

E
KO
1

of Union P.C.

REVIEW

OF

DR. BOARDMAN'S ADDRESS

AGAINST

TRANSFERRED TO
U OF W LIBRARY
KUSSUTH,

A LECTURE DELIVERED IN THE UNION PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY EVENING, MARCH 9, 1852,

BY W. L. McCALLA.

E
+KO

UNITED METHODIST
SOCIETY

Philadelphia:
WILLIAM S. YOUNG, PRINTER,—50 NORTH SIXTH STREET.
1852.

E
KO
1

of

REVIEW

OF

DR. BOARDMAN'S ADDRESS

AGAINST

TRANSFERRED TO
U OF W LIBRARY

KOSSUTH,

A LECTURE DELIVERED IN THE UNION PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY EVENING, MARCH 9, 1852,

BY W. L. McCALLA.

Philadelphia:

WILLIAM S. YOUNG, PRINTER,—50 NORTH SIXTH STREET.
1852.

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA

E
KO

PREFACE.

PERMISSION is asked to state that I was incidentally discussing the question of intervention, before Dr. Boardman delivered his address. If he was right, I was bound to confess my error; if wrong, I was bound to show it. That Washington's warning to our infant republic against intervening between the two devils of popery and atheism, absolutism and anarchy in France, was correct, is not denied by any. But it was beyond the ken of Washington, or any uninspired man, to tell what subsequent events might occur, or might require.

This is admitted by one of those administrations to which Dr. Boardman appeals for the contrary. As reported by Wheaton's *Elements of International Law*, page 109, on the destruction of the Spanish republic by the allied powers, our government says, "*To what extent such interpositions might be carried, on the same principle, was a question on which all independent powers, whose governments differed from theirs, were interested; even those most remote, and none more so than the United States.*" As "such interpositions," "on the same principle," are now being carried to the utmost possible "*extent,*" our being among the "most remote," does not keep us from being as much "*interested,*" as Turkey or Prussia, according to this position of our own Washingtonian government.

The intervention of France for the security of this continent is not the only one of the kind for which Washington's followers are fairly answerable. The "*History of England, during the Thirty Years' Peace,*" after mentioning the plan of a French intervention against liberty on this continent, says, "Here was the principle and procedure of the Holy Alliance openly proposed for the coercion of the South American people. They were to live, not under such government as they might prefer, but under such as the rulers of Europe should impose upon them for their good."

As this was to inure to the acquisition of French, and not to the restoration of English power, in America, Canning, in the name of his government, said, "We will not interfere with Spain, in any attempt which she may make to reconquer what were once her colo-

nies; but *we will not permit any third power* to attack or reconquer them for her." This was one of the proudest days of Canning's life: and it is to the honour of our country, that, as we approved and backed it, in accordance with the teachings of Washington, we are answerable for such a glorious act.

The successors and admirers of Washington, therefore, are responsible for just European intervention in behalf of North and South America, and for their own voluntary position, that when unjust intervention against liberty in Europe is carried to its present *extent*, our government has as great an *interest* in that fact, and as great a right and obligation to act in Europe as any European power.

But if these things were not so, our position is unaltered, because my review demurs to the jurisdiction of Washington, or his successors, or his expositors, and appeals to higher authority than any or all of them.

 The Old School "Presbyterian" is out moderately, and Dr. Hodge of Princeton, strongly, on the right side: and the following gratifying document speaks for itself:

"We are among the clergy of Philadelphia who visited the illustrious Kossuth while passing through our city. Our sentiments respecting him and his cause, as then expressed, remain unchanged. We are gratified that the Rev. Wm. L. McCalla has undertaken to defend the exiled chief.

JOHN CHAMBERS,
JOHN PATTON,
W. W. TAYLOR,
E. W. GILBERT,
JAMES M. DAVIS,
A. CONVERSE,
ROBERT ADAIR,
DAVID MALIN,
SAMUEL M. GOULD,
CHARLES BROWN,
C. S. RENSCHAW,
WM. RAMSEY,
THOMAS BRAINARD."

LECTURE.

IN the eastern part of Europe, a people originally from Asia have, for the last millenium, maintained orderly self-government, long before history entertained the names of the blessed Puritans, Covenanters and Huguenots, who brought the elements of orderly self-government to the American continent. This remarkable statement we do not feel bound to prove, after the public, undisputed declarations of Secretary Webster on the subject. Like Ireland, they are divided into Papists and Protestants, the former of which European diplomacy persuaded to betray the latter. Egyptian taskmasters have made them repent this folly, and long to recover their former liberty. The God of Gustavus Adolphus, Oliver Cromwell, William of Orange, and George Washington, raised up a Christian hero; and after bringing him through the fiery furnace of hardship in Hungary, and temptation in Turkey, sent him forth to prepare the Protestant world for the onslaught which popery and despotism are about to make upon their religion and liberty.

The warning voice is needed, by the death and decomposition of the reformation. The doctrines of its churches have given way to transcendentalism and Puseyism. The piety, fidelity, and magnanimity of its princes have given way to selfishness, ambition, and treachery. Dr. Merle D'Aubigné justly says that there is not now a protestant prince on earth. Even the specious king of Prussia and the popular queen of England have broken their oaths, so as to favour popery and wrong their protestant subjects.

During the discussion of the *omnibus* compromise in Congress, Senator Webster proved that the characteristic burden of that measure was originally considered, by all parties, to be an evil yoke, imposed upon the reluctant neck of the country. Since that time, the rise of cotton and the decline of religion have been so great that Governor M'Duffie declared

to the legislature that the institution once so offensive to republicans, was *the corner stone of democracy*. Was he a protestant prince? The protestant democrat whom God has sent to arouse us from our lethargy, has emancipated more serfs than the whole population of the southern states; and although he has sternly and perseveringly refused to meddle with their affairs, the consciences of their blustering men are too tender to tolerate his presence. He is too much like Washington for them.

Was or was not the father of his country a member of the continental congress? He sympathized with them in an apprehension that "numbers daily *swelling with Catholic emigrants* from Europe" "might become *formidable* to us, and on occasion, be *fit instruments in the hands of power to reduce these ancient, free, protestant colonies* to the same state of slavery with themselves." Jesuit-like, they call themselves democrats, and openly assert that their religion is an essential support of our free institutions. Here, then, is another "*corner stone of democracy*," whose conscience is too tender to tolerate the Lutheran republican whom God has sent among us; and whose very visit was occasioned by the combined efforts of absolutism and Romanism to extinguish liberty and the Bible. Washington and the continental congress expected no better fruits from such a tree, when they told the people of England that popery was "*a religion that has deluged your island with blood, and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion throughout every part of the world.*"

These are a part of the "teachings of Washington," which Dr. Boardman's address has elevated to an obligatory rule of faith and practice, and which he has strangely invoked for the condemnation and destruction of God's messenger of truth and righteousness. When men are so devoted to a *southern blemish*, that they consider it the essence of all moral beauty, and when others are so wedded to the absolutism of popery and monarchy that they declare it essential to liberty, it is natural that the presence of a magnanimous philanthropist should disturb them.

It is consistent for the Bishop of Pittsburgh to call him "*the tempter*;" though in doing so he seems to have forgotten that *Antichrist* got his claim to the kingdoms of the world and the glory thereof from *the great tempter*, after *Christ* had rejected the offer. To me it does not appear consistent for a protestant republican to unite with the worst enemies of God and man in thus calumniating a man of such sound principles and extraordinary honesty. Yet Dr. Boardman has

accused him of attempting "to *seduce* our government," and has felt bound to "warn the people against his *seductions*."

His spleen against England makes him despise the neglect which her great men showed to the illustrious stranger. He sneers at "the *studied indifference* of the crown, the aristocracy, the established clergy, and the cabinet." How could he expect the crown or cabinet of England to love the Washington of Europe? How could he expect their aristocracy and Romanizing clergy to honour a Lutheran democrat? For these things we should look to the freemen and the republican clergy of America. Dr. Boardman himself informs us that here the protestant pulpit, the press and the people are in his favour, while he says, "there is reason enough why all the sympathies of the *Romish hierarchy in Europe and America* should be on the side of *Austria*."

As these are the Doctor's own statements, how comes it that, in regard to opposition to our guest, he is himself on the side of Austria and the Romish hierarchy? With them he is active and scornful in his opposition, which is a great deal worse than "*the studied indifference*" which he despises in the crown and cabinet, aristocracy and clergy of England.

We have shown how he adopts the groundless reproach used by Bishop Conner; we will now show how he far transcends Cardinal Hughes in wanton invectives against this truly admirable character. His lordship said that he failed in becoming a great man, and turned out a *humbug*. Although the love of liberty and the Bible is heretical with him, he did not accuse him of heresy. This charge was left for a presbyterian preacher to make, because the most accomplished politician on earth could not surrender his politics to an unauthorized and incompetent dictator. A visionary in theory, a sophist in argument, an inflated declaimer, unfair, unmanly and uncandid, characterize the diploma given by a wealthy presbyterian minister of high standing, to the man who, for honesty and ability united, excels any other advocate of protestant liberty now living.

We have reason to believe that the crusades for the recovery of the holy sepulchre were planned by the devil, and carried on by his lordship, with an incalculable expense of souls, and bodies, and estates. The Doctor represents the obnoxious enterprise as equal to them in folly, and its author as "a second Peter the Hermit," and in the same category with the artful Absalom. If Kossuth were such a character, Cardinal Hughes and the pope would rejoice in him far more than they now rejoice in his calumniator.—Would they in-

trust the honest Magyar with the command of the numerous hordes which they are now pouring upon our shores, to take possession of our country and congress, of our army and navy, as Cardinal Hughes says they will?

If Kossuth had come to take possession of Dr. Boardman's holy sepulchre, at Washington, he would have brought with him a couple of stones, to represent Lutheranism and democracy. Who could set bounds to the wrath which that would have roused? But as the regular successor of the rock Peter has only sent over his lapidary representatives of popery and despotism, the Doctor's equanimity is not disturbed, except by the great martyr of protestant liberty, whom he equals to Absalom and Peter the Hermit, the one a type and the other a tool of Antichrist.

All this the Doctor professes to do as a Protestant, Calvinistic, Presbyterian minister, of the Simon Pure Old School party; whose conscience binds him to guard religion and morality against this destroyer of society. And by what test or standard, law or rule, does he propose to convict the great offender? Is it by the inspired code, the protestant rule of faith and practice? Is it by the law of nations,—the law of nature and of nature's God, recognised in our Declaration of Independence? The volume of his address endeavours to adhere strictly to the text of the title-page, "*The new Doctrine of Intervention Tried by the Teachings of Washington.*"

Although the European Washington has evidently studied, understood, approved, loved and practised the teachings of the American Washington, yet it is probable that he never expected to be tried by them, in matters of religion and morality; and still less did he expect that a presbyterian apotheosis would place an American general on that throne which the Roman pontiff has usurped.

It is true that Washington was the Father of his country, but if we must be tried by a man, I would rather choose Abraham, the father of the faithful; especially as the history of that patriarch contains a parallel case. Four lawless invaders, corresponding with the sovereigns of France and Prussia, Austria and Russia, treated the defenceless tribes of the plain as these sovereigns of Europe have treated their neighbours. "And there came one that had escaped [like Kossuth,] and told Abraham the Hebrew." Did the teachings of Abraham condemn the religion and morality of the messenger, and pronounce him a type and a tool of Antichrist? Instead of that, he collected his nomadic band, and those of the united states of Eshcol and Aner, who "were

confederate with Abraham," and pursued the Cossacks to the neighbourhood of Damascus, where he treated them as Washington treated somebody else; and brought back the captives and their property. It was well for Abraham that Dr. Boardman was not then the priest of Salem; for instead of blessing him, and giving him bread and wine, I am afraid the Doctor would have cursed him, and given him gall and wormwood.

But, as the Doctor has followed the Cardinal in trying men's religion and morality by an apocryphal, uninspired rule, so has he also in claiming the exclusive interpretation of the rule, by which he can easily make the teachings of Washington the teachings of Boardman, as the interpretation of the Cardinal transubstantiates the law of Christ into the law of Antichrist. And here the two worthies come into collision, for while Dr. Boardman interprets him into a quaker, the Cardinal interprets him into a pope. In a public lecture, on Pope Pius VII., he proved to the satisfaction of the faithful, that he and the American hero were precisely alike; and upon that ground he most sweetly claimed him for the papists, and called him "our own Washington." If the high contending parties would allow me the exercise of *private judgment*, I would say that they do not differ so much from one another as they both differ from Washington.

But while the Dr. thinks it the height of presumption for the Governor of Hungary to interpret the American chief, he does not think it presumptuous in a Philadelphia preacher to interpret the Hungarian chief. His claims do not even culminate here. He exercises the right of judging the Hungarian nation; and of showing that a people who would choose such a governor as Kossuth, have hardly the necessary qualifications for self-government.

This is an opinion which he is about to establish concerning the people of the United States, on account of the high esteem in which the stranger is held among us. His published address appears to contain some of the proofs of such a conclusion. The ignorant impudence of Cardinal Hughes's Galwegians, Corkonians and Fardowns could never maintain a regular and prosperous self-government. The Doctor intimates that we who admire Kossuth have something very much like this ignorant impudence. He boldly proves, that for us to reject his interpretation of Washington "requires a very *high degree of assurance*," and shows that "we are certainly below the average mental capacity of the human family." Moreover, Don Quixote was not only a knight errant, but he was *crazed*, and Sancho was nearly ditto. Now such

people were very little better qualified for self-government than Rozinante and Dapple. The Doctor has us here also! The address shows that however numerous and respectable the followers of Kossuth may be, they are led by an "illusive knight-errantry," and the cheers of approbation come "from masses crazed by the sorcery of his eloquence."

Whenever I get old enough to play infallible dictator, I mean to turn the tables upon these gentlemen, and settle the law, that a Doctor and a Cardinal who can interpret Washington into a terrapin coward, or a double-faced tyrant, have too much assurance, ignorance or craziness, to vote for a constable.

In order to frighten us into the delirium tremens of his imaginary Washington, the Doctor talks affectingly of—the question of peace or war—the eloquent Magyar—his convocations like a burning prairie—war, with its ensanguined horrors, following in its train—the great Serbonian bog, 'twixt Damietta and Mount Casius, where armies whole have sunk—partisans to create dissensions, disturb the public tranquillity, and destroy, perhaps for ever, the cement which binds the union!!!

Having had considerable acquaintance with gentlemen who speak this dialect, I will endeavour to give an intelligible translation to what I have just read. It is as follows. "Unless we treat Kossuth as Dr. Boardman and the papists desire, and extinguish the burning prairies of enthusiastic and practical sympathy shown to him, all the croziers and cocks of Rome and France, and the bears and black eagles of Russia and Austria, shall sup upon our carcasses, and southern senators, like Rhett and Clemens, shall pick the bones, and Messrs. Hughes and Boardman shall bury them deep in the Serbonian bog, a dreadful purgatory, to which Milton and Washington consign all revolutionary democrats and their abettors, according to the decision of their infallible interpreter."

This way of denouncing the apostle of liberty in the name of Washington and Milton, is too much like the Cardinal's cursing Christians in the name of Peter and Paul. As the Jews built tombs to the dead prophets, while they killed the living ones, so some Doctors and Cardinals canonize the dead Washington and anathematize the living one. It is for their real merits that we admire both: and we conscientiously believe that if they were both alive, they would admire and love each other.

We believe the same of Milton and his friend Cromwell, who harmoniously acted upon the principles which Kossuth

advocates; as Headley tells us, when they received "the news of the persecutions in the valley of Piedmont. Six catholic regiments, three of which were Irish," such catholics as are imported here by shiploads, "were appointed to drive the Vaudois from their homes in mid winter," as they drove the Bible-reading Hungarians from their shanties, in Michigan. "The cruelties, the inhuman barbarity, that marked the proceedings against the poor protestants, are well known." But St. Haynau & Co. have endeavoured to renew them in Hungary, with the hearty concurrence of Cardinal Hughes and his holy savages. "When the news of the atrocities reached Cromwell," did he say of their author as the *micropneumatic* Senator Clemens said of the Russian butcher, "he is our good friend?" Did he, like Dr. Boardman, tremble at Milton's bog? "He burst into tears. They were the saints of God who thus suffered, and all his compassion was roused within him."

"On that day he was to sign the treaty with France, which had for a long time been under contemplation. But he immediately refused, declaring that negotiations should proceed no farther, until the king and Mazarin, the prime minister, would pledge themselves to assist him in saving the Vaudois protestants." This political intervention the noble-hearted protestant accorded to Christian sufferers, in addition to the utmost pecuniary assistance which he could afford.

Dr. Boardman tells us that if Kossuth's solicitations had been confined to the latter object, "he would have had the whole country at his feet, and *material aid* would have flowed in upon him, not, as now, in dribblets, but in a generous flood." This is the very sort of application which was made to the Doctor by an eminent Irish clergyman, who solicited material aid for elevating and enlightening, in popish Ireland, the perishing victims of priestly rapacity and oppression. The Doctor knows how much he gave him.

Some men who aim at being perfect oracles, go upon the plan that if the heart should feel, the head will surely reel. They have such a *crazyphobia*, that to avoid undue excitement in the cause of suffering humanity, they import their sympathies from Siberia. This makes them wiser than the priest, who would give his blessing, though he would not give a groat. Governor Kossuth and Dr. Dill got neither a groat nor a blessing. But a redeeming act of dignified magnanimity and benevolence must not be hidden under a bushel. An amiable Swedish girl, wishing to do some good, and make a fortune, and get a husband, obtained the Doctor's countenance and cash. His dignity enabled him to resist "the syren

strains" of the Hungarian, and the pathetic appeals of the Irishman: but the nightingale song of the Swede was too much for mortal man.

The countenance and cash of Oliver Cromwell received another direction, as the martyrs of Jesus could attest. "He gave two thousand pounds from his private purse towards relieving their wants, and appointed Milton, yes, *Milton!* to write letters to the several European powers, *invoking their aid.*" To such an appointment Dr. Boardman would have replied with the indignant question of his address, "*Does the man think we are demented?*" Selfishness and fear think magnanimity madness. But this was the glorious element in which Milton lived. "The noble bard entered with all the zeal and enthusiasm of his great master into the work. A day of fasting and humiliation was appointed, and a collection ordered to be taken in all the churches. The contribution amounted to over £37,000, showing how deeply protestant England was stirred by the persecution of the Piedmontese Christians."

The reason why Kossuth was accused of thinking us demented was, that we were represented by him as "raising our gigantic arm in a commanding attitude to say to the Russian bear, 'KEEP BACK!' and to the Czar, 'HANDS OFF!'" Christians and politicians of the crab school, who move backward instead of forward, can muster goblins enough to frighten from any duty. "It is said that Cromwell, in a burst of passion, replied to some obstacles that were mentioned as interfering with his plans, that *he would sail his ships over the Alps, but that he would put a stop to the persecution.*" "War with France, nay with the whole world, if necessary, he would wage; but this persecution of the children of God should cease." It was not his madness but his faith that carried him through, and made him a protector to the innocent from the cruel papists. He even compelled the popish Mazarin, who, in fact, ruled France, to accomplish the work; "for he stood in deadly fear of Cromwell. It is said that he always turned pale when he heard his name mentioned."

"Oliver was the champion of protestantism the world over, and he wished it so understood. He would defend it wherever his arm could reach." When the iron hand of popish violence was laid upon the protestants of Nismes in France, Cromwell directed his ambassador at Paris to obtain their relief or to leave the kingdom without delay. The thing was done, although "Mazarin shuffled and complained of the haughty and imperious course of the Protector: but (as it was currently reported,) 'he was more afraid of him than of the devil.'"

In our day the French papists destroyed the Bible-reading republic of Rome. Can any one doubt what protestant England ought to have done, and what Cromwell would have done in such a case? This is a case which Dr. Boardman takes up, and he makes a supposition "that a British army had landed at Civita Vecchia, and protected the Triumvirate in carrying into effect the expressed wishes of the nation for a change of Government. What course," he then asks, "would the new enactment [of Kossuth] have imposed upon the other nations, and ourselves as one of them? Why, that we should intervene to resist England."

Although this looks as if the Doctor's logic had nothing left but the sediment, I would say, that in attributing to Kossuth a *new enactment* of international law, he has said what he has never proved, and what no intelligent judge will believe. This passage asserts that we are as much bound to oppose a righteous intervention on the part of England, as an unrighteous one on the part of France. Is this irony? None but an unprincipled infidel would seriously say this for himself, and none but a calumniator would say it of Kossuth. An atheist may say that there is no difference between justice and injustice. A socialist may say that we are no more bound to execute a murderer than to execute the sheriff who hangs him. But Kossuth is a religious man, and not a moral monster. He appeals to the old law of nations, and imposes no new enactments. His cause is built upon order, and not confusion; upon justice, and not caprice. Vattel says "Justice is the basis of all society, the sure bond of all intercourse." "The obligation imposed on all men to be just, is easily demonstrated from the law of nature." "All nations are therefore under a strict obligation to cultivate *justice* towards each other, to observe it scrupulously, and carefully to abstain from every thing that may violate it." "He who assists an odious tyrant, he who declares for an unjust and rebellious people, violates his duty."

This is the grave morality of international law as held by the parties litigant. In its application to Rome and France, Dr. Boardman will not differ from Kossuth and Mazzini. They all hold that Rome had a right to establish her own free government. They all hold that France had no right to restore an intolerable despotism. Two of them believe that it was the duty of the queen, as it would have been the work of Cromwell, to say to the French cock, "STAND BACK!" and to the French coward, "HANDS OFF!"

Of this there is unequivocal historical evidence, in reference

to the very port of Civita Vecchia, embodied in Dr. Boardman's supposition. In relation to the martyrs already mentioned, Headley says, "Not content with the efforts he had put forth for the Piedmontese, he (Cromwell) sent a messenger to the duke of Savoy, remonstrating against his conduct. He also took pains to let the Pope understand that he knew him to be at the bottom of the unnatural persecution, and if he did not beware, he should see his ships in the harbour of Civita Vecchia, and hear the thunder of his cannon around the Vatican. In all his treaties he made the rights of the protestants an indispensable article."

Is it any wonder that worldly politicians dispense with such articles now-a-days? We are sold to our enemies, and our leading clergyman pours oceans of scorn upon the great advocate of our liberty, and all who adhere to him. The treachery of the governments against the body of Christ is as decided as that of Judas against the Head of that body. This is manifest, even to men of questionable piety. In defending the protector from the charge of hypocrisy, Headley says, "It were desirable if English rulers of the present day would exhibit something of this hypocrisy. They will see Poland dismembered—Tahiti invaded by catholics—Switzerland threatened with the legions of despots, and be content with a little bluster, a grave remonstrance or two, but never interpose their strength between the persecuted and the persecutors. Cromwell *might* have done the same; and if he had been as *selfish* and politic as modern sovereigns are, he *would*." Instead of this, "the terror of his name became every where a shield for the persecuted Christians, and he was always remembered by them in their morning and evening devotions."

These prayers of all God's suffering people showed that in that day of trial, the protestant world had but one heart, and that heart was for Cromwell and liberty; because he was so devoted to the two great and inseparable blessings of religion and liberty. In relation to the commencement of his military life, Dr. Merle d'Aubigné says, "For the space of seventeen years, from this day until that of his death, all his thoughts, however well or ill conceived, were for *protestantism and for the liberty of his fellow citizens*." "This was his ruling principle; and this alone explains his whole life." "There was a great work to be accomplished; no less than the settlement of England upon its double foundations of *protestantism and liberty*; for on these depended her future destinies."

Notwithstanding the encouragement which clerical lukewarmness gives to political corruption, in its endeavours to

separate these two blessings which God has joined together, few candid politicians would probably quarrel with Headley's opinion, that, "but for Cromwell's efforts and success, it is very doubtful whether the puritans on this side of the water would have ventured on a contest with the mother country. At all events, the great questions of constitutional and personal liberty which he settled, have been the foundation of every revolution for the emancipation of man, which has since taken place."

All these most important facts concerning the origin of our civil, religious, and political liberty, are indissolubly connected with the legitimate principle of intervention found in Vattel and Kossuth's "syren strains."

The union of Bible religion, constitutional liberty, and just intervention, is also very conspicuous in Macauley's favourite occupant of the English throne. He was the impersonation of the intervention advocated by Kossuth and Vattel. Permit me to give you the last two brushes of Dr. Merle's pencil, when giving a portrait of those stirring times. He paints "seven Anglican bishops who had protested against these encroachments, conveyed to the tower through crowds of people who fell on their knees as they passed, and who, when these patriots were acquitted by the jury, lighted up bonfires in every part of the city, and burnt the Pope in effigy. William of Orange landing on the coast of Devonshire, on the 5th of November, 1688, with the English flag waving at the mast head of his ships, and bearing this inscription: THE PROTESTANT RELIGION AND LIBERTIES OF ENGLAND."

This most conspicuous historical fact, which no protestant can ever cease to cherish, is embodied, expressly or by implication, in more than one of Vattel's statements, which some modern clergymen and politicians may find it difficult to digest. He says, "Religion is, in every sense, an object of great importance to a nation, and one of the most interesting subjects on which the government can be employed. An independent people are accountable for their religion to God alone. In this particular, as in every other, they have a right to regulate their conduct according to the dictates of their own conscience, and to prevent all foreign interference in an affair of so delicate a nature." "When, however, we see a party inflamed with deadly hatred against the religion we profess, and a neighbouring prince persecuting in consequence the professors of that religion, it is lawful for us to give assistance to the sufferers."

This rule was clearly recognised by James the First, whose

descendant, James the Second, justly perished by it, when William's glorious banner of "The protestant religion and liberties of England" was raised among them. A king of France was solicited to tolerate his protestant subjects; to which he answered that he was master in his own kingdom. The word *master* in this haughty answer is embodied in one of Vattel's statements of the Kossuth doctrine. I think that the *solicitor* was William of Orange, and the proud *solicitee* was Louis XIV. Those were times very much like the present.

Vattel says, "But the protestant sovereigns, who saw a general conspiracy of the catholics, obstinately bent on their destruction, were so far *masters* on their side, as to be at liberty to give assistance to a body of men who might strengthen their party, and help them to preserve themselves from the ruin with which they were threatened. All distinctions of states and nations are to be disregarded when there is a question of forming a coalition against a set of *madmen* who would exterminate all those that do not implicitly receive their doctrines."

Thus, while Dr. Boardman finds *madmen* among Kossuth's admirers only, Vattel plants them with him and Cardinal Hughes. The passage in which Vattel expressly refers to the struggle between William and James is the following: "But if the prince, *by violating the fundamental laws*, gives his subjects a *legal right to resist him*,—if *tyranny becoming insupportable*, obliges the nation to rise in their own defence,—every foreign power *has a right to succour an oppressed people who implore their assistance*. The English *justly* complained of James II. The nobility and the most distinguished patriots, having determined to check him in the prosecution of his schemes, which manifestly tended to *overthrow the constitution*, and to *destroy the liberties and the religion* of the people, applied for assistance to the United Provinces. The authority of the prince of Orange had, doubtless, an influence on the deliberations of the states-general; but it did not lead them to the commission of *an act of injustice*: for when a people, *from good reasons*, take up arms against an oppressor, it is but *an act of justice and generosity to assist brave men* in the defence of their liberties."

As religion, liberty and intervention, in a just cause, were so highly characteristic of Oliver and William, so they were of Gustavus Adolphus, the lion of the north, and the champion of the protestant religion; a title at which the author of the address would sneer. He sarcastically says, "Henceforth our government becomes a *grand collegium de propaganda li-*

bertale, and we go on to our destiny as the liberators of the world! Is it not humiliating that, with multitudes of our countrymen, *badinage* like this should be sober prose?"

Here the Doctor scoffs at certain desires and hopes of Kosuth's friends, and applies to them a handsome French word for *foolery*: but on his last two pages he adopts the *foolery*, by expressing in other words the same desires and hopes for himself and his friends. His admitting that such language is *badinage*, presents another feature of resemblance between him and his fellow warriors. Commodore Brownson, in a lecture which I heard, laughingly admitted that much of the flattery given by popish orators to the common people on great public occasions, was mere *glorification*, *nyther* more, *nyther* less. *Glorification* was his elegant English for *foolery*. When we, in our own language, express a desire and hope that our free protestant country may be useful to the world, we mean it for neither *glorification* nor *badinage*.

But the Dr. has contradicted himself in far more important matters than this, in relation to history and doctrine, after noticing which, I shall beg leave to return to the college of propagandism which he has just now excavated. In endeavouring to give a dignified beating to the suffering exile, one of his impassioned interrogatories is, "Does his familiarity with history supply him with a solitary example of national folly and *insanity* at all comparable to that which this nation would present, should we accede to *his counsel*?"

This is one of several instances in which the Dr. divides the freemen of America into lunatics and lucids; the latter word meaning according to Webster, "bright with the radiance of intellect, not darkened or confused by *delirium* or *madness*." Among the lunatics are all subjects of the Kosuth epidemic; such as ex-Vice President Dallas, ex-Secretary Walker, Judge Kane, Judge Kelley, and the pulpit, press and people; that is the "*masses crazed*," (as they are called,) in America; and the down-trodden lovers of religion and liberty in Europe.

Who are the lucids, who muster at the call of Dr. Boardman's bugle? Not General Foote, of the south, nor myriads like him, but those who believe that cotton and the things that make it are the "corner-stone of democracy," and the "cement of the union;" and who would rather have a thirty years' war with our free government, than strike one stroke for the liberty of Europe.

The character of the free-soilers is becoming rather suspected, but the Doctor can safely certify that the atheistical Garrison abolitionists are *compotes mentis*, as they have joined

in his denunciations of the European Washington. With them America can boast a Cardinal Hughes and his semi-human Corkonians and Fardowns; while in Europe he can claim Haynau with his whip for women, Georgey with his murderous treason, Batthyany with his bribe, and the princes and priests with their perjury.

As for our "Utopian heresy," the Dr. says, "it has its ecclesiastical prototype in the scheme of those zealous princes of the seventh and eighth centuries, who put themselves at the head of their regiments, and dragooned whole tribes of savages into the church." This sentence contains a very intelligible *affirmation*. The one which I have just commented on, contains a very intelligible *negation*, in the form of an impassioned interrogatory. They are both about the very same thing, called *Utopian heresy* in one, and *counsel of folly and insanity* in the other. In one he *affirms* that the history of the seventh and eighth centuries furnishes a *prototype*, a model, pattern or exemplar of Kossuth's error; and in the other he peremptorily *denies* that history supplies "*a solitary example*" of such an error. There is only one page between these two irreconcilable statements; and so great is the advantage of lucidity in these times, that while these two neighbouring statements contradict each other, the Doctor has contrived to make them both contradict historical verity.

The denial that history affords a solitary example of the intervention advocated by the pulpit, the press, and the people, has been already in part exposed. The glorious career of the Swedish lion in Germany contradicts it; Cromwell's ironsides and Blake's artillery contradict it. The Orange standard on British soil contradicts it. With the help of God, we hope to show that it is contradicted by the history of that original *Protest*, from which *Protestants* are named: and we envy not the spurious lucidity of that master in Israel who knows none of these things, and who would blot out the bright page of his people's history.

While his negation is unsound, his affirmation is no less so, in asserting that Charlemagne's scheme for converting savages by the sword is the *prototype* of our alleged heresy. The Doctor's own address proves that the pope and other potentates of Europe are now in the commencement of a war against light and liberty, the Bible and protestantism, and that they are converting men to popery by the sword. Has the European Washington come to advocate their cause? Do his admirers espouse their cause?

If Kossuth had come on such a mission, Dr. Boardman

could not consistently oppose him; for he made no perceivable opposition to a popular historical lecturer of high talents, who set forth Charlemagne as a hero and reformer, who gave civilization to Europe, and imposed a debt of gratitude upon mankind. He set forth Hildebrand as a saint, hero, and reformer, to whom we are similarly indebted; and he represented the licentious seducer and infidel Abelard as the father of the Lutheran reformation. For all this he was approved and applauded, and received material aid.

Did these things disturb Dr. Boardman's digestion? Did he stem the torrent? Did he then paint Charlemagne at the head of his regiments, dragooning whole tribes of savages into the church? Did he paint St. Hildebrand and Abelard convicted of numerous atrocities by popish testimony? He left it to a follower of Kossuth to inform the public that Charlemagne gave to the pope that power of evil which his imitator, now on the French throne, restored to him; and that Hildebrand raised that evil power to its culminating point.

Here was a tempter indeed: a pretended protestant recommending to crowded audiences these blackest birds of night, these demons of the dark ages, without ruffling the Doctor's dignity, and without eliciting the charge of *seduction*, which he iterates and reiterates against the honest, candid, noble advocate of human rights.

Professor Brownson did not rebuke the endorser of Hildebrand, because he also lectured in favour of the dark ages. Cardinal Hughes did not call him a humbug because it was a popish humbug under a protestant name. Bishop Conner did not call him a *tempter* because he was seducing protestants into the popish camp, as his prototype, Balaam, decoyed the Israelites into the camp of Midian. Dr. Boardman and all these brother lucids were most amiably tender towards a real *seducer*; but what a cry the whole pack raised when an honest man appeared on the field!

In all this iniquity Brownson, Hughes and Conner acted with some consistency: for it belongs to their religion to hate a lover of the Bible and of liberty. But Dr. Boardman's complicity in such a measure is not only condemned by his public creed, but by that very bull which has gathered the stranger and his friends into the noose of excommunication. In his address he does not profess to condemn the plan "proposed, simply to notify the cabinets of the world, that we shall regard *any interference by one nation in the domestic concerns of another, as a breach of international law*,—leaving it to be decided, as cases arise, whether to follow this declaration *by protest, by an appeal to arms, or by nothing at all.*"

While he denies "an obligation to a constant exercise of that right" of interposition, in which he has no opponent, he says, "It is not denied, however, that *cases may arise* in which *intervention* in this form [of stating the law to the cabinets,] and even with *something more significant than parchment manifestoes*, would be BOTH OUR RIGHT AND OUR DUTY. If the United States occupied the territory which constitutes the domain of Turkey, or that of Prussia, *the very case* which has occasioned the present crusade *might have proved* one of this description. The question then would have been, whether *the law of self-protection* did not require us to repel, by whatever means, the barbarous assault of Russia, upon the liberties of Hungary. Situated as we are, our *abstract right* to interpose, should the same emergency occur a second time, *may be conceded.*"

Elsewhere, he says, "*Occasions may arise, however, to justify foreign intervention. The mere fact of intervention determines nothing* as to its character; it may or may not be an infringement of international rights. In some cases it supplies a just cause of war on the part of other nations. In other cases it is so far from being a *casus belli*, that it *imposes on other nations an obligation of gratitude* to the "intervening nation, as being *eminently conducive to the interests of humanity and constitutional liberty.*" "Governments, too, must act on those common sense principles which control individuals in analogous circumstances. No prudent man ties up his hands against all possible interference in the family quarrels of his neighbours; still less pledges himself to fight other people if they interfere. As a general rule, interference would be wrong in morals, and practically mischievous. But if a man learned that his neighbour was *trying to murder his wife or children*, he would be likely to interfere, and to get others to help him. Cabinets that have not wedded themselves to an abstraction, will reserve a similar discretion; neither prejudging questions of intervention, nor hampering their freedom with self-imposed restrictions; since, 'in truth, it is *not the interfering or keeping aloof, but iniquitous intermeddling or treacherous inaction* which is praised or blamed by the decision of an equitable judge.'"

Although some might suspect the above extracts to exhibit an affectation of extreme perspicacity not justified by the facts, or of a pedantic fondness for the chair of dictation, instead of giving the law from competent authority, yet every one acquainted with the case must see, that if they state the true principles of law, Kossuth is right; and Professor Brownson, and Cardinal Hughes, and Bishop Conner, and Dr. Boardman have cruelly slandered a righteous man, for righteous principles.

He chooses his own words without offering proof, for saying that we have a right to tell the cabinets what the law of nations is, and the right to protest and make war for the violation of that law. He lays it down that such intervention may be a right and a duty, demanding the gratitude of the world, as I have proved from a number of historical facts, and good authorities. He declares, as I have shown, that every case should be decided upon its own merits. Is it just or unjust? He shows that the cause of Hungary is *just*, and that of Russia *unjust*. He states indirectly that Prussia and Turkey had a full right to interfere in the late war, and we have an abstract right to interfere, if there should be a second war, but gives no proof for such a splitting of hairs.

Our distance from Hungary is not half such an obstacle now, as our distance from France was in the revolution: and the right of those nations which helped perishing Greece, was not only an *abstract* but a *concrete* right and duty, as the Dr. has declared: and their right to help Greece, and the right of France to help us, was as good in a first war as in a second. Such questions are not to be decided by numbers, but by proof and principle. What the Dr. calls "the law of self-protection," he thinks would justify Turkey or Prussia in defending Hungary, while it would not justify us.

In the 561st page of Wheaton's "History of the Law of Nations," and in the 114th page of his "Elements of International Law," he places this principle in a light which has escaped the Doctor's notice. In speaking of the intervention for Greece, the last-mentioned work says: "The protestant princes and states of Europe, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, did not scruple to confederate and wage war in order to secure the freedom of religious worship for the votaries of their faith in the bosom of catholic communities to whose subjects it was denied. Still more justifiable was the interference of the Christian powers, to rescue a whole nation not merely from religious persecution, but from the cruel alternative of being transported from their native land into Egyptian bondage, or exterminated by their merciless oppressors."

Concerning this intervention, he says: "Its principle was fully justified by the great, paramount law of self-preservation; 'WHATEVER A NATION MAY LAWFULLY DEFEND FOR ITSELF, IT MAY DEFEND FOR ANOTHER PEOPLE, IF CALLED UPON TO INTERPOSE.' The interference of the Christian powers to put an end to this bloody contest might therefore have been safely rested upon this ground alone." Taking this *great, paramount law* for granted, as it is here stated, the application has

not a shadow of obscurity. America has a constitution more than sixty years old, which it has a right to defend for itself. Hungary has a constitution of centuries, which it has a right to defend for itself. If they and we were to change situations, and our chosen but exiled president should call upon them to interpose, they would have a right to defend for us what they might lawfully defend for themselves; and we should thank them for it, as we thanked France for that very favour. But their chosen governor has called upon us to interpose, and we have a right to defend for them what we might lawfully defend for ourselves. This is the legitimate application of the golden rule in the scriptures, and of a principle of the law of nations called, "THE GREAT PARAMOUNT LAW OF SELF-PRESERVATION."

This sober conclusion should not be weakened in a sober mind by superficial flings at propagandism, such as calling us a grand *collegium de propaganda libertate*. This is evidently an expression *ad invidiam*, because the Roman college for propagating the faith is so odious. But what makes it odious? Proselytism is not odious in itself, but only when it destroys instead of edifying. Every act or institution of proselytism must be judged by its merits, as well as every case of intervention. Is it just or unjust? is the question to be asked. Moses appointed an "inquisition:" it was just. Rome has an inquisition; it is unjust. Christ ordered the universal propagation of his faith, which would give universal liberty. Because the despots of Europe know this, they reject the Bible. Antichrist orders the universal propagation of his faith, which would produce universal slavery. Because the despots know this, they favour popery.

Some time ago we promised to endeavour to show that this position so scorned, is that of the original protest from which protestantism has its name. The spirit of it appears in every true conversion from popery, without the name being advertised to. I am not aware that Count Guicciardini called himself, or thought himself a protestant, until driven from home among protestants. Yet in his trial he was distinguished by an infallible mark of protestantism. When they offered to his accomplished character, noble blood, and high standing an exemption from farther notice, if he would only engage not to act in behalf of others, he preferred death to that selfish, ter-rapin policy, into which some would dragoon us.

The famous historian of the Reformation, Merle d'Aubigné, tells us that "the *status quo*, and no proselytism," were the essentials of the unjust and perfidious platform which gave rise

to the famous protest. This platform offered to the Lutherans the conditions offered to Guicciardini. Dr. Merle says, "If they had been animated by *selfishness*, they would, perhaps, have accepted this decree. In fact they were left free, in appearance, at least, to profess their faith: ought they to demand more? Could they do so? Were they bound to constitute themselves the *champions of liberty of conscience in all the world?*"

Dr. Boardman has settled that question for them, *ex cathedra*. But not so did our blessed fathers settle it. Dr. Merle says, "Never, perhaps, had there been a more critical situation: but these noble-minded men came victorious out of the trial." "If one of the states of the empire desired some day to follow their example and be reformed, should they take away its power of doing so? Having themselves entered the kingdom of heaven, should they shut the door after them? No! Rather endure every thing, sacrifice every thing, even their estates, their crowns and their lives."

If Kossuth had made a selfish settlement in England or America, as Batthyani did in France, men, in whom the flesh prevails, could have received him into their fellowship. But the animal, in man or brute, is instinctively pugnacious against strangers; and he is a stranger indeed. Abhorring the low principles of selfishness and effeminacy, avarice and ambition—devoted to the lofty passion of disinterested philanthropy—willing to make any sacrifice for country and for conscience—he is an offensive mystery to men whose liberality and honesty are nothing more than mere glorification and *badinage*, "*nyther more, nyther less*;" as professor Brownson says.

The act which occasioned the famous protest was just such a one as that by which the perjured emperor of Austria and king of Naples have lately annulled free constitutions. It was the resolution of Spires which solemnly guaranteed religious liberty. Dr. Merle says, "The imperial commissaries announced to the diet that the last resolution of Spires, which left all the states free to act in conformity with the inspirations of their consciences, having given rise to great disorders, the emperor had annulled it by virtue of his supreme power." Thus the Doctor observes, the reformers "remained within the bounds of legality, while their adversaries were driven to *coups d'etat*."

When the reformers wished to present the protest, they received such an answer as the Swiss lately received from the French usurper: "It is a settled affair, submission is all that remains." They nevertheless refused submission, and coura-

geously adhered to their protest, although they all agreed with Luther in his awful prediction, verified in the thirty years' war. He said, "These insatiable leeches will take no repose, until they see the whole of Germany flowing with blood." The prospect of Dr. Boardman's ensanguined fields did not turn them back, and their forward course was that of just intervention in behalf of the oppressed, and against the unjust intervention of the oppressor, whether he be prince or priest.

Dr. Merle says, "The principles contained in this celebrated protest of the 19th April, 1529, constitute the very essence of protestantism." It "*rejects the intervention both of the empire and of the papacy.*" "There has never been any thing more positive, and, at the same time, more aggressive, than the position of the protestants at Spire. By maintaining that their faith alone is capable of saving the world, they defended with intrepid courage the rights of *Christian proselytism*. We cannot abandon this *proselytism*, without deserting the protestant principle."

These are the words of the great historian of the reformation, written long before Dr. Boardman's address upon the *insanity* and *heresy* of just *propagandism*, and denouncing the *newly invented doctrine of intervention* as coming from the serpent seducer. It reminds one of the monk mentioned by Conrad de Heresbach, who edified his audience by saying, "A *new language* has been *invented*, which is called Greek. Guard carefully against it. It is the mother of every species of *heresy*. I observe in the hands of a great many people a book written in this language, which they call the New Testament. It is a book full of *thorns and serpents*."

But Dr. Boardman says, that this book and its teachings ought to be propagated throughout the European Babylon, and liberty will follow in its train. That is the very reason why they do not allow such books, teachers or churches to exist among them. And shall we consent to let our Christian brethren lie chained to the floor of the Babylonish prison-house, and patiently wait until the conquering army shall reach our shores? So says the oracle that orders us to wait for a second invasion. But weak as James I. of England was, he was not weak enough for this. To the ambassador of the queen regent of France, he said, "when my neighbours are attacked in a quarrel in which I am interested, the law of nature requires that I should *anticipate and prevent* the evil which may thence result to myself."

The country of that monarch now feels that its late neglect of this maxim was an evil policy. Blessings be upon Secre-

tary Walker for cheering them in the dark day. Let him and others persevere, and the gratitude of ages will embalm their names. But let them not, like the political quacks of France, expect to secure liberty and happiness while destroying religion and burning the Bible.

In support of this position, let me give you the following opinion of the reformation by an eminent royalist and papist, of that country. His name is Charles Francis Dominic de Villers. "Europe, plunged for several centuries, in a stupor and apathy, interrupted only by wars, or rather by incursions and robberies, without any beneficial object to humanity, received at once a new life and new activity. A universal and deep interest agitated the nations. Their powers were developed, their minds expanded by new political ideas. Former revolutions had only exercised men's arms; this employed their heads. The people who, before, had been only estimated as flocks, passively subject to the caprice of their leaders, now began to act for themselves, and to feel their importance and utility. Those who embraced the reformation made common cause with their princes for liberty; and hence arose a closer bond, a community of interest and of action between the sovereign and his subjects. Both were for ever delivered from the excessive and burdensome power of the clergy, as well as from the struggle, so distressing to all Europe, and which had endured so long, between the popes and the emperors, to know which of them should retain the supreme power. Social order was regulated and brought near to perfection." "The foundations of the Prussian monarchy and the American republic were laid." "Commutations and wars became more general, but they were also sooner terminated, and their rigour was lightened by a *more humane law of nations*." "Thus, the fermentation excited in Europe by religious opinions has created in it a new order of things, *more beneficial to humanity, and has even affected the two worlds*."

These are the sentiments of a prize essay, to which the award was adjudged by "The National Institute of France." It was on the question, "What has been the influence of the reformation by Luther on the political situation of the different states of Europe, and on the progress of knowledge?" The whole essay justifies the dying opinion expressed to Louis Philippe by his first and ablest premier, Casimir Perrier. He told his master that France would never have a settled government until she had a religious people. They were all papists and all atheists: but no intelligent Christian thinks

popery or atheism a *religion*, but *irreligion*. It is infidel, perjured popery which defeats the framers of free constitutions in Europe and America, and endeavours to carry back society to that condition in which the golden rule and the Greek Testament are considered new inventions, and driven to the Serbonian bog with blood and thunder.

While lecturers here recommend popery as the necessary promoter and supporter of civilization and liberty, they nevertheless recommend the blackest demons of the dark ages, as the models upon which to form these blessings. Sir Wm. E. Gladstone proves that a prelatical catechism, forced upon all teachers and pupils by the Neapolitan government, avowedly teaches that semi-civilization is the proper state of society. To bring about, in dear England, that happy condition in which the Corkonians and Fardowns already luxuriate, in Ireland and America, they have inaugurated a cardinal, to bring the canon law into legitimate operation; for which intolerable code the American cardinal apologizes, by saying, that it was made for a semi-barbarous race, and has therefore fallen into desuetude. Thus, while their shuffling and perjury, absolutism and treason are almost undissembled, they expect that increasing corruption will give them the ascendancy in the British parliament and the American congress.

No intelligent man who will look at the plots of the congress of Verona, and the holy alliance against all free governments, can help wondering at the thinness of the veil with which they cover their deadly designs. Some years ago, an Italian exile published in this country, certain alleged articles of the covenant adopted by that congress, and they were several times published, and subjected to the denials or corrections of the priesthood, if they believed them either wholly forged or partially inaccurate. No contradiction or correction having come to hand, they are here copied.

“ARTICLE I. The high contracting powers being convinced that the system of *representative governments* is equally incompatible with monarchical principles, as the maxim of *the sovereignty of the people* with the divine right of kings, engage mutually, in the most solemn manner, to use all their efforts to *put an end to the system of representative governments* in Europe, and to prevent its being introduced into those countries where it is not known.

“ARTICLE II. As it cannot be doubted that *the liberty of the press is the most powerful means* used by the pretended supporters of the rights of nations, to the detriment of those of princes, the high contracting powers promise reciprocally to *adopt all proper means to suppress it*.

"ARTICLE III. The contracting powers offer, in common, *their thanks to the pope, for all that he has done already in their behalf, and solicit his constant co-operation in their design to subjugate the nations.*"

You and I are imperfectly acquainted with such matters as these. I will state what I can, and shall be thankful for information in return. The first of these articles promises to destroy representative governments in Europe. This did not embrace America; but neither does it appear to have included the British isle; for there was a British negotiator there, and England only refused to concur in the great object of the congress, which was to destroy the representative system in Spain, which was accomplished, in conformity with this article.

Some years before this event, when they were forming the Germanic confederation, the plenipotentiary of Great Britain reminded them "that a representative system had existed in Germany, of right, from time immemorial," and successfully asserted the validity of numerous constitutions, acknowledging and regulating this system. Since that time, these constitutions have gone the way of the Spanish victim, by the high contracting powers, in conformity with their first article. After destroying the representative government of Spain, the many constitutions of Germany, then Hungary, and Rome, and France, they now want to finish the continent with Belgium and Switzerland.

But, alas! England finds that although their words appeared to exclude her from the ban, their intentions did not. And now she repents of her treachery in permitting the wild beasts of popery and despotism to murder her friends in detail. But like our southern cavaliers, they feel themselves in a strait. They fear that sort of liberty which withers an oppressive hereditary peerage, as the chivalry fear that liberty which threatens Governor M'Duffie's corner stone of democracy. Puseyism and Maynoothism show that the parliament would like popish protection from liberty; and the same disposition is evinced by the longing looks of congress towards that roost of Jesuitical ravens which are perching in scores upon the capitol, and taking possession of Cardinal Hughes's "own Washington," as the Cardinal told us they would.

When the spirit of America is thus changed, let us not be too certain that our selfish treachery will be safe, when the rolling tide of successful despotism shall pass England to visit our representative government.

In relation to the second article, which resolves to destroy

the liberty of the press, the united and hearty zeal of the despots is evident, by the condition to which it is reduced in their own governments, and the arbitrary demands made upon Switzerland for muzzling her press. How remarkable that the usurpation of Napoleon the Little is already so engrafted into the consolidated despotism of Europe, under the Russian head, that the publisher of a Florentine paper has been fined and imprisoned for an article containing, in the words of the indictment, "political allusions to events in France!" This shows that the thanks which the congress of Verona, in their third article, gave to the pope, were richly deserved; and that their solicitation for his continued "co-operation in their design to subjugate the nations," has been duly complied with. If Brownson and Hughes, Kenrick and Conner neglect to give the same thanks and present the same solicitations to Dr. Boardman, they deserve a rebuke from the pope and the emperor.

The suppression of the press in Europe is by *steel*. Unhappily for us much of the same work is done here by *gold*; and it is not the teachings of Washington, but priestcraft and cottoncraft that act as a torpedo to the press, the congress, and the clergy. The thanks are due, not to the hero of liberty, but to his unsound expositors; as they were given at Verona, not to Christ, but to his pretended vicar.

In allusion to the noble speech of ex-Secretary Walker, in England, Dr. Boardman repudiates with disgust the thought of being associated with England in the cause which Kossuth advocates, because she has been a great and guilty meddler with the rights of nations. This should make us rejoice the more in her repentance and amendment. Is it not more respectable to dine with a gentlemanly reformed drunkard, than to co-operate with the old drunken harlot of Rome, who never will repent or amend?

England is now writhing under the gouty effects of old carousals. The fate of Laud and of his royal master warned them against going over to his holiness, "the Man of sin;" and as their political piety longed for some holy abomination, they concluded to form "the Holy Alliance," consummated at the congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1818, between the five great powers. The British lion, feeling sore under the scratching received from Jackson and our little navy, was incessantly drumming up these mighty potentates to back him on the right of search, and avenge upon America the wounds of that quarrel. We do not ask Dr. Boardman to interpret for us. This was done by the original parties themselves, as Wheaton

informs us in his *Elements of International Law*, p. 106. "This union was intended to form a perpetual system of intervention among the European states," in favour of monarchical institutions. "This general right of interference was sometimes defined so as to be applicable to every case of popular revolution," offensive to monarchy. "At others, it was extended to *every revolutionary movement* pronounced by these powers to endanger, in its consequences, *immediate or remote, the social order of Europe*, or the particular safety of neighbouring states."

Bleeding under recent wounds, and burning for the right of search, all this was intended by England herself to bear down upon the United States, with all that awful force which had crushed the mightiest of conquerors. Who does not know that it is the revolutionary movements of the American continent that endanger, in their consequences, immediate and remote, the monarchical social order of Europe? After settling these hopeful arrangements, England at last got the five powers reluctantly and conditionally to set up the right of search, which General Cass immediately knocked into a cocked hat. But about this her zeal has wonderfully cooled, since she finds that the czar and his vassals intend first to search England, and speak fair to us until they have examined London: although we have the institutions which their own covenants have marked for destruction, as the guiltiest and worst.

Dr. Boardman seems confident that our peace is perfectly secure, if we will leave all sufferers for liberty to their fate. So the British government seemed to think when they were leaving Poland, Tahiti, Germany, Hungary and Italy to perish without pity. She now finds that there is to be a reckoning for her cruel treachery in these cases. When America sees the glorious little island breasting the storm which broke the mighty Napoleon, and that too, in the cause of liberty, can cardinals and cotton and clerical cowards keep down our people? It is more than congress can do, if they sell themselves to the purchasers of Georgey and Batthyany.

One more specimen of the Doctor's logic, before closing this review. As a triumphant proof that we are bound to take care of our precious selves, and help nobody else, even by declaring the law of nations, he says that "*the entire race have a stake in this government.*" I wish to examine this argument; but, with his leave, I will substitute the word *venture*, "something sent to sea in trade," for *stake*, which means "wager."

We will represent the Doctor's "entire race," by a hundred families on a remote island; and "this government," by a Yankee craft with Dr. Boardman for captain. The islanders have hardware enough and to spare, but no dry goods or groceries. To remedy this evil, each family puts into the captain's hands a sufficient "venture" of what he has, to obtain a full supply of what he needs. Prosperous in his voyage out, in his traffic in foreign ports, and in his return, he unaccountably refuses to land and discharge his rich cargo. While he strides his deck with all the dignified importance of Captain Long, his only answer to the hungry canoes which surround his vessel is, "the entire island has a venture in this ship. Its success has been unparalleled in the commercial marine of the world. It is the last hope of the island. I have no right to destroy it; and it would destroy it, (the teachings of Washington say so,) if I were to land among such paupers and give you the property which your "venture" purchased. No! I will do what is a thousand times better for you. I will give you a sight of the dry goods, and a smell of the groceries, and after you have seen and appreciated our noble example, you will be better qualified to enjoy and conserve such precious comforts!"

This argument is not near so lucid to those who gave the venture as to him who keeps the proceeds; although he does it in compliance with the teachings of some great old swindler, whom he calls Washington. But half the people that go to the penitentiary now-a-days are called Adams, Jefferson, Jackson, or the like. How different is the "own Washington" of Cardinal Hughes and Dr. Boardman from the great hero of the American revolution!

THE DOCTRINE OF INTERVENTION.

One of our exchanges re-prints the following preamble and resolution which were adopted by Congress on the 12th of November, 1777:

"And, whereas, the *cause* of the United States *may be* greatly endangered, unless *such of the European powers as regard the rights of mankind* should INTERFERE TO PREVENT the ungenerous combination of powers against the liberation of said States:

"Resolved, That the Commissioners of the United States at the several Courts of Europe *be directed* to apply to the several Courts, and request *their immediate assistance for preventing* a further embarkation of foreign troops to America, and also to urge the necessity of their acknowledging the independence of these States."

Thus, as the New York *Times* observes, the United States Government would seem from this to have taken ground, at a very early day, upon the subject which is regarded by a great many public men now-a-days to disturb their peace. It is true, circumstances have changed materially. *Then* we needed help, and asked for it, on the broad principle that all nations which "regard the rights of mankind," ought to interfere to prevent the combined intervention of despotic powers against our menaced liberties. *Now* we are unwilling—not only to do any thing in regard to such combined interference against freedom and human rights, but even to *say* that we do not approve of it. The simple proposition to protest against such a violation of justice and of right, is denounced as a departure from our ancient policy, and as one of the radical innovations by which the stability of the Republic is threatened.—*Phila. Sun.*