

The Spirit of Jesus and Paul :

THE LIBERTY OF THE PULPIT.

---

TWO SERMONS,

BY

J. G. FORMAN,

PASTOR OF THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH IN DOVER, N. H.

DELIVERED

On the 19th and 26th of April, 1848.

---

BOSTON:

J. M. USHER, 37 CORNHILL:

DOVER: J. G. FORMAN.

1848.

SC

BY

4235

E75

F67

THE LIBRARY OF THE  
THE LIBRARY OF THE  
THE LIBRARY OF THE

TWO SERMONS

J. G. FORTNA

ON THE DAY AND

LESTON

J. M. USHER

COVER: J. G. FORTNA

1818

## P R E F A C E .

---

The following discourses having become the subject of much animadversion, since their delivery, I have concluded to give them to the public in this form, as the most effectual way to guard against misrepresentation, believing that the position I have taken, as a minister of the everlasting gospel, has only to be understood to meet the approval of every intelligent and liberal mind, whatever may be his political or religious opinions.

I am also induced to make this publication, that I may do some small service to the cause of religion, by maintaining the independence of the pulpit, and the right and duty of the Christian Minister to utter his own convictions of religious truth, and rebuke every transgression of God's law, without suffering himself to be silenced and trammelled by political partizans, or the denunciations of a corrupt and hireling press.

An account of the circumstances which have led to the publication, and of the public attack made upon the pulpit, in one of the newspapers of this town, will be found in an appendix at the end of the pamphlet. The two sermons are printed as they were delivered, except so much of the second as related to the Dover Gazette, which I have stricken out and embraced in the Appendix, preferring that the sermon should stand by itself, as an exposition of the subject on which it treats; and that what is of a local and personal character,

should also stand by itself. Taking the whole together no material fact or statement will be found suppressed or altered in the least, though in a few instances the phraseology has been slightly changed. The appendix will also be found to contain a correction of certain falsehoods and perversions of truth, with respect to myself, which have still more recently appeared in the paper alluded to. This part of the pamphlet is required by, and designed for, the community in which I live, as a vindication of myself, and of the religious Society with which I am connected, who have thus far shown no disposition to follow the "advice" and dictation of the Dover Gazette in recommending the "dismissal" of their pastor.

The work, humble and feeble though it be, is submitted to the judgment of an enlightened and candid public, in the hope that it may be productive of some good. If it shall tend in the least to strengthen my brethren, and induce them to come up, in one united phalanx, to the ground on which I have planted myself, I feel that a great moral victory will be achieved. For one I am resolved, by the grace of God, to exercise the right, as a minister of the gospel, to utter my own convictions on every moral and religious subject, and to show the evil consequences of sin, whether committed by individuals, communities or nations; and by this issue I am willing to stand or fall.

J. G. F.

Dover, April 20th, 1848.

# SERMON.

---

## THE SPIRIT OF JESUS AND PAUL.

“ And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know ; but who are ye ?” ACTS xix. 15.

The history of Divine Providence makes us acquainted with the fact that, in different ages of the world, God has borne testimony to every revelation of his truth by signal displays of divine wisdom and power. This is especially true of the revelation given us in the New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. The truths which he was commissioned to teach, and which are given to us in his gospel and illustrated in his life, were accompanied by visible tokens of the divine favor and confirmation.

It was the mission of Jesus to bear witness to the truth, and in addition to the fulfilment of prophecy, and the purity of his life, this mission was sealed by the miracles and wonders which God did by him in the midst of all the people. However self-evident that truth might have been, of itself considered, it had this additional confirmation. Both Jesus and his apostles had the power, and actually did work miracles in attestation of the truths they taught. They healed diseases ; cast out evil spirits ; and brought the dead to life.

Respecting the rationale of miracles ;—whether they are wrought in harmony with, or in violation of the natural laws ; whether the power they evince is the result of a spiritual development to which all may attain, and which properly belongs to man in a state of entire spiritual one-ness with the Father ; or, whether it is to be regarded as a supernatural gift,

imparted to particular persons, for a specific purpose, I do not propose at this time to inquire.

*The aim of this discourse will be to show that there are certain signs and results which attend the gospel of Christ wherever it is faithfully preached, believed and practiced; and which evince, in a striking and beautiful manner, its truth and divine origin.*

1. Let us notice, in the *first* place, the subject of demoniacal possessions, of which an instance is mentioned in the text, and attend briefly to the circumstances connected with the attempt of the exorcists to cast him out.

The fact is well known that in the times of Christ, the Jews had imbibed, from some other source than their sacred writings, certain opinions with respect to demons or evil spirits, and their influence over the conduct and condition of men. So prevalent were these opinions that they have imparted a coloring to the language of the New Testament writers, which should not, however, be regarded as a confirmation of the notion of demoniacal possessions, entertained among the Jews; but rather as an adaptation, in the use of speech, to the language and phraseology of the times.

According to these opinions, the atmosphere was peopled with innumerable evil spirits—the spirits of dead men, who entered into the living, and became the authors of the diseases and various calamities to which they were subject. In accordance with these views we read of “Beelzebub, the prince of devils,” and of “The Prince of the power of the air.” If a child was born dumb, he was said to have been possessed of a dumb spirit from his birth; and when Jesus healed such an one, it was said that he cast the dumb spirit out of him. The following is an example: “And as they went out behold they brought to him a dumb man, possessed of a devil. And when the devil was cast out *the dumb spake*; and the multitude marvelled, saying, It was never so seen in Israel.”\* It is said again, that “the multitude wondered when they saw the dumb speak and the blind to see.”

On a certain occasion one of those who besought him to heal his son, said unto him, “Master, I have brought unto thee

---

\* Matt. ix. 32, 33.

my son, which hath a dumb spirit." In this case it appears the dumb boy was also afflicted with epilepsy, so that he often fell into the fire, or on the ground, "and wallowed, foaming," exhibiting all the symptoms of the worst form of this disease. He was said, however, to possess a devil, and Jesus, when he exerted his miraculous power for his cure, used the common language of the people, "Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee come out of him, and enter no more into him."\*

In like manner the disease of lunacy, or madness, was attributed to the possession of demons. Mary Magdalene was undoubtedly a lunatic of a very violent kind, insomuch that she was said to have been possessed of seven devils. Such also were the two who met Jesus, as they were coming out of the tombs, "which were exceeding fierce so that no man dared to pass that way." These, likewise, he healed, and, at their request, he permitted them to manifest their last act of violence in driving a herd of swine down a steep place into the sea. Or, it is possible that, in order to give further evidence of the power committed to him, he caused the madness, with which the lunatics were afflicted, to take possession of the swine, and they precipitated themselves into the sea, and were drowned. Either supposition is much more rational than the opinion that a legion of personal devils entered into them and caused their destruction.

I have not time to go into a full explanation of the subject of demonology, nor of the numerous instances mentioned in the New Testament in which devils were said to have been cast out. It will be remembered, however, that others cured the same diseases, and the disciples came unto Jesus, and told him how they saw certain persons casting out devils in his name, and that they had forbid them. This fact may have some bearing upon the question whether these cures were wrought by supernatural means or not. There is, doubtless, truth in the remark of a profound theologian, that where there is no need of a miracle God never works one. Similar to this is the exposition given by the learned Doctor Jahn, in his work on Archæology;† and in which many learned biblical

---

\* Mark ix. 17—23. † pp. 217.

scholars agree. Although he gives both sides of the argument it is easy to see which he regards with the most favor. Indeed it is probable that very few enlightened and liberal christians, in this age, believe in the personality of the Devil, having legions of inferior demons under his dominion. Most of the diseases attributed to demoniacal possessions may be found in the Asylums for the insane and the deaf and dumb, at this day; yet no one would think of ascribing them to the agency of the Devil now. We should regard such an opinion as very much akin to the old superstitions on witchcraft; for it would be difficult to perceive any difference, whether a person afflicted with a malady of any kind were supposed to be "bewitched," or "possessed of a devil."

Yet, notwithstanding the matter-of fact style in which we are accustomed to speak of things, we habitually use phraseology, similar to that of the New Testament writers, on this subject, without being understood to favor the idea of demoniacal possessions in the least. We say of a wicked man, actuated by sinister motives, "He possesses an evil spirit," and of a good man, of kind disposition and benevolent heart, "He has a good spirit." We call a penurious disposition, "a mean spirit," and even go so far that we apply the epithets "fiend" and "demon" to a person of violent, and revengeful temper. The spirit of kindness, and the spirit of love, a meek and gentle spirit, or one that is morose and bitter, a peaceful spirit, a sordid spirit, a forgiving spirit, and a revengeful spirit, are forms of speech that show a natural tendency to personify the passions and sentiments of the human mind—a tendency that was characteristic of the times of the Savior, and the people who listened to his teachings.

2. Let us now attend, briefly, to the instance of demoniacal possession, mentioned in the text. It seems there were, among the Jews, a class of mountebanks, called "exorcists," who went about pretending to cast out demons, and to heal the various diseases attributed to their influence. Like many modern pretenders to the healing art, they were, undoubtedly, quite successful in imposing upon the credulity of the people, and made it a profitable business. Their cures, however, were generally found deceptive, and their art was brought into open disrepute.



While Paul was preaching at Ephesus, he fell in with some of these "exorcists" or "vagabond Jews." His labors there were attended with remarkable success, and many people of Asia heard the gospel, both Jews and Greeks. In this instance, too, the word of God was accompanied by a miraculous exhibition of divine power in the cure of disease, and it will be observed, in the record made of the fact, that the diseases are personified, as well as the evil spirits, and both are said to have "departed" from them. "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul; so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs or aprons, *and the diseases departed from them*, and the evil spirits went out of them.\*

When the exorcists saw these wonderful cures wrought, in the name of the Lord Jesus, they took Paul for one of the more skilful of their own craft, and supposed that he had found out some new charm, and therefore was more successful than they. Hearing him use the name of the Lord Jesus they took it upon themselves to imitate him, hoping for equal success. In their attempt it will be perceived, from the account which follows, that the man having the evil spirit, who was doubtless a lunatic, is himself called the evil spirit, a kind of metonymy, whereby one word is placed for another, and which is quite common with the sacred writers—a fact which also explains to us how the demons and evil spirits held conversation with Jesus, it being the diseased persons, themselves, who talked. The experiment of the exorcists and its results are recorded in the following graphic language of the inspired historian :

"Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took it upon them to call over them which had evil spirits, in the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth." Mark the result which succeeded this incantation. "And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know and Paul I know; but who are ye? And the man, in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house, naked and wounded."†

---

\* Acts xix. 12. † Acts xix. 13—16.

Here a fact is brought to light of exceeding interest. Like the two men which encountered Christ, when they were coming out of the tombs, and knew him, this evil spirit, or lunatic, asserted that he knew Jesus and Paul, intimating that he would have obeyed them; but these vagabond exorcists he knew not. Their cupidity and selfishness aroused his madness, and he attacked them with violence and drove them away.

3. I come now to the principal and most important division of my subject, the spirit of Jesus and Paul. In the fruits of that spirit and its power to overcome and subdue the evil spirit of the world we shall see a striking and beautiful proof of the truth and divine origin of the Christian religion. And this is the feature of my subject to which I desire to give particular prominence.

There was something in the spirit of Jesus and Paul—a spirit which we find breathing itself through every precept of the gospel—that made itself known, even to the lunatic and madman, and produced a quiet, calm submission to the Master's will. What that something was, we hardly need inquire. It was the love, the compassion, the kindness of the Redeemer. There was in his very countenance, and the heavenly words he spoke; in his whole demeanor, and the loving mildness of his eye, that which touched the stubborn heart, and made it confess, to its own irrepressible emotions, Truly this is the son of God. All his mighty works; his highest exhibitions of miraculous power, were dictated by this humane and loving spirit; were wrought for the good of those who approached him to be healed. Never did he seek the least advantage to himself; in no instance was there ever the slightest appearance of selfishness; but, always actuated by a kind and generous sympathy, he was ever ready to alleviate the distresses of the sick and the sorrowing. To the practical illustration of the heavenly truths he taught, and the highest good of the human race, he devoted his pure and spotless life.

His apostles, too, were actuated by the same disinterested philanthropy; and having the same generous and loving spirit, it is no marvel, that even the evil spirit of the lunatic, should confess, that he knew Jesus and Paul. The wicked ever know and feel the presence and influence of a good man;

and let such an one fall accidentally among the abandoned and depraved, and they will instinctively cease their vile words and rudeness of speech to do him homage, or yield him, at least, a silent respect. There is a power in the influence of goodness, of virtue, of love, that the most callous and hard-hearted cannot resist. It comes home to the heart, like the melody of a forgotten song, awakening the sweetest recollections; and, if there be the smallest spark of humanity left, or the least vestige of God's image remain, however much it may be obscured by sin, it will kindle that spark anew, and its continued influence will at last, fan it into a flame that shall consume the evil that may be there.

It was this spirit, and this influence, which made the lunatic know who Jesus was, and who was Paul; but these vagabond exorcists had none of this spirit, and their attempt to imitate it signally failed. It is something that never can be imitated. The keen perception of the evil spirit could unveil the hypocrisy at a glance. We all know how quickly the insane detect the least attempt at imposition. The true spirit of Christ must be felt and exhibit itself in the life and character of the man. It cannot be put on. And when it thus shines out in the life, and comes in tones of love, to heal the stricken and diseased soul, as it did in the life and words of Jesus and Paul, its power is felt, and the evil spirit is cast out. To no other power; no other influence will it yield. Evil cannot overcome evil. It only adds its own wrong to the wrong it seeks to overcome; it opposes violence to violence, and the result is, an increase of violence. In the case of the lunatic it excited his madness only the more, that the vagabond Jews should attempt to do what Paul and Jesus did, when they had none of the spirit of either; and he leaped upon them and overcame them, so that they had to flee out of his presence.

How long and slow mankind have been to imbibe the true spirit of the gospel of Christ! How soon that spirit of love and kindness, which he commended to the world in his life and teachings, as the true method of treating evil, was forgotten, in the corruptions of the church! Witness the strife and contentions that succeeded the primitive ages of Christianity, as the followers of Christ lost his spirit, and began to fight for doctrines and modes of faith. Instead of casting out the

evil spirit of the world, by violence and force, they did but increase his strength, and in effect, met with the reply of the lunatic to the exorcists, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?"

Similar to the attempts of these exorcists have been the common efforts of the church to reform the world, and similar have been the results. The ministers of the gospel, instead of clothing themselves with the spirit of love, the spirit of meekness and compassion, which so distinguished the Redeemer, have, in too many instances, gone forth, with denunciations and threatenings on their lips, alarming the weak and timid, and rendering the bold and fearless, more callous and indifferent, when they might have drawn them to Christ, by the divine and holy influences of goodness and love. The character of God, whom Jesus revealed to us as the Father, they have presented to us in language that has excited only terror and dread. We have been taught to regard him as anything else than a Father, who will provide the best good for all his needy and dependent children.

Who is it, even in this enlightened age—this age of moral reform, and social progress—that stand up for the gallows; that go for saving men by hanging them, and inflicting the most severe and barbarous punishments that can be devised; that show themselves the greatest sticklers for the law of Moses—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth;—that defend war and the law of retaliation, and even act as chaplains to the army and the navy? I regret to say, that in too many instances, it is the professed teachers of "the gospel of peace." Oh, can we wonder, that the evil spirit of the world should go mad, and increase in violence, at such attempts to cast him out! To such influences and such means it will never yield; but still continues to reiterate, in deeds, if not in words, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" And it does but utter the truth; for whenever the true spirit of Christ is exhibited it recognizes it at once, and yields submission. It cannot resist the power of love, the peaceful and forgiving spirit of Jesus and Paul.

The time was, not many centuries ago, when the poor lunatic, who met with such compassionate treatment from the Savior, was treated more like a wild beast than a human being,

deserving sympathy and kind treatment. The cruel and heart-rending barbarities that have been inflicted upon the insane, even within the last fifty or a hundred years, would make the heart bleed at the recital. What should we think now to see a man confined in the prisoner's lonely cell, chained to a staple in the floor, with a pallet of straw in the corner of the room, and no article of comfort or kindly voice to cheer the live-long hours? A small opening in the bolted door serves to admit his scanty meal, gathered from the fragments of the keeper's table; the grey light comes through the iron bars and cobwebbed windows, casting a melancholy reflection on all within; no breath of balmy air ever fans that pale and aching brow; and all without—the smiling fields, the foliage of the trees, and the glorious sunlight, are shut forever from his vision? What wonder that he raves and makes a noise? and now the keeper comes to hush the tumult; the heavy door opens and shuts again upon its iron hinges, and soon the sound of blows and cries of anguish tell of the cruel scene that passes within. And all for what? That man has done no crime; but trouble and disappointment have deranged his senses; reason has quit her throne, and he, a poor and helpless maniac, knows not the meaning of these bars and iron bolts that keep him in his gloomy cell. What wonder that his reason does not come again, and that for years he wears the heavy chain, till at last the prisoner is released, and lays his aching head “where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest!”

A scene like this once met my boyhood's gaze, and many a counterpart can be found in the records of insanity in Europe and even in this country. But a better time has come, if the christian world *has been* eighteen hundred years learning the lesson. Medical jurisprudence has at last found out that by means of moral treatment, kindness, pleasant associations, and a degree of freedom, consistent with the patient's welfare and safety, the insane can be cured and restored to their right minds. Asylums are now provided, conducted upon these principles, surrounded by pleasant parks, beautiful landscapes, and pure air, with a free circulation, through all the apartments, and proper ventilation, wholesome food, and suitable exercise. Under this treatment thousands of the un-

fortunate insane are restored to their right minds, to bless their relatives and friends and enjoy the pleasures of home, who would never have seen the dawn of their reason under the old system of chains and gloomy cells.

The spirit of Jesus and Paul, by which they cast out evil spirits and cured those who were afflicted with disease, is still as powerful as ever, if we will but make it the spirit of our lives. It constitutes the basis of every reform; and the sins of mankind, the moral diseases of society, can only be removed by bringing this spirit to bear upon them, through the gospel of Jesus Christ. We have seen that even the insane, and the raving maniac, will yield to its influence. If they are sensible to the power of kindness, why may it not restore all the sinful and wretched to their right minds, and bless them with the spirit of obedience and love? Is it not a wonderful proof of the truth and divine origin of the Christian religion, that it should be the very embodiment of this principle of kindness?—that Jesus of Nazareth, should have taught on the shores of Galilee, and illustrated in his humble life, principles which the world is just learning to apply to practice? Truly the world has been slow of heart to believe the first principles of the gospel of Christ!

The history of intemperance exhibits a similar experience to that which I have traced in the history of insanity. The christian world was a long time learning that the inebriate could be saved by the influence of kindness and brotherly love. Denunciation and threatening was at first employed, and the awful consequences of drunkenness were portrayed in vivid colors, but all without effect. To all these means he replied, in actions that spoke louder than words, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" Then came the Washingtonian movement, based upon the principle of kindness, recognizing the brotherhood of man, and breathing the spirit of Jesus and Paul, and the result is familiar to you all. The evil spirit of drunkenness was cast out, and thousands who had been possessed of demons were restored to their right minds.\*

---

\* A similar train of thought is here followed to that of an esteemed brother, Rev. I. D. Williamson, in an able discourse of his to which I had the pleasure of listening some years ago in Ohio. That discourse, I think, has never been published—at least I have never seen it; but my imperfect recollection of it induces me to make this acknowledgement. I hope it may yet be given to the public.

Notwithstanding these lessons of Christian truth which we have as yet but imperfectly learned, we are slow to believe that this is the true method of overcoming and subduing the evil spirit of the world. Our recent experience with the poor degraded people of Mexico, is not without its lesson of instruction to us. We knew they were morally diseased, corrupted and depraved, and we undertook to cast the evil spirit out of them; but we went not in the spirit of Jesus and of Paul. This spirit they would have known and obeyed; they could not have resisted it. We went like the "exorcists," and hoped to drive the evil spirit out of them; pretending to do it in the name of Jesus, whom Paul preached, while we used other and more violent agencies; and we have experienced similar results. They have replied to us from the mouths of their cannon and artillery, "Jesus we know, and Paul we know, but who are ye?" And though they have proved too feeble to prevail against us, they have tried to do us every injury in their power. The bones of our brethren lie scattered and bleached upon the plains of Mexico, and we have killed thousands of the foe, increasing instead of diminishing the wrongs we have suffered, and inflicting upon them additional wrong.

It is only by the spirit of Christ that we shall be able to overcome them after all. We may kill them and take away their possessions; but their hatred and enmity will remain. They will retain their grudge forever, unless we can subdue them by treating them as our brethren. We must seek to reconcile them to us, and heal their moral diseases, by the kind, loving, and fraternal spirit of the gospel, and then we shall cast the evil spirit out of them and make them our friends. I suggest these thoughts upon this exciting subject, entirely from a Christian point of view, without reference to political considerations of any kind. You know I am no politician, and I trust you can tolerate the sincere convictions of an honest mind.\*

Finally, it is a source of hopeful gratification, to every believer in the religion of Jesus, that the spirit of the gospel is

---

\* This paragraph, and the one preceding, contain the exact language and sentiment, that so highly offended the editor of the *Dover Gazette*, and which called forth an attack from that paper, recommending, that all ministers who preach such "stuff," be rebuked by a "dismissal." He has since denominated it my "political sermon," with how much justice, let the public Judge. See Appendix.

gaining new and peaceful triumphs from age to age. Notwithstanding we have but partially realized the fruits of this spirit, we look forward to the period, when the triumph of christian principles shall be complete and universal; when the law of love shall rule supreme, in every heart, and peace shall flow as a river. Thrones and monarchs shall crumble and fall; old institutions, founded upon violence and oppression, shall pass away; the ages of fraud and corruption—of bigoted intolerance and religious infidelity—the ages of the gibbet, the sword and the halter—of racks and chains, and the instruments of tyranny, shall be known no more. A new and happier age shall succeed; christianity shall achieve its proudest triumphs, in the general diffusion of the principles of brotherhood and peace, and the blessings of truth and liberty shall become the heritage of all mankind.

What is the moral, then, we draw from this subject? It is this. There is but one way that we can overcome evil; and that is by acting out in our daily lives, the spirit of Christ. That way, our divine Master has clearly pointed out to us. "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." It is only in this manner that we shall ever overcome the evil of the human heart, and of the world. The success that has ever attended this spirit evinces the truth and divine origin of the religion from whence it emanates. It is in this manner we believe and trust that the infinite Father will ultimately draw all souls to himself, by the operation of his grace and love, upon the minds and moral affections of his rational offspring. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."



# SERMON.

---

## THE LIBERTY OF THE PULPIT.

“Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men.”—ACTS v. 29.

I have selected this passage of Scripture for the purpose of offering some thoughts, in harmony with the sentiment it expresses, upon the relation of the christian ministry to the people. My motive in selecting this topic, at the present time, will be found in an earnest and sincere desire, on my part, that there should be, at all times, a mutually good understanding between the minister and people of this Society. There is nothing, probably, that will tend more to this end than a somewhat thorough discussion of the subject I have named, especially, so far as it relates to the proper sphere and freedom of the pulpit. Lest I should be thought excited upon a theme, which so intimately concerns my own freedom as a Christian minister, I shall endeavor to preserve a calm spirit, and deliver myself without declamation or rhetorical display.

I feel, moreover, that I can now discuss this subject with all the freedom which it necessarily demands, and without being suspected of any disposition to meddle in the political questions of the day. The Searcher of all hearts knows that I have not at any former time, nor have I now, the least desire to influence the political opinions or action of any man, so long as they do not conflict with any of the great principles of the gospel of Christ. I have never intended, nor is it my intention in future, to have any thing to do with politics, in the

pulpit, either as a science, or in its party aspects; and it is a growing conviction with me, that I will never have any thing to do with it any where else.

The abuses of political power; the party strife; the demagogueism; the scramble for office; the lack of truth, honesty, and principle; the subserviency to party; the proscription of the pulpit, and every thing that utters a voice for truth and humanity; the violent prejudices of partizans, and their denunciations of whatever does not square with their political morality; the constant exhibition of these things, in the political world, illustrating, as it does, the abuses and corruptions of party, is enough to disgust every christian and philanthropic mind, and turn upright men away from the disgraceful scene with loathing and sorrow. It is enough to make the christian patriot sigh for his country, and feel that her desolation draweth nigh.

It is for these reasons, as well as the unfitness of political subjects for the pulpit, that I do now, and forever, eschew party politics. I perfectly agree to the sentiment that a minister of Christ is stepping aside from his appropriate sphere of duty, when he enters the arena of party politics, either in or out of the pulpit. But what is it to preach politics in the pulpit? Is it to preach against war, slavery, intemperance, capital punishment? We shall see.

The elections are now over;\* the war with Mexico is at an end, a treaty of peace having been made, and ratified by one of the belligerent powers, which there seems to be no doubt will soon be ratified by the other. Hostilities have been suspended, and Peace, with her olive branch, is about to visit our country again. What christian heart is there that does not inwardly rejoice at the prospect? In the elections, which have just ended, I have taken no part. Under these circumstances, therefore, it seems to me a great absurdity, for any man to suppose that I have any political motive in uttering my own convictions of truth, either on last Sunday, or to-day.

An additional reason why I have selected this topic, on this occasion, is, that no *misunderstanding* may arise between us in consequence of any thing that has recently happened,

---

\* The state election had transpired some two weeks previous.

or is likely to happen again, with respect to the amount of moral freedom your minister shall possess, in speaking his own conscientious convictions of religious truth. Although I supposed I had made myself plain on this subject, at the beginning of my engagement with you, yet *I feel impressed* with the necessity of making that matter still plainer, if possible. The spirit moves me to speak on this subject, and I shall be guided by its influence, and leave the result to Him, whose I am and whom I serve.

The ground on which I stand, then, is this: *The christian Minister must be true to his own convictions of right, truth and duty, and must not stifle any of these convictions, nor suppress the utterance of a christian truth, to please any man, or any set of men.*

I go even farther than this, and say that he must not do this thing, even though it be required of him by those to whom he ministers, on pain of an immediate dismissal. His obligations to God are higher than his obligations to man. If God has revealed it to his mind, through his word, and he believes it to be a christian truth, that all men are brethren, and that, therefore, it is wrong for them to fight; or, that the spirit of christianity requires, in all cases, that we should overcome evil with good, and be governed by the law of love, instead of the law of retaliation, he must not suppress these truths in his soul, lest it shall offend some man, who does not love to hear so high an expression of truth. To do so would be to prove himself unworthy of the high vocation wherewith he is called. It would be a denial of the Lord that bought him, more heinous than the denial of Peter—a crucifixion of the Son of God afresh, more cruel than that on Calvary. In the one case, it is done knowingly, against light and knowledge; in the other, ignorance, and blindness of heart—afford some palliation. Every repetition of so unfaithful an act, in the minister of Christ, blunts his moral sensibilities and destroys the fineness of his moral perceptions. By a law of his own being, he renders himself incapable of receiving higher truths, and blinds himself to those which he already possesses. Like the servant to whom the Lord committed one talent, he goes and buries it in the earth, and when the day of reckoning comes, even that

which he had is taken away. An apostle has said, "Quench not the spirit." But if we suppress every conception of truth that rises in our hearts, shall we not "grieve away the spirit," and prevent its return, by closing up the avenues through which truth flows in upon the soul?

If the truth offend Mr. A. B. or C., because of their relation to party politics, that will not excuse the minister of Christ from the performance of his duty. Their offence is no fault of his. If the nation or the government has committed a violation of the law of love, and practically set at naught the truth of human brotherhood, he cannot help that. It is the fault, of the individual, or the nation, if they cannot come up to this truth, and no one should be offended with the minister for preaching it. It is a truth which God has commissioned him to preach, and which lies at the very foundation of the religion of which he is ordained a minister. They ought rather to be offended with God for revealing such a truth, and carry up a remonstrance against high heaven, for placing us under obligations to obey it. A final disposition might then be made of the case; but it is vain and foolish to find fault with the Clergy, for doing just what God has required of them, and which they, as his servants, are under the highest obligations to do.

The minister who thus preaches the truth, according to his own highest and best convictions, and keeps within the sphere of his moral and religious duties, is not to be charged with preaching politics, and abusing the government, because the nation or the government, has disregarded that truth. It is politics that interferes with religion and the pulpit, and not the pulpit with politics. If a public or national wrong has been committed—if the laws of God and the rights of humanity have been trampled under foot, and the pulpit utters its voice of warning and condemnation, straightway the champion of Politics steps up to God's servant, with impudent effrontery, and says to him, "Sir, do you hold silence on that subject—that's politics—that's abuse of the government—we'll hear no such preaching as that—'we will not insult our conscience, nor our ears by listening to such stuff, a second time, any where, from the pulpit, if we know it.'" And henceforth the man, who loves his politics more than his religion, his God, or his

fellow men, leaves the house of prayer, stops his support, and stirs up all the political prejudice and animosity he can arouse against religion, the church and the ministry.

The men who would thus hamper religion, and put the clergy in a straight-jacket, have no regard for religion itself or the good of the soul. They would, at any time, pass a gag law, prohibiting the ministry from rebuking public sin and national iniquity, were it not that it would be a too glaring inconsistency with their professions of political and religious toleration. They would have the minister be a time-server, echoing merely their sentiments, or the sentiments of his congregation—preaching no higher morality than suited the politics of the day; and if he dared go beyond this, he must be smartly rebuked, and his mouth stopped on every subject, which they choose to mark “contraband thought.” If a man, bearing the title of clergyman, could be found, so servile, so abject, so faithless, willing to become such a tool, the safer way for him would be to have a committee appointed by his congregation, and submit his sermons to them for approval, before delivery.

But the true man of God will never submit to such tyranny as this. He feels that his obligations to God, to truth and duty, are higher than to man; and that if human prejudice and passion rise up and forbid him to speak, like Peter, and the other apostles, he must obey God rather than men. The voice of conscience, in his own soul, is superior to the commandments of men; and, like these same apostles, when they were forbidden to speak, in the name of Jesus, he answers, “Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye.” How sublime was the devotion of those simple and pure minded men to the cause of truth! When Jesus had risen from the dead, and the conviction that he was indeed the Christ, the Son of the living God, had taken full possession of their souls, how they went forward, strong hearted and undismayed by their enemies, proclaiming the great truths of the gospel!

Although they were accused of denying the authority of Moses; of stirring up sedition; and of being dangerous to the government; and were brought before councils and political rulers, and persecuted from city to city, yet they were faithful

even unto death, and preached the truth boldly, in every synagogue and place, where they found people to hear them. They did not shape their discourses, so as to avoid offending the Jews, or the Ruler of the Synagogue. Nor were they less faithful to the Gentiles. See Paul in the city of Athens, how he stood on Mars Hill, and proved to the inhabitants of that ancient commonwealth, that they were a nation of idolaters. They worshipped idols, according to law; but Paul did not cease to proclaim the truth on that account. Read his epistles, and see how he rebukes wickedness in high places, and reproves his brethren for their sins, in language too plain to be misunderstood.

The prophets, too, were no less faithful, in speaking of the transgressions of the people. Many and severe were the judgments they pronounced upon wicked and rebellious Israel. Sore were the calamities with which they threatened the house of Judah. The desolations that should come upon them were the burden of their prophecies; and they were fulfilled, in the judgments, with which God visited his people. Those men of old were true men, and trusted God, with unfaltering confidence. They were willing to sacrifice every selfish desire on the altar of truth and duty. In all their lives, they were governed by high and holy principle, and believed that no temporary advantage could compensate for its sacrifice. Are not these men worthy of our highest admiration, and our imitation? Ought not the ministers of Christ to be equally faithful in preaching the word of God, and showing the consequences of transgression, upon nations and communities, as well as upon individuals? The obligations of truth and duty are as binding now as in the days of the patriarchs and prophets, or in apostolic times, and woe to that man who disregards them.

It is true, that for this kind of fidelity, Saviors and Prophets, have generally met with a cruel death—have been crucified; sawn asunder; despised, and neglected of their race. And it is even so now. The same spirit rules the world; but dare not resort to such violent means. It accomplishes its work in a more quiet way; but none the less effectually. It is ready now, as then, to stop the mouth of the faithful servant of God; and, if he will not desist, to withhold the bread that feeds him, his wife and his little ones. But still his duty is plain, and he

ought not to hesitate. He must be willing, for the truth, to follow Jesus, through privation, suffering and wrong, to the very foot of the Cross.

What reason is there that the ministers of Christ should be less faithful now, than in the early history of christianity? "O," says one, "it is not a proper time to advocate the principles of peace, and preach against the sin of war, when the country is at war with another nation." Then, according to this doctrine, the time to preach against sin is, when there is no sin, and when sin prevails, keep silence. This might be policy in some; but, if it were adopted, what need of faithful ministers of religion? The race must first attain to holiness, and then they will be needed, and may preach against sin to their heart's content; but not now—not now. At this rate, when would the world become reformed so as to bear the truth with patience? The most proper and suitable of all times to preach against a sin, is when that sin is most popular and prevalent. If war is contrary to the spirit and teachings of Christianity, the most suitable of all times to preach against it, is when it rages most, and nations are most infatuated by its false glory, and its shameful ministry to the selfishness, vindictiveness, and pride of the human heart.

It is really one of the evils of the age that the pulpit and the press, with a few noble exceptions, are prostituted to the service of unfaithful men. The one is trammelled, and afraid to speak out against the most heinous transgressions and wrongs; and the other is corrupted to the purposes of party triumph, and political aggrandizement. If the pulpit of the land were untrammelled and free, and uttered its voice of condemnation against every wrong, and every vice, whether individual or national, we should be blessed with a purer public moral sentiment, and a more righteous and godly people. Some men speak and write eloquently of the liberty of the press. I do not know why we ought not to prize the liberty of the pulpit just as highly. The liberty of speech is quite as sacred as that of the press, and much less liable to abuse; for we know who speaks; but he who writes may conceal himself behind a fictitious name, while he diffuses his poison abroad, and remains unknown and irresponsible.

If such encroachments, on the liberty of the pulpit, as we have contemplated, are to be tolerated, where will the end of these things be? If the nation should think it worth the while to violate every principle of christian truth, and set every moral law at defiance, the minister of Christ would have to hold his peace entirely. If he raised his voice against the iniquity, or made the least remonstrance, he would be silenced with the cry of "politics"—"he preacheth politics; rebuke him by dismissal." Such are the inroads attempted to be made upon the rights of the pulpit. If we yield, we shall find ourselves pushed from the christian platform, altogether, and the christian minister will be placed behind the ear of politics, and dragged whithersoever it goeth, that he may offer up prayers, and perform religious rites, in honor of its triumphs.

What reason is there why the pulpit should not speak out against national sins as well as individual transgressions? Can a nation be any more perfect than the individuals composing it? If a nation commits a moral wrong—a violation of the law of God, why should it not be rebuked, by the faithful christian minister, as well as any other sinner? Does any one pretend that the nation is holy, perfect, sinless? There may be those so blinded to party as to think so; but every intelligent man knows better. There never yet has been a perfect nation or government on earth, and never will be, until the kingdom of God is established in the hearts of all men. While I think my country and its government, the best in the world, I am not so foolish as to think that they are perfect. Every member of the body politic must share the responsibility of the acts of his nation. God holds nations accountable to his moral government, as well as individuals; and no nation can violate the principles of that moral government, and trample the laws of God under its feet, without bringing down upon itself the just retributions of heaven.

Would you learn how God deals with wicked and corrupt nations? Go study the lessons of the past. Look upon the antediluvian world, when the wickedness of its inhabitants had become a stench in the nostrils of Jehovah, how he opened the fountains of the great deep, and the windows of heaven, and swept them from the earth, by a mighty deluge, as with the be-



som of destruction ; and let the recollection thereof remind us that God is judge of the nations.

Behold the cities of the Plain, of Sodom and Gomorrah, with what signal judgments they were overthrown. And the land of Idumea, once the abode of enlightened men, its pastures and fields, beautiful to the eye, ministering to life and enjoyment, see the judgments brought upon it, by the wickedness of its inhabitants. For ages its smoke ascended up to heaven, and it has been the abode of the cormorant and the bittern ; and the owl and the raven have dwelt in it. Thorns and nettles have come up in its palaces, and brambles have covered the fortresses thereof. It has become the habitation of dragons, and a court for owls ; the wild beasts of the desert have possession of it, and vultures make it their abode. When we consider the desolations of this land, verified by the accounts of modern travellers, let us be reminded that God is judge of the nations.

Behold, too, the ancient city of Babylon, the pride and glory of the world, when her licentiousness and crime had made her an abomination in the sight of the Lord, how she was brought down to destruction, as the prophets had foretold. And Jerusalem also, with her beautiful temple, and the splendor of her palaces, how great was her overthrow ! Her people still remain scattered and peeled throughout the earth, a standing national monument, that God is judge of the nations.

Contemplate, for a moment, the fate of ancient Greece, renowned for her works of art, her orators, philosophers and wise men, and behold how she, too, has shared the fate of all nations, who follow their own ways, and set at naught the moral government of God. Where now is her glory and greatness, that so excited the wonder and admiration of the world ? Echo answers, where ? See ancient Rome, too, the mistress of the world ; and, as we contemplate her military glory, her conquests, and her great men, and follow her career of luxury and vice, and her departure from the principles of righteousness and truth, let her downfall remind us again, that God is judge of the nations.

In the history of Divine Providence we see one wicked nation taken to scourge another for its wickedness, and both are

punished for their voluntary abandonment of principle. From these warlike and destructive conflicts we see the Divine Being evolving good, rendering the wickedness of man subservient to his wise designs; but never do we see a wicked nation escaping the just penalties of his laws, however much its wickedness may have been overruled for good. It is as true of nations as of men, "though hand join in hand the wicked shall not be unpunished."

Are not these exhibitions of the ways of God in dealing with nations, suitable themes for the servant of God to dwell upon, as a warning to all other nations and people who violate the principles of righteousness and truth? Must he hold his peace, lest some man who loves his party more than his religion, or his God, shall be offended? If God has said that he will punish nations, as well as individuals, for wrong doing, that's God's truth—not the minister's—and if any body has aught to say against it, let him lay his grievances before God. He requires that all nations, and all men, should "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before Him." He tells us that we are all his children, human brothers, in whatever nation or clime we have been born, or whatever may be the color of our skin. He teaches us to address him, "Our Father," and requires us to love Him supremely, and every human brother as ourselves. If the people, or the nation, violate these truths and neglect these requirements, and the faithful man of God lifts up his voice on the subject, is he to be silenced by the mad-dog cry of "politics?"

Universalists, above all other christians, should be tolerant. When we come into the temple of worship, on the Sabbath day, we should forget that we are whigs or democrats or liberty men, and come as brothers to the house of God. At the very basis of our faith lies the doctrine of universal brotherhood. We have always taken delight in showing that all mankind are children of God, and heirs of salvation. We have always contended that all men were brethren. Holding this sentiment, our ministers have ever occupied the ground, that all war is morally wrong, and opposed to the spirit of Jesus, however expedient or apparently necessary, it may have seemed in any particular case. The moment we say all men are brethren, can we say less than that it is wrong for brethren to

fight and kill each other? I am not speaking of the expediency or necessity of war, though I believe that it is always inexpedient and unnecessary. But I am speaking of the question whether it is morally right. If we who hold to the universal brotherhood of man, cannot come up to that ground, nor even hear our minister utter his sincere conviction that all war and fighting is inconsistent with the requirements of Christ's gospel, then are we strangely inconsistent and intolerant in an extreme degree. How do you think Jesus would have looked on board a Man of War, Chaplain to the Navy, or on the Battle field, praying to his Father to give success to the work of slaughter and death? Where would have been the moral purity and loveliness of his divine and holy life? Where would have been the living example—the Word made manifest in the flesh—by which his doctrines and precepts are commended to the world? Where would have been the moral elevation, on which he stands, so high above the founder of any other religion—so high above Mohammed, and the priests and philosophers of the Pagan world? How would his character and life have appeared along side of the divine and heavenly precepts of his gospel: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you"—"Do violence to no man"—"Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God"—"Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy"—"If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst give him drink?"

If we, as Universalists, cannot come up to this ground, let us, in the name of all that is consistent, give up our faith.\* How

---

\*The following opinion, expressed in the annual sermon, delivered before the U. S. Convention of Universalists, at its last session, shows the convictions, of a great mind, upon the duty of the denomination, with respect to the great moral reforms of the age. He says.

"Among the concerns of practical religion, I intended to say something of the great moral reforms of our day. But I have already trespassed so far on your patience, as to leave time for only two remarks: First, that for one, I cannot see why we should not engage in them, and act in them, according to the spirit of the gospel we profess; and secondly, that we cannot wholly avoid taking part in them, one way or the other, even if we would. \* \* \* The abolition of slavery, the suppression of intemperance, the amelioration of punishments and prisons, —all these are agitating every portion of the civilized world. It is not a little temporary eddy of the waters, in one of our narrow creeks; it is a spring-tide that

can we talk about the universal Paternity of God ; the universal Brotherhood of the race ; the power of love to overcome evil, and reason from these premises to the conclusion of universal salvation, while at the same time we justify war, human slavery, or any other institution that gives the lie direct to our faith ? And what is it but to justify these evils, if we forbid our minister to preach one half of that faith ? To tell him, in effect, that he may theorize about the Divine Paternity and the Brotherhood of Man, and show how his theory proves the salvation of all men, in the next world ; but its practical application to the affairs of life ; to duty and interest, in this world—that part of the subject must be let alone ? O, no, that would offend some brother who worships his political party more than he does God, and would justify his government, in every violation of Christian principle, though it went to perdition, and he with it.

To be a Universalist, merely in *opinion*, without bringing forth any of the fruits of religion, will never tend to advance the Kingdom of Righteousness and Peace among men. As an *opinion*, without having any influence on the heart and life, and especially if the life is grossly inconsistent with its teachings and requirements, it is of no more value than any other abstract opinion. “ Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.”

Universalists have always been opposed to capital punishment, and contended that it was contrary to the spirit of the gospel—that it was wrong for the State to take the life of even *one* man, though he were guilty of the highest crimes. It is easy to see that war stands or falls upon the same ground. If it be wrong for the State to hang *one* man for murder, can it be right for a government to kill thousands of men, women and children—to make a wholesale butchery of brethren of another nation, because of some national quarrel, grievance

---

is coming in upon us, from the broad illimitable ocean. Welcome it, or deprecate it ; it is coming. And prudence itself (the only motive which can be urged against admitting it into our Connexion,) even prudence itself dictates the advice, to let it have free course, and to move with it in every thing that is good. It appears to me, however, that as Universalists, we have higher principles, than merely prudential considerations, that bear on these reforms, and that naturally lead us to engage heartily in the cause. We need only take heed that, whatever we do, it be in the gentle, forbearing spirit of our religion.—*Rev. H. Ballou 2nd, D. D.*

or insult? Yet such is the inconsistency of some *opinionated* Universalists, who are strongly opposed to capital punishment, as contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion, but in favor of war, if the party to which they happen to belong says it is right. O, when will men cease to sacrifice truth, consistency, and every principle of humanity, on the shrine of party politics?

Some men have a great deal to say about "abusing the government"—"vilifying the government." Does it follow because a minister of the gospel, in a mild and christian spirit, points out a national sin that, therefore, he abuses or vilifies the government, or that he loves his country the less? By no means. The love of country is a natural and beautiful sentiment. No man cherishes it more than I do. It is nearly allied to the love of home, of friends, of children. Does the father love his child the less, because he remonstrates with him, against his evil habits, or even punishes him for his disobedience? No. He gives a stronger evidence of his love than that fond and foolish father, who spoils his child by indulgence, and justifies him in his evil ways. So it is with the true christian patriot. He ever stands by his country, in her darkest hour of peril, and warns her against the dangers that threaten her, if she persists in violations of the laws of God. But, if he is thus faithful to his country's dearest interests, he must make up his mind to hear the hirelings of the party press, accuse him of treason, and blacken his name, with maledictions and curses, that are only equalled, in wickedness, by the corrupt and polluted source from whence they emanate.

Let me be understood. I do not contend that the Christian minister should be always preaching against war and slavery, or any other national transgression. By no means. This would be to neglect many other important and vital truths of the Bible. But I do contend that these are moral and religious questions, which it is his duty and right to discuss, in the pulpit, and which claim a reasonable share of his labor and attention. If he avoids their party and political aspects, and meddles in no way with the elections, a religious and Christian people will never complain, however diversified, or whatever may be their political opinions.

This is all I ask as your pastor. I am no politician. I do not discuss politics on the street, nor in the bar-room. I do not vote, for the reason that I wish to stand on higher ground than politicians stand upon. I meddle with politics in no way, neither in the pulpit nor out of it, and I do not wish it to meddle with me. But one thing I do claim. I claim the privilege and right to say, in this pulpit, whenever I think it my duty to do so, that all war is wrong and unchristian; that human slavery is a sin against God, and the dearest rights of humanity; that all men are brothers; and that the gospel of Christ requires us to practice the law of love, and not the law of retaliation. If the nation, or the people, violate these principles, it is no fault of mine. I cannot lower my standard of christian truth to suit the government, to please political editors, nor to secure the favor of political partizans.

This is precisely the ground I took the first Sunday of my engagement with this Society, in a sermon on the pastoral relation. This is what I understand by preaching Christ and him crucified; that is, the doctrines of Christ, and his resurrection from the dead, as the hope of life and immortality. This was the same doctrine in relation to the freedom of the pulpit, which Rev. E. G. Brooks uttered, in his address to the Society, at my ordination and installation. I almost remember his very words. Said he, "Let your minister be a freeman, and utter his own convictions of moral and religious truth. Do not put trammels upon him, nor expect him, on every occasion, to echo your sentiments. Do not require of him that he shall be a time-server, and pander to your prejudices, either religious or political; but let him act and preach, in a manner becoming the dignity of the station, to which you have elected him."

This very freedom I supposed entered into, and formed a part of, the compact between us. But, my friends, if I have entirely mistaken your liberality and religious toleration—if you cannot sustain me in the course I have marked out for myself; and, after hearing this exposition of my views on the subject, you do not desire a continuance of the relation, subsisting between us, only signify your wishes to me, through your committee, and I will resign my pastoral charge, and seek another field of labor. This will be the proper way to

sever the connection, when you desire it, and I shall pursue the same course, whenever I wish to leave you. Let there be no false delicacy about it. I would much rather it should take place in this manner, openly, frankly and understandingly, than by any secret opposition, or indirect means. To give up one's pew, and neglect public worship, because of dissatisfaction with the minister, is not the most fair and honorable method of bringing about a conclusion of his labors. It is a method generally very injurious to the society itself, since its means of usefulness are very much weakened thereby. Few societies, and especially such as have any incumbrance upon them, can afford to do this, as their means of removing that incumbrance, and defraying the expenses of public worship, depend upon the united exertions of all the members. It is better, therefore, that every member should stand by his society, whatever may be his feelings with regard to his minister, and if he wishes a discontinuance of his labors, strive to bring it about in an honorable way.

If the preaching I have given you, and am likely to give you, in future, does not suit you, and you cannot tolerate the freedom I claim, let me know it, according to the stipulations existing between us, and I will take myself out of your way. Rather than continue your pastor, and be the mere echo of your opinions, I had rather follow some menial employment, that would leave my mind and thought free, and it would be far more creditable to me, than to be a time-server, and unfaithful to the truth—than to be in leading strings to any man in my congregation. I know very well how great a personal sacrifice such a step would cost, after coming more than a thousand miles to settle with you; but truth and right and liberty are above all considerations of this kind. My obligations to duty are paramount to every other, and come what may, I must obey God rather than men.

If, on the contrary, you are willing to sustain me, with the views I have expressed, in the enjoyment of my religious liberty—liberty of thought and speech—(who would ever suppose a democrat would deny a man this?)\* if you are dispos-

---

\* This remark was uttered in parenthesis, and designed merely to show the inconsistency of a man, professing to be a democrat, and yet denying, at the same time, the liberty of speech to his minister.

ed that our pastoral relation should continue, and that I should go on and labor, as I have done, to build up the cause of truth and righteousness in this place, I shall be gratified with your determination. I came among you with strong hopes, and I am disposed to labor for your highest spiritual and temporal welfare. Rest assured I shall go on independently while I do stay, and preach the truth, as I understand and believe it, whether men will hear or forbear. I shall not alter my course one hair's breadth, for the denunciations of any political press—no, not even though I should be met on the street, as I have been, and be abused in gross and insulting language, and hear the pulpit damned, to my face, because it will not be silent on the subject of peace—"peace on earth and good will toward men."\*

When I think of the means that have been taken to intimidate me; the newspaper squibs that have appeared, from time to time, reflecting on ministers of the gospel, and which have evidently been designed to bear on this pulpit, since the author of them is a member of this congregation—when, above all, I consider the value of religious freedom, and the sacred cause in which I am engaged, I feel as the great German Reformer, felt, when he said to the messenger, sent to deter him from entering the city of Worms, "Go tell your Master, that though there should be as many devils at Worms, as there are tiles on its roof, I would enter it."

One thing, I think I can say, with safety. You will lose nothing by sustaining an independent pulpit. If one man leaves, or half a dozen of them, because they cannot tolerate the truth, spoken in love, the very course which drives them away, being based on high moral ground, will bring double the number, ultimately, to fill their places; and the society will gain in point of numbers, as well as in moral and religious worth. It will reach a moral elevation that it would never otherwise attain. It is no real loss to a Society to part with a few unprincipled men. They are always a drag—an incubus on the moral advancement of any cause. The sooner they leave the better for truth and freedom. Let no one then be

---

\* This treatment I met with, shortly after Christmas, from Mr. John T. Gibbs, the editor of the *Dover Gazette*, having preached a sermon, on that occasion, from the words quoted above.



discouraged at temporary losses. God prospers the right, the good, the true. Let us obey Him rather than men.

My position I hope is made plain. The attack made upon the pulpit by a public newspaper in this town, conducted by a member of this congregation, and known to be pointed at this pulpit, in particular, justifies me in the free, full, and frank, exposition, which I have given you, of my views respecting the Liberty of the Pulpit. By these views I am willing to stand or fall. As yet, I have had no indication that you are not perfectly willing to sustain me, in this position, except the one referred to; but since that exception has shown itself in a public manner, I have preferred to place the issue plainly before you, and meet it on the spot.\* Of course no one else will suppose himself, or herself, referred to, in any remarks I have made. I have intended to assert general principles and truths, without drawing a likeness of any particular person or Society. I hope no one will show that the application suits him, by thinking it was so intended.

With this people I am contented and happy. It only remains that you should show, by your attendance here, and your zeal in the cause of religion, what is the position you are willing your minister should occupy, as a freeman in Christ. The standard of religious freedom you fix for me, will be the standard for my successor; and knowing what that standard is, it will govern very much, the character of the man, whoever he may be. Few men of religious worth, and pulpit talent, will accept a station, requiring a sacrifice of their moral and religious freedom, as thinking and accountable beings. The position you take, therefore, on this subject will determine your character and position as a Society, and mine as an independent minister of Jesus Christ.

Let me not be misunderstood. I have no intention to preach politics. That is out of the sphere of independence I claim. No man will ever hear me discuss, in the pulpit, whether this party or that, is responsible for the war; whether a tariff or free trade, is best for the interests of the country; whether a United States Bank, or a Sub-Treasury, is the best means of collecting and disbursing the public monies. These questions

\* A quotation from the article referred to, and some further comments are omitted here, and placed in the Appendix.

I shall leave to politicians to determine. But there are certain Gospel truths—truths of Religion and Humanity, that you may expect to hear me discourse upon, a due proportion of my time, taking care to give each religious topic its proper place, and share of attention. These truths, among others, are the brotherhood of all men; the unchristian character and wrongfulness of war, slavery, capital punishment, and other kindred evils; the mild and forgiving spirit of Jesus, and the true method of subduing and overcoming evil. Were I to hold my peace on these great truths, I should be ashamed of myself for the lack of moral courage, fidelity and truth, of which I should feel guilty, and the time-serving and miserable policy to which I should become subjected. "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel."

If these truths are dear to you, as they are to me, we will go on laboring patiently together, for the golden harvests, that shall crown our labors of love. Rest assured our fidelity and devotion will not go unrewarded. The smiles of a benignant Providence will rest upon us, and God will give us strength for every trial, and bring us off more than conquerors through him that loved us. Let us then be faithful and true; and though clouds and thick darkness are round about us, the breaking light of a better day will dawn upon us, and bring us abundance of peace. Under all circumstances, whether of private wrong, or public calamity, let us be true to principle, and scorn every attempt to draw us from the right path, remembering that "we ought to obey God rather than men." Does the truth demand expression from our tongues, and the spirit move us to utterance? Let us speak, though the heavens come down. The voice of God, in our souls, is superior to the commandments of men. Shall we see our brethren parched with a burning thirst, and hear them calling on us to draw water from the wells of salvation, while we stand idly by, with vessels in our hands, and refuse to give them to drink? Shall we remain silent and dumb-stricken, when the wrongs and sufferings of the oppressed, and down-trodden of our race, cry to us to speak in the name of Religion and Humanity? No. Let us be true to ourselves, and our convictions of duty, and resist every attempt that would deprive us of our lib-

erty to think, speak and act, according to the highest dictates of our conscience and our faith. Let truth and virtuous principle be our rule of life, and our voices be heard above the babbling discord of selfishness and sin, contending for right and liberty.

" In the world's broad field of battle,  
 In the bivouac of Life,  
 Be not like *dumb, driven cattle*,  
 Be a hero in the strife !

Lives of great men all remind us,  
 We can make our lives sublime,  
 And, departing, leave behind us,  
 Footprints on the sands of time ;

Footprints, that, perhaps another,  
 Sailing o'er life's solemn main,  
 A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,  
 Seeing, shall take heart again.

Let us then be up and doing,  
 With a heart for every fate ;  
 Still achieving, still pursuing,  
 Learn to labor and to wait."

try to think, speak and act according to the highest virtues  
of our country and our kind. Let truth and justice  
be our rule of life, and our aim be to help others  
leading a life of usefulness and joy, contributing to the  
good of all.

In the winter of 1917  
I was in the city of  
Washington, D. C.  
and saw the President  
and the Vice President  
and the members of the  
Cabinet.

I was very much  
impressed by the  
simplicity and  
modesty of their  
lives.

I was also very  
impressed by the  
kindness and  
courtesy of the  
people who were  
in contact with  
them.

I was very much  
impressed by the  
loyalty and  
devotion of the  
people who were  
in contact with  
them.

I was very much  
impressed by the  
courage and  
bravery of the  
people who were  
in contact with  
them.

I was very much  
impressed by the  
wisdom and  
foresight of the  
people who were  
in contact with  
them.

## APPENDIX.

---

This Appendix will contain a simple statement of facts. Since there are erroneous impressions abroad, with respect to the two sermons published in this pamphlet, and the circumstances connected with their delivery and publication; and, since a special attempt has been made to mislead the public mind, and place me in a false position, it is due to myself and the cause with which I am identified, as well as to the community in which I live, that I should make the statement I propose. I should be glad to spare individual feeling, if I could do it without a sacrifice of truth and duty; but the person on whom these facts bear most strongly, has, himself, made their publicity necessary, as a matter of justice to all concerned, by his endeavors to give a false impression of them, through his newspaper; by writing abusive editorials against the ministry, and myself in particular; by stating what he knows to be false with reference to myself, and concealing and evading what he knows to be true. Had he been wise enough to have seen that his own good would have been promoted by silence, or a candid confession of truth, this publication would never have been made. As it is, I shall enter into no controversy on the subject, nor undertake to notice, specifically, the repeated attacks made upon me, through the paper referred to. Neither have I, nor do I intend, to enter into a newspaper warfare on the subject. If Mr. Gibbs's editorial brethren choose to express their opinions of the matter, I leave him entirely to their mercy. It is no concern of mine, and I disclaim all responsibility for every thing that does not appear over my own name. The position I have taken has nothing to do with politics: it is a simple question of religious liberty—the Liberty of the Pulpit. I commence, therefore, my narrative.

1. When I was settled as the Pastor of the Universalist Society in this place, I happened on the very first Sunday of my engagement to offend Mr. Gibbs, the editor of the Dover Gazette. Speaking of war in a moral and religious point of

view, I had occasion to say, that the war with Mexico was "a dark page in our country's history." I had no idea of giving any one the least offence, and was perfectly astonished to find a member of my congregation, so morbidly insane on the subject of politics, as to be offended at the expression I had made. The occasion was the *fourth* of July, and the theme, "Righteousness exalteth a nation." Hearing that Mr. Gibbs was "put out" I took occasion to call at his office that he might have an opportunity to speak his mind on the subject, hoping to be able to convince him of the distinction between the political, and the moral and religious, aspects of war. Sure enough, the subject was immediately introduced by him, and in a very rude and abrupt manner. His abhorrence of political priests was expressed with considerable violence of tone and gesticulation, and plentifully interspersed with oaths and profanity. Having learned, however, to preserve a calm spirit, with such men, he soon became more tractable, and I gave my views of the distinction referred to. I also assured him that I had no intention to preach politics, and that when I spoke on war, and its kindred evils, I did it as a Christian minister, and not as a politician. This, it will be perceived, is the same ground I still occupy.

This explanation seemed only partially satisfactory; but Mr. Gibbs continued to attend my preaching, although he had threatened to leave, if his views, on this subject, were not conformed to. Friendly relations, however, continued, although occasional paragraphs appeared in his paper from time to time, reflecting severely on ministers of the gospel, for "preaching politics," "vilifying the Government," &c., all of which I understood to be intended for my consideration; but of which I took not the slightest notice.

2. Thus events passed quietly along till Christmas. In the meantime, my own religious convictions became confirmed, that all war is wrong and unchristian—that the true christian cannot fight. I should be glad, if I had room, to give the history of my religious experience on this subject, but I have not. Suffice it to say, that I availed myself of the first opportunity to join "The League of Universal Brotherhood." I enlisted under the banner of the Prince of Peace, and God grant that I may never desert its standard, or shrink from defending and upholding it, till it shall wave in triumph over all the nations, the islands, and the continents of the earth. With these convictions, struggling in my heart for utterance, and believing them to be eminently christian, I determined to make the birth of the Redeemer the occasion for a sermon on the subject. The words of the angels, as they ushered in this great event with heavenly melody, afforded me a text; "On earth peace; good will towards men," was my theme; and I believe every one in

my congregation received the truth gladly, except Mr Gibbs. He was offended.

The week following, he met me in front of the Town Hall, and accosted me in a manner that betrayed great displeasure; and, after alluding to my sermon on Christmas Eve, stated that it was the "*meanest sermon*" he had ever heard in that house, and that others thought so beside him. Who these "others" were, I have never been able to find out. Then followed a tirade against the clergy, interspersed with the usual amount of profanity; and when I undertook to defend the pulpit, I was answered in the following words, reiterated more than once: "If such "stuff" is to be preached in the pulpit, I say d—n the pulpit."\* All this, I listened to calmly, and when allowed to speak, produced a calmer state of mind in Mr. Gibbs. Again, I took the ground, as before, that I had nothing to do with politics; but based my opposition to war on the teachings of Christ. Mr. Gibbs then admitted that I had said nothing about Mexico, or the Mexican war; but he thought I meant to give the Government "*a side rub*;" a sort of "*dig under the fifth rib*." I use his own language; and it is rather a peculiar circumstance, that part of this same language, and the word "stuff," which Mr. Gibbs applies so frequently to such preaching as does not suit him, should occur in the communication of "PAUL," in a recent number of his paper. It shows a remarkable similarity between the style of Mr. Gibbs and his correspondent "Paul." Ah, friend, doth not thy speech betray thee? The author of Paul, *alias* J. T. Gibbs, now accuses me of having said, in that sermon, which contained the "*side rub*," "that the American troops were in Mexico, slaughtering *men, women and children!* and such sort of stuff." If this were the case, it must have been something more than a "*side rub*;" but the assertion of Mr. Gibbs is not true, as those who heard that sermon will remember, and as I can show by an exhibition of the manuscript copy. Though I might have said it, without departing very widely from the truth, yet I did not, and I will not be slandered by the statement. Mr. Gibbs's account of that sermon is not consistent with itself. Similar language may be found in my sermon on the Liberty of the Pulpit, though not said of the American army, nor the Mexican people; but this, Mr. Gibbs did not hear, because he had left the congregation the Sunday previous, muttering and swearing at the sermon on the Spirit of Jesus and Paul, found at the beginning of this pamphlet, and doubtless resolved, not to return till he could effect my "dismissal."

---

\* See page 32.

During the interview referred to, which transpired in front of the Town Hall, I walked, with Mr. Gibbs, to his house, and after the explanation I had given of my views, and my assurance that I had neither intended to preach "politics" nor give the government "a side rub;" but that I should continue to preach Christian Peace and Brotherhood, we parted in a friendly manner, and the subject was not resumed, except by occasional remarks, on his part, about "political priests." On that occasion I took the ground, that if the government placed itself in a position that was obnoxious to the christian doctrine of peace, I could not help that; and that he only showed his political insanity, by supposing I had intended any special "side rub," against the Government. It is due to him to say, that in parting, he made a full retraction of his profane language, and expressed his regret at the unkindness of his manner; but having renewed the offence again, I consider the whole matter opened from the beginning. This forbearance on my part, and conciliatory spirit, designed as it was, to keep peace with a fractious man, as well as I could without sacrificing principle, will account for the continuance of our friendly relations so long. Most men would have been much less forbearing; but I considered it a christian duty, and pursued what seemed to me, the right course, at the time. That forbearance and conciliatory spirit is now made the basis of Mr. Gibbs's vituperative articles on "Ministerial Hypocrisy." A crisis having at last arrived, I found I could no longer conciliate, without sacrificing truth and principle, and I have preferred an open rupture. Mr. Gibbs has left my congregation, and the prospect is very favorable to a much higher degree of prosperity and religious freedom, by reason of his departure.

But to resume my narrative of facts. After Christmas, the Dover Gazette came out again, on "Ministers of the Gospel," and one article was specially entitled, "What we hate;" aimed at such ministers as preach against war. As Mr. Gibbs was a member of my congregation, and attended meetings nowhere else, I understood the drift of these things, but kept on the even tenor of my way.

3. Finally the rupture came. On the 19th of March, I preached what Mr. Gibbs calls my "political sermon," which will be found in the first part of this pamphlet. By mistake it is represented on the title page, to have been delivered on the 19th of April, instead of March, as it should be. The title and subject will be found rather singular for a political sermon. Two paragraphs in it, however, proved too much for Mr. Gibbs's morbid insanity, on the subject of political preaching. They will be found on page 15, in which, however, an additional sentence has been incorporated, in the printed copy, containing the word Mexico, that was not in it, as originally



delivered. This sermon was the innocent cause of all the abuse that has since filled the Dover Gazette, on this subject. The very next issue of that paper, after its delivery, contained two articles on the same old theme, of which the following is one :

“GOOD ADVICE. After we had put in type the article in another part of our paper in regard to Ministers of the Gospel meddling with politics in the desk, we had handed to us the following communication from an old friend :—

‘Bishop Griswold, an Episcopal Bishop, at an ordination, once said :—“Brethren when your Minister preaches politics, tell him he is out of his place. If he persist in it, send *him* home. Tell him you have nothing more for him to do.”

“Also see Stone’s life of Bishop Griswold.”

Now we think this advice of the pious and venerable Bishop *good*, and to the point. Let such Ministers of the Gospel (?) be in due season rebuked by a dismissal.

For our part we will not insult our conscience nor our ears, by hearing such stuff a second time any where, from the pulpit, if we know it.”

This is the extract I quoted in my sermon, to which I added a brief comment, showing its design and object, and submitting to the congregation whether they would follow the dictates of right and duty or the “advice” of the Dover Gazette. Preferring to introduce that extract in this place, I have omitted it from the printed sermon; but as it is to be found here, Mr. Gibbs cannot complain on this score. The article alluded to, in another part of the paper, was a gross and uncalled for attack on ministers of the gospel, accusing them, in a most censorious manner, of “abusing and vilifying the government, and the Chief Magistrate.” It also *pretended* to offer an argument on something that “one Paul” had said—a gentleman who has since figured quite largely in a subsequent number of the paper. Probably the friend who handed the above “pretended” quotation from Bishop Griswold was this same “one Paul,” and those others, who have spoken more harshly of my sermon than Mr Gibbs, were probably some of “Paul’s brethren;” for I have never heard of any one else that took offence at that sermon. It would be some satisfaction, if we could be directed to the page, in Stone’s life of Bishop Griswold, where the above quotation could be found.

When these two articles appeared, every one who knew of the offence Mr. Gibbs had taken the previous Sunday, understood their import and design. Circumstances had occurred and become sufficiently known, that made this just as plain,

as if Mr. Gibbs had affixed a preamble to his "advice," and said "Whereas," &c. It was known that he had left the church at the close of the sermon on the previous Sunday, fault-finding and swearing to those with whom he came in immediate contact. It was known that he had complained to one of the Society Committee, and inquired to know if he was holden for his pew rent another year, and that he said to that member of the committee that he would not "insult his conscience nor his ears by hearing such stuff a second time, if he knew it." It was known that he did not attend church any where else, except at the Universalist, and if he had heard such "stuff" any where, it must have been there. His statement that he would not hear "such stuff" a *second time*, was equivalent to saying he had heard it *once*, at any rate. With a knowledge of these facts, when the articles referred to, came out, they were so evidently pointed at my pulpit, and myself, that I made up my mind the issue had come, and I was prepared to meet it *then*. There could be no longer any conciliation, and I must strike for religious liberty, or submit to be trammelled and tied to the car of politics, without the privilege of uttering my own convictions of truth. The choice I made is known to the community. It was made without consultation with, or "advice" from, any man. In my own closet I prepared the discourse entitled "The Liberty of the Pulpit," and no man saw or heard either that or the other, before their delivery. It is a libel on myself, or any other person accused of such participation in my labors, and has had its origin in the inuendoes and suspicions of Mr. Gibbs. I thank my Creator that I am able to write my own productions. Can Mr. Gibbs say as much? It is also a libel on my preaching, for any man to say I have ever abused or vilified the government. I have as high a regard for the interests and welfare of my country as any other man. I should be sorry to measure my patriotism by Mr. Gibbs's standard.

4. The truth is, this "good advice" was intended to effect my "dismissal," and was the sounding of a note to those whom Mr. Gibbs supposed were under his influence, and would follow his example. This purpose is still more manifest in the last number of his paper. "*Turn him off*"—that's the watchword now, if the minister does not preach the "pure, unadulterated gospel," as Mr. Gibbs understands it, and which he supposes his minister is "hired" to do. This public attack was the fulfilment of a threat he had made some time previous, if I dared go beyond a certain mark. We shall see the result. Mr. Gibbs has had his way long enough, and made trouble enough with his ministers, before he fell in with me. His influence in that way is about ended; and he will find that the

Universalist Society of Dover neither ask nor heed his "good advice." When he identifies himself with them again, by calling them "our" congregation, it is hoped he will become possessed of a more christian spirit, and no longer disgrace them by his profanity and lack of Christian principle.

5. The reports he has given of conversations between us are of the same kind with his statements respecting my sermons. They are wholly exaggerated and false. I have never said "that the Mexican war was a *just war*—that if ever there was a just war, this with Mexico was a just war, that politics in the sacred desk was very wrong." That is not after my manner of speech. Its origin is sufficiently marked in its phraseology. Besides this, it is well known that I am a member of the League of Universal Brotherhood, and have been in the habit of expressing myself in its meetings, from time to time, and in my pulpit, and in private just the contrary way. This statement of Mr. Gibbs hardly needs a contradiction. I find no one who believes it for a moment. No one, acquainted with me, doubts the honesty of my convictions, that all war is wrong and unchristian. Yet I have said, and I say again, that I do not impeach the motives of those who engage in, what they think, a just war. I think the motives of the patriots of the Revolution were pure and upright, and that God has brought good out of their struggle for liberty. The principles for which they fought were true and right, and these I honor and approve. But the means were contrary to the spirit of Christ. I sincerely believe, whether it be popular to say it or not, that if the American Colonies had not resorted to arms, we should at this time have become a greater, a more virtuous, and a more enlightened people, than we are, enjoying the right of self-government, and that, too, without the curse of slavery, blighting the fairest portion of our great Republic. The moral power of christian forbearance and fortitude would have achieved a victory greater than that we won at Saratoga or Yorktown. Great Britain could not have held us in subjection long, from her distant isle of the ocean. Our moral power and greatness would soon have burst the tyrant's chains, and set us free.

I have nothing to say against the motives of the present administration, in waging the war against Mexico. That would be to enter into the political aspects of the subject. God only can search the heart, and fathom its hidden designs. It is enough for me to know that the overt act is contrary to the religion of Jesus. It is on christian grounds that I am opposed to the war. If I were reasoning as a politician, I might show by the principles of international law, that this war is a just one. But I believe the principles of international law,

so far as they recognize war, as a rightful method of redressing national wrongs and grievances, to be equally unchristian with war itself. As a politician, therefore, I do not condemn the war; but as a christian; and since the two conflict, my politics must yield to my christianity. It is out of this material that Mr. Gibbs has manufactured his charge. The words he imputes to me, I never uttered. They are of his own coining. I should like to see the proof of which he boasts. Probably "Paul" is the only witness, and it is doubtful whether he will come on the stand. It will need, at least, a witness, not under the immediate control and influence of Mr. Gibbs, to establish a fact so improbable in itself; and if the witness should prove to be a credible one, I should plead that I had been misunderstood, and my meaning misconstrued, a consequence to which every one is liable, in expressing himself on a subject, in which there is so much feeling involved.

5. From what I have said, it will be perceived that I have very little sympathy with any political party; but, so far as I have any, it has been with that party, whose principles have suffered so much, in the hands of such editors as Mr. Gibbs.\* I have said this, because I would not have my motives misconstrued, and because I have felt that democrats ought to be the last to abridge my liberty of speech. I am happy to know that they very generally disapprove of Mr. Gibbs's attempt to do it. It is but just that I should say this, as this portion of my congregation have shown a perfect willingness to sustain me in the position I occupy. I have, as yet, seen no demonstrations to the contrary. If there is opposition to me on this ground it has yet to appear. Mr. Gibbs stands entirely alone, and is the only man I know of, who has left my congregation, for this cause. It would indeed be a strange kind of democracy that would deny me the religious liberty I claim: I know of no one who holds to such a kind of democracy, but Mr. Gibbs, though there may be others, with whom I am unacquainted.

7. Mr Gibbs has tried to excite pity, by pretending that *he* has been abused. Poor man! he waited patiently two whole weeks for me to visit him, and make him an apology! If there is any apology to be made, he is the man to apologize, and give some evidences of better intentions for the future. He says I called to see him on *pretended* business, and saluted him in my usual pleasant manner, "Good afternoon, Bro. Gibbs," therefore he never abused me, nor the pulpit; that is the argument. As for the item of business, he knows it was *real*.

---

\* What I have said of the abuses of party, and the violent partzanship of men, should not be confounded with the proper organization and uses of party. The latter I recognize and respect.

He knows he made a verbal contract with me, last winter, and I called to see if he intended to fulfil it. Although he had not the manliness to tell me so, I learn that he intends to "repudiate." And as for the salutation, I hope to be able ever to preserve the same fraternal manner towards every man, whether he be an enemy or friend. I did not salute Mr. Gibbs as a brother in the christian faith, for I have never considered him a christian, either in belief or practice. He is known as an infidel, and has attended the Universalist church from other motives than those of a christian believer. It was as a brother of the human family and of another fraternity, that I used that friendly mode of salutation. I still regard Mr. Gibbs as a brother, though I regret his errors, and the blindness which leads him into his present unfortunate position. I understand it to be a requirement of the gospel that I should meet, even my enemy, in the spirit of kindness and love; but he seems unable to conceive how a man can act thus. I thank him for doing me the justice to state one fact, though he did not mean it, to my advantage.

8. In the *pretended* communication of "Paul," Mr. Gibbs gives a sketch of a sermon he never heard, and shows that he was really offended with the one delivered on the previous Sunday, by calling it a "political sermon." In this *pretended* communication, Mr. Gibbs pays himself the following compliment: "You are well able to fight your own battles, and maintain the liberty of the press, and chastise vice and folly wherever found, and give good advice when necessary, to *priest or people*." This is rather a modest opinion for a man to express of himself in his own newspaper; and more especially, if he is known to be an infidel, a profane swearer, and destitute of religious faith or principle. Advice, to a christian minister and people, comes with rather a bad grace, from such a source. Such a man must have exalted conceptions of "pure and unadulterated gospel"—"the gospel once delivered to the saints." It is no wonder he should be suspicious that other men are hypocrites.

9. The charge that I prepared my sermon, on the Spirit of Jesus and Paul, for another congregation, is wholly unfounded. It was prepared for general use, and has since been preached abroad, to general satisfaction. It was a mere accident, that the exchange referred to, took place in the forenoon, instead of the afternoon, it having been originally agreed upon for the afternoon, but changed near the close of the week, on account of a funeral to which the pastor of that church desired to adapt his afternoon service. The kind of hypocrisy, which Mr Gibbs writes about, is too silly to require a refutation. To suppose that a clergyman could be so blind as to talk, through

the week, to his parishioners, the very opposite of what he preached to the same individuals from the pulpit, would be to suppose him a fool. No one but Mr. Gibbs would conceive of such short-sighted hypocrisy as that. It is wonderful to see how this man, who, but a short time since, was louder than any one else in my praise, and who made his paper the medium to sound it abroad, now stultifies himself. It is questionable whether his praise or his censure would do me the greater injury. Certain it is, I have never sought the one, nor do I regard the other.

10. I believe I have now completed my statement. Those who know Mr. Gibbs can judge whether it is like him, or not. Many of the facts are known to others, and some of them he has both admitted and denied. If any one wishes further proof of them, than my own statement, and will call on me, it shall be given. I learn, moreover, that I am not the only minister who has been treated, in a similar manner, by Mr. Gibbs. If this *expose* shall have a tendency to check such conduct in future, one good will be accomplished by it, if nothing more. Some may think it would have been better for me to have treated this whole matter with silent contempt. But if they were placed in my position, they might think and feel differently. A man's reputation is dearer to him than life, and few men will allow it to be assailed without a vindication, especially if it is assailed by a newspaper, enjoying a large circulation in a respectable community. Many have inquired of me to know what foundation there was for these charges of Mr Gibbs. A large portion of the community are unacquainted with the facts, and I desire that it should be made acquainted with them, so as to be able to form an intelligent judgment of the matter. This narrative also gives a remarkable instance of the attempt of a political editor to control the christian pulpit and ministry, and make them subservient to his views and wishes. In this light, it is worthy of record. It is very certain that I feel none the less contempt for the conduct here brought to light, than if I had treated it with silence. It is my intention to take no further notice of the matter, let Mr. Gibbs say what he may hereafter. This statement is not so much intended for him, as the community in which I live, and at whose demand this publication is made. I therefore caution the public from attaching the least importance, or giving credence, to any thing he may say hereafter, inconsistent with the facts I have narrated. The character of the man for truth, intelligence, and moral worth, is so well understood, as to make it wholly unnecessary for me to follow up his statements and correct them. He has already shown a capacity for inventing falsehoods that would make it a work of supererogation to attempt to correct them.

11. In conclusion, I wish to guard against any unfavorable inference that may be drawn from the connection of such a man with the congregation of Universalists, in this place. It is known to every one, that such men are found in the congregations of every denomination, according as accident, interest, or other circumstances draw them thither. If they can control the pulpit, or subserve some selfish purpose, it constitutes a sufficient attraction. Nothing can be argued, therefore, from such a circumstance, with reference to the general character of any congregation. In this community, where this individual is known, the fact of his leaving a congregation is far more to its credit, than if he had remained. The sooner such men leave, unless they will reform, the better for the cause of truth and righteousness, and the reputation of every christian people.

J. G. FORMAN.

Dover, April 28, 1848.

---

ERRATUM.—On the title page, instead of April, read March, as the proper date, when the foregoing discourses were delivered.