

THE CAMDEN JOURNAL.

VOLUME 3.

CAMDEN, SOUTH-CAROLINA, MAY 7, 1852.

NUMBER 37.

THE CAMDEN JOURNAL.

PUBLISHED SEMI-WEEKLY AND WEEKLY BY
THOMAS J. WARREN.

TERMS.

THE SEMI-WEEKLY JOURNAL is published at Three Dollars and Fifty Cents, if paid in advance, or Four Dollars if payment is delayed three months. The WEEKLY JOURNAL is published at Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per quarter, or Three Dollars if not paid till the expiration of the year.

ADVERTISEMENTS will be inserted at the following terms: For one square (fourteen lines or less) in the semi-weekly, one dollar for the first, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion. In the weekly, seventy-five cents per square for the first, and thirty-seven and a half cents for each subsequent insertion. Single insertions one dollar. Semi-monthly, monthly and quarterly advertisements charged the same as for a single insertion.

The number of insertions desired, and the edition to be published in must be noted on the margin of all advertisements, or they will be published semi-weekly until ordered discontinued and charged accordingly.

TO THE PUBLIC.

NO. 1.

Dr. Bellinger as an Alderman before the City Council, denying the right of protection of the City Authorities to a Protestant Clergyman, who was threatened by a mob—His uncalculated attack on the Moral Teachings of the "Chief Reformer"—Receives the sanction and aid of the Church.

The public is so fully aware of all the circumstances which have compelled me to enter into this discussion that they need no explanation.—The multiplied calls on my time and my period of life would lead me infinitely to prefer the rest and quietude of my own thoughts, agreeable studies and ministerial labours and associations, to the excitement and often embittered feelings, which are engendered by a religious controversy. When however, great principles are to be defended and the reputations of the benefactors of mankind are to be rescued from defamation, it then becomes our duty to lay aside for a time our more agreeable occupations and battle manfully in the cause of truth and of justice.

As a native American citizen and an inhabitant of Charleston, for nearly forty years, I have recently felt deeply grieved, that an attempt has been made resulting in partial success by a Roman Catholic Alderman to deprive a Protestant Clergyman of the privilege of free discussion in matters of religion, and he, as a member of the City Council voting against his being protected from a Roman Catholic mob.

As a minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, holding the sentiments of the great reformer, whose commentary on the Book of Galatians, was instrumental in inducing me to enter on the trials and duties of the ministerial life—believing him to have been a great, a pure and a good man, and the greatest benefactor of the Christian world since the day of the Apostles. I have been greatly astonished and shocked to find that the infamous forgeries and abominable slanders invented by the Papists of old, to destroy the reputation of a man who as an instrument of God was enabled to break the fetters which had so long enslaved the human mind, and so shake the Papal throne, that it has been tottering from that day to this, and even now is only upheld from the fury of its own people by the bayonets of France—that some of these slanders have been once more reproduced with variations and additions. They have been repeatedly proved to be false and their authors shamed into silence and confusion. But about every quarter of a century they have been waked up from the grave of infamy in which they were buried and once more paraded before the world to prove that if many of their Popes had been impure and wicked men, the Reformer's had been no less so.

I will endeavor to confine myself in this number to the first head, and enquire whether Dr. Bellinger had any right, under the Constitution or laws of our State or City, to refuse protection to Leahy, who was prevented lecturing by a mob. As far as I understand the spirit of our laws they permit a toleration of all the forms of religion, and the Protestant, the Roman Catholic, the Jew and the Heathen are all placed precisely on an equality. Freedom of thought and speech is the grand palladium of our liberty. It is true this is not the case in many Roman Catholic countries. Protestant churches are not allowed to be built, and Protestant Ministers are sent to prison if they dare to preach. I had myself, whilst travelling in Austria, to lock up in my trunk, which, from circumstances connected with my scientific pursuits, was not liable to search, the Bible of a young fellow traveller given to him by a pious mother. If found in his trunk it would have been confiscated and burned. If you did not kneel down whilst the Host was passing along the streets you received a thump on the head from the long staves of the officials in close attendance, who seemed to say to the head—bow or break. But we have no such laws, and I should be sorry to see any such customs in our free country. The Protestant Aldermen who stood up so nobly in Council for the right of private judgment, and the free toleration of religious worship, seemed to be perfectly aware of their duty under the laws and institutions of our country. I should have thought equally well of them if they had, under similar circumstances, resolved to protect a Roman Catholic priest in his rights to preach, to say mass, or to lecture when and where he pleased, even if they knew before hand that he intended to abuse the Protestants as fiercely as Dr. Bellinger belaboured the moral character of one, whose shoe latches, neither he nor I are worthy to unloose.

After having proceeded thus far a friend sent me "The United States Catholic Miscellany," which contains an article which is worthy of being perused, not only as a curiosity, but as an

evidence of what would be done if power was not wanting. Here it is:

[From the U. S. Catholic Miscellany, April 24, 1852.]

"We commend to our readers, Catholic and Protestant, the letter of Dr. Bellinger given below. Had his only object been to rebuke the insolence and calumny of an Evangelical Editor, we could almost regret to see so much accurate learned research and eloquent sarcasm expended on so despicable an adversary. But the stern justice dealt to Mr. Gildersleeve is only necessary to a higher purpose; in the same way that we unhesitatingly trample on the toad or other noisome reptile, that seeks to dispute with us our honest appointed path. The allusion to Luther in Dr. B.'s speech in Council was merely an incidental one, to which no reasonable man could or did object. We are not sorry that he has been forced by the malignant bravado of the Richmond Editor, to give our community an insight into Luther's real character. Mr. Gildersleeve has exhumed the great Reformer, and the Doctor had no alternative than to dissect him for the satisfaction of all concerned."

Now, Gentlemen of the priory, who hold the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven either to admit or lock out at your pleasure—who have possession of the minds, consciences and souls of your people, permit me, one of the excluded Heretics, to suggest to you that you have acted rather prematurely here. I all along presumed that there was a power behind the throne—a backer of the champion—a secret mover of the wires in this grand exhibition of intolerance and dictation. But I scarcely expected that you would have shown your hand so soon. I have some insight into the maneuvering of your order, and have generally found them cool, calculating, looking far ahead, wildly, doubling on the track, scenting danger from afar, and displaying all the cunning of an animal that shall be nameless, but whose history I once described. You should have left the Doctor to dissect Luther, and then to feel the public pulse by himself. If it was feverish, leave him to administer sudorifics, and if the case became unmanageable, the consulting physicians would have been left unblamed. As it is, however, you are now committed—you are afloat in the same ship, and must sink or swim together.

You say in your Miscellany, "Mr. Gildersleeve has exhumed the great Reformer, and the Dr. had no other alternative than to dissect him for the satisfaction of all concerned."—This seems to be a mistake, as Dr. Bellinger exhumed him, first at his post as Alderman, and then engaged a considerable time in dissecting him for the benefit of all concerned. This practice of exhuming and dissecting is, by-the-way no recent discovery in surgery by the Professors of any Ecclesiastical-Medical College in Charleston. It was practised some centuries ago. The bodies of John Huss and Jerome of Prague required no exhumation or dissection—they were condemned by the Church for entertaining most of the sentiments held by this Protestant community. One of the Bishops put on the head of Huss a large paper cap, on which various and horrid forms of devils were painted, and on which was written, "I commit thy soul to the Devil." Huss smiling observed, it was less painful than a crown of thorns—they were both at different times burnt, and their ashes scattered in the Rhine.—Crammer was spared the degradation of exhumation and dissection. He was burnt, calling out in the midst of the flames, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." Wickliff and Bucu escaped the grasp of their enemies by a merciful act of God, and they were spared from the stake and the faggot by dying a natural death. But their bodies were "exhumed and dissected," according to the ancient Romish practices in Surgery—their bones were dug up and burnt. The Council of Constance, in 1412, ordered Wickliff's bones to be exhumed and thrown on a dung-hill, and a subsequent mandate from the Pope was obeyed by Flemming, Bishop of Lincoln, his bones were burnt, and his ashes thrown into a brook. But did they burn their principles along with their bones?

Fuller, the Church historian, in his quaint and figurative style, says of Wickliff: "This brook has conveyed his ashes into Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the narrow seas, they into the main ocean; and thus, the ashes of Wickliff are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed all the world over."

Luther also expected to be burned, and prepared himself to die a martyr's death, but God had a great work for him to do, and he was spared in spite of his enemies who thirsted for his blood. Since that day, however, the Holy Mother has given birth to successive generations of her children, who for three hundred years have been engaged in exhuming and dissecting the remains of poor Luther—among the last was Dr. Bellinger, and the very last his spiritual guides, who endorsed his sentiments and chuckled over his exploits, and who as the spies of their great cathedral are rising higher every day, will soon come to the kind hearted, generous Protestant ladies and gentlemen, with the honeyed words in their mouths, "help us dear patrons to complete the only true house of God, and we will amply repay you by using all our Jesuitical arts by torturing passages from their contexts, and by quoting writers of no authority, defaming the character of the Father of the Reformation, and convicting him of immoral teachings, and "plainly sanctioning concubinage, polygamy and adultery." Since then poor old Luther has been exhumed by Gildersleeve according to the Catholic Miscellany, and so unceremoniously and so unmercifully dissected by Dr. Bellinger. (These dissections by the way have sometimes proved fatal to the unskilful operator.) I who am neither a Jonas, a Bugenhagen or a Melancton, the worthies who performed his funeral obsequies, will endeavor in a few days to perform the charitable act of once more recommitting his "exhumed and dissected" remains to a peaceful and honorable repose, to which cer-

emonial I will invite the attendance of the public.

Leahy, however, it was supposed might have intended to say something disrespectful of the Romish church. We are, however, unable to know what he intended to say, as the mob threatened—Dr. Bellinger spoke in Council of bloodshed—the Roman Catholic Bishops pastoral letter could not restrain them—and the man was advised to decamp.

What Dr. Bellinger says about "their women and his wife and daughters," is only casting a tub to the whale—a foil used for other purposes. Why introduce this appeal at all? He knows full well that Protestants are just as ready to protect Roman Catholic women as their own. But after all is not Bellinger's statement of the bloodshed which was likely to result from the intended Lecture reflecting most unfavorably on the men of his Church. Will they regard it as creditable to them to have their champion give such a statement of their riotous and blood thirsty propensities?

They are principally foreigners who have fled from what they regard the oppression and poverty of their native country, and have sought an asylum in our own free and hospitable city, where they have found freedom and occupation—a home and bread.

They are rigid Romanists, more under the influence of their spiritual teachers than any other denomination in our city.

They were commanded by their Bishop not to hear Leahy. This seemed to be superfluous in as much as they are exposed to censure, if they listen to Protestant teaching. When we begin to pray at the bed side of sick Protestants, and their Sisters of Charity who are in attendance happen to be in the room, they adhere to the principles instilled into their minds and rush away from our prayers as if a Lion was in the path. And is it possible that they could be so dead to every sentiment of gratitude to a generous community?—so unmindful of the laws of their adopted country, and so disobedient to their spiritual teachers, as to attempt to overawe this community with threatnings of violence and bloodshed? I wish in my heart that I could say that this is a slander on the denomination to whose religious tenets Dr. Bellinger has recently been converted—for I am quite sure that the respectable and law-loving denomination, the Episcopalians, from whom he separated, are better instructed than to act in this lawless and blood-thirsty manner.

But if it all be true which Dr. Bellinger has stated, of the bullying propensities and the disregard of law and order of the professors of his faith in Charleston—then is it high time, that this community should know it, and prepare either to enforce the laws or seek an asylum to which they may retreat with their families when good old Protestant Charleston shall be ruled by a mob, and Protestant ministers be warned to observe a profound silence about the abuses of the Roman Hierarchy, lest a mob of foreigners, who have from time to time, come among us under the pretence of seeking the protection of our laws and the rewards of their honest industry, should suddenly burst out from the bowels of their Trojan horse and deluge the city in blood.

But in battling with the ex-monk Leahy, why did he turn round and vilify the character of the immortal Luther? He was fully aware that more than 30 millions of an enlightened and intelligent race professed the creed which he taught, and read the book of God as translated by his pen and sung in their church the pious and sublime hymns which he composed.

He knew also full well, that many of them were his fellow citizens who had elevated him to the post which he had dishonored by vilifying, without the slightest provocation or necessity, the character of one whose memory they have from their earliest childhood been taught to cherish in their heart of hearts.

He knew also that the whole Protestant world maintain the great principles of Christian truth which this man of steel enforced by his pen, and the burning eloquence of his tongue. Luther was not here to confront him, or he would have trembled under his indignant frown like a mouse under the uplifted foot of Hercules. Of Leahy I know nothing—I never enquired into his character, this belongs to the highly respectable denomination that received him into their Church. However heartily I wish that every Romanist might be converted to the religion of the bible, I cannot believe that the plan adopted by Leahy was wise, or calculated to do good. Be this as it may, I am contending for a great principle, not for the man. If, however, I was compelled to investigate his moral character, I most assuredly would not rely on the evidence of the leaders of the Romanists, who from the manner in which they have spoken of my friend Gildersleeve, and call the champion, who has for years been a terrible thorn in their sides, a "despicable adversary," and liken him to a "toad or other noisome reptile," are not those impartial witnesses whom I should be willing to consult in a point where character is concerned. One thing, however, I am authorized to state with the positive conviction of truth, which will be certified by every clergyman in our city, that he was not invited to Charleston by any minister among us, or with the knowledge of any one of them.

Be this as it may, Leahy had no connection with the Lutheran Church. I never saw him or heard of his name. Immersed in other pursuits, I was startled from my quiet studies by seeing reported in all the daily papers the pretended proceedings of Council—a piece of pomposity of which our City Fathers, if they had any hand in getting it up, ought to be most heartily ashamed.

Therein Dr. Bellinger had blazoned forth to the world his triumph over Leahy and over the very principles on which our Government is founded, and his demolition of the moral character of the great Reformer. If he had made general remarks in the meeting of Council of the defects in the lives of all the Reformers, it

might have been regarded as a defence, for although we revere the memories of Luther, Melancton, Calvin, Crammer, Bucur, and the Fathers of the Reformation, and believe them to have been actuated by the purest and holiest of motives, we do not claim infallibility for any one of them. We have no canonized saints.—Whilst the Lutherans have adopted the great fundamental sentiments of truth he proclaimed, we have a much better guide than the esteemed writings of Luther, or any other human creed—even the Word of God. We read the translation of the Bible he gave us, we sing his sublime hymns, and use many of his forms of prayer, because we believe they express the teachings of the inspired Word of God, but we would prove recreant to the great principles he taught us, if we regarded him as our Prophet, or adopted his opinions without the exercise of our reason and of comparing his teachings with that of a much higher teacher, even Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, that great rock on which the Christian Church is founded, and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

But Dr. Bellinger was not yet satisfied with his triumph over his fellow-Aldermen, over the Constitution of his country, and the rules of common propriety, he went a step further; he after several days of reflection, prepared and published the offensive paper already referred to. Whilst cogitating on the getting up of this remarkable production it is a little surprising that he had not recollected the caption on the first page of the United States Catholic Miscellany—"Congress shall make no laws respecting the religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"—the underscoring is mine. The sentence may easily be found, as it surrounds the figure of an American Eagle holding a cross in the talons of his right foot; and a chalice in the left—which is somewhat significant, as both the cross and the cup have been usurped as the exclusive property of the Romish Priests.

The other remarks of the Editor of the Catholic Miscellany, in commending to Catholics and Protestants the letter of Dr. Bellinger, may as well receive a passing notice here. He says he "could almost regret to see so much of accurate, learned research and eloquent sarcasm expended on so despicable an adversary." The "despicable adversary" (Mr. Gildersleeve) will no doubt take some notice of his "eloquent sarcasm," and I will try to see how much weight there is in his "accurate and learned research"—which happened to come from my Library. He goes on: "The allusion to Luther in Dr. Bellinger's speech in Council was merely incidental, one to which no reasonable man could or did object." I suppose he and I collected public opinion from different societies of persons, since I met with not a solitary individual who did not condemn it, and some of them spoke of it as a "silly exhibition of inflated vanity."

The editor bestows some very refined and gentlemanly compliments on the Rev. Mr. Gildersleeve, such as "malignant bravado," "despicable adversary," who was to be unhesitatingly trampled on "as a toad or other noisome reptile." I am prepared to have similar contemptuous missiles hurled at my head. Fortunately the Bull is shorn of his horns and his hoofs so worn, that he would find it rather difficult in Charleston to trample even on a toad. The editor proceeds "we are not sorry that he has been forced by the malignant bravado of the Richmond editor, to give our community an insight into Luther's real character." Now the editor of the Miscellany knows as well as I do that the Richmond editor had no more to do with the bringing out this terrible Bull against Luther, than was to demolish not only him but Gildersleeve at one blow, than the man in the moon. He knows full well that Dr. Bellinger sent his interpreter of the German language to me, to obtain the volume from which he culled the sentences here and there to bring the charges against Luther.

What use was made of the book, which I cheerfully lent him, and offered him the use of all Luther's works, I will show in a future number. Certain it is, the big gun against Luther was loaded, primed and ready to be let off long before Gildersleeve was thought of, and I suspect before the proceedings of the City Council had travelled to Richmond, and if he could have found no one in Charleston to give the word, he would have fired his blunderbuss in the air, if it were only to enjoy the consternation which would be created among the Protestants of Charleston, and especially among the humble followers of the poor "exhumed and dissected" Mar-in Luther. Overcharged guns generally rebound.

There is yet one other thought that suggests itself to the mind, in pondering over the recent outrages threatened in our city, the mode adopted by an Alderman to permit a Protestant clergyman to be driven from our midst, and the remarkable contrast between the conduct of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant.

Men's characters are formed from the school in which they are educated. The principles we have imbibed influence our character and conduct.

The Roman Catholic is taught to render implicit obedience to the Church. That Church he believes infallible. Our version of the Scriptures he is not permitted to read, and he is not allowed to use his own, according to the decisions of the Council of Trent, without a special permission from the priest. The result is, that if the priest gives no permission, he is left without Biblical instruction: hence, in passing a summer on the continent of Europe, I saw not one Bible among Roman Catholics, either in Bavaria, Austria, Belgium or France. They believe in the power of the priests to forgive sins. They believe that all who are not within the pale of the Romish Church are inevitably lost. This is taught in their catechisms. Bishop England's Catechism (although I have it not with me to refer to) teaches the same doctrine. They regard the Protestant no better than the Infidel, and that all the Reformers are now burning in hell.

The Protestant regards his Religion on the teachings of the scriptures. If his teachers instruct him wrong the Bible must be right. If the Reformers were not perfect in their lives, this does not affect his religion—that is derived from the scriptures, and not from the opinions of men. He believes the true Catholic or Universal Church is composed of the pious and the good of every tongue and nation, and every form of religion, and that Jesus Christ is the head of the Church.

The time now came to test the efficacy of these different kinds of teaching in the same city and within a few days of each other.

Leahy was about to give a lecture, as he at the time informed some of the clergy, on the impure tendency of Den's Theology—which is used in many schools in the Roman Catholic Seminaries. He requested that women and youths should not come to his lecture, for he was about to make "awful disclosures." From the nature of the teachings of Den's Theology, which directs the Priest how to ferret out the secret thoughts of woman's heart, I should be sorry to hear it detailed oven to the ears of men. At the first publication, however, of his intentions, a mob gathers around his lecture room, and neither the laws of the city, or the power of the Bishop, or notices read from their pulpits could restrain them from threatening violence and blood. The man was compelled to fly.

About the same period and a little later, a Roman Catholic Alderman did not threaten only, but actually made "awful disclosures," professing to convict "the Chief Reformer of the Protestant faith with immoral teachings and plainly sanctioning concubinage, polygamy and adultery." And what was the effect on the Protestant part of the community, especially on that branch of it which professes the Lutheran faith? They are composed of probably nearly an equal number with those of the Romanists. They have two large congregations and have made preparations to build a third church. They are composed of men of all ranks; high and low, educated and ignorant, rich and poor, from the Chancellor on the bench to the laborer on the rail road. They revere the memory of their "Chief Reformer." What was now their conduct? Did a mob threaten to pull down the house of the offending Alderman over his head? Was it necessary to call on the City Council for protection? Did their ministers find it necessary to issue a Bulletin to their people imploring them to keep the peace? No; their answer was "we will tolerate error as long as we have truth to combat it."

The public will have the kindness to indulge me, whilst, in a succession of numbers, I enter coolly, dispassionately, and minutely into all the charges brought by Dr. Bellinger and previous Romanists, against the immoral teachings and immoral practices of Martin Luther. After much labor and research I have obtained such documents as will assist them in forming an unprejudiced judgment; and as authorities have been quoted against him, I will bring an array of authorities—Roman Catholic and Protestant—on the other side, that will enable them to judge of the estimation in which his moral character and teachings were held by the wise, the great, and the good of every age.

I am aware that my language in this paper may, to some, appear severe. If it is more so than the occasion demands, I shall regret it. I can conscientiously say that I entertain no unkind feeling towards any human being. If, however, Dr. Bellinger can exclaim: "Nor will I witness an attempt to blacken the Holy Catholic Church (to which I am bound by the strongest ties of affection and loyalty, and on which my eternal hopes are anchored) without holding before me that bright shield of truth, which dazes and confounds her enemies," he will accord the same feelings and the same privileges to others.

JOHN BACHMAN, D. D., L. L. D.,
Pastor of the Lutheran Church
of German Protestants.

The Girls of California.—Some young fellow writing to his sister in Zanesville, Ohio, says:

"It is a rare treat in this country to enter a house hallowed by the presence of a lady, where instead of a floor covered with dirty boots and tatter peellings, you see nicely carpeted with coffee sacks neatly stitched together; and then to see in what trim order they keep their cupboards, whilst we men, miserable housekeepers that we are, pile everything pell-mell on one shelf; bread meat, candles, soap, grease, hats and cigar stumps all-together. If a gentleman is courting a lady, the precise time when he popped the question, and what was said on the occasion, is known through the country in the short space of no time. Men are seized with the hallucination in regard to female beauty, as bewildered Don Quixotte when we invested a red-faced, tub shaped city wench with the comelines and charms of a Venus. An old maid was lately married in our neighborhood who had, no doubt, been singing 'why don't the men propose?' for the last twenty years. She was red-haired, squint-eyed and freckled—sans teeth and sans money—in short she had about as little pretension to beauty as the old gal whose husband had to practice kissing the cow a year, before he could screw up his courage to give her a smack."

A STRETCH OF IMAGINATION.—Mr. Webster, in concluding his argument in the great India Rubber case at Trenton, on Wednesday, gave out in his powerful forcible passage:

"I look to the time when ships shall traverse the ocean, propelled with India rubber sails; I look to the time when ships that sail over the world shall have India rubber sheathing; I look to the time when this substance shall be applied to thousands of different uses, so that what he has now patented is but as dust in the balance compared with the uses not yet developed, and which should be well developed."

A bushel of wheat is 60 pounds, rye 53, barley 47, oats 38, peas 64, beans 64, clover 66.