The Miners' Journal

POTTSVILLE, PA.

Saturday Morning, May 20.

B. BANNAN, Editor and Proprietor;
C. LITTLE, Associate Editor.

WHIG STATE TICKET.

FOR GOVERNOR:

JAMES POLLOCK, of Northumberland;

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER:

GEORGE DARSIE, of Allegheny;

FOR SUPREME COURT:

DANIEL M. SMYSER, of Montgomery.

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

FOR GOVERNOR:

WILLIAM BIGLER, of Clearfield County.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER:

HENRY S MOTT, of Pike County.

FOR SUPREME JUDGE:

JEREMIAH S. BLACK, of Somerset County.

TO MR. ANGELE ON ROMANISM.

Except for our acquaintance with Mr. Angele, we should certainly take him for a Jesuit—judging from the tenor of his third article on "The Nativists." It is throughout—a column and a quarter in the *Register*—but a special plea for Papacy. In addition to what he recites that church has accomplished, and for which he lauds her so highly, had he been as explicit in detailing the means employed, his history of that "powerful hierarchy" would have been more complete. The dungeon, the rack, the faggot and the sword were the chief instruments in the hands of this boasted promoter of "religious and civilization," to all ages and all countries who re-*fused* to re-*ceive* them!—The blood of its detractors, victims has been shed like water—helpless women and innocent children butchered in cold blood, at the caprice of heathenish tyrants, and tortures the most cruel and barbarous practised upon all who refused absolute submission to the supreme mandates of the Pope. Go, read the bloody massacre of Saint Bartholomew's, when the streets of Paris alone ran red with the blood of 5000 Protestants! count the victims among the unoffending Waldenses, and examine the records of the Inquisition.—There, too, are the deeds of Romanism—the seed of the church, the costly price of those splendid paintings and the noble statuary, so much admired by Mr. Angele. Place them side by side on the record—they are *historical facts*. Truly has Mr. Angele called the Romish church a "*powerful* hierarchy," when kings and princes were made to do her homage, but her influence was far from always being wielded for good.

Here Mr. Angele falls into another gross error, and combats an enemy of his own imagining. No sensible American, with any knowledge of the statutes of his country, and as all acquainted with the ruinous effects of our liberal government upon the fold of the church, exertions any serious apprehensions from the numerical growth of Romanists among us. It is not that. But a grain of sand may "check the beam," in a nicely adjusted scale. In a government, where the opposing political parties are so keenly balanced as in this county, a slight addition to either side may determine the preponderance. This is the fear, that this Romish influence, combined with the intrigues of politicians, may work dangerous consequences in the civil regulations of the country. The experience of the last few years alone convinces us that the arms of the Romish Priesthood is at variance, in many essential respects, with the fundamental principles and best objects of our republican government; and hence every lover of his country will be ever watchful of this insidious influence, and careful to curb it within proper bounds.

We particularize the Priesthood, because it is from this source principally that danger is to be apprehended. Many of the Roman Catholic laity make good, enterprising citizens, and as such deserve our high commendation and respect. Some of the most eminent and serviceable men of the country have belonged to that church; and in the record of the past cruelties and iron rule of Popedom, the laity are not to be held amenable—it is at the hands of the Popes, the Cardinals, the Bishops and Priests that the blood of the sainted martyrs will be required. How can their bishops, for instance, become faithful citizens of this or any other country, when they have already sworn allegiance to the "*royalties of St Peter against all men*?" It is the constant plodding of these heretical craftsmen that we resist—it is endeavors to unite Church and State, and render both subservient to the will of the Pope. It is against these more particularly, combined with the utter submission and piliancy of their people to the hands of superiors, totally inconsistent with the essential doctrines of a *free* country, that we raise a voice of warning.

But we now come to the principal argument of Mr. Angele—and a famous one it is—that, because the Romish church is a very ancient establishment and embraces the "fundamental doctrines" of christianity, the hostility between it and the orthodox Protestant denominations is "most unnatural;" forgetting in his over-zealous eulogy that it was *Rome herself* which first drew the line of separation, and that she arrogates the pre-eminent position of the *only true* Church, and to this day anathematizes with the bitterest imprecations all persons, christian and infidel alike, outside of her ecclesiastical jurisdiction, as *heretics*, "excommunicated and cursed, and given body and soul to the devil," her priests, bishops and other superiors pledging themselves, under the most solemn obligations, to "persecute and oppose" (*pro posse persequar et oppugnabo*, in the words of the oath) all such, under all circumstances and through all time. This curse, with shell, book and candle, is even now, in this nineteenth century, annually pronounced by the Pope of Rome and other ecclesiastics in other places, on Thursday of Passion week, the day before Good Friday.

We were proceeding further to answer Mr. Angele under this head, when our attention was directed to the following extract. It is from the pen of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hopkins, and though written for an entirely different purpose—with reference to the establishment of an Episcopal Bishop at Jerusalem—could not have been more pertinent to the subject in hand, had it been prepared directly in reply to Mr. Angele. It is from a tract, in the form of a letter to the editors of the *Church Journal*, and reads thus:

> This new theory, which makes the authority of Christ's Gospel depend, not upon the *truth*, but upon the question of *date* and *geography*, is supposed to be a necessary deduction from the doctrine that these Churches still remain the true Church, and a regular Episcopacy, by virtue of which they are parts of the Holy Catholic Church, notwithstanding their heresies and corruptions, and must therefore be received in their proper homes, however they may be attacked elsewhere. But, there is not a particle of really Catholic authority, in any single argument of reason or common sense, for the assumption that they ever ever been able to discover. The honor or its paternity, if honor it be, belongs solely to this modern school, and its birth is owing to their inordinate thirst after their favorite phantom of Catholic union, to which they are ever willing to sacrifice Catholic purity of doctrine, whenever it stand in their way. Nevertheless, as these apparent guides of yours attach so much importance to this perilous notion, I must pay it the respect of a fuller examination."

First, then, I am willing to grant that every Church should retain the fundamentals of the Gospel, *in so far*, a portion of the Church Catholic or universal, and therefore Hooker said, "we must acknowledge even heretics themselves to be, though a maimed part, yet a part of the visible Church"—(B. 3. ch. 2. § 11.) But I maintain that notwithstanding this, *heretics have no rights as against the truth*, since, if they had, there must be a right in what is wrong, and the command of our Lord to preach the gospel to every creature,' must be wholly neutralized by the mere fact that error was in possession along with a certain amount of truth, before the advocates of the undiluted truth of the Savior could gain access to it. Your Trinitarian friend might as well persuade us that the physician must not attempt to extirpate a cancer from a fat cut, because he assists the sufferer to be a man, or because the disease is of long standing, as that heresy must not be extirpated from a Church, because we acknowledge the Church, or because the false doctrine has existed for many centuries in the same quarter.

In the second place, I maintain the present correctness of the same truly *judicious* Hooker, where he saith, 'Heretics are not *utterly cut off* from the visible Church of Christ. If the fathers do anywhere, as oftentimes they do, make the true visible Church of Christ and heretical companies opposite; they are to be construed as separating heretics, *not altogether from the company of believers, but from the fellowship of sound believers*.' For where professed rebellion is, there can be no visible Church of Christ; there may be, where sound belief wanteth. Infidels being clean without the pale of the Church, they directly and utterly reject the very principles of Christianity; which heretics embrace, and err only by misconstruction.' (Eccl. Pol. B. 3. C. 2. § 11.)

Hence it results that heretics may well be received as a part of the Catholic or Universal Church *in one respect*, while they are *cut off from it in another*. Just as the lepers in ancient Israel were still a part of the nation, although they were separated by the divine law from the fellowship of their brethren, by reason of their uncleanness.—Just as the criminals in our penitentiaries are still citizens of the State, and objects of its care and protection, while they are excluded from the social intercourse and privileges of citizens, by reason of their crimes. Just as the inhabitants of a district infected with the plague or yellow fever, are still counted amongst the general population of the country, although it may be necessary to preserve the rest from infection by surrounding them with a *cordon sanitaire*, and forbidding them to travel beyond their own limits. Just as a rebellious province is still regarded as a part of the whole State, even when it is in open hostility with the government, and must be treated as an enemy until it subdued. Nothing is more plain and simple than this proposition or our great master in Israel, when it is considered in the light of sound common sense, and fair analogy.

I contend, in the third place, for this eminent divine's further opinion, when at the conclusion of the same section of this admirable work, he saith:—'Wherefore heretics being Christians in regard of the general truth of Christ which they openly profess, yet they are by the Fathers every where spoken of as men *clean excluded out of the right belonging Church* by reason of their particular errors, *for which all that are of a sound belief* must detest it'—there can be no prescriptive right of time, place or numbers, by which the 'right believing Church' can be authorized to join communion with them, or treat them as if they were in the entitled to any similar position. For our Lord himself commanded his apostles to go *into all the world* and preach the Gospel—not the Gospel as it might be distorted and polluted by heresy, but the Gospel as it should be perfectly made manifest to them by the Holy Spirit. Hence that apostolic church has the same warrant in all and every quarter. The divisions of nations, patriarchates, dioceses, are all human. And they are to be religiously respected by every Christian on the Scriptural rule of obedience to 'every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake.' But this obedience must be rendered only so long as they do not interfere with the DIVINE RIGHT of the genuine and unadulterated Gospel—for this is the position that the glorious Redeemer and, 'I appoint unto you a king one, as my Father hath appointed unto me.' The boundaries of that kingdom embrace ALL THE WORLD. And their true source—not time by latest decent only, but those by their apostolic doctrine—are bound to carry out that celestial command to the utmost of their power; and no heretical body or bodies of men, however numerous, or wherever established, under whatever circumstances of time or place, can have a shadow of right to exclude that pure Gospel from the people.

This may suffice for the present, on the novel hypothesis of our Trinitarian brethren, which Mr. Palmer has endeavored to establish in his learned and able, but in some important points very erroneous work, 'The Treatise on the Church.' And I mention it here, not because you have adverted to it specifically in your ingenious argument, but because it is the real basis of the whole opposition to the establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric, and all the loud complaints made about the violation of the pledges said to have been made by its first bishop. I wish to give it prominence, also, for another reason, to which it is high time that our American Churchmen should open their eyes clearly. For the same hypothesis of Mr. Palmer and his school, applied as he very fairly and candidly applies it, condemns the whole attempt to establish the Church in the great Mississippi valley, in Florida, in Texas and in California, as an invasion of the pre-existing rights of the Church of Rome. It condemns likewise the establishment of the Church of England at Paris, in Canada, and Malta. And therefore every solitary instance, in which, through all these regions, a proselyte from Rome is received into the Church, is liable to precisely the same charge, on his new and most unCatholic principles, that is now brought against the bishop of Jerusalem.

We had prepared some criticisms on our present Naturalization laws, as an appropriate accompaniment to this article, but defer their publication for a future number.

* Will Mr. Angele point us out a country where Romanism has subserved the interests of "civilization." What and where are her trophies, in this respect? Is Ireland an example? Do the enslaved, beggarly masses in the Papal States, the centre and immediate field of Romish influence, show the legitimate fruits of this sort of civilization? Is distracted Spain or priest-ridden Mexico a fair sample, or the Papal dominions in South America? For the most part, notwithstanding the most genial climate and other natural advantages, where under the heavens can be found poorer, more inefficient governments, or more ignorant, degraded and plastic subjects than in those unfortunate countries where Popery wields the sceptre? It this be Romish "civilization," let all true Americans devoutly pray to be delivered from it.

WORK ON THE SABBATH.

The Sabbath is a Divine, not a human institution. In the beginning Providence specially set apart one day in seven as a day of rest, for the *physical* as well as moral good of his creatures; and the mechanism of the whole universe has been so nicely adjusted, that no one of its laws can be violated with impunity—each such transgression surely induces its own retribution. The following, extracted from a late report of the Philadelphia Sabbath Association, furnishes a case in point of the necessity of rest from daily labor, and moreover affords a striking proof that if Railroad Companies, and others, will overtask the natural powers of their employees, by desecrating that sacred injunction to remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," they necessarily, *in the due and ordinary course of things*, subject themselves to corresponding inconveniences and dangers, that in the end cost more than the gain by the extra amount of work performed:

"H. H. E., a young man believed to have been well qualified and of good character, was a railroad engineer at the time of accession, near Harrisburg, about two years since. He was on the train all Thursday night until 5 o'clock Friday morning; started again at 3 o'clock A. M., and out until 4 o'clock, Saturday morning;—came into collision with another train, and one of his legs was amputated to save his life. The woman, who served him at a meal, previous to the calamity, says he could hardly keep awake while eating. It is supposed the engineers on both trains were asleep.

"The three preceding Sabbaths were spent as follows: February 1st, out on duty all day and part of night. February 8th, half of the day. February 15th, all day and all night.

"J. H., of Harrisburg, engineer on the railroad, resigned his situation on account of the deprivation of the rest necessary to enable him to discharge his responsible duties. He was not allowed a Sabbath; has been so exhausted *as to sleep for miles on the engine, and in this state has run by the stations.*

Upon these the report concludes thus,—

"There can be no necessity of enlarging upon facts like these; they speak for themselves. It much concerns the public safety that those who are to watch over and guide the powerful machines hurrying, at fearful speed, trains of cars freighted with precious human lives, should, in all respects not only be well skilled in their duty, but in a proper condition to perform it; at least that they should not be disabled by want of requisite sleep through the week, or of the rest of the Sabbath: for they need both."

THE WHY AND THE WHEREFORE.

The local reporter of the Norristown *Herald*, "Vidi," noticing the horrible infanticide in that place last week, appends this very significant apology:

"P. S. In correction of several rumors growing out of the above unfortunate occurrence we should state that the parties have not dealt at the store of Messrs Longaker, Childs & Co., since the 24th day of January last."

Well, whom *did* they deal with—that's what the public want to know; and why did they *not* deal with Messrs. Longaker, Childs & Co.? Were these latter gentlemen too conscientious to sell Rum to such "parties;" and did they never sell to others equally as bad? Come, tell us, Mr. Vidi, what special merit attaches to this firm, that they should be so honorably excepted. Let us see. The *Olive Branch* before us says:

"We have understood that Patrick Murphy was NOT paid for the liquor he sold to Daly, and this fact might account for Longaker & Childs not selling to him just then!"

There's the milk in the cocoa. Messrs L., C. & Co. would not sell liquor to Daly, not because they had any peculiar scruples of conscience about selling to such folks, or that they feared it might perhaps craze the mother and cause her to cut her infant's head off, or that they ever gave a thought as to what fruit it would produce, but simply because *he did not have the money to pay for it*—that's why Daly did not deal with Messrs. Longaker, Childs & Co.

☞ *On the 1st* of April an ordinance for the suppression of houses of ill-fame went into effect in San Francisco. On the evening of that day the first arrests were made. Fourteen women were arrested, of whom eight were of Spanish extraction, and six were tiny-footed celestials.

ROMANISM IN CONGRESS.

Mr. Cass, the great Mogul of the Democratic party, has somewhat changed his tune on Romanism since his special pleading in the Bedini affair. He has doubtless discovered his mistake. On Monday in the Senate, according to previous announcement, he spoke at considerable length, advocating religious toleration and the propriety of this government taking the necessary steps to secure to American citizens in foreign countries the same religious toleration which is extended to all in this. In the course of his speech, he alluded to the letter of Bishop Hughes, defending the Tuscan government in its treatment of the Madiai family. After referring to the systematical intolerance of Catholic authorities in all Catholic countries, in both hemispheres, and quoting facts, particularly the Madiai persecution in Tuscany to sustain his positions, he closed in the following words:

And does Archbishop Hughes believe that all these abuses are doomed to continue unmolested and unchastened. That they will much longer resist the mighty tide of public opinion which has already done so much in these, our latter days, and is fated to do so much more? It must not be! The past is a pledge for the future.

Within the memory of the present generation, abuses of ages seemed to possess an impregnable fortress, occupying its position in the midst of Christianity, and *civilization overlooking, overawing both*. But, one after another, its bulwarks have fallen before the efforts of truth, and ere long, the citadel itself will be levelled to the ground. And are the representatives of the American people to lay their hands on their mouths, and their mouths in the dust, to look on and see oppressions to which their countrymen are exposed abroad, and not even express displeasure and their demands? And all from an affectation of national decorum—national squeamishness it should be called—which is so tender to the presumption of others, as to sacrifice our own true rights and honor. I trust no such humiliation is in store for us.

After some further discussion, the subject was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The next day the matter was resumed by Mr. Mallory, of Florida, criticising a previous remark of Mr. Badger, of North Carolina, to the effect that as soon as the Catholic population of any State in the Union should get the supremacy, religious toleration would be at an end in that State, authoritatively made, not long since, in the St. Louis *Shepherd of the Valley*.

Mr. M. stated that the *Shepherd* was not an organ of the Church, and that the Bishop of St. Louis had, in a circular letter addressed to the people of his diocese, cautioned them against its "dangerous ultrism." Mr. M., it may be remarked, *had never seen* this circular but had only *heard* of it! Ah!

Neither have we seen it, and this is the first time we have ever heard of it; but we take the face of the paper itself as sufficient evidence to the contrary of its existence, or at least of its *influence*, if such a document were ever issued. To assure the reading public and especially the members of the same faith which it assumes to advocate, of the entire orthodoxy of the *Shepherd*, the following official recommendation appears at the head of its columns:

'The Shepherd of the Valley' is published with my approbation, and I recommend it to the support of this diocese.
PETER RICHARD,
Archbishop of St. Louis.

Of what good, we ask, is a private circular of caution, when the paper's "ultra" sins are covered by such an authoritative endorsement!

Mr. Badger's quotation, we beg leave to remark, was not exactly correct—it should have been:

If the Catholics ever gain the ascendancy here, as they certainly will, religious freedom in this country is at an end!

This evidently applies the threat to the *whole* Union, and not to any one State, as he supposed.

EASTON CONSPIRACY CASE.

A singular and exciting trial was begun in the Court of Quarter Sessions, at Easton, on the 19th ult. Dr. C. C. Field, Dr. Daniel Lachenour, Aaron S. Dech, James Stevenson and Isaac Parker, were charged with a conspiracy to extort money from Benjamin Green, a wealthy citizen of that place, upwards of 80 years old. The accused were mostly men of wealth and high standing in the community, which, together with the novel character of the case and the unusual amount of legal talent employed—all the prominent members of the Northampton Bar were retained, besides the Hon. Garrick Mallory, of Philadelphia—created a deep interest in the neighborhood, and crowds daily thronged the Court House. Stevenson plead guilty, and was the main witness for the Commonwealth. A very large number of others were also examined, from whose testimony the following facts substantially were made out:

"That Benjamin Green, of Easton, an old man, in his dotage, and possessed of considerable property, is very fond of women—and fond of talking about them; that Stevenson, one of the defendants, who was a student with Dr. Traill Green, a son of Benjamin, became acquainted with the old man and his peculiarities; that last fall he procured a young woman from New Jersey to come to Easton and keep company with the old man Green; that Stevenson communicated information of these doings to Dr. Field, during a long week which they took together, when a general discussion of the Green family took place between them; the Dr. Field suggested the idea of having some sport with the old man, stating that he was easily frightened and very fearful of exposure; that Stevenson assented to the propositions of Field, and thought they might have a rare sport with the old man; that Field at sundry times urged Stevenson to proceed, and frighten the old man by telling him the girl was in a delicate situation and would prosecute him; that Stevenson hesitating, Field assured him that a handsome sum could be made out of it, as Green would pay several hundred dollars to save exposure. It was finally agreed between them, that they should undertake it, and fixed the sum to be demanded at $500. Accordingly Stevenson mentioned the matter to Green, and he was very much alarmed when told the girl would prosecute him. He asked Stevenson what he could do to settle the matter quietly; and Stevenson told him that $500 would settle it. As he did no business for himself, and had no money except small sums furnished him by his family, he was embarrassed as to how to raise the necessary funds. Stevenson referred him to Field, who would aid him as a friend. At this stage of the case Dr. Lachenour and Dech were let into the secret, by Dr. Field, as they were men of large means, sometimes "shaved" notes, and could raise the money for the old man. The thing was arranged; and Dech furnished the money, taking a note of Green for $600 for $500 loaned. Green paid over the $500 to Stevenson, who gave Field $100 of it for his share, and kept the rest. The old man wanted a receipt from the girl, and they promised to get it for him, but did not do so. All this time Stevenson did not know who had furnished the money, as Field had negotiated the matter without letting him know.

"Some days after this, Field and Stevenson were in conversation on the subject, when when one of them suggested that a handsome speculation might have been made out of the old man, Green—that he would have paid much more than he did. It was finally agreed that Stevenson should slander him again, by telling him the girl had come back, and employed several of the leading lawyers of the place, and would prosecute him. When Stevenson told Green this, he was alarmed, and asked if he had not paid the girl. Stevenson told him he had, but she would not sign the receipt. He then wished to know how he could get out of the scrape; and Stevenson again referred him to Dr. Field as a friend. After much negotiation, it was arranged that Dech was to furnish Green $2,000, and take his note for $2,500. This was agreed to; and Dech took a note for $3,102 33—the $2 33 being for interest on the $500 note, which he gave up to Green. The $2,000 realized on this operation was divided as follows: $700 to Stevenson, $500 to Field, $500 to Lachenour, and $300 to Dech. The money was in $100 notes of the Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank of Easton; and difficult to get off without suspicion—consequently Stevenson kept his on hand, as well as three $100 bills he had changed for Field.

"In a short time Green's family ascertained what had been going on, and set about ferreting the matter out. The defendants saw that something was afoot, but could do nothing. Stevenson feared to leave the place lest suspicion should be increased. A friend of his, Isaac Parker, came in from the western part of the State, and went to New York; and he determined to go and see him. This is the first that Parker is known in the transaction. H. D. Maxwell went on the same train with Stevenson; watched his movements on the way, and had him secretly watched in New York. This was on the 9th of November. Some time that night he had him arrested at the Marchant's Hotel; and Parker was also arrested at 99 Cedar street, where he had been stayed one day!

"Stevenson on the next morning waited on Green, and told him that he was in the power of the conspirators, and that they would not settle for less than $1000. Green was in a terrible state of excitement, and agreed to pay the money. Stevenson then went to the conspirators, and told them that Green would pay the money, but that he must have $100 more for himself. This was agreed to, and Stevenson returned to Green, and told him that the conspirators would not settle for less than $1100