THE STAR AND BANNER.

GETTYSBURG.

Friday Evening, August 27, 1852.

FOR PRESIDENT,

GEN. WINFIELD SCOTT.

VICE PRESIDENT,

WILLIAM A. GRAHAM.

FOR SUPREME JUDGE,

JOSEPH BUFFINGTON.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,

JACOB HOFFMAN, (Berks)

FOR CONGRESS,

SAMUEL L. RUSSELL,

OF BEDFORD.

WHIG COUNTY TICKET.

ASSEMBLY.

David Mellinger, (of East-Berlin.)

COMMISSIONER.

John Mickley, jr., (of Hamiltonban.)

AUDITOR.

John Dickson, (of Gettysburg.)

DIRECTORS OF THE POOR.

Peter Smith, (of Mount-pleasant.)

Joseph Baily, (of Cumberland.)

"I HAVE SERVED THE UNION FOR NINETY-ODD YEARS, AND FEEL MYSELF A CITIZEN OF EVERY STAT OF IT; AND WHATEVER OF LIFE AND STRENGTH I MAY HAVE SHALL BE DEVOTED TO ITS PRESERVATION."—*General Winfield Scott.*

Mass Meeting in Gettysburg.

☞The Whig County Committee has appointed *Friday the 17th of September next*, for the holding of a general Mass Meeting of the friends of SCOTT & GRAHAM, in Gettysburg. Arrangements are being made to secure the attendance of distinguished speakers, including Hon. James Cooper, Hon. T. Stevens, J. C. Kunkle, Jacob Hoffman, (our candidate for Canal Commissioner,) S. L. Russell (candidate for Congress,) Hon. Edward Stanly, of N. C., Colleges, and others. Judge Conrad of Philadelphia, and other speakers. Full particulars next week.

An Infamous Blackguarding Document.

☞Our County, especially the lower part of it, has within a few days past, been flooded with an infamous pamphlet, a copy of which is now before us, with the following bold title:

"THE POLITICAL LETTERS AND WRITINGS OF GEN. SCOTT,

REVIEWED, DISCUSSED, AND COMPARED.

His Native Americanism proved by his own words!

His support of the Bankrupt Law proved by his own words!

His support of the United States Bank proved by his own words!

His ignorance of the Constitution proved by his own words!

His hostility to Catholics proved by his own words!

And, finally, his incompetency, his aristocracy, and his perverseing efforts against the naturalization laws, proved by his own words!

This precious document, as its forbidding title indicates, is addressed to the Catholic portion of the community, and by means of a most discreditable and villainous combination of misrepresentation, falsehood and forgery, it is sought to array the prejudices of that respectable religious sect against Gen. Scott. To accomplish this purpose, Gen. Scott's sentiments are most grossly perverted and misrepresented—his true opinions as expressed over and over again on the subject are studiously suppressed—while letters are forged and unblushingly published as his, and even anonymous newspaper publications reprinted with Gen. Scott's name attached to them! The villainy of this production is so evident and palpable that the printer has declined putting his imprint to it, and it goes forth to the world without any accreditable paternity. Yet Mr. Kurtz, the member of congress from the Harrisburg District, does not hesitate to give it his endorsement and insult his constituents by *franking* an indelicate number of them for circulation in our midst.

In the instances of which the Opposition are playing it order to break down Gen. Scott, bids fair to overreach itself. The demagogueism prevailing all efforts their is so palpable, that its only effect must be to the end to cause an honest indignation in the minds of those to whom it is addressed, against all who may be participants in it. Look at the game thus being played.

First we have the rank and file of the Locofoco party, throughout the length and breadth of the land, electioneering against Gen. Scott and endeavoring to poison the minds of Protestant voters against him by charging him with being a Catholic, and until the Catholic institutions in Mexico—and other similar stuff. And then the leaders of this same party, backed by their entire tribe of newspaper scribblers, turn round, address themselves to Catholic voters, and charge Gen. Scott not only with being a Protestant, but with being a "Native," hostile to the Catholics, incompetent, aristocratic, and ignorant! And to support either of these allegations, spurious representation, falsehood, and forgery, are resorted to as coolly and unblushingly as though the voters to whom they are addressed, were steeped in stolid ignorance and incapacity of seeing through the miserable demagogueism with which they are perseveringly piled and insulted. Is it not high time that the honest, intelligent voters thus addressed, Protestant as well Catholics, should go to the polls *en masse* and through the ballot box denounce a rightous sentence of condemnation upon the political demagogues who thus year after year make it their trade to batten up the prejudiced ignorance of those to whom they address their villainous appeals. It is the only effectual mode of breaking it up.

Gen. Scott on Nativeism.

☞Well, reader, after a good deal of fruitless search among our Locofoco exchanges, we have at length got hold of a copy of the letter said to have been written by Gen. Scott in 1841 to George W. Reed, and which the *Compiler* has so long been harping upon as proof positive as to Gen. Scott's Nativeism. And where think you we found it? Among our exchanges or in the columns of respectable Opposition journals? No—the fraud is so palpable that few of the Locofoco presses will have anything to do with it—but we find it among a mass of other misrepresentations, falsehoods, and forgeries, put forth in an irresponsible electioneering document with which the country is deluged, and which we have noticed in another column. We give it as we find it, thus redeeming our promise to the *Compiler*:

WASHINGTON, *November 19, 1841*

DEAR SIR: I have been to know acknowledge your letter of the 8th inst. written, as you are pleased to tell, in behalf of several hundred native American republicans of Philadelphia.

Not confidential, but not for publication, I have already replied to a letter from David M Stage, Esq., of your city, on the same subject. I will write to you in like manner, and in haste. This is the month when the presence of official business will meet with me, in quick succession fine days or exercise. I must not, however, wholly neglect your communication.

Should any considerable number of my fellow-countrymen assign my political claims to give me a prominent position before the public. I shall take it for granted that they do so with a full knowledge of you have prop-oned. Those views have their origin in the stormy elections of the spring of 1840, and were confirmed in the sun that the foreign electors were chosen in New York. On both occasions I was in that city, and heard in the streets "Down with the natives." It was heard in almost every group of foreigners met in my rambles and outrage.

Proud with foreigners, true friends set down to rule my Country, in the parlor at the Astor House (November, 1840) to draw up an address, designed to rally an American party.

The day after the election I set out for the South, and was not confined in the saddle, till the address was not published. Probably the election of General Harrison rendered the publication at that time unnecessary, in the opinion of my two friends.

I now hesitate between extending the period of residence before naturalization and a total repeal. All sides of the question have strong and almost equal indines to the latter.

Concerning fidelity to the principles of the Philadelphia movement, I should prefer assuming the name of American Republicans, rather than Native or Democratic Americans, as I should respectfully suggest. Brought up in the principles of the Revolution—of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, whom in youth I remembered life, I have always been called. I have ever professed myself a republican or a Whig, which with me was the same thing. Democratic principles are inferable all good native citizens devoted to our country and institutions—and not drawn from a class of adopted citizens who, by long residence, have become identified with us in feeling and interest.

I am happy to see, by the Philadelphia National American, that religion is to be excluded as a test of political preferment. Nativeism is to be sought by birth and conviction. I shall never consent to a party or State religion. Religion is a matter to be mingled with either. It should always be kept between each individual and his God, except in the way of moral and social example, and in family churches and other occasions of voluntary assemblage, (Congress included,) of a moral or religious character.

Nothing concerns to the great work which you and other patriots have set on foot, I remain, with high respect, your obedient servant,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

To GEORGE WASHINGTON REED, Esq., and others, Philadelphia.

Now we have but a word or two to say upon this letter, and that is—that it is utterly unfair and dishonorable to hold Gen. Scott responsible for its sentiments, inasmuch as its genuineness has been time and again denied, and the original challenged at the hands of those who impute it to Gen. Scott. If the letter as published were a *bona fide* one, written by Gen. Scott to Mr. Reed, it would be the easiest thing imaginable to get Mr. Reed, who is now opposing Gen. Scott, to certify to its genuineness or to show it to a committee of respectable, responsible gentlemen, whose certificate would be conclusive. But nothing of this kind is attempted. On the other hand everything goes to show that the letter is a bold, palpable *forgery*. The friends of Gen. Scott have pronounced it a forgery, and challenged the production of the original—and more than all the Opposition don't agree themselves as to the character of the letter they say Gen. Scott wrote! The letter as we find it above, the member of congress from the Harrisburg "*Democratic Union*," has this paragraph:

"Fired with indignation, two friends set down with me in my parlor at the Astor House, (November, 1840) to draw up an address, designed to rally an American party."

In the latter edition of "*the Investigator*," a paper issued from the same office and edited by the same persons, we find the same portion published in the following manner:

"In the letter to the Native, George W. Reed, of Philadelphia, Gen. Scott says—"Fired with indignation against the *Irish rabble*, who strutted down with the Natives!" two friends sat down with me in my parlor at the Astor House, (in November, 1840,) to draw up an address, designed to rally an American party."

Now, to say the least, the Opposition ought to be consistent in their forgeries—if they expect to make the people believe that Gen. Scott really wrote a letter to Mr. Reed, they ought first agree as to what he *did* write.

But, after all, it matters little whether the foregoing letter be genuine or not. If genuine, it would only show that in 1841 the writer, under the press of peculiar influences, was disposed to adopt stringent views in regard to our Naturalization policy—views which have long since been changed and which are no longer entertained. There are few men living, we presume—excepting probably stupid blockheads within brain enough to form an original idea—who have not at one time or another held erroneous views or who have not honestly changed views when found to be wrong. There is no doubt that Gen. Scott, at one time, did think favorably of a *modification* of our Naturalization Laws to correct *abuses*. With the frankness of a true soldier and honest man he admits it. But then there is just as little doubt that Gen. Scott long since acknowledged his error in this respect and put on paper, over his own signature, his real views. And it is in the careful suppression of these views, that the Opposition do high such gross and manifest injustice. It is publishing the letter said to have been written to Mr. Reed in 1841, they would evince common honesty enough to put their readers in possession of the subsequent correspondence, the genuineness of which no one disputes, all would be right.

Having given the letter to George W. Reed, we now hold the Compiler to its promise to copy the two letters following:

WASHINGTON, *May 8th, 1848.*

MY DEAR GENERAL:

Your distinguished services in two wars, and your no less distinguished services during the long and intermediate period of peace, have deservedly won for you the love and admiration of your country. A large portion of our fellow-citizens, who yielded to none in their admiration of your bravery and humanity in war, as well as of your patriotism and prudence in peace, have been told that you favor the principles of the so-called "Native" party. From an extensive correspondence and acquaintance with citizens of this class, I hoped that some proof against that calumnious principle should be attributed to you.

But they know you, as I do, they would see that a great injustice is done you. I know your kind and liberal views towards the naturalized citizens. I remember the grateful emotions of my heart when I first read the account of your receiving from British prisoners, many of your countrymen, made prisoners of war while fighting under the American flag. You, sir, was the first to assert and maintain the perfect equality of adopted and native citizens. In your recent campaign in Mexico, I hope you have found additional motives to recognize the equality, and that all the adopted citizens will with each other in braving danger wherever you commanded.

Not for myself, therefore, but for the satisfaction of others, do I respectfully ask you to say whether, after a long and faithful adhesion to the flag of their adopted country, by soldiers of foreign birth, you are for adding new restrictions to the present rules of naturalization; or whether you are in favor of having the privileges, now enjoyed under the Constitution and laws of the Union, more extended and faithfully executed, secured to such portions of foreign born Men as may wish to become citizens of the United States?

I have the honor to be.

Sincerely yours.

W. E. HOSTOMP.

Major-General Winfield Scott.

REPLY.

WASHINGTON, *May 29th, 1848.*

DEAR SIR:

In reply to your kind letter of the 8th instant, I take pleasure in saying that, grateful for the services of adopted citizens in the late war, my public opinions, you do me no more than justice in assuming that I entertain kind and liberal views towards our naturalized citizens." CERTAINLY IT WOULD BE UNPATRIOTIC TO DO SO. I RECOMMEND OR SUPPORT ANY MEASURE INTENDED TO EXCLUDE THEM FROM A DIRECT AND FULL PARTICIPATION IN ALL CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, SECURED TO THEM BY THE OUR REPUBLICAN LAWS AND INSTITUTIONS.

It is true that in a season of unusual excitement, some years ago, when both parties competed for Irish votes, I was induced to express my views in regard to the