

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

George Champlin Sibley Papers

George and Mary Easton Sibley Papers

7-1837

Major Sibley's Church History Cross-Examined and Put to the Test of Record, July 1837

Hiram Chamberlain
St. Charles, Missouri

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/george>



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chamberlain, Hiram, "Major Sibley's Church History Cross-Examined and Put to the Test of Record, July 1837" (1837). *George Champlin Sibley Papers*. 365.
<https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/george/365>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the George and Mary Easton Sibley Papers at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in George Champlin Sibley Papers by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact phuffman@lindenwood.edu.

MAJOR SIBLEY'S
CHURCH HISTORY CROSS-EXAMINED
AND PUT TO THE TEST OF RECORD,
BY H. CHAMBERLAIN.



The reason why I am again before the public is, that I am publicly assailed. And having obtained justice once, I very naturally look for it in this instance. I do so with unwavering confidence, because I have long believed the people of this State disposed to deal frankly and fairly when differences arise in any quarter: and have already proved them to be quick-sighted and prompt to award a righteous sentence in favor of an injured party, where misrepresentations are employed to subvert plain matters of fact. Perhaps no people were ever more so. The experience, which I, at least, have had of this disposition, induces me to trouble them with some *brief remarks*, and *incontrovertible proofs*, in reference to the Major's "Recent History." So far as the people of this county are concerned, however, I might well spare myself all that trouble. For the thing has really done nobody any harm with us, that I can ascertain. But it seems necessary to prevent any misapprehension, which may arise in the minds of strangers, from the industrious efforts of a few, disposed if possible to do me an injury, by means of a printed book. I yield therefore, to a law of nature, which imposes on every man the *duty* of self defence. This duty being discharged, I am perfectly satisfied. I am at peace.

It may assist the reader, to premise, that in the summer of 1835, while the writer was busily employed in visiting the sick, during the prevalence of Cholera; certain individuals went up to the Presbytery of St. Charles, then in session near Palmyra, and made such representations to them, of our character and conduct, as led to the passage of a set of resolutions which were deemed highly injurious and oppressive in their bearing on this church. The more so, as the meeting was held without our knowledge. The case went up by appeal to the Synod, and thence to the Assembly of 1836.

On the eve of my departure to meet that Assembly, and with a manifest view of prejudicing the minds of the members, and the public generally, against me; a list of violent personal charges, made professedly on the ground of "Common Fame," without investigation, were published against me by order of the Presbytery of St. Charles, a body of which Mr. Lindsay was a member, and which had no jurisdiction over me. To sustain these charges the names of G. C. Sibley, Thomas Lindsay, S. L. Watson, and others, were appended. The reader will please note this last fact. I have further use for it.

These charges were met by a pamphlet on my return, which to this hour, remains unanswered. They were also, carefully and faithfully investigated in a judicial process before the Presbytery of Missouri, to which I belong.— The result was a unanimous verdict, containing a perfect acquittal. ▲ part of this verdict reads thus: "Presbytery feel constrained to say, that the exhibition of such charges, evinces in our judgment a very censorious fault finding and reprehensible spirit, on the part of those, whoever they may be, that have been engaged in bunting them up." This bitter pill, administered by the solemn sentence of an impartial bench of Judges, my opponents were obliged to swallow, tho' it produced many and strange contortions.

The witnesses, Messrs. Sibley, Lindsay and Watson, were not however entirely cured of their desire to testify against me. The verdict had been rendered in November. A long winter was before them. The appeal of the church in which I was interested, had not been issued in '36, but was pending before the Assembly of '37, to be convened in May. In so great a dilemma something must be done. The Major has leisure. He must write a book.

Accordingly, when it was too late for me to reply to any thing before reaching Philadelphia, an anonymous pamphlet issued from the Clarion press, purporting to be a recent and impartial history of this church. Of this pamphlet, Major G. C. Sibley has publicly acknowledged himself to be "the real responsible author." I met with it on the Ohio, where it had been conveyed with instructions to distribute copies among members on their way. I found two more in the Assembly, on the Clerk's table, recommended to special notice, by the certificate of Messrs. Lindsay and Watson. The leading object of this distinguished work seems to be, to place myself, my friends, and the Presbytery of Missouri, in an unfavorable light before the public, and to influence in an unlawful way, the judgment of the supreme Judiciary in regard to our appeal. Why not let justice take its course, and keep the vision of the court clear from the vapor of partisan prints? Why should this vapor be blown in the very face of judgment?

On the first page of the pamphlet, we are told "the objects in view are—to present the whole subject impartially." Also—that "a sense of duty constrains the writer to prepare this narrative, after having examined a great mass of testimony, the greater part of which, was obtained from the records of the St. Charles and Missouri Presbyteries, and the Synod of Missouri.—The facts proven from those records, together with such as he knows he can prove by competent witnesses, and can verify himself from his own knowledge, will form the basis on which he means to found the following story."—The records here named, are now before me. They are my witnesses also.—But with what the Major may prove, which has never been proven; when witnesses themselves were anxious; and displayed their anxiety on more occasions than one; when proof was invited; and months were given for them to testify and prove all they could; with what he himself may know, that he did not see fit to testify, when sworn to tell all he knew in the case,—I really have no argument. I take the records of the Judicatories, and ask the reader to examine them.

With Major Sibley, I have no private, personal controversy. I never had any personal acquaintance, or intercourse with him, except as a witness against me, when he testified of "his impression"—not "his belief." I expect none. I have to do with him, now, only as the writer of a book. "A sense of duty [will not] constrain" me, here, to sketch his own history, tho' some parts of it might prove quite interesting. When I speak of him, I am to be understood as dealing with the book, and with that alone. Of this he cannot justly complain, as every man, when he prints, and publishes—is subject to review.

I propose then, here to show the public the moral certainty of the following proposition, viz: That the book, considered as a history of our affairs, is utterly unworthy the confidence of any man, or body of men. It cannot be true.

PROOFS.

1st. To show his perfect impartiality in writing, and to secure the unsuspecting confidence of the reader, Major Sibley says, page 24—"The writer who is also a member of this church, positively disclaims any party connection, or party feeling whatever, in these affairs; and every motive capable of misleading his judgment in any degree."

The record of Major Sibley's testimony, when under oath as a witness against me, however, says, "This he confesses, that from the beginning he

has decidedly disapproved of his official course, since his arrival here, in January, 1835; and has freely expressed, that disapprobation on many occasions, both by words and acts. Quest. When did your opposition to me commence? Ans. *Many years ago*, when I heard of the difficulties with Mr. Giddings! He first said "twelve years ago," and corrected himself on my suggesting that I had not been so long in the State. Reader, compare these words of the book, denying *any party feeling whatever*, with the words of the witness—expressing his "disapprobation on many occasions," and avowing an "opposition" which commenced "many years ago," and tell me, can both be true?

2d. Major Sibley says, page 20—"There does not appear to exist the slightest evidence to justify Mr. Chamberlain's charge against this church, that its colored members, who are slaves, have ever voted or been in *any manner arrayed against him*. Those members are unobtrusive, and not at all apt to claim the right to vote, and have never done so, or been urged to do it, during the troubles of the last two years—indeed no occasion has been presented within that period to require any expression of their sentiments in relation to the affairs of the church." The pamphlet is dated, April, 1837.

Now, I have never made any charge against "this church," and have no controversy whatever with the colored people. I object to nothing, so far as their agency is concerned, but to the use that the party have seen fit to make of their names. I say *the party*—because it has been proven that the colored members cannot write. Let the reader know, then, that the record shows two distinct papers used against me before the St. Charles Presbytery. The one signed by *ten*, the other by *eleven* names of colored persons, following the names of white communicants.

The first is here given in part only, that the reader may judge. It seems to be a stricture on government and ecclesiastical law, and reads thus: "We, the members of the Presbyterian church of St. Charles, who hereunto annex our names, desiring to maintain order and good government," &c. "We hold that without consent of Presbytery, no part of the church has any right to set up its own authorities, or withdraw and form a new church, by electing new Elders; causing division and disturbances," &c. A very grave document, certainly to be so signed! The second paper referred to, reads thus: "Members of the church of St. Charles, opposed to H. Chamberlain, and have subscribed their names to stand by the Elders and Deacons in support of order and good government in our church.

St. Charles, May 20th, 1837.

(White names omitted.)

Sina Symonds, col'd woman;
Jno Buuyan Lindsay;
Richard, do.
Letty, do.
William, do.
Jane, do.
Milly, do.
Nelly Collier;
Abigail Millington;
Isaac Redman;
Betsey Sibley;—Black members."

Who now will endorse for the truth of the book, with his eye on these strange papers, received and gravely acted upon?

3d. Referring to the appeal of the church, Major Sibley says, (page 16,) "This appeal contains some very sober reflections upon the session of Saint Charles, and those who support their authority; charging against them that, though a minority, they had, for several years, imposed on them the appellants "an oppressive yoke," which they could bear no longer—that they had been guilty of misrepresentation, slander and forgery, and exercised unwarrantable power," Such is Mr. Chamberlain's appeal to the synod."

Now as to "slander" I leave any man to judge, who reads the testimony. But as to "forgery," the word is not to be found any where in our appeal. The writer gravely marks it with commas, as a quotation, from the appeal. But it is not there. And it is not any where on our papers as charged.—The appeal does say "employed papers with unauthorised signatures," and that fact is proven, I trust, to the reader's full satisfaction, in the paper signed by the names of colored persons, without adding, as might easily be done, from the same paper, the names of white persons, as unauthorised. So the appeal did not charge them with "Forgery." And all the Major's regret at "such a paper," is thrown on a nonentity.

4th. To fix on me the charge of disturbing the peace of the Saint Charles Church, is one grand leading object of the Pamphlet. It was a leading object of the party, also—of witnesses against me in the prosecution. Their great strength was steadily and vigorously applied here. Major Sibley testifies on his oath and says he 'knows it to be true.' (Does the reader remember what he says in his book about impartiality?)

The Presbytery of Missouri, however, (Mr. Gray being present and voting,) after much delay and long and patient investigation, decided this point, unanimously, as follows:

"It is clearly in evidence that the peace of the Saint Charles Church is disturbed, and very much disturbed. They are of opinion, too, that the going and being there, of the accused, have been the occasion of much strife and disturbance; but it is not in proof that the accused is the guilty cause of all or any of these consequences. The Presbytery have sought industriously for that act of the accused from which guilt in this particular can be inferred, but have sought in vain. An examination of the immense mass of testimony, which we have, with labor and much expense of time and trouble, taken, will convince any mind, capable of investigating such a subject impartially, that there is no such solitary act."

Never was there a more triumphant and perfect acquittal, considering the protracted and determined efforts which my accusers had made. But the Major, having sworn that he 'knew the charge to be true,' will have it his own way. He gives the verdict above quoted, and then says, page 22-3, "This decision of the Presbytery, whilst it fully affirms the fact charged against the accused, not only omits to offer any remedy for the admitted evil, already inflicted, or any security for the future; but on the contrary, virtually consents to the continuance of the disturbance through the same agency, by exonerating from all blame, the brother, who confessedly occasioned it.—The writer believes that, after the full admission, that Mr. Chamberlain was disturbing this Church, the Presbytery ought to have used their authority in our behalf."

What flagrant injustice! The writer, who either does not understand language, or can so pervert it, truly ought not to write history. Most clearly, Presbytery neither affirm, confess, or admit any such thing as is here represented. They affirm the opposite. They do not say I have occasioned or caused strife. They say I have been "the occasion," not the "guilty cause." The distinction is perfectly obvious, and altogether important, between being the occasion of an evil, and causing it to be. They "have sought in vain." and found "no such solitary act," from which it can even be "inferred" that I have done it. Thus a modest retiring lady, of great worth and spotless reputation may be the occasion of two men shooting each other. So may a timid deer, a noble charger, or a purse of inanimate dollars. Are either of these chargeable with the deed? Will you hang, or imprison the estimable lady? Paul was "the occasion" of great commotion at Ephesus. Was he in the wrong? Christ and his apostles were the occasion of very much sinning and wrangling among the people. Were they at fault? Every rational being, every object in nature, may be made the occasion of sin among evil minded persons. So it was obviously the opinion of Presbytery, delibe-

ately formed and solemnly pronounced that others had made me "the occasion" of much strife and disturbance by their own act. This is the only fair interpretation that can be given,—otherwise their sentence is without meaning. Had the real authors of this confusion been under the jurisdiction of that body, the blank might have been promptly filled with their names.—The public might then have been plainly told that — — — had done it. The Major might even have been silent, and his book never seen the light. He must have known that the decision of the Missouri Presbytery was wholly against him, being entirely in my favor, and therefore, labors to invalidate it. Thus, on page 21-2: "The charge of disturbing the peace of this church does not appear to have been so thoroughly investigated by the Presbytery, as was requisite to enable them to pronounce a just judgment upon it." But that judicatory, after having devoted much time and labor to the investigation, have thought proper to say, under the sanction of their judicial oaths, and in direct opposition to the charges of our historian, "that in their judgment, all the facts have been elicited, which are important to the prosecution; and that it is due to the interests of the church and the accused, that we delay no longer." Ought not this declaration, together with the fact, that weeks and months had been devoted to the subject, to satisfy any reasonable mind, and put to silence, forever, such cavilling?

The author says also, of the decision, on page 22, that it is "just such an one as cannot be satisfactory to either party;" yet it has been entirely satisfactory to me, and to my friends, so far as I can ascertain. My satisfaction was expressed, when the verdict was rendered, in the presence of the Judicatory, and soon after, publicly, to the congregation to whom I minister.

5. The testimony shows that I did not originate the evil division—that there were difficulties in the church long before I came. But our impartial historian labors to prove the contrary. And having said, when a witness, under oath, referring to the state of the church, for the last eight years, that "the peace and harmony were never disturbed in any serious degree, except by the several attempts of Mr. Chamberlain to become its minister." He devotes the first page of his book, to sustain that testimony, and thus speaks of Mr. Wood, page 2: "In the Winter 1830, the Rev. George C. Wood accepted an invitation for a year; at the expiration of which, the session did not renew the invitation. A strong desire was manifested, however, by a considerable majority of both church and congregation, to retain Mr. Wood another year. This was firmly opposed by two Elders, (Lindsay and Watson,) and fourteen other members." This opposition produced some excited feeling in the church, and congregation for a short time, but it was soon calmed and peace and harmony restored by the prudent course pursued by Mr. Wood. He knew that it was his duty to retire, and not to seek to enter a church, the doors of which were closed against him, by its sworn guardians."

The reader will be surprised, if indeed he can be, after the errors already shown, to be here told, that Mr. Watson was not an Elder, at all, until some time after these events. But Thomas Lindsay and Milton P. Cayce were elders. And the latter did not close the door, but really was very desirous of keeping it open, and retaining Mr. Woods. Mr. Cayce was a witness in my case. He testifies of his eldership—speaks of removing from this place, and says: "Previous to my removal, and in the year 1832, after Mr. Wood had labored among us about one year, he was elected by the church for another year. At the time of this election, a division and discussion took place respecting the manner of voting. It was proposed by Mr. Lindsay, to cast lots, and objected to by a large majority, Mr. Lindsay insisted on it, and proposing prayer during the discussion, and the vote was finally taken by ballot. Mr. Lindsay and about four others voting against him. The opposition to Mr. Wood continued until the 20th August, 1832, he, (Mr. Wood,) wrote to me as follows concerning the divisions of the church: "As we have good authorities for records at the present day. I understand from Mr. Durfee

that a paper is in circulation, the substance of which is a veto against my staying at Saint Charles, on any condition, whatever. This paper never originated from any better spirit than that, which was the cause of a papal persecution. Every subscriber well knew that I did not intend to return to this place, and therefore, there was nothing in the nature of things to call forth such a paper. The only construction I can put upon it is a wanton attempt to injure my character, and to destroy my usefulness as a preacher of the gospel. Strange as it may appear, Mr. Durfee told me that eighteen persons had subscribed, and now, dear Sir, I care nothing about it. I know who the 18 are, and shall be very careful not to do any thing to injure their feelings by the way of courting their acquaintance, or having any thing to do with them, directly or indirectly."

"I am sorry for one thing, and that is, that these persons are doing *all in their power to disturb the peace and harmony of the church*, and if they persevere, they will ruin it entirely. This I greatly lament. I have one request to make, and that is, that you get this veto for me—as it, by its circulation has become an official paper and in all justice belongs to me. When the amount of subscribers is finished, I will subscribe it with all my heart, or that part of it which relates to my not returning, as I never had such an idea." Mr. Wood fulfilled the purpose expressed in this letter, and never returned to be the minister of this church. There were many complaints by the majority, that the few should govern the many, and some threatened to leave the church. The result was *much dissatisfaction*." Such is the testimony of Mr. Cayce, a ruling Elder, acquainted with the facts, which our Historian is laboring to disprove. Another part of the testimony, referring to this former division reads thus: "Witness had neighbors who were members, as well as others, who were not members, who were sorry, at Mr. Wood's leaving; some were so much dissatisfied that they would never come to church since, or sign any paper for its support. Witness also believes the church has never prospered so much since." These extracts from the Records, placed by the side of Major Sibley's History need no comment of mine.

6. To effect the general object of the Pamphlet—to sustain his own testimony—and show that I am a disturber of the peace, in opposition to the decision of Presbytery. The author introduces Mr. Gray, at page 3; speaks of the great unanimity in the choice of him, and charges me, on page 6 and 7, with interfering with his prospects here. This point is labored and it is curious to observe how men will argue. The testimony however shows, that there was not perfect harmony when the congregation convened for the election of Mr. Gray. One witness says 'he became dissatisfied and retired.' Another witness testifies "I thought there should have been some other nominated, also as the congregation were too much hurried in their solicitations and had not an opportunity of having their choice. I did not like Mr. Gray from what I had heard of his preaching. I determined not to support him if he came." This far famed election was considered by many as merely *nominal* at the time. It is so spoken of in the testimony. To show that it was a mere *nominal* proceeding, a communication from Mr. Gray was made public at the meeting. It is in evidence and reads thus. "The more, I have thought, the more I am convinced, I ought not to go there, and ought not to *suffer my name to be used* for that purpose in your congregation, unless there was a strong probability I would accept if invited. This I think would be inexpedient at present. I hope therefore you will *counteract* any at-

tempt that may be made to make out a call." It was with a full knowledge of these facts, and with an assurance that Mr. Gray was not expected that I consented to remain in Saint Charles. And all that has been said, and written of my interfering with him; or ever intending to do so, is most unreasonable and unjust.

7. The Major's, history of the calling of a meeting of the congregation, and of the several meetings of the church subsequently are also against the strongest current of the testimony. The Record says. "The following petition was presented to the session, signed by fifty six names, thirty three of whom were members of the church, and twenty one regular members of the congregation." Mr. Campbell in his testimony gives the very names of the members desiring my settlement among them. The witnesses testify positively, that the petition was presented to the Elders, and Mr. Campbell says. "All the elders except myself refused to call a meeting in compliance with the petition." So clear is this point that the Synod, in their decision say—"It is in evidence before Synod, that a petition was presented to the session of the churches of Saint Charles. It appears to Synod, that a majority signed this petition, and therefore, that the meeting should have been called." Yet our Historian says, page 10, "though no such petition was ever presented to them" and of the signers, he says, page 6, "only *twenty-five* were, it is believed, members of this church." It had been better certainly, after the decision of Synod, if the Major had given his impression, not his belief? He also charges Mr. Campbell, a very honest and worthy brother, who never thought of having his name enrolled on the Historic page, without specification or proof, with "resorting to certain expedients," to procure signatures to this petition—"disingenuous and unfair." And says: "Mr. Chamberlain himself exerted an influence not strictly justifiable in the premises" Now Mr. Campbell, as an independent christian freeman circulated a petition, which met the approbation of a clear majority of the church, while, as the testimony shows, I had no agency whatever in procuring signatures; but was actually at Franklin, many miles distant, and as many of my friends know very differently employed. What flagrant personal injustice to charge me so, without evidence!!

The meeting petitioned for, was called by Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Emmons testifies that a large majority voted for me. To disprove this testimony of Mr. Emmons, the Major says of Mr. Campbell, page 8, "He testifies that he does not think a majority of all the members voted, though he knew there was a majority present." Now no such testimony of Mr. Campbell, in reference to *this* meeting, was ever given. It is testimony however, wrested from its proper place, and applied here to suit a purpose—to make the witness contradict Mr. Emmons. So a man's oath is not safe in the hands of this writer!

On the 26th April the Church resolved to call a meeting to elect one or more ruling Elders, on the 2d. Sabbath in May. So our impartial writer bestows special attention on it, and speaks of it on page 9—11 as held 25th, 26th and 27th of April—(three days in succession.) He calls it "the little meeting." "Mr. Chamberlain and his little party," and says page 10, "This meeting of "the church" consisted of *less than a third part* of its members." Yet in all the labored efforts of a judicial investigation, neither Major Sibley himself, nor any other witness, desirous as they were to invalidate our proceedings, ever dared to assert such things.

And every member present on the 26th April knows that they were vit-true, that that was not a "little meeting?" Our Historian makes more broad assertions about the meeting on the 10th of May, at which the election of Elders took place, and says, page 12: "*There were very few members of the church concerned in the election—those who participated—some were not members of the church of Saint Charles.*" But unfortunately for the Major, the testimony is against him again, "Quest. Was there a full meeting at the election of Elders? A. There was. Q. Was the vote unanimous? A. It was. Q. Do you know what proportion of the members were present at the election of Elders? A. majority." A part of the testimony which refers to a previous election reads thus: "Q. Were there any persons, members of other churches, who voted. A. There were not.—That rule has always been strictly attended to, in all elections we have had."

8. Our Historian says, page 19, "The new Elders were DEPOSED by Presbytery and synod," and on the strength of this statement, he charges me, and my associates with placing ourselves "in an attitude very much like defiance towards the law of the Presbyterian church." And on page 19, he says "this action of Mr. Chamberlain took place after the Synod had DEPOSED his new Elders from office, and dissolved his connection with them, as a session, and was consequently an act of usurpation, and in violation of the settled law of the Presbyterian church." Here is indeed a very high charge against one, at least, of the "sworn guardians" of our ecclesiastical body.—A charge brought and persevered in—notwithstanding the shield thrown over me, by the solemn judgment of my Presbytery—a high minded and honorable court of Christ. As the reader might well suppose, this charge has no foundation in truth. The Synod gave me their *advice*. They said of the choice of Elders, "This act Synod judge irregular and void." And of the acts of these new Elders they said, "these are irregular," they never used the important, technical word "*deposed*." We appealed from their decision, and our appeal secured to us, the *right* of continuance, until our appeal should be issued, as every constitutional lawyer well knows. To be "*deposed*" is a very different thing in our law. *Deposition* would indeed set us all aside. Because that implies *crime* and is never applied without such implication. The act of Synod was designed to annul the election. But the *appeal* arrested its force. Accordingly, when I asked in the assembly of '37 "If we had a *right* to continue?—if the Elders might still exercise their office?" I was answered "Yes" Yet the Major, in making the foregoing charge, against us all, has "no party feeling whatever"—no motive to mislead.

9 On page 19, he says: "It is very true, that several *respectable* and *worthy citizens* of Saint Charles have, until recently contributed to the support of Mr. Chamberlain. Some of them are in truth, *open* and *violent enemies* of the Presbyterian church, and are not sorry to witness the *shameful confusion* that has for the last two years been kept up in this church." This is really a very strange character to give "*several respectable and worthy citizens!*" It is no more than simple justice to them, that I say here, I know of nothing to sustain it. It corresponds very well, however, with a charge contained in another part of the record, as made by Messrs. Lindsay, Watson and others before their Presbytery, viz. "That a party have called in unbelievers, and *scoffers* to vote down the church." Whether such language applied to our "res-

pectable and worthy citizens" in a public manner, is most likely to increase their respect for its authors, I leave them and the public to judge. I, for one, shall be content, if I am so happy as to treat "*respectable citizens*" with *respectful* language.

I now ask, is the reader satisfied with the foregoing specifications?—That the truth of my proposition is established?—That the history is "*utterly unworthy of his confidence?*" I shall take it for granted that he is, and stay my pen from noting further particulars. Yet I hope he will not, for a moment, suppose I have noted all the errors of this book. I assure him there are others in reserve. There are assertions of facts, which it were easy to disprove—language is ascribed to us, which we never used—principles of action, which we never embraced. He who is not more than satisfied, however, with what I have already presented, would not be satisfied with any thing which I could write. And there may be some such. I will do them all the good in my power, and as little harm, and leave them to be convinced in a world where none doubt.

Messrs. Lindsay and Watson certified the truth of this pamphlet, bad as it is—and sent it to the Assembly with their certificate on a blank leaf. Though the records were kept back, to our injury, the certified book was there in good time. They do, indeed, except a little to the 1st chapter, for Watson knew he was not an Elder, as there stated, tho' he had not the frankness to confess it.—And also to the 3d, for Mr. Lindsay knew he had no such character as that roinancing chapter labors to give him. But they affirm the truth of all the balance, and thus involve themselves before the assembly and before the world in the errors which are herein set forth. They do it deliberately, and with settled purpose, because they do it to affect a judicial decision of one of the largest ecclesiastical courts in the land. Some of our older citizens may be a little curious, and wonder, as I do, *what there is, in the character, the head the heart or the blood* of S. L. Watson, that entitles him to certify to the prejudice of any man! I respect judicial decisions—but let them be based on evidence, and not on such histories as this. I honor gray hairs. But let them blossom on the truth, and be borne aloft, and shaken above such masses of error.

The reader cannot fail to have observed, that there are some great principles, interesting to all, at issue between me and my friends. The author and party to which he belongs,—I say distinctly, *the party* to which he belongs. For his covering has been stripped off, and his position shown before all. The Major stands, with military precision, in the front rank, in full uniform, and with all the fresh laurels of his historic pen, clustering around him.

We, on the one part, contend for the right of appearing and being heard with evidence. They, on the other, would have us tried and condemned without it. We hold the right of appeal as sacred, and all the benefits it secures to an injured party. They would thrust us from these benefits, and bind us up to obey the decision of the inferior court, whatever it may be. We maintain inviolate, the right of majorities to govern, and of the people to be ruled by representatives of their choice. They would have the minority govern, and their "sworn guardians" rule the people for years, without redress of grievance. We think justice

ought to take a straight course, and that all attempts to forestall judgment, are morally wrong, and productive of mischief only.— They would argue their cause beforehand, with the court by means of partisan prints, covertly sent, and certified by themselves. We aver, that when a man has been published, slandered, tried, and finally acquitted by such men as composed the Missouri Presbytery, he should be let alone. They agree, that the witnesses against him, having failed of their object, shall further prosecute him with a book.

Really they do show, in an impressive manner, the truth of one sentiment, that stands recorded on the last page of the aforesaid history, viz: “There exists *an inherent, mutually repulsive influence, so positively immovable and insurmountable*, that were Mr. C. believed by all to be as pure as Caesar’s wife, and to possess the learning and talents of St. Paul, it would prevent the union.”— Such feelings on the part of professing christians, so different from the teachings of the divine Savior, printed and published to be read by perishing men, I sorely lament, and have mourned over them for months. I have not, indeed, at all, doubted their deep-rooted and bitter influence. They account fully to my mind for the movements of the party—for the acts of the Presbytery of Saint Charles,—for my arraignment and trial,—for the disposition to persevere after an ignoble defeat—in efforts to hunt me down by means of a printed book. No man can account for such facts without admitting the influence of such feelings. And here we are relieved from all conjecture, by a naked avowal of their existence.

Certainly, it affords matter for melancholy reflection, that the bosom, where such fires are pent up, must be strangely agitated—must heave and swell at times, as the volcano, and cannot afford much joy, to its possessor. I pray, therefore, that the grace of God may extinguish these devouring elements wherever they may exist, and give to the *reader, to me, and to all, the holy oil of Peace*—pure, lasting, heavenly minded Peace!

II. CHAMBERLAIN.

Saint Charles, July 1837.

N. B. The foregoing facts of record are commended to the serious consideration of certain, whose names are not before the public, but who are clearly seen in the distance.