



CLINTON, LOUISIANA: WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 3d, 1855.

We return our thanks to Mr. McKay, of the Pilot, for late favors.

We hope our brothers of the Press to whom we have sent our paper will not omit to place the Patriot on their exchange lists.

We have been compelled to leave out several interesting communications. They will appear in our next issue.

By referring to an advertisement of Dr. Langworthy, which will be found in another column, it will be perceived that he has taken our young friend Norwood Tildon into co-partnership with him. The Colonel is very popular with the people in this locality, and particularly so with the ladies. Therefore, we think ourselves safe in asserting that all who call on Messrs. Langworthy & Tildon will be received and served with politeness and attention.

All the World's a Stage.

By reference to their card in another column, it will be seen that the Clinton Trio Club and the Thespian Corps are making extensive preparations for the performance on the 8th. We wish them all success, and hope to be enabled to add a word or two in commendation after their first appearance.

That beautiful gothic structure on Philippa street, New Orleans, erected by the Mechanic's Association, at an expense of \$70,000, was totally destroyed by fire a few days since. The building was insured for \$30,000.

Remarkable Balloon Ascent.

On yesterday morning a couple of gentlemen, denizens of the Crescent City, passed through this place on their return home, having with them a large balloon in which they had just had quite a remarkable aerial excursion. They went up from Congo Square, New Orleans, on Monday last, at 5 o'clock, P. M., a distance of some six thousand feet, and after traversing the air in several directions, they commenced descending, and at a quarter before 8, they landed safely and quietly near the residence of Wilford Carter's, about ten miles east of this place. This was pretty fast sailing. The distance traveled is near a hundred miles.

Important Discovery.

CHRISTMAS.—This day occurs on the 25th of December—a day annually celebrated in memory of the birth of Christ.—Jackson Sentinel.

Doctor, as you appear to be "posted up," in small matters of this kind, be so good as to inform us when the 4th of July occurs this year.

There are 120,000 Jews in the United States, as shown by the synagogue rolls.

Well Done, Girl!

The Tribune tells the following story: One Sunday evening, not many nights ago, the Rev. Mr. Thompson performed a marriage ceremony at the Tabernacle—both parties said Yes at the proper time, and the reverend gentleman said Amen!

"I want you to perform the same thing for me," said a well-dressed, youngish man to Mr. Thompson.

"When?"

"Now—right off, to-night."

"Can't you put it off a little? It will make it rather late."

"No—the lady says, now or never; and I am very anxious. Will you go?"

"Close by—only a few steps west of the park. We are all ready, and will not detain you but a few minutes on your way home."

Mr. Thompson went to the place, which was a respectable boarding-house, and everything evinced decorum. The lady, young and pretty, neatly dressed, and altogether a desirable partner for the gentleman—was presented, and a short prayer, as usual upon such occasions, offered, and then hands joined.

"You, with a full sense of the obligations you assume, do promise, here in the presence of God, and these witnesses, that you will take this woman, whose right hand you clasp in yours, to be your lawful, wedded wife, and as such you will love and cherish forever."

"I do."

"And you, Miss, on your part, will you take this man to be your lawful, wedded husband?"

"Yes."

We have heard in times past, when show-ers were fashionable, some very heavy claps of thunder, but none that ever rattled about the tympanum of that bridegroom was quite so loud as that stunning little monosyllable.

"No, I never will!" said she, most emphatically, and walked away proudly to her seat, leaving her almost-husband looking, and probably feeling, just the least trifle in the world foolish.

Mr. Thompson remonstrated—not to induce her to change that No for Yes, but for trifling with him in a solemn duty of his calling—and asked for an explanation.

"I meant no disrespect to you, sir, or to trifle with your duty, or the solemn obligation you were called upon to ratify; but I had no other way to vindicate my character. I came to the city a poor sewing girl. I worked for this man. He made proposals of marriage to me; but from other circumstances I doubted his sincerity, and left his employment and went back to the country for a while. When I returned, I found the door of my former boarding-house close against me, and this lady, whom I had esteemed as a kind friend, cold and quite indisposed to renew my acquaintance, and I insisted upon knowing the reason. I learned that this man had blackened my character, denied his proposals of marriage, and said I was—no matter what. I said to the lady, 'let me come back, and I will prove my innocence; will you believe what I say, if he will marry me?'"

"Yes, I certainly will, and so will all who know you."

"I renewed the acquaintance—he renewed his proposals; I accepted and said: 'Yes, the minister at once.' He slandered me—I deceived him; I proved my words true, and his false. It was the only way a poor, helpless girl had to avenge herself upon a man who had proved himself unworthy to be her husband. It was only, at the right time, to say a word. I have said it. I hope it will be a lesson to men, an example to other girls; and that in many other and different circumstances they will learn to say No."

CONGRESS—NATURALIZATION LAWS.

The news from Congress reports that the attention of both Houses, immediately upon their organization, was called to the subject of the Naturalization Laws. Notice was given in both the Senate and House of Representatives that bills would be introduced sometime during the present session to extend the time of probation which the foreigner must spend in the United States before he shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizenship, to twenty-one years, instead of five, which is now the present limit. This is precisely the move the American party is desirous to see made, but we are somewhat afraid that it is premature and will fail. The Native American leaders in that body are certainly very bold, thus to hazard a general engagement before they can marshal their whole force into the field. Had the movement been postponed until next fall, when all the newly elected Native American members would have taken their seats, victory would have been certain, and we could then have obtained all for our country that we ask.

If, however, our party is defeated this session, it will only be the defeat of a skirmish, and we must be content to wait till the gigantic forces of our party are more concentrated and better organized for action.

The Old Fogey opposition object strongly to this movement, on the ground of its unconstitutionality, and some of our own party members seem infected with this mistake, but it will be our duty to show that the term of probation to a foreigner can be extended to twenty-one years, and that too without touching the Constitution. The jealous regard which our compatriots, acting under an erroneous impression, have discovered for the Constitution in its present shape, is pleasing indeed; and is a silent but forcible refutation of those insidious slanders which have been perpetrated on Native Americanism by those who are busy to proclaim that the effect of its doctrines carried out is to change the Constitution and to rend our Union into many fragments. The view taken of this matter by our friends mentioned above is, we confess, more creditable to their hearts than their heads, but in the mistake they have manifested a willingness to submit to any evil rather than attempt to remedy it by altering or amending the Constitution. The term of time prescribed for a foreigner to remain in the country before he is allowed to vote is not fixed in the Constitution, but under the authority of this clause: "Congress shall have power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization."

The power is vested in Congress to enact from time to time such regulations on this subject as its wisdom shall dictate, or the condition of the country requires. Action has been taken on the matter several times, and various laws have been passed, fixing the term of probation at one time, at two years, at another at three, at another at five, and in the administration of John Adams the elder, at fourteen years. In the subsequent administration of Thomas Jefferson it was again reduced to five years, and so has continued up to this time.

Thus it is clearly evident from the frequent changes which have been made in the naturalization laws, Congress has the discretionary power to mould them in conformity with the condition of the country, and has exercised this power more than once, and yet no change of the Constitution has been made. If the people, or their Representatives in Congress see proper to extend this term to twenty-one years, the step is wholly legitimate, and the use of this discretionary power will not disturb even a word or clause in that great magna charta of our rights and liberties.—Those who have been so ready to cry out that the Union is in danger, and that the Constitution is about to be torn in twain, would do well to read that document at least once. The purpose and intent of this measure is one of self-defence and protection to ourselves and our country, and it proposes not to deprive any one of the rights and immunities of citizenship, upon the abstract fact that he is a foreigner, but because the exercise of the right of voting by this class generally is dangerous to the political health of our patriotic institutions. The foreigner who intends to live with us has as much interest in guarding these and keeping them pure and healthy as any native born citizen, and that man who happening first to see the light in a foreign land believes that the Native American party is persecuting the class of men to which he belongs, is laboring under a most egregious error. The good things which we expect to realize from a pure Government and well administered, we are ever ready to divide with any foreigner, but in justice to ourselves we are positively opposed to allowing those to meddle with the State who will make things worse instead of better. The idea is prevalent among the foreign population that they are entitled to count vote, and they do not consider that this privilege is given to them out of pure benevolence on the part of the Government, which it has a right to withhold at any time when the exercise of this benevolence becomes dangerous; but they conceive that these privileges belong to them of right, and that to be deprived of them is to take something from them which they are entitled to. This is a dangerous mistake and any one can see the fallacy of the thing who will consider that a man exercises the rights and privileges of citizenship only as they are conferred on him by the State, which it can take away at any time when the exercise of them becomes dangerous to its stability.

The intent had in view in extending the time of probation of a foreigner to twenty-one years, is to keep off all unwashed hands from our ballot-box, and to thoroughly Americanize, if possible, the foreign population before they are allowed to intermeddle in the making and administering our laws. The sober, patriotic intelligence of the American masses is the palladium of our liberties and upon that is staked the destiny of our country. We should be careful indeed how we adulterate this intelligence with ship loads upon ship loads of ignorance, stupidity, venality and religious intolerance. The boasted policy of those politico philanthropists who under color of doing service to the oppressed, would gather into our

country the dregs of European society is not unlike the senseless babbling of an idiot, and if carried out would in the event cut their own throats. The mere presence of such a population produces a moral leprosy in American society, but to allow them to lay their unwashed hands on the ballot-box would be to give a suicidal stab to our own interests.

Let the term of foreign probation be extended to twenty-one years, or a time sufficient to wean off the foreigner from the prejudices of his home Government and thoroughly Americanize him.—In the meantime let him be covered with the protection of the law both in his person and his property—give him the liberty of the whole country and the choice of every avocation to make a livelihood or even wealth—let him thoroughly imbibe the spirit of our Government and laws, from social intercourse with our native born citizens—give him every inducement to be honest, industrious and frugal, and at the end of his probation it need not be feared that he will abuse his trust or become dangerous to the State.

Let citizens friendly to the Russian cause be requested to meet at Banks' Arcade, on Thursday, 4th of January, at 7 P. M., for the purpose of adopting measures to obtain subscriptions for the benefit of the widows and orphans of the soldiers, sailors and marines of the Russian service, in the war against the Allies.—Daily True Dela.

This is philanthropy with a vengeance. Are not such individuals reaching too far out of doors for objects upon which to exercise their charity? If they would look to the thousands of poor devils in our own country who are in want of the necessities of life, they would see in them subjects of charity and benevolence more deserving their attention. How many talented young men who are forced, from a want of means to acquire an education, to bury the brightest of intellectual gifts in obscurity, unknown and comparatively worthless to their country? If such pseudo philanthropists as the above would look at things at home and will invest their surplus cash in increasing the intelligence of the people generally—that intelligence which is the palladium of American liberty and which is the only hope for a bright future to our country they may be of some service to their State and posterity. As to our position in regard to the struggle going on in Europe we feel as the wife did when her husband and the bear fought—hurrah for the one and well done for the other, we do not care which whips.

[For the Patriot.]

MR. EDITOR—Let you and I and the readers of the "Patriot" have a little talk about that great association of Americans called "Know Nothings," and to commence—there are a great many objections urged against them by the public press, many of which are no doubt felt to be serious and insuperable. There are many who think they see a manifest impropriety in the character of such an organization, and who are doubtless sincere in their opinions. Men of this character always act upon what they conceive to be principle, and are never inaccessible to fair reasoning.

A great many object to it upon very loose and indefinite grounds, such as, "Dark deeds fear the light"—"Secresy and villainy are twin sisters." Others content themselves with the broad and comforting insinuation that "something is rotten in Denmark"—while others put their objections upon the broad and magnanimous base, "Everybody has a right to know what everybody thinks, and how everybody is disposed to vote."

There will be no necessity for suggesting to any mind of ordinary power of perception the character of men who compose these last named classes. They consist of the old superannuated political pensioners—the honorable corps "de Hospital Invalide Politique"—the very ancient and honorable order of broken down politicians—mind-broken wheel-horses—slow nags—not fast enough to win in a whip and spur race—but who expect to triumph eventually over speed and popularity by a pertinacious adherence to the track—of men who are in, and who hear in every intonation of the times the solemn sentence, Out—of men whose political iniquities forbid every hope of an association with the principles of public virtue and pure patriotism—of men who have ridden upon the chariot of power, and feel reluctant to have their political bones cracked by the triumphant car of our nation's regeneration.

While we consent to feel sorry for them, we cannot descend to the kindness of an argument with them—prejudice invariably becomes doubly embittered by an attempt to enlighten it—and hatred is generally aggravated by acts of mercy and love.

But with those who find real difficulties in this matter, and who are actuated by an earnest desire to know the right, and to do it, it will afford me infinite pleasure to converse. The first objection urged is—"that the Principles of the Order are proscriptive and contrary to the spirit of the Constitution." Permit me to refer you to the very able circular issued in Clinton over the signature of gentlemen formerly connected with the Democratic party, and entitled "Common Enemies," in which document the harmony of the principles of the Order with the Constitution is distinctly and ably shown. This branch of the subject has both a political and religious complexion. So far as its political cast is concerned, it will be enough for me to say that the Constitution was framed for the exclusive benefit of those whose interests and sentiments were identified with American nationality, and not for men who acquire the mere fact (not the right) of voting as the result either of perjury, abetted by unhesitating politicians, or as the result of some pestilential scourge which fits a great many naturalization papers for a new filling. We humbly conceive that the framers of that instrument, from whose exalted patriotism it derived both its form and its tone, contemplated that all the rights and powers which were to flow from it should be exercised in a purely national spirit. They little dreamed how broad an interpretation political corruption and moral degeneracy would place upon the pure and unadulterated sentiment and purpose embraced in that instrument. Such, however, has been the case,

and for further reasoning on this department of our subject, we refer you to "Common Enemies."

But there is another portion of the subject which the circular does not touch, and which may well have the appearance of hostility to one cardinal principle of the Constitution—religious toleration. It is urged with much obstinacy by the opponents of the Order, that the Catholic religion is proscribed, and that a great and leading feature of the Order is religious intolerance. If such were the fact; I should be forced to the admission that the spirit of the Constitution was manifestly violated, and this admission would lead me to the still further conclusion that the Order was an improper organization; and in this is, doubtless, to be found the difficulty which begets the minds of many conscientious opponents of our Order.

We start out by saying—1st. That the Constitution does not authorize the dominancy of any religious sect as a political agent. 2d. That many of our State Constitutions expressly forbid the association of sectarian supremacy and political power. 3d. That while no religious sect has any constitutional right to aspire to any political power, yet when any religious association attempts to render itself secular in its influence and authority, that every true lover of his country and the Constitution ought to forbid it. 4th. That when religious influence and power are used to impress the character and effect of political action, such use of religious power is directly in the teeth of the Constitution. The Order respects religion of every hue and shade which bases its fabric upon the Christian Gospel. It accords equal rights and privileges to all, when confined to their proper office and sphere, but declines connection with any religion or religious association whose system of government and whose course of conduct is inimical to the Constitution and the interests of the country.

The grounds of its objection to the Catholic Religion are—1st. "Its system of government." As a system of spiritual power, it is absolute and arbitrary in its form, centering in the hands of the Pope a degree of spiritual authority which renders him the absolute master and sovereign over the whole machinery of the church, and over the minds of countless multitudes of its adherents. Armed with the power of anathema and excommunication, and a great deal more authority which is exercised by him and the priesthood, but denied by many to exist or to be exercised, he is not only the spiritual but temporal master of millions who dare not disobey his mandate. To many enlightened Catholics, who can distinguish between legitimate power and its abuse, the authority of the Pope has no terror, but to the ignorant and unenlightened mass, the fiat of the Papal Chair is the mandate of Heaven itself. The entire priesthood in all its grades, dependent upon the integrity of the fabric for their position are servile in their submission to its authority, and in turn, wield a similar moral and temporal despotism over the minds of their flocks. Thus the Pontiff at Rome, through the perfect and powerful church machinery of which he is the head, can, by his nod, deeply impress, if not absolutely mould the character of our national policy.

It must be understood that there are multitudes of Catholic Church members, and also members of the priesthood to whom these remarks do not and could not apply; yet there are unhappily too many who cannot be excepted from them. It has been stated in public print that the Pope has declared that he would eventually control American politics; and who does not see that the precipitation of a few millions of ignorant and besotted beings upon our shores, and arming them with all the rights of American citizens, that the Papal suggestion is not only feasible, but probable.

Take in connection with these matters, the repeated interference of the priesthood with our national policies, not merely as individuals, but as exercising an ecclesiastical power, and the Catholic Church, instead of a mere system of spiritual government, looks very temporal in its tone and muscle.

Underlying all this, is the great Catholic doctrine exercised from time almost immemorial, until Henry VIII. resisted it, that the Pope is not only spiritual but temporal ruler of the earth. The abject submission of the early Kings of England and France to the Papal bulls, are illustrations, not only of the claim, but the power itself; and there are instances in later times when the same power has been asserted over rulers, but resisted. This resistance, however, does not occur with the immense and ignorant mass of Catholic adherents, and if the temporal authority of the Pope falls at some isolated points, yet there are immense elements of power upon and over which it never fails.

We have seen it gravely urged in Catholic prints in this country, even that, as the Head of the Church, the temporal power of the Pope should be dominant, (over the adherents of the church, of course,) and in the same argument the will of the people and the authority of the Pope were considered as antagonisms, and the will of the people, as against the temporal authority of the Pope, was treated as wholly at war with the structure of Church Government—in short, Democracy and the Papal authority were regarded as a conflict of jurisdiction, in which Democracy or the will of the people must give way. Who can fail to see that the argument is correct? What will have the subjects of Nicholas? There is but one will in Russia—that of the Czar. If the Pope is the spiritual and temporal Head of the Church, there is but one will in Popedom, and that is the will of the Pope. To argue that a Democracy could exist under the dominion of the Pope, would be to argue an absurd thing, for if the will of the Pope is supreme, the will of the people cannot be; and hence the Catholic writers, in ridiculing the idea of Democracy, or will of the people, as co-existent with the authority of the Pope is just. This argument is clearly correct, and so think millions of men who are the obedient subjects to the temporal power of Rome.

It is to the Catholic Church, not as a system of religious belief, but as a system of temporal power and a political agent, that the Order is opposed. It is unwilling that American politics shall be moulded in Italy, or that any other temporal power shall govern here than the will of the American people, whether the idea of popular will in the mind of some matters is observed or not.

There is no restraint here upon religious belief, or religious worship. There is no condemnation of the Catholic religion, as a branch of the Christian religion, nor the exclusion of any Catholic because he belongs to that church merely as a matter of religious attachment. The resistance of political influences, when emanating from religious associations which are deemed

hostile and pernicious to the interests and institutions of the country, cannot in any sense be called proscriptive. The Constitution says—"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." The Order leaves this Constitutional principle in full force, and would enforce it if its violation were attempted. If a Catholic were elected to office, now or hereafter, his election would be valid, and no religious test could be applied to him; but election is one thing, and qualification is another. The Order does not seek to establish any test, but as the Constitution leaves all perfectly free in the exercise of the rights of suffrage, its members are determined to sustain none but purely American power, and to vote for no man who, by his religious or civil faith or allegiance, is subject to any other. Thus the Constitutional questions are disposed of, and the next difficulty which arises is the secret character of the organization. I now answer all intimations of vanity and corruption by stating that the Order embodies a very great proportion of public and private decency, and moral worth. There are thousands of men of the highest character among its members, and whose reputations and high moral and social standing give the lie to all such imputations, which are only resorted to when reason is without employment and when the passions of the mind have lost their master. The idea "that everybody has a right to know what everybody is going to do," will be found a difficult proposition for a young logician to reason out. I find no such principle in the Constitution, and its assertion develops the weakness of the outsiders. For a man who has borne the reputation of being sensible, such a proposition seriously stated, would seem like incipient derangement. I regard it only as a sort of a pry used by old and cunning politicians to find out to which they will never be admitted through the proper and legitimate channels.

Believing the principles of the Order to be perfectly correct, and purely national, secrecy is adopted, to render the action of the body more certain, speedy and efficient, an end which it certainly subserves with a great deal of faithfulness.

Elaborate arguments have been put forward by able men, to prove that the secrecy of the Order was politically if not morally wrong; and also to persuade the writers, if no one else, that secret organizations are not needed in our country. Time, paper and ink would be wasted to attempt a refutation of the first proposition. It is answered by a doctrine peculiar to the American people; that is, "freedom of opinion and action," so long as action is not contrary to law. There is no law which requires a man to divulge his political opinions or his purposes—hence there is no wrong—hence secrecy is right. It is urged in the same connection that the outsiders ought to know what is going on, to be prepared against our treasonable course of policy. There are honorable men enough in the Order to detect and crush all treasonable purposes without any foreign aid.

It is urged that the organization is a direct attack upon the sovereignty of the people. Bah! Fogyism! fooled again. They have the voting majority! How can sovereignty attack itself?

The argument that secrecy is not necessary, is met and answered by a difference of opinion. What would be thought of a commander who should develop his plan of battle to his antagonist, and in consequence be routed, horse, foot and dragoons? and what would be thought of a party which, with the moral elements of victory in their hands, should by a publication of their intended course of action, expose themselves to be out-generated, by men who know where corruption is, and how to employ it? The result of secrecy is, that during a canvass, the old, wire-pulling politicians are driven into an inglorious inactivity. There is no point of attack presented—no plan of a campaign for them to counterplot—no opening for scandal, since the only thing intelligent to themselves is, they can say, "Corruption!" "Something rotten in Denmark." Hence the beauty and force of secrecy, not to cover evil deeds, but to blind those who would do evil if they had a chance. We employ it as an agent for prompt, efficient and successful action, and to those who think that it cures anything else, we have only to say, "Houdi vos qui mal y pense."

Edmund Lafayette, the grandson of Gen. Lafayette, and the only lineal descendant of the illustrious deceased, was in Washington, at last accounts. On the 20th he visited the two Houses of Congress, and was introduced to members and others. He intends to make a tour through the South and then return to France.

John R. Cooke, Esq., an eminent lawyer and member of the Virginia State Convention of 1829, died at Richmond on the 15th ult.

A. W. Latham, Pension Agent at Washington, has resigned.

The Whig Governor elect of the State of Pennsylvania, Hon. James Pollock, will be inaugurated into office on the 16th of January.

The fuel on the New England railroads cost nearly one-quarter of the entire operating expenses. They are experimenting with coal-burning engines, with a view of reducing this expense.

A TURKISH WILL.—A TESTATOR left to his eldest son one-half of his horses, to his second son one-third of his horses, to his third son one-ninth of his horses; the testator had seventeen horses. The executor did not know what to do, as seventeen will neither divide by two, nor by three, nor by nine. A dervise came up on horseback, and the executor consulted him. The dervise said, "Take my horse and add him to the others." There were then eighteen horses. The executor then gave to the eldest son one-half, nine; to the second son one-third, six; to the third son one-ninth, two; total, seventeen. The dervise then said, "You don't want my horse now; I will take him back again."

The age is getting more refined. "Root hog or die," is now rendered as follows: "Penetrate the subsoil, my porcine friend, or early expect an obituary notice on your untimely death."

OUR ARMY.—One ninety-fifth part of the entire army in the United States was killed or wounded by the Indians during the past year. Yet the Indians have been remarkably peaceful during the twelve-month, and Billy Bowlegs has behaved "first-rate," as he said when our Aldermen took him into the tea-room. The truth is, our army is not much of an institution to boast of, so far as numbers are concerned. Gather all our force together, and let a man of sound lungs essay to lecture them—he would find it no difficult task, nor need to make no great outlay for cough lozenges in the morning. Ten thousand seven hundred and forty-five men—that is the actually available amount—seems like a small company to draw a girdle of safety around thirty-one States and unreserved Territories that are as big with many more.—N. Y. Times.

country the dregs of European society is not unlike the senseless babbling of an idiot, and if carried out would in the event cut their own throats. The mere presence of such a population produces a moral leprosy in American society, but to allow them to lay their unwashed hands on the ballot-box would be to give a suicidal stab to our own interests.

Let the term of foreign probation be extended to twenty-one years, or a time sufficient to wean off the foreigner from the prejudices of his home Government and thoroughly Americanize him.—In the meantime let him be covered with the protection of the law both in his person and his property—give him the liberty of the whole country and the choice of every avocation to make a livelihood or even wealth—let him thoroughly imbibe the spirit of our Government and laws, from social intercourse with our native born citizens—give him every inducement to be honest, industrious and frugal, and at the end of his probation it need not be feared that he will abuse his trust or become dangerous to the State.

Let citizens friendly to the Russian cause be requested to meet at Banks' Arcade, on Thursday, 4th of January, at 7 P. M., for the purpose of adopting measures to obtain subscriptions for the benefit of the widows and orphans of the soldiers, sailors and marines of the Russian service, in the war against the Allies.—Daily True Dela.

This is philanthropy with a vengeance. Are not such individuals reaching too far out of doors for objects upon which to exercise their charity? If they would look to the thousands of poor devils in our own country who are in want of the necessities of life, they would see in them subjects of charity and benevolence more deserving their attention. How many talented young men who are forced, from a want of means to acquire an education, to bury the brightest of intellectual gifts in obscurity, unknown and comparatively worthless to their country? If such pseudo philanthropists as the above would look at things at home and will invest their surplus cash in increasing the intelligence of the people generally—that intelligence which is the palladium of American liberty and which is the only hope for a bright future to our country they may be of some service to their State and posterity. As to our position in regard to the struggle going on in Europe we feel as the wife did when her husband and the bear fought—hurrah for the one and well done for the other, we do not care which whips.

[For the Patriot.]

MR. EDITOR—Let you and I and the readers of the "Patriot" have a little talk about that great association of Americans called "Know Nothings," and to commence—there are a great many objections urged against them by the public press, many of which are no doubt felt to be serious and insuperable. There are many who think they see a manifest impropriety in the character of such an organization, and who are doubtless sincere in their opinions. Men of this character always act upon what they conceive to be principle, and are never inaccessible to fair reasoning.

A great many object to it upon very loose and indefinite grounds, such as, "Dark deeds fear the light"—"Secresy and villainy are twin sisters." Others content themselves with the broad and comforting insinuation that "something is rotten in Denmark"—while others put their objections upon the broad and magnanimous base, "Everybody has a right to know what everybody thinks, and how everybody is disposed to vote."

There will be no necessity for suggesting to any mind of ordinary power of perception the character of men who compose these last named classes. They consist of the old superannuated political pensioners—the honorable corps "de Hospital Invalide Politique"—the very ancient and honorable order of broken down politicians—mind-broken wheel-horses—slow nags—not fast enough to win in a whip and spur race—but who expect to triumph eventually over speed and popularity by a pertinacious adherence to the track—of men who are in, and who hear in every intonation of the times the solemn sentence, Out—of men whose political iniquities forbid every hope of an association with the principles of public virtue and pure patriotism—of men who have ridden upon the chariot of power, and feel reluctant to have their political bones cracked by the triumphant car of our nation's regeneration.

While we consent to feel sorry for them, we cannot descend to the kindness of an argument with them—prejudice invariably becomes doubly embittered by an attempt to enlighten it—and hatred is generally aggravated by acts of mercy and love.

But with those who find real difficulties in this matter, and who are actuated by an earnest desire to know the right, and to do it, it will afford me infinite pleasure to converse. The first objection urged is—"that the Principles of the Order are proscriptive and contrary to the spirit of the Constitution." Permit me to refer you to the very able circular issued in Clinton over the signature of gentlemen formerly connected with the Democratic party, and entitled "Common Enemies," in which document the harmony of the principles of the Order with the Constitution is distinctly and ably shown. This branch of the subject has both a political and religious complexion. So far as its political cast is concerned, it will be enough for me to say that the Constitution was framed for the exclusive benefit of those whose interests and sentiments were identified with American nationality, and not for men who acquire the mere fact (not the right) of voting as the result either of perjury, abetted by unhesitating politicians, or as the result of some pestilential scourge which fits a great many naturalization papers for a new filling. We humbly conceive that the framers of that instrument, from whose exalted patriotism it derived both its form and its tone, contemplated that all the rights and powers which were to flow from it should be exercised in a purely national spirit. They little dreamed how broad an interpretation political corruption and moral degeneracy would place upon the pure and unadulterated sentiment and purpose embraced in that instrument. Such, however, has been the case,

and for further reasoning on this department of our subject, we refer you to "Common Enemies."

But there is another portion of the subject which the circular does not touch, and which may well have the appearance of hostility to one cardinal principle of the Constitution—religious toleration. It is urged with much obstinacy by the opponents of the Order, that the Catholic religion is proscribed, and that a great and leading feature of the Order is religious intolerance. If such were the fact; I should be forced to the admission that the spirit of the Constitution was manifestly violated, and this admission would lead me to the still further conclusion that the Order was an improper organization; and in this is, doubtless, to be found the difficulty which begets the minds of many conscientious opponents of our Order.

We start out by saying—1st. That the Constitution does not authorize the dominancy of any religious sect as a political agent. 2d. That many of our State Constitutions expressly forbid the association of sectarian supremacy and political power. 3d. That while no religious sect has any constitutional right to aspire to any political power, yet when any religious association attempts to render itself secular in its influence and authority, that every true lover of his country and the Constitution ought to forbid it. 4th. That when religious influence and power are used to impress the character and effect of political action, such use of religious power is directly in the teeth of the Constitution. The Order respects religion of every hue and shade which bases its fabric upon the Christian Gospel. It accords equal rights and privileges to all, when confined to their proper office and sphere, but declines connection with any religion or religious association whose system of government and whose course of conduct is inimical to the Constitution and the interests of the country.

The grounds of its objection to the Catholic Religion are—1st. "Its system of government." As a system of spiritual power, it is absolute and arbitrary in its form, centering in the hands of the Pope a degree of spiritual authority which renders him the absolute master and sovereign over the whole machinery of the church, and over the minds of countless multitudes of its adherents. Armed with the power of anathema and excommunication, and a great deal more authority which is exercised by him and the priesthood, but denied by many to exist or to be exercised, he is not only the spiritual but temporal master of millions who dare not disobey his mandate. To many enlightened Catholics, who can distinguish between legitimate power and its abuse, the authority of the Pope has no terror, but to the ignorant and unenlightened mass, the fiat of the Papal Chair is the mandate of Heaven itself. The entire priesthood in all its grades, dependent upon the integrity of the fabric for their position are servile in their submission to its authority, and in turn, wield a similar moral and temporal despotism over the minds of their flocks. Thus the Pontiff at Rome, through the perfect and powerful church machinery of which he is the head, can, by his nod, deeply impress, if not absolutely mould the character of our national policy.

It must be understood that there are multitudes of Catholic Church members, and also members of the priesthood to whom these remarks do not and could not apply; yet there are unhappily too many who cannot be excepted from them. It has been stated in public print that the Pope has declared that he would eventually control American politics; and who does not see that the precipitation of a few millions of ignorant and besotted beings upon our shores, and arming them with all the rights of American citizens, that the Papal suggestion is not only feasible, but probable.

Take in connection with these matters, the repeated interference of the priesthood with our national policies, not merely as individuals, but as exercising an ecclesiastical power, and the Catholic Church, instead of a mere system of spiritual government, looks very temporal in its tone and muscle.

Underlying all this, is the great Catholic doctrine exercised from time almost immemorial, until Henry VIII. resisted it, that the Pope is not only spiritual but temporal ruler of the earth. The abject submission of the early Kings of England and France to the Papal bulls, are illustrations, not only of the claim, but the power itself; and there are instances in later times when the same power has been asserted over rulers, but resisted. This resistance, however, does not occur with the immense and ignorant mass of Catholic adherents, and if the temporal authority of the Pope falls at some isolated points, yet there are immense elements of power upon and over which it never fails.

We have seen it gravely urged in Catholic prints in this country, even that, as the Head of the Church, the temporal power of the Pope should be dominant, (over the adherents of the church, of course,) and in the same argument the will of the people and the authority of the Pope were considered as antagonisms, and the will of the people, as against the temporal authority of the Pope, was treated as wholly at war with the structure of Church Government—in short, Democracy and the Papal authority were regarded as a conflict of jurisdiction, in which Democracy or the will of the people must give way. Who can fail to see that the argument is correct? What will have the subjects of Nicholas? There is but one will in Russia—that of the Czar. If the Pope is the spiritual and temporal Head of the Church, there is but one will in Popedom, and that is the will of the Pope. To argue that a Democracy could exist under the dominion of the Pope, would be to argue an absurd thing, for if the will of the Pope is supreme, the will of the people cannot be; and hence the Catholic writers, in ridiculing the idea of Democracy, or will of the people, as co-existent with the authority of the Pope is just. This argument is clearly correct, and so think millions of men who are the obedient subjects to the temporal power of Rome.

It is to the Catholic Church, not as a system of religious belief, but as a system of temporal power and a political agent, that the Order is opposed. It is unwilling that American politics shall be moulded in Italy, or that any other temporal power shall govern here than the will of the American people, whether the idea of popular will in the mind of some matters is observed or not.