

Lest you may charge that I have given a translation stronger than is warranted by the text, I subjoin his own language in the original French: "*Voyez le succes avec lequel on était parvenu a y detruire le brigandage qui s'y est relevé plus audacieux que jamais. Le brigandage, en effet, subsistera toujours dans un pays gouverne par des pretres et des aristocrates, enemies de toute idee genereuse.*"

Now, sir, we find that up to 1829, Lafayette was an avowed, persevering active opponent to the Romish priesthood.—Somewhere in 1829, you contend he suddenly and entirely changed his views; and your only authority is that pretended letter of "Old Line's," dug up no body knows whence, but immediately after, in 1831, we find him again the opponent of the Romish priests, and in terms which make those of the motto tame and spiritless in the comparison, denouncing the influence of these same priests as necessarily productive of one of the most grievous evils that can befall society. The organ of credulity, sir, must have an unusual development in the head of that man who, with these facts before him, can believe in the genuineness of that letter!

But pray, sir, how long is it since your clerical corporation have become the eulogist of Lafayette? When did he become exalted as "a *patriot*" in your eyes, and admired as "the refined and accomplished French Marquis," and lauded as the "Catholic hero"? Why have you delayed so long in quoting him as one of your adherents?

"Did you *prudently* wait until the Catholic hero has been dead *twenty years*, that you might incur the less risk of contradiction?" Is it that the prestige of his name on American minds might just now be of advantage in the schemes for aggrandizement now so rife with your corporation, if it could be shown that he was a Catholic in your contracted sense of that term? Did you hope to blot out from our remembrance your former vilifications of his good name; your expressions of deep hatred and abhorrence of his character; and your invocations upon him of a bloody expiation of the crime of opposition to you? How has he been esteemed by your corporation for more than sixty years? The Archbishop of Sens, who bitterly opposed Lafayette and his efforts in favor of religious tolerance, as was perfectly natural, declared as far back as 1788, in the King's Council, that "*Lafayette was their most dangerous antagonist*, because his logic consisted in action."*

*The New-York Catholic Diary*, of January 25th, 1834, under the superintendence and with the approval of your corporation, copies from an English paper, *The Age*, the following article, indorsing and approving its sentiments by the following heading: "Truth told in Tory Style."

"Louis Philippe was declared by that *old ass, Lafayette*, the best of all possible republicans, and all liberal Europe uttered a dissonant bray of applause. * * *. But, badinage apart, it is impossible to think *of those wretches* without infinite scorn. It is, however, pleasant to reflect that they will not last long. We wait with impatience for the crowning of Henry V. in Rheims, and we hope that he will come back with a full recollection of all that was done in his absence, and a steady determination to *inflict adequate and unsparing punishment* on all the guilty. If he returns with *an amnesty* in his hands, *he perishes, and deserves to perish.*"

The Boston Roman Catholic paper, *The Pilot*, of April 16th, 1835, also under the direction of another of your corporation, condemns an article in the *North American Review*, as "too inflated with the *undeserved* and hyperbolical encomiums on the *negative virtues* of Lafayette, on the *imputed* qualities of *a man whose memory is abhorred* by all good and patriotic Frenchmen?"

What sort of a Catholic, sir, was Lafayette in the estimation of your corporation when they dared to put forth, and endorse before the American people too, such infamously scurrilous and malevolent language as this, toward the venerated and illustrious compeer of Washington?

And now, sir, how stands the case between us? I have in previous letters proved that Lafayette uttered that motto in the very words usually quoted, which you denied and challenged me to prove.

I have also given substantial, and as yet wholly unrefuted reasons for believing that the letter attributed to Lafayette contradicting that motto, the letter quoted by you as genuine, and which you still persist in considering genuine, is *a forgery*, and that even *the book*, from which it is pretended to be quoted, is also *a forgery.*

I have also shown that, on the new basis assumed by you, sir, to argue the main issue, to wit, that Lafayette is a Catholic, (in some narrow sense of your own,) and therefore, could not have held or expressed the sentiments of that motto, *your conclusion is utterly fallacious.* He was not a Catholic in any such sense as not to be openly and uniformly opposed to Romish priests.

I have shown, not only that he was thus opposed to your corporation, but as might in such case be expected, your corporation was bitterly opposed to him.

With these facts substantiated, I leave the public to judge whether the motto in question is not completely proved to be Lafayette's and if so, whether it is wise to disregard the warning of it as of no weight nor significance.

Respectfully, sir,

Your obedient servant,

SAMUEL F. B. MORSE.

† The famous decree for the revocation of the edict of Nantz.

* Sparran, N. Y. edit., 1853, Vol. 1, p. 116.