

THE STAR.

The Sentinel and the Hon. Charles Miner. The first letter of the Hon. Richard Rush, on Masonry, was published week before last in the Sentinel of this place. The Editor of that paper is a high Mason—Royal Arch, we believe. For the last year or so, with a few exceptions, he has left the subjects of Masonry and Anti-Masonry out of his own paper. Whether he has written of dicta for another, we shall not, at present, positively assert. But this much we do say, that although he has (as he says) kept "aloof from this controversy," he has not pursued that course towards the public which every high-minded, honorable journalist deems it a duty. Because, a neutral or impartial paper should never omit containing a notice of all "public and private matters" that in any manner whatever interest those who patronize it.

In the last Sentinel, commences a long tirade against Mr. Rush's letter, by the late Hon. CHARLES MINER, a high Mason. We refer the public to the following masterly review of Mr. M. and his laborious production, from the Lancaster Herald:

CHARLES MINER.

This gentleman, who is editor of the Village Record, has again taken up his pen in defence of Masonry. For Mr. Miner's talents as an editor, and merits as a man, we entertain much respect. His zeal, however, in this instance in support of the handmaid, has led him to overlook or disregard many facts and circumstances, which if he intended to present a fair and candid statement, he should have taken into consideration. Indeed, in most instances, he has totally departed from the point in dispute. He takes it for granted that the Antimasonic party is warring against him, solely and individually, and with laudible, but uncalled for zeal, endeavours to escape their chastisement by solemn protestations of innocence and honesty. He forgets, or affects not to comprehend the merits of the cause which Antimasons are supporting. He will not understand that it is against the Institution, whose principles inculcate and require murder—whose objects are selfish, and whose spirit strikes at the root of our liberties, not against him, or any other individual, we wage warfare. If he had viewed the question in this broad and correct light, his voluntary asseverations of innocence would have been unnecessary, and his stubborn and unbending would have been at every point. But this suited not his purpose. He pursues the same jesuitical, equivocating track which masons always follow, when they do undertake a serious defence of the order. He has ingeniously attempted to take the masonic institution under his wing—to conceal its hideous front—to keep out of view its blood-stained banner, and substitute himself in its stead. He cunningly contrives to make it a contest between antimasonry and himself, in which he appears as defendant, protesting his innocence; and hoping by exciting the sympathy of his readers, to keep the murderous principles and wicked deeds of masonry out of sight. This was cunning, but it was not candid; it was ingenious, but the artifice is too shallow to escape detection. Upon a few of the points treated of in his lengthy essay, we shall make some remarks. To follow him through his mazy windings would be an endless task. To the principle which antimasons have adopted to guide them as a political party that none but decided and publickly known antimasons be supported for office, Mr. Miner takes exception, and pronounces it "Wrong in principle and policy, cruel and unjust, to all who are innocent—proscriptive and uncharitable in the extreme."

Now if the refusal of a citizen to vote for a man who holds principles contrary to his own be obnoxious to such severe censure, Mr. Miner cannot have failed to have merited it more than one occasion during his political career. Will he pretend that he has not always acted upon this doctrine? Will he deny that he has not uniformly withheld his political support from men whose principles be considered dangerous, or whose views on important topics, differed essentially from his own? We know he will not. He would be unworthy the name of freeman, if he did not exercise the privilege of a freeman, and bestow his vote on that man whose opinions on subjects of national policy, or the abstract principles of government, accorded most nearly with his own. This is a constitutional right of the people, which no man can gain say. No individual can have a claim to any vote until it is voluntarily bestowed on him. To advance such a claim would be the height of absurdity and presumption. If I withhold it from him with, or without cause, he has no right to complain of injustice. It is my own and I can bestow it on whom I please.

This is the principle too, which has been avowed, and acted upon by every political party since the organization of our government. Federalists and Democrats adopted it. The late Jackson party pursued it. It was rigidly adhered to also by the late Adams party to which Mr. Miner belongs.

proclaimed that no man from "governor down to fence viewer," should be supported for office, unless he was an active friend of the then administration. Where then were Mr. Miner's crocodile tears about "proscription and persecution?" They were unseen, and his lamentations unheard. Now, however, when the darling interests of masonry are at stake, he whines most pitifully about injustice and want of charity.

But says Mr. Miner, the subject of masonry affords no legitimate grounds for the formation of a political party opposed to it. It is perfectly proper that parties should exist on the subjects of nullification, internal improvement, the U. S. Bank, domestic manufactures, &c. &c. but the idea of an Antimasonic party is monstrous! Raise parties on any subject but holy cut-throat masonry. That must not be touched. It is too sacred to be even spoken of by the unenlightened. The origin of Antimasonry is too humble, the interests at stake are of too little consequences, says this masonic dignitary to justify the formation of a political party!—So think not the people.

Mr. Miner remarks that the question which divided parties previous to the revolution, was shall British aggression be resisted or submitted to? We would add the question now is, and it is second only to that quoted, shall masonic aggression be resisted or submitted to? Shall we bow to her usurped dominion and yield ourselves willing slaves to her power, or shall we resist like freeman? This momentous question is of too little importance to merit a thought from Mr. Miner. The abolition of a secret order that has proved itself the foe of our laws and rights, weighs not a feather when put in the scale against the question, shall the United States dig this canal or make that railway. The preservation of our liberties against the murderous principles and acts of masonry, compared to which all other subjects on which parties may now divide are insignificant, is in the estimation of Mr. Miner of infinitely less importance than the question shall we raise all our own sheep or shall England raise a few for us. To expose further the absurdity and sophistry of this position would be useless.

But we are further tauntingly told that Antimasons have no principles on national policy, or are altogether divided and unsettled. Mr. Miner triumphantly asks 'are the antimasons united in respect to the policy that ought to be pursued to sustain the national faith pledged to the Indians?' In reply, we ask Mr. Miner whether the masonic party is united on this question? Do the sentiments of President Jackson and Mr. Clay coincide? Do the views of Mr. Miner and Mr. Buchanan of this city, correspond. Are the views of the prominent members of the masonic party in the north, the middle and the south states the same? Until Mr. Miner answers this question in the affirmative, we think he should refrain from reproaching us with want of unity on the subject, even if it did exist. Again, is the antimasonic party united in respect to a national system of internal improvement? asks Mr. Miner. We would again reply to this interrogatory by putting another—is the masonic party united on this question? Let the leaders of that party in the North and the South answer. Mr. Miner knows their sentiments to be as opposite as day and night. Are we united with respect to the Tariff? we are further interrogated. Is the masonic party unanimous? Let the same leaders of that party, answer. Let the Anti-tariff masonic convention to be held in Philadelphia speak. Are we united in favor of rechartering the U. S. Bank, continues Mr. Miner. Let him put the same question to the masonic party. When they clear their skirt of a difference of opinion on the subject, it will be time to make this inquiry of Antimasons. When that period arrives Mr. Miner will find that neither this nor any other topic of general interest has been overlooked—that antimasons have principles on national policy, but that those principles are at the present time of secondary importance to the preservation of the nation itself, from the destructive grasp of an unhallowed combination. They are but secondary to the great question, shall we submit to masonic aggression and dominion or shall we resist.

Mr. Miner boldly affirms that the "Antimasonic question will be absorbed in a year or two at most." If we recollect aright, he made the same prediction in an equally confident tone more than two years ago. But contrary to his wishes and expectations antimasonry still lives. Its healthful influence is spreading throughout the union, and instead of being "absorbed" will eventually drive the Hydra Headed monster masonry, from the land. The antimasonic cause is no "evitement;" the party is composed of sober minded men who act from conviction. Every act they do is the result of deliberation. They commenced with a full knowledge of the odium they would have to encounter, and the persecution they would have to bear. They counted the cost before they embarked, and immense as was the risk, they fearlessly espoused the cause. Masons may preach that antimasonry is dying away, but so long as a lodge is in existence in the country, they may rest assured that although Antimasonry may be "dying," it will not be dead.

Mr. Miner complains of the injustice of punishing the innocent with the guilty—of punishing the masons of Pennsylvania for the sins of a few in New York. But we would ask him, have the masonic party in New York or Pennsylvania, or in the Union, disavowed the murder of Morgan, or punished the miscreants who violated the laws of the land by an adherence to the laws of masonry. Were the perpetrators of this

foul deed expelled—cast off from the lodge and made to undergo the dread penalty provided for him who sheds another's blood? No—so far from masonry disavowing the crime and aiding the ministers of justice in convicting the culprits, the institution has adopted the act as its own. The criminals have been retained as worthy members of the lodge. They have been shielded and protected with a power which has baffled the laws and exertions of a great state to punish them. Money has been furnished for counsel by the lodge, witnesses have been "spirited" away, others have refused to give testimony because they would violate their masonic oath—Jurors have failed to convict upon evidence which none but masons trying the case of a brother mason would dare to disregard a feeling of sympathy deep and universal, for the guilty has been expressed by the fraternity. Where, therefore, is the injustice of holding the Institution accountable for the crimes of its members, when those crimes are committed in accordance with its known principles and sanctioned by its oath bound subjects.—There can be none. The order is both in a legal and moral point of view, guilty, and such as sanction its principles are implicated in its guilt. These are facts and inferences which Mr. Miner could not deny, but cunningly give them the "go-by," protesting that he did not assist at, or counsel the murder of Morgan. He will not boldly deny that the obligations of masonry as disclosed to the public, are not authentic, and that Morgan was murdered in conformity with them, but this is the inference he would like to see drawn. He is not so reckless as to deny what every body knows to be true, when he can see that he would not be credited—especially when he thinks he can much more effectually serve the handmaid by silence on that subject, and a protestation of innocence in regard to himself.

The argument which Mr. Miner attempts to draw against antimasonry and in favor of masonry, from the butcheries among different religious sects, has become too stale for effect. Our surprise is that so intelligent a man as Mr. M. should use it. It is grounded upon the absurd and exploded boast of the heaven descended character of masonry. The attempt to compare the pure doctrines of christianity to the hell-born doctrines of the lodge, is blasphemous and wicked. The effort to justify the deliberate crimes of the order, planned in the midst of revelry, within the polluted walls of a tyled lodge, and executed according to its principles, to the half unconscious deeds of fiery bigots, hurried along by their zeal for a religion the benign spirit of which their misguided judgments could not comprehend: is monstrous & shocking to the feelings of every Christian. Our astonishment is, that any man should be so reckless as to talk in such a strain. Yet strange as it may seem, this has been the constant resort whenever the crimes of masonry have been urged as an imperious reason for destroying the Institution. "You will not condemn," say they, "christianity and all christians, because of the blood that has been shed by its professors in contending for their peculiar creeds"—and you certainly will not condemn masonry and all masons for the crimes of a few, although these crimes are the natural result of its principles and are adopted by the society. Fanatics have cut each others throats, therefore masonry has a right to erect a separate government, swear her subjects to unconditional submission, and, if they rebel, why because Christians have killed each other, masonry must in imitation, cut the throats of its seceding subjects. So much for charitable masonry, holy masonry, heaven-born masonry.

Equally absurd, too is the argument which Mr. M. attempts to draw in justification of the secrecy of masonry, from the fact that banks, cabinet councils, commanders of armies, &c. do not forthwith publish to the world their doings—as if there was any similarity, between the salutary and often necessary silence of private individuals—or of persons trusted with the concerns of a nation, and the secrecy of the lodge which is eternal, or can only be revealed at the risk of life. A general of an army does not tell his enemy that he is going to attack him at midnight, therefore it is "persecution" to complain that masonic secrets have murdered a citizen and defied the laws. More masonic sophistry and arrogance.

The next point in Mr. M's ten columns that deserves a passing notice, is his asseveration that masonry is not political. Let BENJAMIN RUSSELL, grand master of the grand Lodge of Mass. speak. In his circular addressed "TO THE MASONIC FRATERNITY" published in the Boston Centinel, March 30th, 1816, and designed to promote the election of JOHN BROOKS to the gubernatorial chair of that state, is the following bold and explicit avowal.—"Where two candidates present themselves for your support, you are not bound to enquire to what party he belongs, but is he a 'good and true man'—and again; 'all other things being favorable you are bound by EVERY MASONIC OBLIGATION to give your vote for one who is a free and accepted Brother, in preference to the one who is not," and in conclusion says "BROTHER JOHN BROOKS shall receive the vote of a master mason."

After such positive proof, we would suppose none were hardy enough to deny that masonry is political. Were additional evidence wanting, the observation of nearly every individual might supply it by looking over our state at the Offices held by masons. True, Mr. Miner says that out of Thirty-Three Commissioners elected in Chester Co. but three have been masons. But with a want of candor unworthy an honorable man he gives that part of the story only, which is favorable to the order. Let him, look

abroad & tell us how many masonic judges there are in the State—how many masons are now, and have been members of congress and of the legislature, and how many hold lucrative county offices. After he has done this, let him extend his enquiries throughout the Union. If the result coincides with his statement as to the Chester Co. commissioners, we will cheerfully confess that masonry is not political, and that we have charged it unjustly. Mr. M. must have known that the fact, if it be one that he adduces to disprove this charge, is not applicable to the case. Such petty offices as county commissioner, the craft have not sought after. They aim at higher stations, leaving such insignificant posts to the people.

In his defence of the Masonic Press against the severe but just censure of Mr. Rush, Mr. Miner is as unfortunate as on other topics. Say what he will, masonry has muzzled the press—placed a tyler over every column that successfully excludes truth and light on this subject, although the grossest calumnies against the opponents of masonry find ready admission.

The piece of Egotism with which Mr. M. concludes in enumerating the highly important services he has rendered the country, may be pardoned, when it is known that the object is a generous one, to draw off attention from masonry and fix it upon himself. To make his "private grief" instead of the crimes of masonry the subject of controversy. In this he will fail.

Many other points in Mr. M's "reasoning appeal" as he terms it, might be exposed and their absurdity made manifest. But we have bestowed much more room on it than we at first intended. We do not hesitate to say, that it is the most consummate piece of sophistry and disingenuousness that could be produced in so many columns. It may be considered, the last desperate kick of an ardent mason,—the last chapter of Charles Miner's lamentations.

A PEEP BEHIND THE CURTAIN.

From the Washington Telegraph. REMARK.—The Globe is the acknowledged favorite of the administration. So far as the countenance and support of the Executive can give it character, it has it to the full. But will none of those who approach the President, and who respect his character admonish him of the great injury which the prevarications and falsehoods of his organ inflict upon him. That venacious print attempts to assert that the statement that Mr. Crawford was about to make a publication, "in two prints in this city." Now the fact is, that, some weeks ago the CONSTITUTIONALIST, a Crawford, Georgia paper, published, as we believe, in the neighborhood of Mr. Crawford's residence, asserted that Mr. Crawford's "final reply" to Mr. Calhoun would appear in the Globe in a few days.—This statement was reiterated by the Richmond Enquirer, and had appeared in most of the Southern daily papers before it was noticed in either of the two prints in this city, which so much annoy those who established the Globe.

The editor of the Globe so fond of his association with great men, asserts that "Mr. Crawford has neither directly nor indirectly transmitted any thing to the editor for publication." Does this prove that Mr. Crawford did not directly transmit a "final reply" to some one else, to be handed over to the editor? But, says the editor, we never had any correspondence with Mr. Crawford in relation to his controversy with Mr. Calhoun! Wonderful! What! does not Mr. Crawford consider Mr. F. P. Blair, once the confidential agent and friend of Mr. Clay, the factotum who made "the bargain," and now, as then, the associate of Amos Kendall, worthy of his confidence? What! does not Mr. Crawford correspond with Mr. Blair, the organ of the administration!! Certainly this proves that Mr. Crawford has no correspondent at Washington!!! For who can believe that, if a "final reply" had been sent to Washington, Mr. Crawford would have sent it to any one else than the editor!!!!

Now, for our part, we can very readily believe that Mr. Crawford did not send his "final reply" to the editor and yet also believe that it was sent, to some other person (one high in office) to be handed over for publication in the Globe. We do believe that it was so sent, and that its publication has been suppressed for reasons which will hereafter appear, and which, when they appear, will cast a moral blot upon the reputation of more than one great man. We can also believe that for the same reasons which caused its publication to be suppressed, Mr. Crawford has been advised to select some other print as the vehicle of his communication to the public. Nor shall we be surprised if the facts which caused its suppression here, prevent its publication altogether. It is thus that coward guilt seeks to hide its shame in silence. But the facts are known, and if Mr. Crawford does not make his publication and thus call them forth, they will appear in time to electrify the nation, and to overwhelm the guilty. "Truth is mighty and will prevail."

But we note again the attempt of the Globe to charge upon "two city prints" the statement, that Mr. Crawford was about to publish his "final reply" in the Globe in a few days. The statement appeared in a paper in Mr. Crawford's own State, and was no doubt made on his authority. The manner of the article quoted from the Globe shows that it was forwarded for publication and suppressed for weighty considerations. Let it come when & where it may, it will bear upon its face the proof of what we now say—and whether it comes or not, we will in due time disclose the cause of its suppression.—O WE ASK THE PUBLIC TO NOTE THIS.



Here shall the Press the People's rights proclaim Unaw'd by influence, and unbrib'd by gain.

Tuesday Morning, September 8, 1831. Democratic Anti-Masonic Nominations: FOR PRESIDENT, John McLean, of Ohio. FOR VICE-PRESIDENT, Richard Rush, of Penn.

THE CONVENTION.—In another column will be found the proceedings of the Convention which assembled in this Borough last Monday week.—The Convention was attended by Delegates from every township in the county, which shows that our cause has gained new vigor. The proceedings of the Convention also show, that, in settling the Ticket, perfect harmony and good feeling pervaded, because no member of the ticket received but the one balloting. We are proud of such proceedings. The Ticket should and will, we doubt not, receive the cordial support of every genuine Anti-mason, and ensure to our cause such a victory over masonry this fall as will prostrate the Aristocratic faction so low, that there will hereafter be no further opposition to the pure, genuine Republican principles of Antimasonry.

"An honest man's the noblest work of God." Mr. LEWIS CHRIST, a member of the late Anti-Masonic Convention of this county, is a "free and accepted mason," and a member, we believe, of Good Samaritan Lodge, No. 200, of this borough. He is a gentleman of unimpeached integrity and genuine piety, and has taken this method to manifest his abhorrence of Masonry, and renounce his connexion with the "unholy thing." Thus will all truly pious men eventually do.—None, but those who deceive themselves, will attempt to reconcile Religion and Masonry. No surer evidence can be given of the want of regeneration, than to be enabled to endure the blasphemies of Freemasonry, without remorse of conscience. Those who adhere to, and sustain the abominable Institution, and yet venture to partake of the sacred ordinances of the christian religion, would do well to inquire whether they do not commit sacrilege; whether there is not danger that they "eat and drink unto themselves damnation"?

We are aware of the impropriety of referring to a Suit pending in our Courts. Nor should we now have done so, if it were not to correct certain falsehoods of the Compiler. The Editor, in his last paper, gives, as the reason of his submitting to a verdict of Guilty, "because the law would not permit, nor could the Court with propriety allow the facts to be proved, even if the publication were known to be every word true." Now, we happened to be in Court on the trial, and know this not to be the true reason. The prosecutor proved on the trial, that immediately after he instituted the prosecution, he served a written notice on Defendant, that he should be at liberty to prove the truth of any of the facts alleged in the libel, and that the law, excluding each proof, would be waived on the trial.—Nor was any objection made to such evidence on the trial. The malignant attempt made in the last Compiler to perpetuate the calumny will, in due time, recoil with intolerable weight on its miserable author.

KENTUCKY.—This State has elected Eight Jackson and Four Clay members of Congress. No rational man can entertain a hope of Kentucky's going for Clay. Unless his friends are infatuated, indeed, they will relinquish him in favor of some candidate professing the same national principles with better prospects of success. Clay, under any circumstances, will not receive 75 electoral votes at the next Presidential election. Some of our friends, we trust, hoisted his flag at an unpropitious hour.

UNITED STATES CONVENTION.

In a few weeks, there will assemble in the city of Baltimore, Delegates from almost every State & Territory in the Union, for the purpose of meeting in National Convention to nominate suitable candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States, to be supported by those who are opposed to all Secret Societies—whose friends to the Tariff; the United States Bank, and the Judiciary—in short by all who are the true friends of a pure, uncontaminated Republican Government—such as it has been in "days gone by."—To that Convention, the eyes of the American people are bent with intense interest. And it behooves every friend of his country to be up and doing. Our country wants regeneration. Aristocracy has swayed the sceptre long enough—too long, for the good of Virtue and Patriotism.

On no man could the Convention bestow the honor of the nomination of President, that is more worthy than JOHN MCLEAN, of Ohio. In him we find the Patriot and Statesman. In him we have one who is a friend of his country in every particular. And in him we find the man that has always been decidedly opposed to Secret Societies, of every name and grade. Such is the man, who can redeem the American Republic from that abyss of polluted corruption into which Aristocratic Grand Kings and High Priests have plunged it. And that he is the man, whom the Convention will, in their wisdom, select, we have now no doubt.

A QUESTION FOR ANTI-MASONS.—Who renders the most effectual aid to the Masonic cause, he who votes their ticket at the polls, or he who, through the whole year, supports a paper to advocate their principles?