

James H. Lingley
June 23 - 1899.
CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

REV. NEHEMIAH ADAMS

AND

REV. J. H. FAIRCHILD,

WITH NOTES AND COMMENTS

BY A COMMITTEE OF THE PAYSON CHURCH.

Boston:

DUTTON AND WENTWORTH, PRINTERS,

NO. 37, CONGRESS STREET.

1846.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Boston, Nov. 16, 1846.

TO REV. J. H. FAIRCHILD,—

Dear Sir: The undersigned, being a Committee of the Payson Church, take the liberty of addressing to you this note, to remind you of our grievances occasioned by the long continued efforts of Rev. N. Adams to exclude us from the fellowship of sister churches, by opposing the granting of letters of recommendation from his church to ours. We deem this an invasion of our sacred rights and privileges as a congregational church. We have been duly organized into such a church by a council constituted according to the usages of the churches of our denomination. And the persevering attempts which Mr. A. has made to unchurch us, we consider wholly unjustifiable, and without any valid reason. We are not aware that the Payson Church is heterodox in sentiment, or disorderly in practice; neither has it been intimated to us that its members have done any thing to give offence to Mr. A. and his church, except it be the fact that we have exercised the right of every congregational church to choose their own pastor. Indeed, this we understand to be the chief ground of complaint, and the reason assigned by Mr. A. for refusing to dismiss his members to join us. We were not before aware that congregationalism allowed the pastor of a sister church to refuse letters of recommendation to another church, because the pastor of said church was obnoxious to him. We are quite sure that not only congregationalism, but the rules and covenant of his own church *require* the granting of such letters. We wish for further information respecting this refusal, that both we and the public generally may know for *certainly*, who is in fault; for that there is a fault *somewhere*, cannot be disputed. Understanding that some correspondence has passed between you and Mr. Adams in relation to this matter, we hereby request you to put that correspondence into our hands for publication, with the liberty of adding such notes and comments as, in our judgment, may seem necessary.

We are well aware of your great reluctance to have your name brought again into public notice, and of the honorable and persevering efforts you have made to prevent it. But there is a point beyond which forbearance ceases to be a virtue. We think that you are now brought to that point; and to remain any longer a silent sufferer under the renewed attempts made to injure you and your church, would, in our opinion, be recreant to duty, and productive of much to evil to the church and the ministry. We feel that the time has come when the truth should be told fearlessly and fully, "let it cut where and whom it may." The sufferings in your person, and family, and friends, which your enemies have occasioned, have been enough to draw tears from eyes unused to weep. Those who attempt to renew these sufferings and repeat these injuries, ought to be exposed, that the world may judge between you and them.

We deeply sympathize with you, and deem it a Christian duty to do all in our power to sustain and comfort you. Our respect for you, and our confidence in you remain unshaken and undiminished. We would rather say that the meekness, patience and forbearance which you have exhibited under your peculiar trials and provocations, have bound our hearts to yours with cords stronger than ever. And it is because we thus esteem you that we are anxious that you should comply with the request which we now make. Though it may be painful to you to make such disclosures as that correspondence must unveil, yet we are convinced that the whole world will justify you in so doing, and that, if they censure you at all, it will be for having kept it to yourself so long without using it for the purpose of vindicating yourself and your church against the gross calumnies which have been spoken and written. We cannot, therefore, willingly consent that you should withhold it any longer. We beg you to put it into our hands that we may publish it without unnecessary delay.

Yours in sympathy and affection,

EBENEZER HAYWARD,
WILLIAM A. AIKEN,
NATHANIEL D. VOSE,
DANIEL TRACY,
CALVIN WALTON.

Mr. Fairchild's Reply.

Boston, Nov. 19, 1846.

To the Committee of the Payson Church,—

Dear Brethren: The letter which you have put into my hands requesting of me the correspondence which has passed between Rev. N. Adams and myself for publication, with liberty to add such notes and comments as you might think necessary, presented to my mind a question of duty which I did not feel willing to decide without duly considering the matter, and seeking the advice of judicious counsellors, both clergymen and laymen. The result is that I comply with your request, though feeling, as you justly intimate that I would, the greatest reluctance to have my name appear before the public again in connection with matters relating to myself. But your call and the call of duty are paramount to all private and personal considerations.

I feel truly grateful for the affectionate and sympathetic tone of your letter. Most of you have known me and my manner of life for a long series of years. You came around me in my troubles to comfort me, and gave me your hands and your hearts, assuring me that my asseverations of innocence were sufficient to satisfy you, until guilt was proved. But you know and the world know that no guilt has been proved. I rejoice in the assurance you now give me that your love and confidence remain unabated. May I never prove unworthy of them, or afford you the least occasion to regret that you bestowed them upon me.

As you intimate in your letter, I have received injuries from my enemies and persecutors, which must have sunk me into the grave long ago, had I not been upheld by an Almighty arm. After my honorable acquittal by the civil court, I expected that they would bridle their tongues and lay down their arms. And those who reside in South Boston would doubtless have done so, had not Mr. Adams given his aid in this work of ruin. But I harbor no ill-will towards him, neither is it in my heart to seek his injury. He has placed me in a position which compels me to act in self-defence, just as I have done from the beginning of my troubles. No one can pretend that I have ever been the

aggressor. To exercise any further forbearance in this matter would, as you justly say, cease to be a virtue.

To show you what efforts I have made to bring him to a sense of his wrongdoing, and induce him to make christian satisfaction, I will here copy the following letters for your perusal, that you may see how my kindest attempts to settle our difficulties have been spurned by him and treated with scorn.

Boston, Oct. 22, 1846.

TO REV. N. ADAMS,—

Sir,—I have been credibly informed that in your Church meeting on Friday evening, the 16th inst. you publicly said that there was more guilt resting on my head, than on the head of any man who walks the streets of Boston, or words to that effect. Duty to myself, to my family, to my church, and to the ministry forbids me to let this matter pass unnoticed. Several ways of noticing it have been suggested to me. But my only anxiety has been to take that course which is most in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel, and most likely to meet the approbation of heaven and of all good men. I have come to the conclusion that my *first* duty is to address to you this private note, that it may fully appear, in the event of an appeal to the public, that I did not proceed hastily, or without due regard to christian courtesy and the rules of the Gospel.

I must say to you that I consider the attack which you made on me in the presence of your Church as wholly unjustifiable and grossly slanderous. Had you any civil or ecclesiastical right thus to attack me? Was it christianly thus to assail a man in his absence, with no opportunity to defend himself? Suppose any other pastor in Boston had made the same attack on your character in the presence of his Church? Would you not have deemed it a gross outrage upon your rights and privileges? Could he have done it with impunity? And yet he would not have committed a greater impropriety than you have done. I am as truly under the protection of the laws of the land and the rules of the Church, as you would be in the case supposed. I am as truly the pastor of a congregational Church, in every legal and ecclesiastical sense, as yourself.

I have been told also that, in your Church meeting, you gave the members to understand that you had seen a letter giving an account of some awful disclosures about me which one fellow passenger had made to another on board some ship at sea. Why did you not state to them that the letter was shown you by deacon Drake, and written by Mr. Patton, formerly of South Boston, but now of Hartford,—two men who have done their utmost to crush and destroy me. Why did you not state also that the gentleman who is said to have made the disclosures on ship-board, is now at his home in Boston, within ten minutes' walk of your own house, and request the Church to appoint a committee to call on the gentleman and ascertain the facts in the case? Did you not know that you were then reviving an old story which had been proved to be false and slanderous, years ago?

But what surprised me most of all was the misrepresentation which you gave in your Church meeting as to the cause which delayed the Referees till a late hour at night, in making up their result.* Did you not know that the Refe-

* The first public demonstration against Mr. F. was made by the deacons in May, 1844. By mutual consent the matter was submitted to the consideration and decision of a Board of Referees composed of the Rev. Messrs. H. Winslow, N. Adams, W. A. Stearns, deacons N. Dana, D. Noyes, and Col. T. M. Vinson. These gentlemen, after a patient and thorough investigation of all the charges then preferred against Mr. F., unanimously acquitted him, and without the slightest censure even by implication. We make this statement here, because frequent allusion is made to this Board and their doings in the following pages.

rees would contradict you? Had you forgotten that your only trouble was to determine what ought to be done with the deacons? One of the Referees has given me an account of what took place that night, and particularly of what *you* said and did. The time may come when the whole of your doings on that occasion will be brought to light.

When I took up my pen, I did not intend to go so much into a detail of the matters to which allusion has been made, as I have done. But I do not see how I could have said less, if I spoke at all.

You well know that we are ministers of the Gospel and pastors of Churches,—that we profess and teach a religion which inculcates peace, charity, forbearance, and forgiveness,—and that we ought to be very cautious how we say or do any thing to wound that cause which we are sacredly bound to love and cherish. With this object in view, I hereby request you to take back what you said in your Church meeting derogatory to my character, in the same public manner in which you uttered it, and to give letters in the usual form to those members of your Church in good standing, who may wish to join the Payson Church. If you comply with this request, and henceforth treat me and my Church with christian kindness and courtesy, all past difficulties between us may be regarded as settled. But if not, the first step which my Church will probably take, will be to request of me the correspondence which has passed between you and me that they may publish it,—a request which I shall grant. In addition to this, they will publish the contents of your two letters recently addressed to Mrs. J. of Pittston, Maine, and of her replies.

A reasonable time will be allowed you to consider and act in reference to this matter.

Yours, &c.,

J. H. FAIRCHILD.

P. S. By Christian kindness and courtesy I do not mean to include an exchange of pulpits.*

A few days after this I received the following note from Mr. Adams:—

Mr. Fairchild,—I received a communication from you through the Post Office on Saturday afternoon. I did not open it; and it remains to this moment unopened. You will remember that in replying to a previous communication from you, I said that I would not consent to be addressed by you again in the same manner, and requested, if you had any further communication to make to me, that you would inform me, in a brief note, as to the purport of it. On receiving another communication from you without such an explanatory note, my first intention was to return it immediately. One consideration only has prevented me. I am not sure that some anticipations which you may possibly have formed, may not have changed the tone of your feelings. If so, I would not even seem to repulse you, but would show myself ready to repeat my former acts of good will towards you. I shall therefore wait to hear from you, in the manner already indicated, before I read your present communication. I will only add that recent developments within my knowledge have rendered any further discussion of your case by you, in the last degree superfluous.

Monday, P. M., Oct. 26, 1846.

N. ADAMS.

In reply to this, I sent the following note:—

TO REV. N. ADAMS,—

Boston, Oct. 29, 1846.

Sir: My letter which you say remains unopened, contains no confessions or concessions. I was advised by judicious and intelligent clergymen and laymen to send it to you, not so much for my *own* sake as *yours*. You refer

* Since writing this letter I have been informed that Mr. A. was very particular to state to his church, that he had no wish "to interfere with my rights and privileges as a citizen." I would here ask whether *my* rights and privileges as a citizen are not as

me to a former letter of yours, in which you requested me, if I had any further communication to make to you, to inform you in a brief note, as to the purport of it. Since you made that request I wrote you a letter without any note informing you of its purport. That letter has never been returned. The presumption therefore is that you opened and read it. But perhaps my last letter remains unopened because of the "recent developments which have come to your knowledge." I have only to say that my chief object in writing you the letter was to inform you, in a kind and Christian manner, of some "recent developments which have come to *my* knowledge" with regard to your conduct towards me, that you might not have occasion to say hereafter that I had not treated you as the Gospel directs.

I have now done my duty; and I hereby request you to return that letter unopened by my son who is the bearer of this, if it so please you. My Church will soon attend to the matter in such a way as duty may seem to require.

Yours, &c.,

J. H. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. Adams refused to give up the letter to my son as I requested; hence the presumption is that he has since opened and read it.

The preceding correspondence must, I think, satisfy you that there has been no lack of effort on my part to conciliate Mr. Adams, and induce him to treat me and my church with Christian kindness and courtesy. You will say that any further attempt would be not only "in the last degree superfluous" but unbecoming the character of a gentleman and a Christian. This will more clearly appear from the correspondence which you have requested, and which I now submit to your disposal.

Your most affectionate and devoted pastor,

J. H. FAIRCHILD.

We deem it necessary to state here the circumstances under which the following letter was written by Mr. Adams. He wrote it on Saturday afternoon. The evening preceding he had been testifying to his impressions before the Council at Exeter. Soon after he had finished his testimony the Council closed their open session, and adjourned till Monday morning at 10 o'clock, then to meet and make up their result. On Saturday morning Mr. A. called on Mr. and Mrs. F. and spake many kind and encouraging words to them,—told them that he thought he had hurt himself more by what he said the preceding evening than he had Mr. F.,—took an affectionate leave of them,—went directly to Marblehead where his family were then staying, and that very day wrote the subjoined letter, which was handed to Mr. F. on Monday morning, just as the Council went into secret session.

From Mr. Adams to Mr. Fairchild.

MARBLEHEAD, July 27, 1844.

My dear Brother: On my return, and after reflecting upon all that I have heard and seen during this eventful week, I feel constrained to write you a line. My interview with you at your request and that of Mrs. F. at your

perfect as *his*? If an attempt were made to exclude *him* from his office and functions, would he not regard it as a very serious "interference with his rights and privileges as a citizen?" And what would he think of the man who was making the attempt, if, when he reproved him for so doing, he should reply, 'I do not wish to imprison you, or to prevent you from walking the streets unmolested, unless it be by the cold looks and distant reserve of those who were once ready to greet you with a smile and a cordial grasp of the hand. All I wish is to turn you out of your office, or to render you so odious to the community that none will attend on your ministry, "except loafers and the drift-wood population.'" Would he deem this no "interference with his rights and privileges as a citizen?" If not, then what *would* he regard as such an interference?

house this morning, deepened the feelings of sympathy which I thought last evening, could not possibly be exceeded. I feel prepared to do or suffer any thing for you in any event. However you may prove to have acted, right or wrong, the feeling which will ever govern every other, will be that of tender sympathy, weeping for your injuries, if you prove to be innocent, or weeping at your fall.

I have no knowledge of the prevailing opinion of the Council. My surmises would not influence me, even if they were stronger on either side in what I am about to say to you. I am writing this for no one ever to see but you. I write this, and may you read it with prayer to the all-seeing God.

I am writing on the supposition that notwithstanding all that has been said, you, my dear Brother, have had criminal intercourse with R. D. Whether you have or not, God, and you, and she only know.

Now suppose that the Council declare that, in their opinion, you are guilty. You will have this alternative presented to your mind, in case you are guilty, (*viz.*), To lie about it, or to confess it. To lie about it will be to carry the wrath of God in your conscience. To confess *then* will be to have doubts yourself, it may be, and to excite doubts in others, of the genuineness of your repentance. You will repent, if at all, by constraint, which will always injure you.

While you are reading this, and within a few hours subsequently, that is, before the result of the Council is declared, you have an opportunity for repentance and confession, such as you can never see again. You can repent now, uninfluenced by the fear of man, ignorant of what the Council will decide, and not knowing but that they will clear you. It is in your power now, by the grace of God, to address a letter to the Council while in session, which, as an illustration of a broken heart and contrite spirit, may do more good through all time, than your misconduct may have done harm. O what infinite importance hangs about you and your decisions, during the session of the Council! As soon as they declare the result, the opportunity is gone forever. You can, of course repent afterwards, and be forgiven; but you can see, my dear Brother, what unspeakable importance attaches to a repentance exercised, and a confession made at a moment, when nothing but the fear of God and sincere sorrow may appear to have influenced you.

There is another consideration. If you are unjustly acquitted, your betrayed and ruined victim will be the object of persecution, and no one knows of what suffering. God knows if you robbed that poor girl of her virtue; and now if you, her destroyer, are the instrument of further injustice and suffering to her, what punishment can avenging justice find for you commensurate with your wickedness.* I would stand before you, dear Brother, in your path, and be-

* We here see who had the sympathy of Mr. A. It was "the betrayed and ruined victim" of Mr. F. We are amazed that Mr. A. should have written this, after having listened to her testimony at Exeter. True, she tried hard enough to make it appear to the Council, as she doubtless had done previously to Mr. A. in private or to some of his associates, that she was indeed Mr. F.'s "betrayed and ruined victim." But when she stated to the Council that "she was never afraid of Mr. F., and always had her own way," we should not have thought it possible for Mr. A. to call her Mr. F.'s "betrayed and ruined victim." And then he seems to be very much afraid lest she should suffer persecution, but not at all concerned lest Mr. F. might then be suffering the severest persecution from the malice of his enemies. And that malice Mr. A. well knew; for he had seen much convincing evidence of it exhibited on a former occasion in the presence of the Referees. But Mr. F. has been acquitted by "the more competent tribunal" to which the Council referred him; and yet we have never heard of any persecution being inflicted on his "betrayed and ruined victim." On the contrary, she has since been caressed by those who regard themselves as respectable people,—received donations in money,—invited, as we have been credibly informed, to a thanksgiving dinner, and admitted into what some, in South Boston, call the *first* circle, though we are puzzled to tell what the *second* must be. This seems to confirm what the mother is reported to have said, "that her daughter was never so much thought of, or moved in such good society as since she had the baby."

seech you, by the mercies of God, not to suffer yourself to be unjustly acquitted. The greatest wrath which God may provide for you may be to let you be acquitted, though a guilty man. You hope to be acquitted. My dear Brother, woe to you if you are acquitted, if guilty. Prevent it while you may.

You will say 'What a hypocrite and liar the world will call me if, on a dying bed, as I or they supposed, I said I was innocent when I was guilty!' Let the world know how bad you were. By your dreadful experience warn men, as you will, of the tremendous effects of guilt on the heart and soul. You may thus be a means of good which cannot be measured,—an everlasting rock with a lighthouse on it, amidst the surges and storms of the sea. You may save more souls thus, than you have done, or may do by any other means.* But all depends, perhaps, on your acting right before the Council adjourns.

Now if you are innocent, all this has no weight of course, except to increase your load of sorrow. But if otherwise, (and all the testimony on your side, and all your asseverations do not remove my first impressions that you are otherwise than innocent.) O take the advice of one who loves you, and will rejoice in heaven with you at the infinite grace of God. Do you need any thing to open the way for you before the Council? Use this letter for that purpose, if nothing else occurs. Send for two of them and confer with them. And relying on that blood which was shed for you and me, give yourself up to Christ to magnify the grace of God. Every moment may be important. I will believe that God has great mercy and a great work for you. Consider poor exiled Dr. F. If guilty, you may ever be like him, useless and lost, unless you come forward to confession.

But if you are innocent, have courage, my dear, *dear* Brother. God will glorify himself by you as yet, and you will yet praise him, and your enemies will be found liars unto you, and you will tread upon their high places. In love, and prayer, and hope,

Most affectionately and truly yours,

N. ADAMS.

REV. J. H. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. F's reply.†

TO. REV. N. ADAMS,—

Boston, March 10, 1846.

My dear Sir: In addressing to you this letter, I beg leave to assure you that I am not actuated by any unkind feelings, or any desire to injure you in

* We have often heard about "new measures" for the conversion of sinners. But the measure here recommended by Mr. A. is indeed the *newest* as well as the *strangest* which has ever come to our ears. Would he bring this new measure into practice? In order "to save more souls," would he have an abandoned female falsely charge a clergyman with crime, who had faithfully and successfully preached the Gospel for thirty years, and then have that clergyman come forward and confess the crime that thereby "he might save more souls than he has done, or may do by any other means?" Even if he were guilty, we are so dull of apprehension that we cannot see the least possible connection between his confession and the saving of souls. To use the language of Mr. A. in his second letter to Mr. F., we cannot "resist a smile at the ludicrous folly of the invention." Surely Mr. A. must have more of a *poetical* than a *logical* mind.

† This reply was written under the following circumstances. Mr. F. took no notice of Mr. A.'s letter till early in March last. He then became satisfied from Mr. A.'s persevering opposition to him, that he was determined not to rest till he had banished him from the pulpit. After we had published our reply to the remonstrance sent to the installing Council, it was hoped that Mr. A. would see that his refusal to grant letters from his Church to ours, could not be justified either by the Gospel or congregationalism. But he still persisted in his refusal; and when, on the first of March, he succeeded in obtaining a vote of his Church to defer action on the application for a letter then before them, till October, Mr. F. felt in duty bound to notice his Marblehead letter, and to express his views of it, and of Mr. A.'s treatment of him, in a kind and Christian manner.

your character as a man, or in your profession as a minister of the Gospel. In both these respects, and indeed in every other, I wish you well. And I address you thus privately from an extreme reluctance to agitate the public mind by any further publications in reference to my case, and my present determination not to do so, unless duty should absolutely require it.

There are certain things connected with your treatment of me which I have been wholly unable to explain on any principles of Christianity or civil law. And in saying this I do not mean even to insinuate that you would willingly and willfully disregard the principles of religion, or trample on the laws of your country. Christian charity requires me to regard you as a good man and a good minister of Christ, and that you sincerely believe yourself governed by the best and purest motives. But while I admit all this, I would respectfully inquire whether it is not *possible* for you to be influenced by wrong motives and feelings, though deeming them to be right? I presume you will not deny that it is *possible* for a man to be sincerely and conscientiously in the wrong. Paul acknowledges that it was once so with him. May it not be so with you? As your friend and brother in Christ, I would affectionately request you to examine and see. Charity compels me and very many of your friends to believe that this is the case, otherwise no explanation could be given of your conduct at all consistent with the principles of that religion which you profess. It is the opinion of many that you hastily committed yourself on one-sided testimony,—that you gave undue influence to impressions; and having made up your mind against me before my trial, you have become unwittingly under the control of that pride of opinion so natural to men, which is very reluctant to say, ‘I was mistaken.’ And such I am quite sure would be *your* opinion, were our respective circumstances reversed. And I entreat you, while reading this letter, to divest yourself of all prejudice, and to fancy yourself placed in my position; and then bring yourself under the entire control of our Saviour’s golden rule.

You stated to the Council at Exeter that the next morning after you had read to me the papers containing the charges, you asked me, in the most solemn manner, to declare to you my innocence or guilt, and that I said nothing. And you further stated that if I had then solemnly affirmed my innocence you would have “stood by me to the death.” But as I did not thus affirm it, your impressions were against me. I would here ask you, in all kindness, whether you can justify yourself in thus yielding to impressions, which are the most deceptive things imaginable? Just look at my circumstances at that time. I was then very greatly excited,—my nerves were unstrung,—I had not been able to sleep during two or three preceding nights,—I did not know but that an officer might arrest me on the spot, (for I was then wholly unacquainted with the forms of law in such cases,)—having in my possession no evidence by which I could impeach those witnesses,—with a mind (as events soon proved) in an incipient state of derangement and wholly intent on one object; and that was the arrival of the carriage to convey me to the depot. Such was my condition when you say that you proposed to me the question. Can you wonder that I should have no distinct recollection of your asking me the question, or of any thing which then transpired? Besides, when you read to me the charges on the preceding day, in the presence of several witnesses, I had affirmed my innocence in the most unequivocal manner, and without any mental reservation whatever. Had I been perfectly calm and collected when you proposed the question the next morning, it is very probable that I should have “answered you to never a word,” on the ground that one solemn asseveration ought to have satisfied you, and that to press the matter any further was an implied distrust of my veracity,—an implication which, I doubt not, you would have felt in like circumstances, as keenly as myself.

I have said enough to let you see the origin of that strange course which you have pursued in reference to my case. Now admitting you to be a good

man,—that you are sincere in your opposition to me and my Church, and that you firmly believe yourself actuated in all this by Christian motives, let me request you to reconcile, if you can, your principles with your conduct. Just place yourself in my position for one moment, and then attempt to explain such treatment from any one of your brethren in the ministry, on the principles of Christianity or of civil government. I think you would find it utterly impossible to reconcile the conduct of such a minister with his professed principles. You might deem him a good Christian, but you would not be likely to deem him a *consistent* one. Let me state the case to you and review it, that you may see the position in which you stand as a good man and a good minister; and that you are such I cheerfully concede, only premising that, like every other good man, you may be in error, though honest and sincere.

The letter which I received from you on Monday morning, July 29, 1844, just after the Council had commenced their secret session, was truly a strange, and to me, at that time, a mysterious composition. On reading it, I could think of only *one* motive which could possibly have led you to write such a letter. But I was unwilling to ascribe to you such a motive, lest I should prove myself destitute of that charity which I so much needed to have exercised towards myself. I therefore dismissed the thought from my mind. But my first impression (and I know not why *my* impressions are not as likely to be correct as *yours*,)—my first impression on reading that letter, has only been deepened and confirmed by your subsequent conduct. Before I mention what that impression was, permit me to refresh your memory by stating a few facts.

I begin with my trial before the Council. I presume you will not deny that you and the Committee of the Association, came to Exeter with your minds previously made up against me, and with a determination, if possible, to procure my deposition from the ministry. Indeed, you and Mr. Riddel gave me distinctly to understand in my parlor, some days before the Council met, that, in your opinion, I was guilty, and you virtually put me under oath to make declaration on the subject; and I did then declare my innocence, as I had done previously in your study, and also, (as you well know,) at a time when I supposed myself to be dying. But because, as you stated to the Council, “my tones of voice were truly painful to you,” and because I immediately inquired in the same tone, what new evidence you had obtained against me, you represented to the Council that I impressed your mind with a conviction of my guilt. But who can wonder that I hastily inquired after the new evidence, when two brother clergymen who, as I then thought, were my true friends, came upon me in my feeble state, and gave me distinctly to understand that they believed me guilty,—who, I say, can wonder if an innocent man should be agitated, in such circumstances, and make an unfavorable impression on the minds of those who already believed him guilty, and whose object was to obtain from him a confession? You acted as one of the Committee of the Association; and that that Committee believed me guilty before I was tried was evident to all, from what Dr. Beecher said at the opening of the Council. He, in effect, told them that unless they condemned me, I should be a millstone about their necks; and I have been credibly informed that he made similar remarks to members of the Council when not in session. The spirit of this declaration was carried out by the manner in which Mr. Riddel examined the principal witness, and the confidence, sympathy, and affection which he manifested towards her both *in* the lecture room, and *out* of it. Witness his walking with her arm in arm, and his calling on the Moderator to protect her, when she needed no protection, except from herself, and from those who were caressing and encouraging her.

Let me now refer you to your own conduct on that eventful week. After Mrs. Davidson’s depositions had been read to the Council, you will recollect that you walked a short distance with Mrs. Fairchild and myself, and spoke of those depositions, and exclaimed, with a good deal of feeling, “What a moth-

er, to testify so about her own daughter! She is worse than the monsters of the deep!" As though a mother could be justified in withholding the truth when under oath, because it would have an unfavorable effect upon her daughter. But though the mother might have been, in your view, "worse than the monsters of the deep," yet her testimony respecting her daughter was fully confirmed before the civil court. It was there *proved* that the mother was much better acquainted with the infirmities of her daughter than you were.

And then, as if to make my condemnation by the Council certain, you presented yourself to be sworn to testify—to what? To any facts? to any confessions or concessions which I had made? Not at all; but to *impressions*. And the very solemn manner in which you performed that "painful duty," as you called it, doubtless made an impression on the minds of a majority of that Council very greatly to my prejudice. And think too of the *time* in which you testified. Why did you not testify as soon as the other witnesses had given in their testimonials? When they had done, we were given to understand that all verbal testimony against me was finished. Why did you wait till the evidence on my side was closed? Why should you take it upon yourself to make a speech or argument against me *under oath*, as soon as my witnesses were through? What an outrage upon all the rules of evidence ever known under any law civil or ecclesiastical! Why not testify to facts? You had one fact in your possession very important to me. You knew what I had said to you in your study in the presence of four other gentlemen, as soon as you had finished reading to me the papers containing the charges against me. *Then* I was, in duty, bound to speak; and I *did* speak, denying the charges in the most explicit manner. Why did you not testify to this fact before the Council? But you omitted it altogether, and confined yourself to *impressions*—impressions which I never designed to make; and of this I could have convinced you in a moment, if you had given me a previous opportunity to explain myself in private. But I had no suspicion that I had made any such impression on your mind, till you were stating it under oath. No wonder that you said to me the next morning, in the presence of my wife, "that you thought you had hurt yourself more than you had me, by what you said the preceding evening."

And this brings me to the only key by which I can unlock the meaning and design of your letter. As you felt that you had hurt yourself by the illegal and unchristian manner in which you had been testifying, you were doubtless anxious to retrieve that wrong step, and get rid of that injury. And how could this be done so effectually as by inducing me to go before the Council and make a confession? If this could be done, the matter would of course be settled, and no serious injury result to you from your strange testimony on that occasion. This brings me to speak of the first impression which I received on reading your letter. I said to myself 'Is it possible that my Brother Adams should be actuated by such a motive,—the motive of sheer selfishness? Can it be that he wishes me to be my own destroyer by confessing what I had solemnly denied, even when I supposed I had not another hour to live, and of which I knew myself to be innocent? Can it be that he wishes me to do this, rather than that he himself should acknowledge that he had done wrong, and might be mistaken in his impressions?' This was the train of thought which then passed through my mind. But preferring to err, if I must err at all, on the side of charity, I said nothing. I felt it possible that I had misapprehended your motive, and concluded to wait patiently for something to take place which would convince me that your object in writing was not such as I feared it might have been. Well, I have waited till the present time, and nothing has transpired on your part tending to remove my first impression as to your motive. On the contrary, all that you have since done, has only strengthened that impression. I have read the letter often and carefully, and notwithstanding all its honeyed and gracious words, I find it utterly impossible to discover

any other motive which could have dictated it, (though charity compels me to believe it possible that your mind might have been in such a state as to prevent you from being aware of it.) I may be wrong in this. And I do hope, for the sake of humanity, as well as Christianity, that I am wrong. But I cannot, as at present informed, give it any other construction; and I sincerely believe that every candid, unprejudiced person who should read it, *with a full knowledge of all the circumstances of the case*, would give it the same construction.

This is neither the time nor place to take up that letter and comment, in detail, upon its singular contents. And if this should *ever* be done, I hope, for your sake, that more charity will be exhibited than has been by some in their comments on *my* letter. And although I do not know that any member of my Church, or any person residing in South Boston, (except my wife, to whom I handed it as soon as I had read it,) is aware of the existence of your letter, yet I have recently shown it to a few confidential friends, not to injure you, but to obtain their advice as to my duty in reference to it. They were as much surprised at its contents as myself, and said that (taken in connection with your subsequent conduct,) they did not see how I could have put on it a different construction. You doubtless have a copy of it. Please read it over with candor, and, if possible, with a mind unbiassed by prejudice. Look at the arguments you employed to induce me to confess. Was there ever any thing so artful, and yet professedly so kind and affectionate? I will notice only one. You say that "by confessing I may save more souls than I have done or may do by any other means." Now if I were such a man as you would have others believe me to be, what effect could such an argument have upon me? What should I care about the salvation of souls? If I were bad enough to go out of the world "with a lie in my right hand," (as you intimated that I was, to a worthy member of my present Church,) would *such* an argument move me? I cannot conceive it possible that your argument should have produced the effect which you designed, except on the supposition of my innocence. I can easily conceive it possible that an innocent clergyman might be in a state of mind to be fraudulently persuaded to confess himself guilty, if he could thereby be the means of converting more souls than he had done during a ministry of thirty years. And it *has* sometimes happened that an innocent man has been led to make confessions by the use of similar arguments. See, for example, the published report of the trial of Stephen and Jesse Bourne for the murder of Russell Colvin before the Supreme Court of Vermont, holden at Manchester, October, 1819. Hence it is a wise and merciful provision of law that no attempt shall be made to induce a criminal to confess against himself till after he is tried, by exciting either his hopes or his fears; for this would be to make him his own executioner. And how many innocent men, if placed in such circumstances of excitement,—of weakness of body and almost distraction of mind as I then was, might have been induced, by such an appeal to their hopes and fears as was made in your letter, to follow your advice and make a confession? But thanks be to God, he gave me strength to withstand all your arguments and eloquence, and moving appeals. I would not do evil that good might come. Your letter had no other effect than "to increase the burden of my sorrow," as you truly said it would if I were innocent, and to excite feelings in my mind towards its author, which nothing but necessity could have led me to harbor a single moment.

I cannot look back upon one act of yours in reference to this whole affair, which does not force on my mind the conviction that I have rightly interpreted the object of your letter. You had committed yourself before the Grand Jury; and you are doubtless aware that it was your testimony chiefly which procured the indictment. And having succeeded there by your testimony, you would naturally be anxious for similar success before the Council. Well, you succeeded there also. But you soon found that the Christian public were not sat-

isfied with the result of Council. The able and lucid review of their doings, published in the Puritan, showed that I was not fairly tried,—that undue advantage was taken of me,—that the Committee of the Association went far beyond the limits of their appointment,—that they had too much control over the Council,—that they assumed the office of prosecutors,—that they acted a part against me which could not be justified by any law human or divine,—that they objected to my having a candid and able lawyer who was providentially present, to aid me in cross-examining the witnesses,—and that you yourself, in your zeal to procure my condemnation, resorted to that unheard of expedient,—*testifying to impressions*, though you might have been as honest and sincere in the matter as was Saul of Tarsus, in his zeal when persecuting the early disciples.

Some two months after my trial at Exeter, Mr. Hayward says that he had an interview with you respecting my case,—that he told you he was going to Exeter to advise me not to deliver myself up for trial in Boston,—that though he believed me innocent, yet there was such a powerful combination against me, there was great danger of my being convicted by the Jury, and that I had better retire and die a martyr. He *did* come and give this advice. But I would not listen to it a moment. I assured him that if God spared my life, I would come and meet my enemies as soon as I could make the necessary preparation, and cast myself upon God and the laws of my country for protection. He says that he returned and reported to you my determination,—that you approved of it, and said that I ought to do so,—that it was a duty which I owed to myself and the ministry; for you yourself might be the next victim. But for myself I have seen no evidence that you really entertained any serious fear that you might be the next victim; for if you had, how could you have persisted in countenancing the principal witness against me, especially after she had confessed to the Court that she had twice sworn falsely in relation to the very matter about which she was then testifying, and who was proved to have said that if she would accuse me and procure my conviction, she was to have twice as much money as I was to pay. In countenancing such a witness, where was your fear of being the next victim? Might not such characters have felt encouraged by your conduct to make similar charges against innocent men, and particularly against innocent clergymen? It would seem that if you ever had any such fears you were willing to forego them all, if you could only avoid the necessity of acknowledging that you had done wrong in testifying to your impressions, and in condemning me before I was tried. Perhaps, however, I have mistaken views on this point; if so, I should be happy to be corrected.

Mr. Hayward further says you assured him that if I would come to Boston, and have a trial, and obtain an acquittal, your pulpit should be opened to me, let others do as they might. And this you said long *after* you had read my letter to which you allude in your remonstrance, and long *after* you had received your unfavorable impressions and testified to them before the Grand Jury and the Council, and long *after* my trial at Exeter had been published to the world. Well, I *did* come voluntarily,—was fairly and impartially tried by a Jury of my countrymen, and honorably and unanimously acquitted, though, to my utter astonishment, *you* were not present in Court to hear any of the testimony.

But my acquittal did not satisfy you. You not only omitted opening your pulpit to me, (and of this I never have, and never shall complain,) but when the Council met to form the Payson Church, you opposed it, evidently on the ground that I might become their pastor; and the question was asked by you, or at your suggestion, whether such were not the design,—a question which you had no right to ask, and which the Committee were requested not to answer, because irrelevant, as being a matter about which that Council had no concern, and an interference with the undisputed right of every congregational

Church to select their own pastor.* Fifty-six individuals had expressed a desire to be organized into a Church, because, in their view, the interests of religion in this place required it. You told the Council when in secret session, that you did not believe what they said,—that they had other and very different motives. And when reminded that you had no right thus to impugn the motives and call in question the veracity of so many professors of religion in good standing, you made some apology; but added, “that is my firm impression.” Now let me affectionately ask you whether it is not time for you to cease doing injury to others by stating your impressions? Would it not be more safe, as well as more Christian in such cases, to confine yourself to *facts*? Character is too precious to be taken away by your impressions. If such a rule of judging were applied to you, where might soon be your standing in the opinion of the public?

Having failed in that effort, you sent a remonstrance to the Council called by the Payson Church, to prevent them from installing me. And when the Council refused to do your bidding, you then objected to give letters, in the usual form, to members of your Church who wished to join us. You even said in your Church meeting, that you would sooner resign your office than sign such letters.

Now, my dear sir, what does all this conduct mean? Is it possible that you advised my coming to Boston for trial, because you believed and hoped that I would be convicted by the jury? and, as a lure to draw me here, said to my friend that you would open your pulpit to me on my acquittal? Can I attach any other meaning to such conduct than that which I have given to your letter? It does seem to me that rather than acknowledge, even by your silence, that you might have done wrong, or been mistaken, you were willing to deprive me of my office, disgrace me and my dear family, and send us forth poor and despised, to subsist on the cold charity of the world. And all this, when no tribunal had even pretended to have proved me guilty, and when you yourself had previously said that you felt bound to regard me as innocent, till guilt was *proved*. O! where is that deep sympathy which you professed for me in your

* We have been informed that when Mr. A.'s Church were acting on the application for letters to our Church, he intimated to the brethren that the Payson Church was formed by deception and fraud,—that if the Committee had made known the fact that they meant to call Mr. F. the Council would probably have refused to organize the applicants into a Church. Now we pronounce this representation utterly and totally false. There was no deception practised. There was probably not a member of that Council who doubted that it was our design to invite Mr. F. to become our pastor; and although Mr. A. and two others voted against our organization, yet eleven voted for it, and the Rev. Mr. Rogers preached an admirable sermon on the occasion. But to be asked what clergyman we intended to call, was deemed by the Council highly improper, and one of the members said, “I hope that the Committee will answer no such questions; for if we are to allow such questions to be asked, we had better put on cardinal caps at once.”

We will here state that if Mr. F. had not been in existence we should probably have been formed into a Church, because it was utterly impossible for us to remain connected with a Church whose deacons had treated any human creature as they had treated Mr. F. Their conduct, in our judgment, admitted of no excuse, whether Mr. F. was innocent or guilty. Every step which they had taken in the matter was so at variance with the spirit and rules of the Gospel, and so derogatory to the Christian character, that we could no longer hold fellowship with them in the ordinances of religion, especially when we discovered that they justified themselves in all that they had done. We think that good men would have been grieved at the thought that Mr. F. might be guilty, while they apparently rejoiced. They seemed to have adopted the motto of Voltaire, “*crush the wretch—crush the wretch!*” Being on the spot, and knowing as we did all the circumstances of the case, how could we, with a clear conscience, have continued in church-membership with such men? When one of the deacons said, “Ah! we have got Fairchild now; he can't get rid of this,” it was uttered with so much apparent exultation and joy, that we were unwilling henceforth to receive the bread and the wine at his hands, or acknowledge him as “a brother beloved in the Lord.” And what decent man in the community can blame us?

letter? If I could put a more favorable construction on your actions and your letter, I would do it with all my heart. But how can I? Let me quote to you the last paragraph. "If you are innocent, have courage, my dear, *dear* Brother. God will glorify himself by you as yet, and you will yet praise him, and your enemies will be found liars unto you, and you will tread upon their high places. In love, and prayer, and hope, most affectionately and truly yours." Now when you wrote this, you had heard all the evidence before the Council, and you believed me guilty. You believed me one of the worst men that ever lived. How then could you call such a vile abandoned wretch, "my dear, *dear* Brother?" You had the same opinion of me then as you would have had if the Council had pronounced me guilty, as your subsequent conduct has fully proved. You deemed *my* letter which was adduced as evidence against me at my trial, a strange production for a good clergyman to write. Is it any more strange than *yours*?

That part of your letter which I have just quoted seems to be prophetic. It may not be modest in me to say how far your prophecy has been already, or may hereafter be fulfilled. There is one part of it, however, which I can in truth say has been literally fulfilled; "*my enemies have been found liars unto me.*" And I do hope and pray that God will yet glorify himself by me, and that I shall yet praise him. But whether I am now, or ever shall be treading on the high places of my enemies, is a matter about which it becomes not me to speak. All this I cheerfully leave in the hands of that God who will assuredly do right both by them and by me. He has enabled me, hitherto, to meet them at every turn, and to thwart them in all their attempts to ruin me. The three years watching scene,—the promise of fifty dollars a year to my accuser for ten years,—the offer of two hundred dollars to Mrs. B. to induce her to sign a false certificate to my injury,*—the indictment,—the

* When Mrs. B. was upon the stand testifying to other things, Mr. F.'s counsel proceeded to question her in relation to this matter. But the Court overruled, and said that if what she was about to state had been said to her by any of the witnesses, it would be relevant; but as such was not the fact, it could not be admitted. Mrs. B. had previously given her deposition on that point; and since it tends to show most fully the wicked attempts which were made to destroy Mr. F. we deem it important to publish her deposition to the world, reminding the reader that the object of Mr. F.'s enemies was to produce the certificate of Mrs. B., had she signed it, as evidence against him at the Exeter Council.

I, Ann Louisa Brown, (wife of George W. Brown,) whose name formerly was Ann Louisa Breslow, make solemn affidavit and say, that some time in the latter part of the month of July last past, three men came to my residence in Waltham in Middlesex County. One of the men was a tall light complexioned and fleshy man, having a paper in his hand, on which something was written; and he asked me to read what was written upon said paper. I took said paper into my hand and read as follows, (if my memory serves me rightly.) "I Ann Breslow saw Rhoda Davidson repeatedly go up into Mr. Fairchild's study, knowing that he was there, and had suspicions of them. I saw her go up one Saturday afternoon. I took the child, Florena,—led her up crying to the study door and found it locked, and knew they were in there." He asked me to sign my name to said paper. I told him I could not in truth. He said I could. He looked at the other men and said, "I guess we can make nothing here." And then he said, "have not Mr. Fairchild's friends been here, and offered you money to say nothing about it?" I told him they had not, and if they had, I would not lie for Mr. Fairchild any sooner than for him. He then offered me one hundred dollars to sign said paper. I refused. And then, in a low voice, he said, "Finally I will give you two hundred dollars if you will sign it. It is the mere scratch of a pen, and you cannot earn money so easy in any other way." I replied, "If I can't earn money easier, I cannot be any poorer than to die in the alms-house."

A. L. BROWN.

Middlesex, ss. November 12, 1844. Then the above named A. L. Brown made oath that the above written affidavit by her subscribed is true, according to her best belief and knowledge.

ARAD MOORE, *Justice of the Peace.*

attempt to drag me to Court as a felon,—the huge anonymous pamphlet,*—the remonstrance sent to the installing Council—all—all have been overruled by a kind Providence for a confirmation of my innocence.

Let me here inquire, do you know how it happened that soon after the publication of my book, Governor Briggs was induced to make a requisition on Governor Steele for my arrest? Do *you* know who had a hand in it? I know that Mr. Parker had not. “Was not the hand of Joab in it?” Verily the words of David have so far, in my case, proved true; “When the wicked, even mine enemies and my foes came upon me to eat up my flesh, they stumbled and fell.”

You, Sir, were one of the Referees who sat on my case when I was accused by the decons. You heard them testify. You saw the unkind and unchristian spirit which they manifested; and you were made acquainted with the disgraceful course pursued by them in order to crush and destroy me. The investigation resulted in my triumphant acquittal. You then told the world that “nothing had appeared in any part of my life to prevent your according to me your full confidence as a minister of Christ.” And in a private interview with me you said, “If those men do not now let you alone,—if they give you any further trouble, we will let the world know what we think of them; and we will call on the Phillips Church to discipline them; and if they refuse to do so, we will withdraw fellowship from that Church.” But we have no evidence that those men are any better now than they were then. Though by clearing me, you, in effect, condemned them as guilty of a heinous offence, yet they have never confessed their wrong to those whom they had injured, but have uniformly justified themselves in all that they had done. Knowing all this, how is it possible that you should, in so short a time, have been connected with those very men in their attempts to do what was long before threatened—“leave no stone unturned till I was banished from the pulpit?” How happens

* This pamphlet was issued by Mr. F.’s enemies, for the purpose of convincing the public that he was still a bad man, and ought not to have been acquitted by the Jury. But though it was familiarly called “the deacons’ book,” yet not one of them dared to put his name to it, so as to assume the responsibility of its lies and slanders. So it came into the world “fatherless and motherless.” But as it had a reputed parentage, it has been of great service to Mr. F. It has been a sort of sequel to *his* book, in showing to the world the disposition of his enemies towards him. And though *they* meant it for his injury, *God* has overruled it for his good. And we have heard it remarked that Mr. F.’s friends ought to present them a vote of thanks for the service which that book has done him. It contains the correspondence between Mr. F. and his enemies, which plainly shows the different spirit by which they were actuated, and furnishes a key to “INIQUITY UNFOLDED” and “TRUTH REVEALED.” And if they wish to do Mr. F. a further act of kindness by speaking through the press, we hope that Deacon Drake will soon publish the letter recently received from Mr. Patton of Hartford. When Mr. F.’s book was published under his own name, containing such grave and serious charges against the deacons, they met it by saying that it was false and libellous; and as Mr. F. was then in another State, of course they could not reach him. Well, about three months after its publication, Mr. F. was here, and has been here most of the time since; but no prosecution has been commenced against him for his slanders. When Mr. F. was advised, after his acquittal, to take civil action against his enemies as conspirators, he replied, “I am a minister of the Gospel. Neither Christ nor his apostles have left me any such example. Besides, if I were to do so, some persons might regard me as vindictive, which would injure me as a minister of peace and good-will. I prefer leaving them to God and public opinion, while I go to work in my Lord’s vineyard, and quietly and faithfully perform the duties of my office.” But we can hardly suppose that those men have any *conscientious* scruples about going to law with Mr. F., when we consider what they have already done. They have been instrumental in bringing him into law-suits which have cost him almost all his property, (or rather his wife’s;) and we have often heard him remark that the only punishment which he would inflict on those men, if he had the power, would be to compel them to refund the amount which they have caused him to expend. If they did not know that the things which Mr. F. has said of them in his book were true in every essential point, who can doubt that they would long ago have arraigned him before the civil court to answer for his libels?

it that you are now the special friend and advocate of that very Church and those very deacons? If the last charge brought against me had changed your views with respect to the first, I should not have been so much surprised at the stand you have taken. But I have been credibly informed that you have often said, since the last charge was brought, that it did not alter your views with regard to the first,—that “every thing was then patiently, thoroughly, and conscientiously investigated, and that, if you were to go over the same ground again, you should come to the same result.” This result, and your knowledge of those men, ought to have made you cautious about joining them in their crusade against me.

Permit me here to remind you of another act which was any thing but kind and Christian. I refer to the vote of expulsion from the Association which you advocated, when you knew that I had publicly declared my determination to deliver myself up for trial before the Civil Court, as soon as my counsel were prepared to have me come. If you doubted my word, why did you not wait a sufficient time to see whether I would come or not? Your passing the vote under such circumstances only showed, as it seems to me and many others, your desire to prejudice my cause in view of the public, and especially in view of the Court, should I ever come to trial. I have been told by a member of the Association, that when that vote was passed, it was stated by some of its advocates, that it could be easily rescinded in case of my acquittal, and that it should be entered *privately* on your records, and no announcement of it be made to the public. But the very next day, if I remember correctly, it was published in one of the penny papers! And this was done without giving me any official notice of the vote, neither have I received any such notice to this day!! Was this Christian? Was it even gentlemanly? And why was not that vote rescinded as soon as I was acquitted? Why does it remain on your records to this day? And when the Woburn Association sent a unanimous request to your Association to rescind that vote, why did you virtually throw it under the table? Why was no specific action taken thereon, and no reply made to those who sent it? Was this respectful? Have not those worthy brethren reason to feel aggrieved at such apparent contempt? How severely and justly too does Dr. Richards of Hanover rebuke such conduct in his letter which was published in the reply to your remonstrance? He there says, “I fear lest the obstinacy of human nature, which hates to acknowledge an error or a fault, will make them delay or refuse to do what is right in this case.” I do not speak of that vote because I wish it rescinded for the purpose of restoring me to membership with your Association, as I contemplate joining another; but for the sake of justice and consistency.

Verily it would seem as if Christian love and charity were trampled in the dust. It would seem as if you were *especially desirous* of making me out a guilty man, and of banishing me from the pulpit. Is this kind and brotherly? Were my case your own, would you think it right for a brother clergyman to assume such a position towards you? If such an unkind and ungracious work must be done at all, would you not deem it best to leave it to the avowed enemies of Christ and his ministers?

Just look at your remonstrance which was sent to the installing Council. How untrue in its premises and in its deductions! In what an unfavorable light did it place before the public the venerable and worthy Moderator of the Exeter Council! It makes him say that “though I applied to him as Moderator to reassemble the Council, I afterwards retracted my request and deprived him of the power.” But his letter to me, as well as mine to him, which you have doubtless read, plainly show that I never made any such request of him, and of course could not have retracted it. I do not impute to him any intentional wrong. Charity leads me to say and to believe that he was forgetful. But his enemies, if he have any, might not be quite so charitable. I am very sure that *mine* would not. And I have not a doubt that the Moderator and

Scribe would have reassembled that Council forthwith to affirm the decision of the Court, if special pains had not been taken to prevent them by a few individuals not members of the Council. Facts seem not to warrant the belief that the influence of the Committee of the Association expired at Exeter.*

Do, Sir, have patience with me a little longer. Just look at the manner in which you introduce my name into the remonstrance,—*Mr. Joy H. Fairchild!* whereas Dr. Dana and Dr. Storrs gave me my title,—a title to which I have as good a right as yourself. I do not speak of this because I care any thing about the title, but simply to remind you of your object in omitting it. What spirit should you think me possessed of, and what should you judge to be my motive, if I were to publish a communication in which I spoke of you as *Mr. Nehemiah Adams?* And what would the world think? And yet my reason for doing so would be quite as valid as yours. Now this has been done in reference to me,—and done by a professor and a teacher of that religion which not only enjoins charity, but says “be courteous.”

I have been informed that when some member of your Church suggested that the Payson Church and their pastor were in regular standing, or Dr. Woods would not have taken the part he did in the Council, you intimated that undue influence had been used to induce him to preach on that occasion. I am not aware that any special pains were taken to obtain him for my preacher. If such were the fact, it is certainly unknown to me. But I *do* know that special pains were taken to *prevent* him from preaching. I *do* know that he received several letters which, I presume, were as full of sympathy, and arguments, and appeals to persuade him not to preach, as was your letter to persuade me to confess. But the Dr. knew his duty; and knowing it, he dared to perform it. And do not *you* know your duty in this matter? Do you not know that you have no more ecclesiastical right to refuse letters of recommendation to the Payson Church than to any other sister Church in Boston? You may persist in such refusal; but you will find it difficult to justify it, except on the ground that *might makes right*. A poor ground to go upon in managing

* The result of the trial at Exeter evidently contemplated the possibility that the case would go to a higher tribunal for final adjudication. Indeed, the Council virtually so recommended, and gave assurance to Mr. F., by implication at least, that if he were acquitted by the more competent tribunal, he should be restored to his office and his functions, and that the Council would so declare, if necessary, by a formal act affirming the decision of the Court. This was our understanding of the matter; and so it was of the Moderator and Scribe. For soon after the Exeter trial, they published, in the N. E. Puritan, a communication giving their own views of the matter, and, as they supposed, the views of the Council, as the following extract clearly shows:—

“Should another tribunal elicit new facts and put a new face upon things more favorable to Mr. F., none will more gladly hail the light than those who have now felt constrained to vote against him. Should evidence be produced effecting his entire exculpation, and setting him forth to the world as an innocent man, they would haste, with unutterable joy, to reverse their present decision, and reckon him again among the faithful ministers of Jesus. But till this be done, they abide by the act they have passed.

“The subscribers consider themselves as expressing the views of the Council in these remarks.

DANIEL DANA, MODERATOR.
L. F. DIMMICK, SCRIBE.”

Now the question is, why did not the Moderator and Scribe redeem the pledge here given? Why did they not “haste with unutterable joy” to reassemble the Council, that they might “reverse their decision?” We have not a doubt that the influence of some one who was strongly opposed to Mr. F., and fixedly committed against him, was brought to bear successfully on the Moderator and Scribe, to prevent them from doing what they publicly declared they would do, in case of Mr. F.’s acquittal. This we honestly believe to be true. And how can we avoid such a belief, when we look at the things which we *know* have been done? If the officers of that Council see fit to declare, over their signatures, that no such influence *was* used, and no such advice *was* given, then we will acknowledge that we have drawn a wrong inference from correct premises.

the affairs of that kingdom which is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." How much better would it be for all concerned, if the efforts made to crush me and my Church, were made to promote harmony and brotherly love,—to rouse the Churches from their present state of spiritual slumber,—to invoke the return of the blessed Comforter who has been grieved away,—to the preaching of sermons full of warm-hearted appeals to Christians to be up and doing, and to sinners to make haste and delay not to flee to Christ for pardon and salvation? Then you would not have occasion to dread my presence here lest I should disturb the peace of the Churches, as you, in your remonstrance, intimated might be the case. It is this unreasonable and unchristian opposition which makes the disturbance, and in my view, grieves away the Spirit. If the time, and thought, and labor which have been expended in efforts to prevent me from preaching the Gospel, (especially since my trial and acquittal,) had been devoted to the promotion of vital piety, I doubt not that the Churches and their pastors would have been in a much happier state than they now are. This open and continued rebellion against the laws of the land and the principles of Christian charity, has no tendency to promote that religion which we profess and teach.

By the way, let me ask you where else, but in this place, could I have resettled in the ministry with any hope of comfort or usefulness? Suppose I had settled in the country, no matter how far distant from Boston. How long should I have been there before another "Epaphroditus" would have been sent after me by enemies, as was the case when I was happily and usefully settled in Exeter? When an attack is made on the character of an innocent man, is it not a dictate of common sense, that he should seek to regain his character on the very spot where the attempt was made to destroy it? But you think I ought not to have done so, for fear of disturbing the harmony of the pastors and Churches. Now I must say that this strikes me as an exhibition of the same spirit of selfishness which seems to have dictated your letter urging me to confess. Had my case been your own, would you not have sought protection and a home among your friends who had long known you and confided in you,—who had stood by you and defended you in all your trials, and were ready to share their last morsel with you? Would not a sense of gratitude, no less than of self-preservation, have brought you back to their arms? My belief is that you would not have sought a new home among strangers.

Please excuse me for reminding you of a constitutional infirmity which some of your friends have often observed, but of which you seem not to be aware; and that is, an unyielding spirit,—a determination to have your own way, without due regard to the rights and feelings of others. To explain what I mean, let me refer you to a single example, which some will probably long remember. I allude to your charge to the Rev. Mr. T. It was his particular request, as I have been informed, that you would make no attack on episcopacy, and for reasons which he stated to you. But instead of gratifying his wishes, I have been told that your charge was pretty much made up of invectives against the polity and forms of the Episcopal Church. Now had you been constituted like most clergymen, you would either have gratified his wishes, or declined the service. Christian courtesy seemed to require it. So it would seem that Christian courtesy, to say nothing of Christian charity, would have led you so far to submit to law and custom, as to desist from any further attempts to injure me, after my acquittal by the Jury. But I have been as much disappointed as was Mr. T. On my acquittal, I expected that you would take me by the hand, and congratulate me. I thought I had reason to expect this from the tone of your letter, as well as from your conversation with Mr. Hayward. And *had* you done so, a more favorable construction might have been put upon your letter. At any rate, it would have been more difficult for any one to call in question your honesty and sincerity.

In your interview with me and my wife the morning you left Exeter, you said to me, "Don't despond. If the Council should condemn you, and you are innocent, take courage. God will yet make a way for it to appear." And has he not made a way for it to appear, and the *only* way which could reasonably have been expected? For surely it would not have been reasonable to expect him to work a miracle, or to make a direct revelation from heaven in order to establish my innocence. You believe in the efficacy of prayer. How many thousands of God's people were pleading with him to bring the truth to light at the time of my trial before the Civil Court? You believe too, in a superintending Providence. And has not Providence smiled on every effort made to defend myself, and signally frowned on all the attempts of my enemies to convict me of crime? Let a similar attempt be made to ruin you. Let the influence of watchers, and deacons, and money, and lying tongues, and brother clergymen be brought to bear against you, as in my case. Could you hope to share a better fate, or to escape with a character less tarnished than mine? Could you expect to witness any more signal interpositions of Providence in your favor, than have been witnessed in mine? And what should you think of that minister of the Gospel who should still persist in his efforts to banish you from the pulpit, or to exclude your Church from the fellowship of sister Churches, because they would not cease to sustain you as their pastor? Should you not judge, that a very broad mantle of charity would be necessary to cover such a fault? Would you be apt to designate such conduct by any milder term than persecution?

My innocence has been proved to the entire satisfaction of an honest Court and Jury. And why should not *you* be satisfied,—at least so far satisfied as to let me alone, and not go behind the law to injure me? Is this acting the part of a good citizen? If a mob or riot should take place in Boston, doubtless you would inculcate upon your people the duty of obeying the laws and submitting to the constituted authorities. But when a man has been charged with crime, which he solemnly denied, and been honorably acquitted, after a full and fair examination of the case before the tribunal appointed by the laws of his country, is it not rebellion against those laws to continue to treat him as if he were guilty, and try to deprive him of the benefit of his acquittal? Is this doing as you would be done by? And especially, is this redeeming the pledge given me, in the right hand of fellowship, at my ordination? Was that service a mere unmeaning ceremony? If not, then my brethren in the ministry were bound by it to stand by me and defend me, (as many of them have,) till I was *proved* guilty of the crimes charged upon me. But there has been no such proof. Even the Council did not pretend that they had proved me guilty, while the Court and Jury declared me innocent. Now if you are not satisfied, and still think me guilty, are you not bound, as a Christian and a good citizen, to keep your opinion to yourself? Your declaration that "you are willing to allow me all my rights as a citizen," is like telling a man that you do not wish to interfere with his rights and privileges as a citizen, while, at the same time, you are holding him by the throat and choking him to death. Have you any more ecclesiastical or legal right to say or do any thing to my injury than to the injury of any other clergyman? Is not the broad shield of the law over me for *my* protection, as truly as over you for *yours*? Have you any more right to attempt to close my lips as a preacher, than I have to attempt to close yours? Might I not as well object to your being in the ministry, on account of "the moral tone" of your *letter*, as you have to object to my being in the ministry, on account of "the moral tone of my *book*?" If you choose to regard me as a bad man, and to treat me as such, so far as preaching in your pulpit is concerned, so be it. I care as little about occupying your pulpit as did Mr. Kirk, when you excluded him, because you judged it wrong for him to be preaching in Boston as an evangelist. But I *do* care about your attempts to exclude my Church from the fellowship of sister Churches. You cannot adduce the shadow of an argument to justify such conduct.

In this communication, I have spoken of the remonstrance sent to the Council to prevent my installation, as being yours. True, I have no *positive* proof that it is yours. But from certain circumstances, I have no doubt that you originated it, and that, had it not been for your influence, no such paper would ever have been sent to the Council. Did you not present it, or cause it to be presented to Dr. Codman and Mr. Albro for their signatures? They, however, had too much good sense, as well as charity, to give their names. But though your influence could not prevail on them to sign it, yet it doubtless prevailed on some others to do so. And I do not believe that you yourself will deny that, had it not been for you, and two other clergymen who were strongly committed against me before my trial, that remonstrance would never have been thought of. Though I do not *know* who wrote it, yet I presume you will not affirm that it was written by him who headed it, or by those who presented it to the Council. I think it would have been much more to the credit of the author if he had signed it first, and been the bearer of it to the Council. And then how contrary to the principles of congregationalism, for which you profess to be so zealous an advocate, to remonstrate as *pastors* against my installation, without the concurrence of the *Churches*?*

I have only to say, in conclusion, what I said at the beginning, that charity forbids me to indulge the thought that you have been actuated in this matter by a malignant spirit, or that you have not felt as though you were "doing God service." I am sensible that even a good man will sometimes say and do strange things, when he is conscientiously in the wrong. Neither have I any wish to injure you in any respect whatever. For certainly if I had in-

* We must here be permitted to express the opinion that those worthy pastors, whose names were appended to that remonstrance, signed it without duly considering what they were doing. Had they possessed a correct knowledge of the facts in the case, we are quite sure that no influence used by Mr. A. could have prevailed on them to do such an act. The paper which they subscribed was not true either in its premises or in its deductions, as was fully proved in our reply to it. But we think we know how it is with the pastors in Boston. They claim to be a *unit*. And on this principle they are doubtless sometimes led to do things not in exact accordance with their kind feelings and sound judgment, for the sake of gratifying the earnest wishes of some few, who plead the importance of *all* acting in unity, and that *all* must be pledged to one course of conduct. Now this may be well enough in cases of little moment. But when they are called upon to remonstrate against the settlement of a pastor, we think they ought first to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the merits of the case, lest they put their names to statements as true, which are utterly false. And especially should they avoid an act, which, if it be done at all, belongs of right to the Churches acting in concert with the pastors. Does congregationalism merge the Churches into the pastors? If so, we know not what congregationalism is; and what is more, we choose not to know. The more ignorant we are of it, and the farther we stand aloof from it, the better.

In justice to those pastors who were induced to sign that remonstrance, we will here state that we have not heard of their saying or doing any thing to the injury of Mr. F. or his Church, since his installation. So far as we are informed, they have, at least, let us alone to fight the battles of the Lord as best we could, and to do what we were able for the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints, without any direct hindrance from them. We deem them deserving of credit for having acted on the principle which Christ taught his disciples when John said to him, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, forbid him not. For he that is not against us, is on our part." And as to the pastors in the country, they are generally, so far as we know, friendly to us and our pastor, and are "bidding us God-speed." And such, we presume, would have been the case with the pastors in the city, had not some of them unfortunately committed themselves against Mr. F. before he was tried. We well know how hard it is for poor human nature to acknowledge an error in judgment, or a fault in practice. But we trust that this transaction will teach every one this important lesson,—never to commit himself against an accused minister on *ex-parte* testimony, nor until he knows *all* the evidence *for*, as well as *against* him; and especially when he discovers strong indications of a plan contrived by his bitter enemies to destroy him.

dulged such a wish, I should have published your letter in connection with the reply to your remonstrance, accompanied with such comments as the composition and object of it seemed to require. But I am so anxious to have this unpleasant controversy ended, that I did not inform the Committee any thing about your letter, or that I had any such letter in my possession. I am willing to leave you and your motives, in the part you have taken against me, to the Judge of all men. But I am not willing that you should further seek to injure me and my Church either in public or private. Cease from such efforts, and give the regular letters to your members who may wish to join us, and use your influence to rescind the vote of your Association, and you will hear nothing further from me on the subject, either through the public press, or by private letters. But if otherwise, I fear that I shall be compelled, by a sense of duty to myself and my Church, to publish to the world your letter and mine. You have the general confidence of the Christian community. And many are ready to ask, "how happens it that Mr. Adams should treat Mr. Fairchild in this manner, after all the evidence which has been adduced in favor of his innocence?" On this account it is, that some, to whom I have shown your letter, urge its *immediate* publication, because, in their judgment, it answers the above question, and that I ought to do it in self-defence. Indeed, I have been censured for not having published it months ago. But I wish to do as I would be done unto. My end and aim is peace. And if there be a failure, I do not intend that either you, or the public shall lay the blame to me.

I have recently received a letter from a worthy clergyman residing in the State of New York, and whom I know only by reputation, in which, after informing me that he had carefully read the reply to your remonstrance, he says, "The whole matter is presented in a light so clear, that men can no longer conceal themselves or their motives. The question is no longer one of doubt or certainty, but of love or hate; and you will probably find men hereafter to range themselves accordingly." The thought that any, who profess Christian charity, should range themselves on the side of *hate*, is truly painful to me. But if it must be so, I submit, trusting in God to overrule it for good. He can cause even "the wrath of man to praise him."

By my acquittal and my subsequent installation, I claim all the rights and privileges of a citizen and of a minister of the Gospel. You have a right (which I am willing you should exercise,) to exclude me from your pulpit. Be satisfied with that right. To claim any thing more is a kind of clerical dictation and authority to which, I am quite sure, *the people* will never submit. And to attempt any thing more is not only to violate an important principle of law and Gospel, but to break up the harmony of the Churches, which you profess so much to dread. And before making the attempt, would it not be well to read over your published sermon "on injuries done to Christ," which created much excitement at the time; and then ask yourself whether *you* may not have injured him, (however unintentionally,) by the course which you have taken in this matter. Does he not regard an injury done to his Church and ministers, as an injury done to himself? And ought you not to abstain from any further efforts to pull up what *you* regard as tares, when, by so doing, you may pull up the wheat also? Would it not be much wiser and safer to follow the direction of the Great Husbandman—"Let both grow together until the harvest"? Who has made thee a judge over me? To my own Master I stand or fall. There is such a thing as wounding Christ in the house of his friends. And is not such a wound inflicted by treating one of his ministers as a criminal when no crime has been proved against him, and especially when he has been pronounced "not guilty," by an impartial Jury?

Yours "in love, and prayer, and hope,"

J. H. FAIRCHILD.

To this letter Mr. Adams replied as follows:—

Boston, April 10, 1846.

Mr. Fairchild,—I have received a communication from you dated March 10th. Many duties and great doubts whether I ought to answer your letter at all, are the occasion of my not sending this before.

The sight of your familiar handwriting gave occasion to some feelings which survived the reading of your letter. I was glad to find you addressing me again, though I knew not for what purpose. Before reading your letter, I felt impelled to write to you, if your letter should open the way. As your communication was inclosed and directed so as to meet no eye but mine, I resolved not to let any one know that you had written to me, as I supposed this to be your wish. No one, therefore, knows that I have received a letter from you, and the present letter is equally private.

I shall tell you plainly and faithfully, but with kindness, what I think of your letter and of you. My hesitation at doing this has made me keep back this letter, and may delay it, after it is finished; but I now think it best to send it, especially as you have invited it, and in some measure, made it necessary. To have treated your letter with silence, might have seemed to you like contempt, which I do not wish to cherish. Yet if I write, I must be honest, and this perhaps will not be acceptable to you, considering what I am obliged to say. You will bear in mind, however, that no one, beside yourself, knows of your letter to me, nor of my reply.

With what preface then shall I introduce the remark that your letter confirms all my convictions of your character? The occasion of it seems to be the refusal of my Church to dismiss members to your care. This leads you to ask me the reason of my prominent and persevering opposition to you? After insinuating your reasons for supposing me to have been forward in several demonstrations against you, you boldly ask if I know who procured the requisition from the Governor against you? The implication in this question is as utterly without foundation, as some other allegations are gratuitous. Your purpose, however, is to intimidate me from holding out in my opposition to you. In the absence of all other probable ways of influencing me, you bring forward my last letter to you, written at Marblehead in July or August, 1844, and pretend to construe it into a plot to screen myself by urging you, guilty or not, to confess before the Council at Exeter.

I kept no copy of that letter, and can judge of its particular expressions only by the quotations you make from it. It seems, then, that in the interval of the Trial and the Result at Exeter, I urged you to confess your sin, before the Council should declare against you, and while confession would seem to have any virtue in it. At the same time, it seems that I said to you, "If you are innocent, take courage. Your enemies will be found liars unto you, and you will tread upon their high places"—with other exhortations to the same effect.

On reading these quotations, it occurred to me that, had I conceived the plot, (which I had entirely forgotten,) of making you confess, so that I might be justified in my convictions and testimony, I used a singular way to effect it. Those words of encouragement and cheering appeals to you, if innocent, were unaccountably indiscreet. I really think I have more art and skill than such a letter for such a purpose would prove. If I am a knave, I know I am not so much a fool as not to write a more insidious letter to accomplish such a purpose. You know it too, and therefore I shall not think of replying seriously to what you have forced yourself to say.

I have often thought of late how that letter must have troubled you, if you were all that I feared. It seems it does trouble you to this day. You knew that I inferred, from your silence with regard to it, that you were guilty, or you

would have responded to it in some moment of kindness.* The time has at length come when you feel compelled to notice it; and the way in which you have chosen to do so is, by pretending to impute cunning to me in writing. With all that was sad in my feelings in reading your letter, when I came to that part of it, I could not resist a smile at the ludicrous folly of the invention. But as one quotation followed another, illustrating my former love of you, I felt sad again to think of the past, and to see how desperate you must have grown to invent a charge which your own quotations palpably contradict. The only way in which I could account for this part of your letter, (indeed it is the main design of it) was by supposing that you had been, for so long a time, engaged in breaking down the character of witnesses against you, and in inventing false explanations, that you had acquired a degree of unearthly skill in the trade.† I see through your design. I deplore the sad condition into which the long practice of evil has brought your moral faculties. If you had ever ruined the virtue of an individual, and then, to screen yourself, had contrived to destroy her reputation, you would be in a state of mind which would help you to invent such a construction of my letter, and, what is more, make you bold enough to propose it.

As to the letter itself, I remember the reason why I took no copy of it. I was on the point of transcribing it; but I felt that to do so was to use a degree of wariness which, with the frame of mind in which I wrote, I could not allow. But after I heard the Result of Council, and perceived that you had made no confession, I recollect wishing that I had kept a copy of the letter so that, if the Result of Council should lead you again to desperation and to self-destruction, I might show, to my Christian friends, the means which I, at least, had used to save your soul. If you are ever willing to publish the letter, you have my full and free consent to do so, and, in the mean time, to read it privately to any and every one, as you say you have done to some. If you would like to add your recent letter to the publication, I shall not object to it, nor regret it on my own account.

I am very sorry to say that no part of your letter awakened any suspicion or

* What! Mr. F. respond to *such* a letter! We admire his prudence and foresight; for he must have felt that, if he had rightly interpreted the object of it, to answer it *then*, would be to sink himself lower than even Mr. A. had attempted to sink him. He acted wisely in remaining silent, that he might see whether future events would confirm his suspicions as to Mr. A.'s design in writing the letter. And after having waited more than a year and a half, and having had, as he thought, abundant evidence of the spirit and motive which dictated it, he then noticed it in a Christian and courteous manner, as it became him to do. Our only surprise is that he did not take it immediately into the lecture room, and read it aloud to the Council, and warn them in tones of thunder not to condemn one of their brethren, when *such* influence had been used to convict him. And we verily believe that if Mr. F. had read that letter to the Council, they would have come to a very different result.

† Is not Mr. Adams aware that the witnesses broke themselves down? Out of their own mouths they were condemned. When they left the stand, there was probably not a single jurymen or a single unprejudiced spectator, who gave the least credit to their stories. Not a witness was introduced by Mr. F. but for the sole purpose of bearing testimony to what his accusers had been heard to utter or seen to do, in relation to the very matter then before the Court. Does Mr. A. sympathize with perjury? Is he afraid that those who swear falsely will be broken down? Or is his pride mortified because he has been duped by a lying wanton? But the mortification he must bear. It will cleave to him as long as his name shall be remembered. He may continue his efforts to break down Mr. F. if he will, till the end of life; but he can never get rid of the reproach which he has brought upon himself by the part he has acted in this affair. When the trial before the Civil Court was ended and the verdict returned, he might have saved himself. And had he then submitted to the law, which, as a good citizen, he was bound to do, all might have been well with him. His name and his fame might have suffered no lasting harm. We would remind Mr. A. of this text, "He shall have judgment without mercy, who hath shown no mercy."

hope, in my mind, that you are a good man. The letter throughout is vindictive. It breathes, I regret to say, an insulting, insinuating, retaliatory spirit. Had you been an innocent, injured man, I think your trials would have softened your feelings; and, in addressing me thus privately, however much you might have been grieved at my treatment of you, you would have expressed something like expostulation and sorrow at my mistakes. Instead of this, you pretend, (for it is only pretence,) to impute the worst of motives. You search my public life for something wherewith to provoke me, and ask questions when you dare not assert any thing unfavorable to me.

I think you cannot suppose that Rev. Drs. Dana, Storrs, and Emerson, and Messrs. Dimmick, Parker, and Richards, to mention no others, were so imbecile as to be governed by my impressions, without judging whether the facts stated justified those impressions. In saying this, you injure those men even more than you exalt me, and they have reason to be offended with you, while all who know them must regard what you say as too absurd to be answered.*

You do not suppose that when I told you I had hurt myself by my testimony more than I had hurt you, I believed or meant to say that I had hurt my reputation more than I had hurt yours.†

Neither do you think that I was so inconsiderate as to tell any one that if you should get clear in a court of justice, I would invite you to preach for me.‡

I presume you cannot think that I delivered a Charge to a man on a subject upon which he requested me not to speak.§ Your allusion to this, and to Evangelists, and to a published sermon of mine,—are they the dictates of Christian feeling, or of an irritating, retaliatory spirit, which is disappointed in not finding something more injurious, as a ground of reproach? When I saw you indulging in such feelings which pervade your letter, I could not help feeling and saying, as the Prophet did when he looked on the remains of the disobedient prophet whom a lion slew—"Alas! my brother!"

* This charge against Mr. F., for seeming to impute imbecility to those worthy gentlemen, comes with an ill grace from Mr. A. He certainly designed, by his testimony, to influence those men in their decision; if not, why did he testify? And now because Mr. F. intimates that he *did* influence them, just as he intended to do, he reproaches Mr. F. as though *he* had been representing them as imbecile! And be it remembered that all his testimony amounted to nothing but the *impressions* he received from certain appearances in Mr. F. which *he* thought were indicative of guilt. Now, if he had been in possession of any *facts* to convict Mr. F. of crime, would he not have been upon the stand before the Civil Court, and there have given oath to those facts? His absence is proof positive that he knew nothing against Mr. F. in the matter about which he testified at Exeter. His object was to influence the Council solely by his impressions; and because Mr. F. complains of him for doing this, he accuses him of imputing to them imbecility! If the majority of the Council have reason to be offended with either of them, it is Mr. A. who has given the offence, and not Mr. F.; for had he not deemed them imbecile enough to be moved by his speech, why did he make it?

† So far as Mr. F. was concerned, there were only two things which Mr. A. could have hurt by his testimony. These were Mr. F.'s feelings and his reputation. Can any body believe that Mr. A. meant that he had hurt his *own feelings* more than Mr. F.'s by his testimony on that occasion? If not, then he must have meant *his own reputation*. But whether he meant it or not, is not such the fact in the opinion of all judicious men?

‡ Why should not Mr. F. think so? Mr. Hayward has repeatedly assured him that he heard Mr. Adams say, on two different occasions, that his pulpit should be opened to Mr. F. on his acquittal by the Civil Court. And to the truth of this statement Mr. H. is ready at any time to give his oath.

§ Here again we ask, why should not Mr. F. think so? He must either think so and believe so, or think and believe that Mr. T. has falsified the truth. For Mr. T. has made the statement to many individuals, and he reaffirms it still. Why does not Mr. A. come out boldly like a man and deny these things, and not try to get rid of them by such unbecoming evasions?

It is with unaffected kindness towards you that I wish you to look at some things in your conduct in their true light. Not to reproach you—not to afflict you, even if you were worse than any have supposed you to be, but to lead you, if possible, to a right state of mind, I will state some things for your consideration.

I sat by your side the morning after you had met with the men who had acted as the Referees on your previous difficulties. We had read the Davidson papers the day before. That morning I disclosed to you, for the first time, the idea that those men, your friends, who had once acquitted you, had this impression that, in your denial, you secretly made a distinction between criminal intercourse and paternity.*

I was not your enemy nor your accuser, but your friend, and you believed me to be so. At my suggestion you had seen Mr. S. the day before, on the subject of prosecuting the alleged conspirators. The evening before, I had also been to South Boston to stop a prosecution against you, and you knew that I had succeeded. You had every reason, therefore, to feel that I was your friend, which I had also proved by gladly entertaining you at my house.

Now what do you think my opinion of you must have been when I found you capable of saying in your pamphlet that when I stated to you the fears of the Referees, and you made no answer, you think a parallel case is to be found in the conduct of Jesus before Pontius Pilate, who “answered never a word, insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly”—you, the innocent Jesus, and I, your accuser, prosecutor, and judge. What opinion must I have had of you on reading that paragraph, knowing all the facts as I did?†

But this was not worse in its impression on me than the reasons you assign for your silence. You were filled with indignant resentment that you should be suspected of prevarication! It was this which made you hold your peace as Jesus did before his impious heathen judge. You know—I say you know—that, at that moment, you were not capable of entertaining such feelings towards me and the other Referees.

But in the next sentence you say that the reason why you did not speak was, you had passed two sleepless nights,—you were on the borders of derangement,—you feared an arrest,—you were afraid the carriage might not come; and, in such a condition of body and mind, it is not strange that you should not have had strength or presence of mind enough to reply to my suggestion.

Now which of these two explanations is the true one,—the indignant resentment, or the prostration of your power of attention? for you know that the two states of mind could not co-exist. Did you deliberately and purposely act like the injured Jesus, and hold your peace? or were you so unstrung that you could not think, or feel, or act at all? If you say the former, it is contradicted by your feelings of kindness and confidence towards me. If you say

* Mr. Adams stated to the Council at Exeter that he proposed the question to Mr. F., *to satisfy his own mind*, whether he did not mean to make “a distinction between criminal intercourse and paternity.” It is quite new to us that the other Referees had any such impression; especially after Mr. F. had assured them, in the most solemn manner, that “he never touched the girl.” Did this look like making any such distinction? We believe that the other Referees had sense enough to know that if Mr. F. “never touched the girl,” he could not have had any mental reservation, and of course no such impression could have been made on their minds. Neither could it have been made on Mr. A.’s mind, had he not been more given to *impressions* than any man we ever knew.

† We would ask the reader whether this and the three following paragraphs, are not a gross perversion of that part of Mr. F.’s letter on which Mr. A. is here commenting? Mr. F. simply stated the fact that silence was no evidence of guilt. And to prove this, he adduced the example of Jesus before Pontius Pilate. And yet Mr. A. seems to think that, by so doing, Mr. F. has committed a sort of sacrilege,—perhaps an unpardonable sin; at least, a sin which makes him odious in Mr. A.’s eyes.

the latter, how could you dare insinuate the former, and venture to use such a comparison? If you say both, no one will believe you.

Again. On page 39th of your pamphlet, you profess to give a true narrative of the affair between yourself and the young woman who, on your attempting the third time, within two days, to kiss her, repulsed you and said, "Do you think such conduct proper for a minister?" You did not deny this before the Referees, but admitted it, and argued upon it, and acknowledged that you had done foolishly. In our exculpation before making up our result, it was this transaction which made us hesitate so long what to say of you, till finally, at half past 11 o'clock at night, as you know, we came to the conclusion that we could conscientiously say that nothing had appeared to impair our confidence in your moral and Christian character. The thing took place ten or twelve years before. We were pained at the folly of it; but could not call it an immorality.

But in your account of it, you suppress the essential part of the story; and on the principle that "*suppressio veri*" is "*suggestio falsi*," you cannot wonder how the reading of that false account of that affair affected me. It confirmed all my suspicions of your guilt. I saw that you were capable of falsifying; while, in connection with your comparison of yourself to Christ, it threw a terrible suspicion on the piece of rhubarb under the operation of which you told the Referees that you disappeared in a moment from Mrs. D.'s house when Mrs. H. went in to detect you in adultery. While I still say that with the same evidence as the Referees then had, and with the good opinion of you which we then entertained, I should come to the same result, your pamphlet makes me suspicious with respect to all the cases which came before the Referees, and things are coming to our knowledge which may lead us, in justice to ourselves, to make a public re-consideration of our Result.* Seeing you capable, as I did in reading your pamphlet, in one case of inventing an explanation and using a comparison which I knew to be false and unjustifiable, and in another case of suppressing the essential parts of a story; you cannot wonder that I lost all confidence in you, believed you capable of doing and feigning, and saying any thing, and that the bonds of brotherhood between us went asunder. Having taken so active a part in the matter of the Referees, and being thus deceived and imposed on by you, you cannot wonder at any prominence or perseverance in my opposition to you.† No man living knows

* On reading this, immediate inquiry was made of four of the other five Referees, to ascertain what "things had come to their knowledge." They all affirmed that they had heard nothing,—no, *not a word!* The inquiry made of them was the first intimation that it might be necessary for them, "in justice to themselves, to make a public re-consideration of their result." We think that Mr. A. would have come nearer the truth, if he had said that he was searching and writing in various directions, hoping, in this way, to find something against Mr. F. which would give him another opportunity to sit in judgment on his case. But Mr. A. need not flatter himself with the idea that he will ever again sit in Council, or a Board of Referees to pass judgment on Mr. F. We should as soon expect justice to be done him by a Jury composed of such men as the Deacons and the Dunhams.

† We should have thought that Mr. A. would have had too much self-respect and self-consistency, as well as regard for the truth, to have penned the preceding statements. They might have answered his purpose to be told in his Church meeting to influence the action of the brethren, where no one was present to point out his mistakes. But to put them on paper and into Mr. F.'s hands, is, to us, a matter of utter astonishment, and must, we think, be to him a matter of deep regret. Knowing, as Mr. A. did, all the circumstances of the kissing affair to which he alludes, and having passed judgment on it and said it was nothing, what shall we think of the man who could sit down and deliberately pen such statements? Mr. A. does not pretend to deny that the account which Mr. F. has given in his pamphlet is true, *so far as it goes*. He dare not deny it; for the evidence of its truth, as exhibited to the Referees, was such as to admit of no denial. Now we assert, without fear of contradiction, that if what Mr. F. has stated in his pamphlet of that affair be true, then it is impossible for him to have omitted any thing

you so thoroughly as I do,* and if you ask the reason for my feelings and conduct towards you, you have it in the abuse of my confidence,—the injuries

which could have involved him even in a suspicion of guilt. The confidence of that female in Mr. F. from that time till he asked his dismissal, (a period of eight years,)—her continuing to reside in his family for many months afterwards,—her frequent calls on him for his counsel and advice,—her repeated declarations to many individuals, of the high estimation in which she held him as a preacher and a Christian, and her opinion expressed, as soon as she heard of his dismissal, that “his loss to the people could never be made up,”—all these things are proof positive that she imputed no bad motive to Mr. F. Indeed, she gave a key to the whole matter when she stated to the Referees, that it was done when she was in deep affliction, in consequence of the derangement of a beloved brother. It was to console and comfort her. True, Mr. F. admitted that he had done foolishly, not because he was actuated by any impure motive; but because it gave his enemies an opportunity to make a very foolish and wicked use of it. But they gained nothing by it. It only showed to what straits they were driven to get evidence against him. When Deacon Drake got her alone and told her, in those grave and pious tones for which he is somewhat remarkable, all about his suspicions, and the result of their watching the window-blinds and curtains, and how anxious he was to prove Mr. F. an innocent man, and thus fairly wormed the story out of her, merely to satisfy his own mind, and not for public use, or to involve her in any trouble, he doubtless expected to make much capital out of it. But alas! his mean attempts at worming, availed him nothing;—for many individuals, with whom she had been most intimate, could testify to a thousand things which they had heard her say of Mr. F., which could not be true, if the deacon had put a right construction on her story, or if she could be induced by him to say any thing to Mr. F.’s injury. Well might the deacon afterwards say, as we are credibly informed he did, that he was disappointed in her testimony. And we verily believe that if every clergyman who has kissed a female as innocently as did Mr. F., and with motives as pure, were to be turned out of the pulpit, it would take a long time to fill the vacancies.

If Mr. F. had any particular design in omitting any part of this affair, because there was something very dark and suspicious in it, we should judge that his motive was to save the feelings of the witness, and especially to protect the Referees from merited censure; for they had examined thoroughly into the whole matter, and published to the world that, in their judgment, there was not a stain upon Mr. F.’s character. We will here quote that paragraph in their Result, which has special reference to this point:—

“After a protracted and laborious investigation of all the particulars touching this subject, the undersigned are constrained to say that the circumstances brought to view as tending to excite suspicion against the Rev. Mr. Fairchild, do not impair our confidence in his moral and Christian character. In this remark, we include also alleged misconduct on his part, while pastor of a Church in East Hartford, Conn.; and we are happy to state, that after a severe and thorough scrutiny, nothing has appeared in any part of his life, which prevents our according to him our full confidence as a minister of Christ.

H. WINSLOW,
N. ADAMS,
W. A. STEARNS,
THO. M. VINSON,
NATH’L DANA,
DANIEL NOYES.”

Now if Mr. A. wishes to stultify himself in this matter, so be it. But let him not attempt to involve the other Referees in the same disgrace. Let him not say that they are thus ready to eat their own words and annul their own doings in a matter which they say they had investigated with “a severe and thorough scrutiny.”

But Mr. A. tells Mr. F. that “it was this transaction which made the Referees hesi-

* We presume that when Mr. A. penned this, he anticipated, from hints dropped by “a mutual friend,” some astounding information from Pittston. But alas! it seems he did not get “the shadow of a shade against him.” We think we know Mr. F. quite as well as does Mr. A. Some of us have been intimate with him for more than fifteen years, and have known him under circumstances which would be likely to give us a fair opportunity to judge of his character and habits. And never, in all our intimacies, did we discover the least thing, either in word or deed, which even excited a suspicion that he was not a pure minded man. We think too that Mrs. F. having lived with him more than twenty years, must be supposed to know as much about her husband’s habits as Mr. A., or any one else. *Her* views of him are well known to the public. And when this fact is mentioned to his enemies, the only way in which they can evade its force is by replying, “she is as bad as he.”

of my love. You say, in your letter, "If the *last* charge brought against you had changed my views with respect to the *first*, you should not have been so much surprised at the stand I have taken." Your conduct under the last charge has opened my eyes.* Drs. Woods and Burgess, and Mr. Bennett and

tate so long what to say of him, till finally, at half past 11 o'clock at night, they came to the conclusion, &c." But was it indeed so? We have had, from one of the Referees, the following account of what took place that night. He says that after they went into secret session, Mr. A. was the first to speak, and that he said, "Now in all this there is nothing against Brother Fairchild. There is not even the shadow of a shade against him." When this gentleman was asked what detained them till that late hour, he replied that Mr. Adams had drawn up their report, in which he had censured the deacons with great severity, and advised the Phillips Church to discipline them, and if they refused to do so, he proposed to call on the sister Churches to withdraw fellowship from that Church. And this agrees perfectly with Mr. F.'s account given in his letter of what Mr. A. said to him in private. The Referees were not prepared to adopt Mr. A.'s report; and for these reasons among others that the deacons were not on trial,—that Mr. F. had been tried and acquitted,—that his acquittal would, by implication, be a severe censure upon those men,—that to do any thing more might seriously injure the Phillips Church which they wished to avoid,—and that if the deacons did not in future let him alone to pursue quietly his labors in Exeter, they could then do what Mr. A. proposed to do at that time. This counsel prevailed. And yet Mr. A. says that they were kept up till that late hour because they knew not what to say about that kissing affair, and when he himself had said that "there was not even the shadow of a shade against him!!"

But Mr. A. tells Mr. F. that as he has suppressed a part of the truth, he has uttered a constructive falsehood. We have shown the reader that Mr. F. could have had no such motive in omitting a part of the story. He never professed to state *all* that was said or done on that occasion. This would have made a volume five times larger than his pamphlet. Besides, he made continual reference to the Referees to confirm the truth of his statements as to those matters which came before them. And never did he receive an intimation from one of them that he had not stated those matters truly, till he read Mr. A.'s letter. But is he willing to have his Latin quotation thrown back upon himself? Whether willing or unwilling, he must take it. When testifying before the Council at Exeter, he had taken an oath to tell "the *whole* truth." But he confined his testimony solely to Mr. F.'s silence and appearance, when he renewed his inquiry as to his innocence or guilt. He omitted to state this important fact, that as soon as he had read to Mr. F., in the presence of the Referees, the Davidson papers containing the charges against him, he asked him whether those charges were true or false, and that he raised his hand and said, "They are a tissue of falsehood from beginning to end. I never touched the girl." This he found it convenient to suppress. Whereas, had he stated it to the Council, all his testimony about impressions would have been scattered to the winds. It would have had no effect upon the Council. But it seems that Mr. F.'s full and explicit denial, left no impression on Mr. A.'s mind. But his silence and strange appearance the next morning, when on the borders of derangement, made a *deep* and *lasting* impression. The one he could remember and state with great solemnity before the Council; while the other had flitted away from his memory "like a dream when one awaketh." And thus by omitting to tell the whole truth as required by his

* And what has Mr. F.'s conduct been under the last charge? We are not aware of his having done any thing but vindicate himself just as every upright man would do, and *ought* to do. And he has done it most effectually, without bribing a single witness, or using any unjustifiable or improper means. We have no evidence that Mr. A. had changed his views with regard to this matter, till December, 1844. At that time Mr. F. published his pamphlet; and while it convinced thousands of his innocence, it seems to have had the contrary effect on Mr. A.'s mind, confirming all his suspicions. From that time he seems to have viewed all the matters which came before the Referees, just as the deacons did. If Mr. F. had not inserted the note on pages 51-52 of his pamphlet, we presume that no such change would have taken place in consequence of the book. That note, though kind and affectionate, called in question the soundness of Mr. A.'s judgment and the correctness of his course in "testifying to his impressions." This doubtless gave him offence, and thus "opened his eyes;" for we have not since heard of one kind or charitable word coming from his lips in reference to Mr. F., but quite the reverse. We would request the reader, if convenient to do so, just to cast his eyes over that note, that he may see what *we* apprehend caused so great a change in Mr. A.'s feelings, and "makes him suspicious with respect to all the cases which came before the Referees."

others, have not been more deceived than I was. They will, ere long, be undeceived, as I have been.

With such feelings and opinions, you cannot wonder that I am unwilling to dismiss Church members to your care. What would you think of me if I did? Courts of Justice may say of you "not guilty,"—ministers may fellowship you,—Councils may install you,—Churches may dismiss members to your care; but you know me well enough to know that I will never publicly treat you otherwise than as my conscience dictates. You attribute my conduct to what you are pleased to call an "unyielding spirit." Whatever of firmness I possess has enabled me to be of some benefit to you in times past, and if you should ever have occasion for it again, and deservedly, it shall be at your service.

Your treatment of Messrs. Beecher and Riddel in your pamphlet, shows a very bad spirit. Your jeers at Brother Beecher as "the Commentator of the Canticles" is enough to satisfy me that you are not a good man.* In the first place, he never made or preached a commentary on that book, any further than every minister is led to notice it incidentally in the course of his sermons, nor did he ever entertain any theory of explanation beyond what is generally received. But suppose that he had. Imagine Dr. Payson accused of immorality, and A. C., for example, being a witness against him. Can you conceive of Dr. Payson in his defence, published in a pamphlet, jeering at Mr. C., and sneering at him as the "Expositor of the Cherubim?" What sort of a spirit is this for a holy man, in the furnace of affliction, to exhibit? Surely, the Son of God has not been with you there.

You make it appear that Mr. Riddel walked with Rhoda Davidson at Exeter familiarly, and as a companion. Whereas all who saw him know that he only helped her through the crowd across the street from the Vestry to the Hotel, as a mere act of humanity to one whom he believed innocent and injured;† and because he, as Chairman of the Committee from the Association,

oath, he doubtless led the Council to their strange result. Nor are we alone in this opinion. The able and candid Reviewer of the Exeter trial uses this language: "If our own view of the case be correct, Mr. Adams did more by his impressions and his manner of stating them before the Council, than almost any thing else, to bring the matter to the issue to which it has come." Now we will say to him, not in Latin, but in plain English, "Physician, heal thyself."

* Mr. F. did not intend to jeer at Dr. B. As he appeared so confident of Mr. F.'s guilt at Exeter before he was tried, and so anxious to impress his belief on the minds of the Council, Mr. F. took occasion to remind him in his pamphlet of an occurrence which happened in 1828, and which led Dr. B. to turn his attention particularly to the Canticles, and to form an opinion that he was raised up by Providence to give to the world a true exposition of that Book. But as no such exposition had appeared, Mr. F. simply reminded him that since he was mistaken *then*, so he might be *now*. Mr. F. received his information from Dr. Wisner. If Dr. B. denies it, and calls on Mr. F. for proof, we doubt not that he will be able to substantiate what he has said. He has no desire to tell the story to the world. But if necessary he can give it as it was given to him by Dr. W.; and probably be able to find some living witnesses of its truth.

† What a lesson to teach our daughters! Is there a parent among us, who is not shocked at the idea? What! teach a daughter that she is "innocent," after doing what this girl said she had done,—living with a married man fifteen months, though "always having her own way,"—then becoming a mother,—and then publicly accusing a clergyman, because she was to have "as much agin money," though she had stated six weeks before the birth of the child, that "she had been with so many, it would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to tell who the father was." Such a girl innocent! and such a lesson taught our daughters! and taught by ministers of the Gospel too!! O shame! where is thy blush? Let Mr. F. be what he might, what was she according to her own showing? Yet she was deemed "innocent and injured," and Mr. F. against whom nothing was proved, was deemed the vilest of the vile: Mr. F. discredited and discarded by the Committee of the Association, while Miss Rhoda, the wanton, was credited and caressed! Surely truth is stranger than fiction here.

If Mr. Riddel denies the statement which Mr. F. made about his attentions to R. D.

had the direction of the witnesses. You have much to answer for in what you have said of him, as pure and upright a man as can any where be found.

One thing, which, in the progress of your affairs, has had an accumulative force in confirming my opinion of your character, is the character of all your public communications. It is very evident that the Spirit of all grace has not breathed upon you in preparing your published writings. The savor of piety, of meekness, gentleness, and forgiveness is no where found in them. They are your worst enemies. One of the most influential men in our Churches said to me, "I was always in doubt what to think of Mr. Fairchild's case, till I accidentally took up his pamphlet and read two pages," (naming the subject of them;) "from that time my mind has been clear."

A distinguished member of the Grand Jury who indicted you, said to me, in company, a short time since, that after your acquittal, he thought the public would, in time, so far acquiesce in the verdict as to regard you with charity. But he said, "I have often told his friends that his book destroyed him."

Your production in the Boston Times in reply to our Remonstrance is of the same character with the pamphlet. You did not expect, of course, to conciliate any Christian respect or esteem when you wrote the sentence advising some of the Remonstrants "to tarry at Jericho till their beards were grown." In short, were I your enemy, I could wish you no greater evil than that you should continue writing as you have done.

The way in which you subscribe your letter to me, quoting an affectionate expression of mine and flinging it back to me, is not in accordance with my ideas of that delicacy which usually attends innocence. But enough. All—all conspires to make me feel that my first fears and convictions are true. As Dr. S. said to me the day before yesterday, "The impression has deepened on my mind that Mr. Fairchild is a guilty man."

Having now replied to your letter, I cannot consent that you should write to me again in a similar temper and strain. Neither can I spend time to discuss your case with you. If you find it necessary to address a letter to me, I have to ask that you will send with it a very brief note, informing me of your purpose in the letter, so that I may decide whether to read the letter or to return it unopened.

Should I now tell you that notwithstanding all that I have said, I still feel interested in you, and then proceed to show it, I have no doubt you would affect to pervert what I should say as you have done with my letter from Marblehead. The poor satisfaction of being justified in my convictions and testimony has not occurred to me in my kind endeavors for your best good. There will be so many others whose opinions and conduct would be justified by your repentance and confession, that I could hardly hope for any preëminence in such a reward.*

at Exeter, and says that "he only helped her through the crowd across the street," it will then be time enough to adduce the proof. But we presume that he will not deny it. Why should he? It is certainly no disgrace to any gentleman to walk arm in arm with a lady whom he deems "innocent and injured." Such gallantry is more generally considered an honor than a disgrace.

* When Mr. A. says that "there will be so many others whose opinions and conduct would be justified by Mr. F.'s repentance and confession," we think he must refer particularly to the deacons. For surely he cannot mean the Davidsons who proved themselves such barefaced liars before the Court. Nor can he mean the Dunhams. And what have the deacons done to deserve so much of his sympathy and concern? We will tell him in part; for to tell the whole would require a volume, rather than a single note. We need not notice the watching scene so graphically described in Mr. F.'s pamphlet,—nor the outrageous attack made on him by one of the deacons with his tongue in the public highway,—nor the private agreement made by the deacons with Mr. F. (after having affirmed to them his innocence,) to resign his office on their solemn promise to say nothing to his injury,—nor the letters of high recommendation which they

I can never forget some things in our past intercourse of a pleasant nature. When I was young in the ministry, you once invited me to preach at your protracted meeting; "for, they tell me," you added, "that you preach a good deal about the love of God." I was not aware of doing so; but the remark encouraged me to think more of that theme in preaching.

permitted the Church and the dismissing Council to give him, when all the while they regarded him as a knave and a hypocrite, thus allowing him to go forth as "a wolf in sheep's clothing," to kill and devour some innocent flock,—nor the scurrilous letters and circulars sent to Exeter by "Epaphroditus," in which special reference was made to the deacons for information,—nor the frequent interviews between them and the Dunhams about that time,—nor their treatment of Mr. F. and the spirit they manifested when they had made it necessary for him to meet them and answer to their charges before the Board of Referees, which he did most successfully and triumphantly,—nor the attachment, (which was advised by one of them,) levied on Mr. F.'s house for a debt which he never owed, and which no one attempted to prove before the court where he was summoned to appear, but which cost him nearly one hundred dollars, through sheer malice. With most of these matters Mr. A. is perfectly familiar. But we wish to state to him some other things equally important, and which have been *proved* either at the Council or the Court. It has been *proved* that soon after Mr. F.'s acquittal by the Referees, Deacon Drake called *three* times on Mr. Shailer at Brookline, and gave him the first intimation that Mr. F. was the guilty man, and then plainly insinuated to Mr. S. that if the charge were not brought against Mr. F., he himself would probably be involved in the affair; and thus prevailed on Mr. S. to go to Taunton where the girl was then residing. It has been *proved* that she there signed a paper containing grave charges against Mr. F. on condition of the payment of five hundred dollars. It has been *proved* that such payment was promised, and a written obligation given accordingly. Mr. Robbins, the gentleman with whom she resided, testified before the Court, that Rhoda said to him, "they give me as much agin as Mr. Fairchild." She told him further that "the deacons of South Boston had secured the money to her, provided she secured a conviction of Mr. Fairchild." Deacon Vinton acknowledged, in the counting-room of Messrs. Hayward and Morse, that *he* had signed a paper agreeing to pay a certain sum of money on the final conviction of Mr. F. And on the 29th page of what is called "the Deacon's Book," we find the form of the obligation which, the book says, Deacon Vinton had signed, and several other individuals, though their names are not mentioned. Now look at this picture! Read their obligation! We will here quote it literally. "Boston, June 7th, 1844. We, whose names are hereunto subscribed, do covenant and agree to pay annually in the month of October, the first payment to be made next October, for the term of ten years from the date hereof to"—[they ought to have printed the name,] "in trust for the maintenance of a child born in September, 1842, of Miss Rhoda Davidson, formerly of Newcastle, Maine, the sums set against our names respectively, provided, nevertheless, that when the sum of five hundred dollars shall have been paid, that the payments shall cease, and provided also, that if the father of said child shall be ascertained, and an equal amount obtained from him, that this obligation shall be void." Here it is, *verbatim et literatim*. But alas for the signers! "the father of said child could not be ascertained." And no wonder; for it was in evidence before the Court that she had said that "it would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to tell who the father was." And so their obligation is binding on them to pay fifty dollars a year for ten years. And old Mr. Davidson comes regularly to Boston, as we are informed, every October, for the annual instalment. What a shrewd bargain the girl made with the deacons! She fairly outwitted them. Though one of them is very keen in his bargains, yet we do not believe that he often doubles his money. How were the biters bitten! And yet these men would doubtless have the world believe that there was no attempt to influence the girl by money in this matter, or any exhibition of hatred and ill-will towards Mr. F., but that it was all done to purify the Church, and possibly to show the superabundance of their benevolence and compassion in maintaining a poor illegitimate child; and that they would have been equally ready to pay five hundred dollars on condition that the girl would publicly accuse Mr. S., especially if they had seen the initials W. H. S. on Rhoda's pincushion. This might possibly have been as convincing evidence to their minds as the paying of hushmoney. But however this may be, they have assumed the burden and they must bear it seven years longer; and it *may* not be taken off even then. More than one man has paid hushmoney, and more than one Haman has been hung on his own gallows. How true is this text: "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness, and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong"!

It is worthy of remark, that the deacons sent a paper to the Council at Exeter, remonstrating against their hearing any thing which Mr. F. might state to that body touching their treatment of him in relation to the matter then before them, because they had

I recollect how interested I felt in you when you were in the controversy respecting Theodore Parker. I went over to your house one evening on purpose to speak a cheering word to you at the door; but you heard my voice, came down, and drew me in by the hand, and saying "Brother Adams, I was never so glad to see any body in all my life." I remember how we counselled together, and ate those fine large strawberries from your garden.

I have not forgotten the gratitude you expressed, and the affectionate message you brought me from Mrs. F. on account of my remembering you in my prayer at the close of Mr. Patton's ordination.

I remember how earnestly I undertook the preparation for the meeting of the Referees, and how happy I felt that I was able to rely on your word alone in opposition to strong circumstantial evidence against you.*

You never said or did any thing to me to make me your enemy. Yet in view of all our past acquaintance have you brought yourself to accuse me of wishing to sacrifice you to justify myself. No! you do not believe this, though you have brought yourself into such straits that it seems necessary to say it. Why then have I turned against you? I stood by you with unfaltering confidence till I read your letter to Rhoda Davidson. That was the flash and the bolt which consumed my spirits. The effect of it has never been re-

had no conversation with the principal witnesses in the case. Among other reasons which they assign, the following is one: "Because we think it irrelevant to the case in hearing, which we understand to relate to charges brought by Rhoda Davidson, *with which we do not consider ourselves connected.*" Yes, this is their very language, and signed by their own proper names; and the only published paper, relating to this matter, to which they have ever ventured to append their names. They here tell the Council that they had no connection with the charges then in hearing, when the obligation quoted above, to pay fifty dollars a year for ten years, had been signed six weeks before, and when the girl herself had told Mr. Robbins that "she had as much agin money secured to her by the deacons, provided she secured a conviction of Mr. F." The girl also testified before the Council that "they wanted her to reveal, because it would throw light on the subject, and cause people not to think so hard of the deacons of the Church at South Boston, who were suspicious of Mr. F. upon some other affairs."

And yet Mr. Adams is so anxious to bring Mr. F. to repentance and confession in order to "justify the opinions and conduct" of these men, that he is willing himself to forego all "hope of any preëminence in such a reward." He seems to regard them as very pious and holy men, deserving not only his own sympathy and confidence, but the sympathy and confidence of all the Orthodox pastors and churches in Boston; while the Payson Church must be cast out as loathsome to all decent people, because her members sustain Mr. F. as their pastor, and refuse to submit to Mr. A.'s dictation. But let him take his own course. If he has not had rope enough yet, let him take more. Let him go back *again*, as he has done *once*, thirty years into Mr. F.'s *private* life to seek for something against him, and then, after having descended to such meanness, let him throw himself back upon his own dignity, as he affected to do in refusing to open Mr. F.'s letter, but would not return it. And if he will further seek to exclude *us* from the sisterhood of Churches, let him. If he *will* continue to sympathize with those deacons, let him. And let him sustain them, if he can. But let him not think to do it by crushing us and our pastor. Why, if he could *prove* that "there is more guilt resting on Mr. F.'s head, than on the head of any man in Boston," it would not remove one particle of the stain which adheres to their garments. If he could get him ever so low into the ditch, those men would still be undermost. We are affected to think that ministers and deacons of the Church of Christ should do such things, and that any godly pastors and laymen should sustain them in it. O what cause for humiliation, and shame, and grief, and tears! Only let a few deacons, and Dunhams, and clergymen pounce upon Mr. A. as they have upon Mr. F., and what would become of him! And we may add, what would become of *any* minister?

* This is the very man who said, in view of all the evidence, "there is not the shadow of a shade against Brother Fairchild." Now he can speak of the "strong circumstantial evidence against him!" Consistency, thou art indeed a jewel.

moved.* Many things have confirmed it. And now, if you are guilty you will not,—you cannot wonder at my opposition. You respect me more than you do those who continue to be deceived by you.

If you wish to know why I write in a strain of agreeable recollections to one of whom I have such an opinion as I now possess, you have the reason in the remark you made to me about the love of God. Such are my views of the infinite kindness and love of God in Jesus Christ, that I can fancy you in this world, and ere long saying in view of the deepest guilt,

“His blood can make the foulest clean,
His blood availed for me.”

I often have very tender feelings towards you as I pass over the South Bridge. What a “bridge of sighs” to you! I never shall forget how old Mr. Davidson looked when he had said before the Association, “I told him he admitted to Mrs. E. that he had had criminal intercourse with my daughter,” and some one asked him what you said, and he said, “I looked him in the face, but he looked away and walked on, and said, however that may be, I am in your power.” I never can forget the impression made by the narrative, that you must then have had deep agony of soul, for which I can never feel any thing but the strongest compassion.† With all my compassion and tenderness

* We would here remind the reader that that letter was put into Mr. A’s hands about the middle of June. On the 27th of July he wrote his Marblehead letter, so full of sympathy and brotherly love. And yet *five weeks before* he penned that letter, he had received “the flash and the bolt which consumed his spirits, and the effect of which had never been removed.” After *such* a flash, and *such* a bolt, producing *such* an effect, we will leave it to him to reconcile the writing of *such* a letter, with the piety, candor, and sincerity which ought to characterize every minister of the Gospel. But after all, was *that* “the flash and the bolt” which had so curdled Mr. A’s milk of human kindness? Was it not rather some after-clap? for more than four months after reading that letter he declared that his pulpit should be opened to Mr. F., in case of his acquittal before a civil tribunal. We would also state that that letter was published in one of the penny papers, some weeks before Mr. F’s trial at Exeter. And when the publishing of that letter was spoken of in the Council, Mr. A. said, “When I learned that the letter had been given to the public, I regarded the act as a felony.” Who gave it to the public? We do not know. But we *do* know that the letter was entrusted to the care of Deacon Drake. Whether *he* committed the act which Mr. A. regarded as a felony, we presume not to say.

† At an earlier stage of these proceedings we should have been utterly amazed that Mr. A. should have referred to this old man’s testimony before the Association. But *now* we wonder at nothing. He must have known that the same testimony which old Mr. Davidson gave before the Association, he gave in Court; and that it was there totally destroyed. His statement to the Association was got up for the occasion, he having in his eye the “as much agin money” which had been promised “on condition of Mr. F’s final conviction.” This is evident from the testimony of Mr. John Dodge before the Court,—a man held in high esteem by all who know him, and whose very appearance and manner of testifying carried conviction to every one who heard him that he was telling the truth. To refresh Mr. A’s memory we will here subjoin the testimony of Mr. Dodge.

“Davidson told me in February 1843, about his visit to Boston. It was in my barn. He said if I would not name it, he would tell me how much he had made out of the Rhoda affair in Boston. He said he went first to Billerica, then to Boston, and then to see Mr. F. He said he told Mr. F., “my daughter Rhoda has got a child, and says it is yours.” Mr. F. said, “It can’t be so, I never had any intercourse with your daughter, and am wholly an innocent man. Mr. F. said too that Rhoda came to him and wanted money, and wanted to go home; but he told her that he was poor, going on a journey, and she must go to somebody who was better able; and that then Rhoda wanted to see Mr. F. alone. She did so, and said, “Mr. F., I am going to have a child; and if you don’t let me have it, I’ll swear it on you.” Mr. F. then said he told her he was a poor man,—that the charge would ruin his family, and he had rather pay money than be accused. She demanded the money and he agreed to pay one hundred dollars then, and one hundred within a year; and though the time had not come for the second sum, he would try and raise it, provided it could be kept a secret. The money was paid. Then old Mr. Davidson said to Mr. F., “You have now settled with my daughter. You must now settle with me.” Mr. F. said, “This is *hard*, this is

for you, I am thoroughly convinced of your consummate wickedness, but with all those convictions I have preached, and trust I have felt too much of the love and mercy of God to despair of your recovery and forgiveness. Hence my letter from Marblehead and this part of the present letter. If there is ever any change in your feelings and determination, you will find me the same firm and faithful friend as ever. I will add, at the risk of being charged with inconsistency, and against all my convictions, if you are innocent, maintain a humble, quiet, steady course of labor for the good of souls and leave yourself to God. "For remember, I pray thee, who ever perished being innocent, or where were the righteous cut off?" *

unjust, this is cruel; I am an innocent man; but I had rather pay the money than be ruined; but I am innocent." Said Davidson, "Whether you are innocent or guilty makes no difference. It shall be laid on you if you do not come to my terms." Mr. F., after protesting his innocence again, agreed to pay three hundred dollars in yearly payments. Davidson closed by saying that Mr. F. was a nice man, a true gentleman, and he believed him a humble Christian. I am a member of the Congregational Church."

Here then is the story, and the true story. It was told to Mr. Dodge in confidence, when the old man had no possible motive to falsify the truth. And this agrees essentially with the account which Mr. F. has given of the affair from the beginning. How it looks to see Mr. Adams, rather than admit that he had been gulled, quoting this old man's testimony before the Association to justify his "impressions" of Mr. F.,—and quoting it twelve months after the same testimony in Court had been utterly demolished, not only by Mr. Dodge, but also by several other witnesses equally credible, and who had heard him make similar statements to them! And yet Mr. A. gravely tells Mr. F. that "he can never forget the impression" (what a man for impressions!) "made by the narrative,"—an impression so deep that "he can never feel any thing for Mr. F. but the strongest compassion." Oh, "*the bridge of sighs!*" And we would here ask, without designing to give offence to any, whether that old man's testimony ought not to prove "a bridge of sighs" to those who used it for the purpose of expelling Mr. F. from the Association?

* Does Mr. Adams mean to say that the innocent have *never* perished, and that the righteous were *never* cut off? It is indeed true that the innocent have never perished, and the righteous were never cut off, if those who cut them off and caused them to perish are suitable judges in the case; for they never deem their victims either innocent or righteous, but always wicked and guilty. Were not Christ, and his apostles, and a multitude of martyrs, "of whom the world was not worthy," innocent and righteous? And yet they were cut off. And in later times, has not many a man been imprisoned and even executed upon the gallows, who was entirely innocent of the crimes for which he suffered?

But we thank Mr. A. for this quotation. It was taken from the book of Job; and we should like to turn his attention to some things in Job's history as bearing a strong resemblance to some things in Mr. F's. It seems that Job had three friends who came to sympathize with him in his troubles; which reminds us of Mr. F's three friends who went to Exeter. Job's friends "sat down with him seven days and seven nights, and none spake a word unto him; for they saw that his grief was great." But the Council at Exeter had hardly been in session *seven minutes*, before one of Mr. F's friends told them in effect, "that if they did not put him down, he would be a millstone about their necks." The friends of Job had previously made up their minds against him. Before they went to sympathize with him, they believed him a hypocrite and guilty of the most "consummate wickedness," just as did Mr. F's friends. The first who spake, after their long silence, was Eliphaz the Temanite, in the language quoted by Mr. A., "Remember, I pray thee, who ever perished, being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off?" We will add another quotation from his speech; for he was evidently "testifying to his impressions." "They that plough iniquity and sow wickedness, reap the same. By the blast of God they perish, and by the breath of his nostrils are they consumed." Thus we see how the mind of Eliphaz was warped by his previous presumption of Job's guilt. Then Bildad the Shuite addresses him in much the same strain. He tells him that "he is a hypocrite,"—that "his hope shall be cut off,"—and that "his trust shall be a spider's web." Then stood up Zophar the Naamathite and said, "Should not a multitude of words be answered? and should a man full of talk be justified? Should thy lies make men hold their peace? know thou that God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth."

No wonder that poor Job, in the presence of such friends, appeared strange, and made an unfavorable impression on their minds. He knew that he was not the man they took him to be. But all his solemn asseverations of innocence did not "remove their first impres-

I may wish, for my own justification hereafter, to have a copy of my letter from Marblehead. If you will send it to me through the Post Office, I will copy it with your permission, and return it immediately. That letter was bathed in prayers and tears. I begin to hope that it may be the occasion, if not the means, of great joy to both of us. If you wish to know what I would advise you to do, I will, in the same confidential manner in which I have written this, and without the knowledge of any one, with deep interest and kindness, inform you. In the mean time, I am, with the utmost benevolence and kindness,

Your friend,

N. A.

P. S. I shall not interpret your silence at this reply unfavorably to you. I say this, because, if you are not prepared to intimate any change in your feelings, I should prefer not to spend any more time in a correspondence, and will consider your silence as a mere regard to my wishes.

To this letter Mr. F. returned the following brief reply:—

Boston, May 12, 1846.

My Dear Sir: Inclosed I send you a copy of your letter dated Marblehead, July 27, 1844. Your request that I would send the original to you through the Post Office, I could not comply with, because letters thus sent are sometimes lost; and I felt quite unwilling to expose your letter to such a hazard.

If you inferred from the manner in which I directed my last letter to you, that I designed it for your eye alone, you mistook my object. You will recollect that on the inside wrapper I wrote "to be *opened* by no one but Mr. Adams." I wished you to be the *first* to read it, expecting that *after* you had read it, you would make what use of it you pleased. And that liberty you still have.

I presume you did not expect me to make any reply to your last letter. I think that no man, unless lost to all self-respect, would ever take up his pen to reply *privately* to *such* a communication.

If you, in conjunction with those who have, for years, been my bitter enemies and persecutors, see fit to make another demonstration against me, I trust in God that I shall be able to meet it as successfully as I did the others. And I feel truly thankful for those weapons of defence which, in such an event, your letters will furnish. The world will then have an opportunity to judge who has been most injured by his own writings, you or myself. Till then, I shall endeavor, (as I have endeavored from the beginning,) to do as you advise—"maintain a humble, quiet, steady course of labor for the good of souls, and leave myself to God." And if you choose to make any further attempts to annoy and hinder me in this good work, on *you* be the responsibility.

Yours, in great kindness,

REV. N. ADAMS.

J. H. FAIRCHILD.

sions." At first he was as meek as a lamb, and as plaintive as a dove. But at length he grew restive and impatient under their false charges and pious cant, and addressed them in language so indignant and sarcastic, as made them quake and quail, and blush for very shame. He exclaims, "My brethren have dealt deceitfully as a brook, and as the stream of brooks they pass away. Ye dig a pit for your friend. Ye are forgers of lies. No doubt ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you. But I have understanding as well as you. I am not inferior to you. Miserable comforters are ye all. If your soul were in my soul's stead, I would heap up words against you, and shake my head at you. Suffer me that I may speak; and after that I have spoken,—mock on." What withering irony! What biting sarcasm!

Now Mr. Adams thinks that Mr. F. cannot be a good man because he has shown such a spirit and temper in his writings. But would he cast Job out of the pale of his charity, because *he* exhibited such a spirit and temper when replying to *his* sympathizing friends? Whatever Mr. A's opinion may be, we believe that Job was a good man, notwithstanding he addressed his three friends in such burning words of indignation. And we have not yet discovered any thing in Mr. F's spirit and temper which forbids us to indulge the same belief respecting him.

It seems that Mr. Adams was quite willing to assume the responsibility of annoying Mr. F. in "his labor for the good of souls." At a meeting of Mr. A.'s Church early in March, it was voted, we are told, by twenty-seven yeas and twenty-one nays, to defer acting till October, on an application then before them by a gentleman and his wife, for a letter of dismissal from them and recommendation to us. Soon after this meeting, Mr. A. called on the lady, who expressed to him her disapprobation of the course taken by him in opposing the granting of the usual letter to herself and husband. She well knew, and so did Mr. A., that both the *rules* and the *covenant* of that Church *required* the granting of letters in the usual form, to any members in good standing, who might wish to unite with a sister Church. This she claimed as a right, it being one of the conditions on which she originally connected herself with that Church. In justification of his course, he intimated to her the probability that before October Mr. F. would be proved to be as bad a man as any one had ever supposed him to be; and asked her whether, if this should be the case, she would not be thankful that the Church had not granted the letter? From this conversation, the inference was plain that a portion of the seven months was to be improved in searching after some new evidence to prove Mr. F. a bad man. Mr. F. himself supposed that this was to be the plan of operation. He, however, said nothing; but attended diligently to his appropriate duties, and endeavored to "maintain a humble, quiet, steady course of labor for the good of souls, and leave himself to God." He heard nothing more of what was going on till early in September, when a kind Providence disclosed to him a most singular, and we must say, contemptible transaction. A respectable female member of the First Church in Exeter, was on a visit last August to some relatives in Pittston, Maine. An aged and worthy lady with whom she spent a part of her time, remarked to her that she had recently received two letters from Rev. N. Adams of Boston, making inquiries about the moral character of Mr. Fairchild. She handed her the letters which she read, and stated to her the substance of the replies which she made to Mr. A. This lady, on her return to Exeter, mentioned the circumstance to some friends of Mr. F., and one of them notified him by letter. On consultation, it was deemed advisable that some one should go to Pittston and ascertain the particulars more definitely from the lady herself. Accordingly, a friend of Mr. F. went to Pittston and had an interview with the lady, and found that what had been stated to him by the lady from Exeter was indeed true. After his return he sent Mr. F. the following statement:—

EXETER, N. H., Oct. 5, 1846.

I hereby certify that I was at Pittston, in the County of Kennebeck and State of Maine, on the first day of October this present year, and that I then called upon Mrs. J., widow of the late E. J., formerly of said Pittston, for the purpose of obtaining some information relative to a correspondence which I understood had passed between her and the Rev. Nehemiah Adams, of Boston, relating to the Rev. J. H. Fairchild.

Mrs. J. informed me that she was wholly unacquainted with Mr. Adams; but that soon after her return from a visit in Connecticut, which was about the 15th of June last, she received a note from Mr. Adams, saying that he wrote her by the advice of a mutual friend, for information relative to the conduct of Mr. Fairchild and a Miss P. of Connecticut. He stated that he presumed she did not doubt that Mr. Fairchild was a bad man, and that he thought it a duty which she owed to the cause of Christ to expose him. He promised to keep her name a secret if she would communicate all she knew of him, and assured her that no harm should be done her.

Mrs. J. says she replied to this letter and stated to Mr. Adams that she knew Mr. Fairchild when he was a young man keeping school in Connecticut, and that he paid some attention to a Miss P. who was a niece or cousin of hers, and that she was one of his scholars; but that she never heard that he was engaged to her, or that he intended to marry her, and that she never knew or heard of any impropriety on the part of either of them, and that the character of both of them stood high and above suspicion; or in words to that effect. She said she also requested Mr. Adams to give her the name of the *mutual friend spoken of by him*.

Mrs. J. says that Mr. Adams replied to her letter, and that he stated he still thought she knew something against Mr. Fairchild, and that he thought it her duty not to with-

hold what she knew about him, and set forth some reasons, (which I have now forgotten,) why she ought to expose him; but he did not give her the name of the *mutual friend*.

Mrs. J. replied to this letter, as she says, and referred him to her first letter as containing the whole truth relative to all she ever knew or heard respecting Mr. Fairchild and Miss P.; and here, she says, the correspondence ceased.

Mrs. J. stated to me that at the time she knew Mr. Fairchild, she should think he was about twenty-two years of age, and that he was unmarried,—that she never, from the time she first saw him to the time she received Mr. Adams' letter, heard of any suspicion or rumor of any impropriety, either on the part of Mr. F. or Miss P., and that if there had been any thing of the kind, she should *certainly* have known it. She also stated that Miss P. was still living, and that her character was now, as it ever had been, above reproach or suspicion. She further stated that Mr. Adams might write to Connecticut for information respecting them for five hundred years, and yet he would find nothing against the character of either. She appeared to be surprised that a *mutual friend* should have ever put Mr. Adams upon such a false track, and she exhibited the greatest anxiety to know *who he could be*.

ISAAC L. FOLSOM.

Now what shall we say of this transaction! We dare not trust ourselves to speak of it in such terms as our feelings would dictate. Can this statement be true? We could wish, for the sake of humanity as well as the ministry, that it were not true. But the respectable character and standing of those on whose authority the statement is made, forbid us to entertain a doubt of its truth, at least as to all its essential particulars. If Mr. A. denies it, then let him produce a certified copy of the correspondence. The public will then see whether the matter has been stated correctly. Till that be done, we are forced to believe, however reluctantly, that such letters have been written. Had we been told three years ago that Mr. Adams could ever have written *such* letters and for *such a purpose*, we should have pronounced it utterly impossible. "Was the Spirit of all grace breathing upon him" when writing those letters? We should judge that he was under the influence of another and quite a different spirit. And yet this is the man who gravely tells Mr. F. that "his writings are his worst enemies;" that he could wish him no greater evil than that he should continue writing as he has done; and that his book has destroyed him!" Had he written any thing like these Pittston letters, we should indeed think that his destruction, as a clergyman, was certain. We can bear with many failings in a minister of the Gospel, because we know that, like ourselves, he is only a man, and subject to imprudencies and indiscretions, like other men. But when he descends from his high and dignified station to do an act of meanness, especially for the purpose of bringing reproach and disgrace upon a brother clergyman who never wronged or injured him, our respect for such a minister and our confidence in him are gone. And if Mr. A. could prove that Mr. F. had done such an act in reference to him, or any human being, others might sit under his ministry if they chose, without any annoyance from us; but for ourselves we should pray to be excused. He certainly could no longer preach to *our* edification or comfort.

Only think of it! If Mr. A. had written such letters to get information against Mr. F. *before his trial*, that would have been bad enough, though there might have been some shadow of excuse for him. But to do it sixteen months after his trial and acquittal, and when he had been laboring among us as our pastor with fidelity and success for nearly a year, strikes us as such an outrage upon every rule of propriety as well as the spirit of the Gospel, that we are ready to weep over the man, and to say, in the language quoted by him in his letter to Mr. F.—"Alas! my brother!" It is somewhere stated, if we remember correctly, in the writings of Dr. Hopkins, formerly of Newport, but now in heaven, (referring to cases of discipline in the Church,) that whenever a brother finds in his bosom a secret wish or desire that an accused member should be proved guilty rather than innocent, he ought at once to distrust the purity of his motives, and to conclude that his feelings are not those of a Christian. And who does not admit the correctness of this sentiment? But

can any one suppose that Mr. A. was more anxious to prove Mr. F. innocent than guilty, when he wrote those letters to Pittston? Let the letters themselves answer the question.

Think, too, of the period in Mr. F.'s history about which Mr. A. sought information—*thirty-three years ago—three years before his ordination!* Why, the law says that no man shall be tried for such charges as have been preferred against Mr. F., after the expiration of six years. And this is a just, as well as a merciful provision of law; for witnesses may die, or facts may be forgotten, so that the most innocent man living might be ruined in his reputation, in spite of all his efforts to save himself. But Mr. A. goes back not six years only, but more than five times six. And what does he find? Nothing. The lady knows no ill of Mr. F. And after she tells him so, he writes again, and in effect tells her that she is mistaken—that she *must* know something against him, and that she “owes it to the cause of Christ to expose him.” But he does not give her, as she requested, *the name of the mutual friend* who advised him to write. We wonder who this friend is.

Does Mr. A. say that he was actuated in all this by the purest of motives,—that he had “impressions” that Mr. F. was a bad man, and that the glory of God and the good of the Church demanded his exposure? Doubtless those who led John Rogers to the stake, said and felt the same. Those who kindled the flames which were to consume him, unquestionably believed that they were doing God service, because, in their judgment, Christ would be dishonored if they allowed such a vile heretic to live. And this was not the work of the lawless rabble, but sanctioned by the high dignitaries of the Church. The glory of God and the good of the Church has been the plea of all persecutors from the beginning. Their work of ruin has always been undertaken and carried on under this plea.

Mr. F. wishes us here to state that about the time of his trial before the Referees, he mentioned to Mr. A. that the deacons were going to adduce evidence against him for something alleged to have taken place ten or twelve years ago. “What!” exclaimed Mr. Adams, “do those men think that the day of judgment has come, when a man’s whole life is to be reviewed, and that they themselves are the appointed judges?” But it would seem that since he has taken the judge’s bench, he thinks it proper for him to go back *thirty-three years*, to find matter why sentence of condemnation should be passed upon Mr. F.

We would here ask Mr. A., in all kindness, whether he received it in charge at his ordination, to treat a brother minister in this manner? Was this enjoined upon him as part of the duties of his sacred office? And as he has himself become somewhat noted of late for his charges, we ask him whether, in the next charge he may give, he would tell the candidate that if he have “impressions” that a brother minister is a bad man, he must be so zealous for the purity of the ministry, as not only to testify to his “impressions” against him, but if he fail to procure his conviction by so doing, and a jury of his countrymen acquit him, he must then not submit to the law, but try to banish him from the pulpit by writing private letters to make inquiries whether there was not some stain upon his character before he entered the ministry, especially if he has been in the ministry more than thirty years, only giving (by way of parenthesis,) the assurance that the name of the person to whom he writes shall be kept a secret, and no harm shall be done him. Who would not be shocked at hearing such a charge? But if it be shocking to hear it, would it not be still more shocking to have it carried into practice?

Mrs. Fairchild has also stated to us that during the progress of the trial at Exeter, and the same evening on which Mr. Adams had been testifying to his impressions before the Council, he said to her when alone, “Well, you have one thing left to comfort you yet. If your husband lives through this, you need never be afraid of any thing else hurting him as long as he *does* live; for it won’t be in any body’s power to do it.” Mrs. F. further states that the next

morning she sent Mr. A. a note, requesting him to call before he left Exeter and when he came she immediately alluded to the note she had sent him; to which he replied, "I was coming in if you had not sent for me!" And soon after her husband entered the parlor he said to him, "Brother Adams! how could you have so misapprehended me as to have testified as you did last night?" He replied, "Well, I think I hurt myself more by what I said than I did you, and I think that what you said when you supposed yourself to be dying ought to be set off against it. And I have come in this morning to tell you to take courage. They have now got to the bottom of the well; and if they don't condemn you now, you will stand higher than you ever did. And if they should condemn you, don't despond; for if you are innocent, God will yet make a way for it to appear." And after saying some other consolatory and encouraging things, he went immediately to Marblehead, and that very day wrote his letter urging Mr. F. to go before the Council and make a confession!!—urging him to confess himself a liar and a hypocrite!!! How consoling must this letter have been to Mr. and Mrs. F., from whom he had just taken his leave with such kind and gracious words of encouragement!

It seems that Mr. A. was not satisfied with going "to the bottom of the well," but he must afterwards ascend and peep carefully between the stones and into the crevices to see if some filth had not been left behind which had escaped the notice of the Council and the jury. For, be it remembered, that the Council did not dare to vote that Mr. F. was guilty, but simply suspended him from the ministry "till he should present a clearer vindication of himself before some tribunal more competent than themselves to compel the attendance of witnesses, and the utterance of all the truth." And when he came before that more competent tribunal, his prosecutors did not produce evidence enough, as the Courier justly remarked, "to hang a dog upon."

Now suppose Mr. Adams had obtained from the lady at Pittston the desired information? Suppose she had made some "awful disclosures" respecting Mr. F. when he was in college, "thirty-three years ago." What possible use could he have made of it? He had promised that "her name should be kept a secret, and no harm should be done her." How did he expect to use her testimony without disclosing her name, and thus violating his solemn pledge and promise? Or did he intend to use it in his Church meeting, to prevent them from granting letters to their members who wished to join us, as he did the very valuable information which he thought he had obtained from a letter addressed to his friend, Deacon Drake, by Mr. Patton? In our opinion any information obtained against Mr. F. from any quarter whatever by such means, while it might have weight with those who already believed him guilty and wished to prove him so, would have a directly contrary effect on all candid and unprejudiced minds. And we do think that the individual who should give information unfavorable to another in reply to such insidious letters, and *especially* the man who could descend so low as to write such letters, ought to be ashamed of themselves, and henceforth be "girded with sackcloth and sit in ashes." If such conduct be tolerated, no man in the community is safe. If such means are to be made available in destroying a man, there is not a clergyman in the land, who has preached thirty years, though as pure and upright as Paul, whose reputation and influence might not be utterly ruined. Let him be made the victim of such influences and efforts to destroy him, and we venture to predict that he would deeply sympathize with Mr. F., and weep over his sorrows and pity him for his injuries. And his tears would not be like those which Mr. A. promised to shed over him whether he stood or fell,—whether he was proved innocent or guilty.

But we have something more to say about that astounding information which came through Mr. Patton to Deacon Drake, from on ship-board; (for they seem to have compassed sea and land to make proselytes to their party against Mr. F.) When the deacon showed that letter to Mr. Adams, he must have

known that it was the same old story newly vampt up, which he had circulated in South Boston years ago, and which he must, we think, have ascertained to be false, as others had done, by getting the opinion of Mr. F.'s physician. For had he not been made acquainted with its falsity, no one who knows the bitterness of his feelings towards Mr. F., can believe that he would have permitted it to slumber so long, when he might have used it, if true, with complete success in destroying Mr. F.* But there was an end to be gained when that letter was shown to Mr. Adams. In a short time Mr. A.'s Church were to act on the application for a letter of dismissal to our Church, which had been postponed for seven months. He probably foresaw that if Mr. A. would state to his Church that he had seen such a letter, no vote could be obtained in favor of the application then pending. And Mr. A. did make the statement; and had he not made it, and some other statements equally groundless, there is little doubt but that the letter would have been granted; for even after his statements, as we have been told, nineteen voted for it, and twenty-six against it, while several of the brethren who designed to have voted for it, were so confused by what he said, that they did not see their way clear to vote at all.

And by whom was that letter written? By young Mr. Patton of Hartford;—by the same man who went before the Council at Exeter, and stated voluntarily and unasked, in order to convict Mr. F. of falsehood, that the Phillips Church contained one hundred and two male members, and repeated the statement, when there was only about one half of that number who were then residents in this place, or who took any part in their business transactions;—the same man who afterwards reported to the world, through the New York Evangelist, that the Council that installed Mr. F. over the Payson Church, sat with closed doors, when the young man himself was present to witness all their doings from beginning to end, and who must have known that if the Committee had designed *permanently* to exclude any one, he would have been the first to be excluded, as being, of all others, the most offensive. Yes, this young man wrote the letter to Deacon Drake. What an employment for a preacher of that Gospel which enjoins charity, peace, and good-will to men!—thus attempting to destroy the reputation of a clergyman who had never wronged him, and who had been laboring successfully in the ministry many years before he was in his nurse's arms! Mr. Adams intimated to his Church, we are told, that this letter would soon be published. We have not yet seen it. But we now call for its publication. And we hereby give assurance to Mr. A. and Deacon Drake that no civil prosecution shall be commenced against them for publishing it, nor against its author. We desire its publication that Dr. Hayward may have a suitable opportunity of telling the world the whole truth about the matter, (as Mr. F. has done on the 68th page of his pamphlet,) that he may thus nail the story, as base coin, to the counter, and show up the men who have been engaged in the disgraceful business of giving it circulation. But perhaps Mr. A.'s recent interview with the Dr. has led him to conclude that it is most prudent to suppress its publication. But has he yet retracted what he said to his Church about that letter? If so, we have not been informed of it. Probably, like the deacons, he takes nothing back, but justifies himself in all that he has done.†

* We would here ask the deacon whether he has forgotten the call which he made on a certain Apothecary in Washington Street near State Street, soon after Mr. F. came to Boston and delivered himself up for trial? Does he recollect how unbelieving he was when the gentleman assured him that he had never sold Mr. F. any medicine of a suspicious character, and how he threatened to bring him upon the stand where he would be *compelled* to tell all he knew? We should think that the result of that interview would have cooled down the deacon's heat to a degree lower than zero. But we find it rising again to the boiling point, as soon as he received Mr. Patton's letter. How disgraceful is such conduct to any man, but especially to an officer in a Christian church!

† Since writing the above, a copy of Mr. Patton's letter has been put into our hands. We are now more anxious than ever that Deacon Drake should publish it. And we

We have now shown to the public the course which Mr. A. has seen fit to pursue in reference to Mr. F. A most painful task we confess; but one which, as it seemed to us, Christian duty imperiously demanded at our hands. Let us briefly state the case. Mr. Adams first receives impressions unfavorable to Mr. F. because he was silent when Mr. A. questioned him as to his innocence or guilt, at a time, when he was on the borders of derangement, and became a raving maniac in less than eighteen hours afterwards, and when, the morning preceding the one on which he questioned him, Mr. A. had read the papers containing the charges against him in the presence of the former Board of Referees, and then asked him whether those charges were true or false; to which he replied, "They are a tissue of falsehood from beginning to end. I never touched the girl." Mr. A. then goes before the Grand Jury, and there testifies to his impressions, which doubtless procured the indictment; and who can wonder that they should have indicted him, after a clergyman of Mr. A.'s character and standing, had given his opinion that he was guilty? He then

renew the assurance that no civil prosecution shall be commenced against him for so doing, by us or our pastor. But we give him no such assurance, if he continues to show it *privately* to individuals. We advise him to cease at once from that plan of operation to injure Mr. F. Deacon Drake has no more right to put into the hands of others, or to read to them in private, a false and libellous letter, though written by another, than if it were written by himself. And we now tell him (and we know what we say,) that every time he shows that letter, or repeats its contents to another, he is guilty of "bearing false witness against his neighbor." We consent to its publication, because Dr. H. will then be called upon in justice to himself as well as to Mr. F., to point out its falsehoods, and tell the true story to the world, as he has already told it to many persons who have called on him for information.

But lest the deacon should not publish the letter, there are a few sentences which we will here quote, to show the reader how it was to be used. "Will you please show this letter to Rev. N. Adams, as it will save me the trouble of writing to him." The gentleman, who gave us the copy of the letter, says that over the name of Mr. Adams there was pasted a piece of paper; but by holding it up to the light, he could distinctly read the name. Now we ask who concealed that name? We cannot believe that Deacon Drake would do it of his own accord; for he doubtless regards himself as encouraged and sustained in his conduct by Mr. A. Of course, he would naturally wish that every reader of the letter should know that so good a man as Mr. A. is reputed to be, is connected with him and Mr. Patton in their efforts to destroy Mr. F. The probability therefore is that Mr. A. gave directions to have his name concealed. And we do not wonder at this. We should think that he would be ashamed to have it known that he was one of such a trio. But alas! he must find something thicker than a piece of tissue paper to conceal his connection with those men. We are truly sorry that he should have fallen into such company. But we pity him less, because he joined them with his eyes open. He knew them well, and the object which they designed to accomplish; and it would seem that he has become their most efficient co-worker. What Christian can think of pastors and deacons engaged in such an employment, without weeping eyes and a bleeding heart! Truly, our eyes weep and our hearts bleed at the necessity which is upon us, to tell this story to the world, lest the enemies of Christianity should rejoice and triumph. But it is no fault of ours. We cannot consent to remain silent, when such unchristian attempts are made to ruin our pastor; especially after he has done all that a Christian could do, in private, to restrain those men from pursuing him any further, and henceforth to let him alone.

We will quote another sentence from Mr. P.'s letter. "I thought these things would interest you, and might, some way, be put to use. We must not despair." And truly, they were put to use. The letter was dated Oct. 12th, and on the 16th of the same month, Mr. A. makes use of it to open the eyes of his brethren, to Mr. F.'s "consummate wickedness," and to prevent them from voting to place any of their members under his pastoral care; though doubtless, had they requested to be placed under the pastoral care of Mr. Patton, or the guardianship of Deacon Drake, he would have granted the request with all readiness. And had any one suggested that they were not suitable persons to have the care of Church-members, he might possibly have defended, with much eloquence, their good Christian character as exhibited in their never "backbiting with their tongue" and never ceasing to manifest that "charity which thinketh no evil," which "covereth a multitude of sins," and "constraineth them to do to others, as they would that others should do to them."

"We must not despair." Despair of what? Why, of destroying a man who never

goes before the Council at Exeter and again testifies to his impressions, and is again successful. He then writes his Marblehead letter, urging Mr. F., with much eloquence and pathos, to go before the Council, and make a confession. He then tells Mr. H., as an inducement for Mr. F. to submit his case to the decision of a jury, that if he will come to Court and obtain an acquittal, his pulpit should be opened to him. He then advocates Mr. F.'s expulsion from the Association on the testimony of old Mr. Davidson; and there he is again successful. But he did not appear before the Court in Boston to testify, having doubtless learned that juries try men, not on *impressions*, but *facts*. Mr. F. was acquitted. But this did not satisfy Mr. A. He then opposes the formation of the Payson Church, because he was apprehensive that it was their design to invite Mr. F. to become their pastor. Not succeeding in this, he then gets up a remonstrance in order to prevent the Council from installing Mr. F. Failing in this attempt, he then opposes the granting of letters from his Church to ours, in which he has hitherto succeeded. And then he writes the Pittston letters, in which, according to Mr. Folsom's statement, he tells the lady "that he presumed she did not doubt that Mr. F. was a bad man, and that he thought it her duty to expose him, and promised to keep her name a secret, if she would communicate all she knew of him, and that no harm should be done her." And when she wrote him that she knew no ill of Mr. F., he writes her again, and tells her "that he still thought she knew something against him, and that it was her duty not to withhold what she knew." And then finally, on the 16th of last October, he comes out in the presence of his Church against Mr. F., without any civil or ecclesiastical right to do so, and intimates to them, among other injurious things, the awful disclosures which were made by one gentleman to another on ship-board at sea; but he omitted to state who showed him the letter containing this information, or the fact that the gentleman who was said

wronged them, by sending fresh daggers to his heart, and the hearts of his wife and children, merely because he will not confess himself "a liar and a hypocrite," to sustain them in their suspicions and "impressions," and to "justify their opinions and conduct." We know not how the good people of Hartford will feel when they are informed of this libellous letter written by their pastor. But perhaps they will excuse him and permit him to retain his pulpit, as he was permitted to retain his seat in the American Board, "on account of his extreme youth." We beg them to treat him with all possible lenity. We would recommend nothing more severe than a short residence with the beardless youth at Jericho. We think that even Mr. A. will not accuse us of showing "a bad spirit" in giving this advice.

In immediate connection with the last quotation, Mr. Patton says, "God will yet bring out the truth respecting Mr. Fairchild." This is precisely our opinion. And we believe that God will do it to the entire vindication of Mr. F., and to the utter shame and confusion of his enemies. A few more letters like this and those to Pittston, will do up the work completely. We believe that there is kind and Christian feeling enough in the community, and among all denominations, not to suffer a faithful minister of the Gospel to be put down by means so repugnant to the principles of Christianity, so fatal to domestic comfort and happiness, and so destructive to the well-being of society.

One more quotation, and we shall have done with Mr. P.'s letter for the present. "There seems to have been foul play somewhere." Yes, this is as true as the Gospel. *There has been foul play somewhere.* And we think, that the readers of this pamphlet will be at no loss to determine, who has had a hand in that foul game.

Here then we find Mr. Adams making use of the contents of that false and libellous letter in the presence of his Church, to convince them of the enormous guilt resting on Mr. F.'s head, and to deter them from recommending their members to fellowship with us. Instead of going directly to Dr. H. to ascertain whether those things were so, which he might have done in fifteen minutes, he proclaims them to his Church to accomplish a most unworthy purpose, and never goes near the Dr. till *after* he had gained his point. And having subsequently had an interview with the Dr. and ascertained his mistake, did he then go before his Church and take back what he had said? If so, that fact has not come to our knowledge. Mr. A. *suspects* Mr. F. of having violated the seventh commandment. We would ask Mr. A. whether the ninth commandment has not the same high sanction and authority as the seventh, and whether he thinks that no guilt is attached to a breach of it?

to have made the disclosures was one of the most respectable physicians in Boston, and then at home, ready to answer any inquiries which they might wish to make of him.*

Now in view of all these facts, who can blame Mr. F. for being aggrieved by such treatment, and making his grievances known to the public? We do think, that the most peaceful, pious, and conscientious members of our Churches will approve and applaud the course he has taken. They verily could not expect him to remain silent any longer under the gross calumnies which have been heaped upon him. And knowing as we did, the kind letters which Mr. F. had addressed to Mr. A. to induce him to change his course of conduct, and to settle their difficulties in a brotherly and Christian manner, but without success,—who can blame *us* for requesting him to permit us to publish this correspondence, or for connecting with it these notes and comments?

We have just read the result of the late Council that dismissed Mr. Storrs from the Harvard Church in Brookline. And as Mr. Adams has signed his name to that result as Moderator of the Council, we would direct his attention to a single clause, which it might be well for him to consider and inwardly digest. After an implied censure upon Mr. S. for not redeeming the pledge he had given to the same Council on a former occasion, that he would cheerfully submit to their decision, which was unanimously against his dismissal, we find the following sentence: "Inasmuch as the result which has been accomplished has a direct tendency to weaken and destroy that respect for the ministry, and that confidence in the purity of their motives, which are the foundation of their influence and usefulness in the Church and in the community." Now if Mr. S. had been convicted of writing such letters as Mr. A. has written we should think that the sentence above quoted would have been peculiarly appropriate. Alas! how much easier it is to preach than to practise! to see another's faults than our own!

Applications have been made by different individuals to twelve Churches for letters to our Church. Eleven of this number have given letters. Mr. A's Church have refused. Even the Phillips Church have given letters to eight of their members who have united with us. But their letters were written in such a form,—so different from what their rules and covenant require, that we will here give a copy as a religious curiosity, as well as an exhibition of the spirit which the leading men in that Church indulge towards us and our pastor.

PHILLIPS CHURCH, Boston, June 12, 1846.

Whereas, Mrs. C. D., a member of this Church, heretofore in regular standing, has requested a letter of dismission and recommendation to the "Payson Church;" and whereas, it is known that said Church have, as their permanent religious teacher, Joy H. Fairchild, who was deposed from the ministry, and as this Church believe justly so, for immoral conduct, and has never been regularly restored to the ministry; whereas this Church do not, however, wish to abridge personal liberty, or to trample on the rights of conscience, therefore—

Voted, That although *we* consider the request of Mrs. D. inexpedient and improper, yet if, in the exercise of her own responsibility, she shall connect herself with said Church, she shall be considered as no longer a member of this Church.

Attest,

C. J. F. ALLEN, Ch. Clerk.

Now this letter, in the opinion of legal counsel, contains at least three libels. In the first place, Mr. F. never was deposed from the ministry at all, but

* Mr. A. says in his remonstrance, "We object to the proposed installation of Mr. F. because, in our judgment, there is enough in what Mr. F. confesses that he has done, and in what he wrote in connection with it, and in what he has more recently published, to make it inexpedient for him to preach the Gospel in this city and vicinity, not to say anywhere." Now we would respectfully request Mr. A. to look at what *he* has said, and done, and written, and compare it with what Mr. F. has said, and done, and written, and then turn to this text, "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

simply suspended till he could do a certain act recommended to him by the Council at Exeter; and which act he did by coming before "the more competent tribunal" and obtaining an acquittal. And in the next place, the Council never voted him guilty of any immoral conduct; nor did they even say that they *believed* him guilty. And in the third place, he was restored to the ministry by the act of acquittal in the Civil Court; and as if that were not enough, he was voted as being in regular standing in the ministry before the Council proceeded to install him; and to make his restoration, if possible, still more complete, he was regularly installed over the Payson Church by that Council, composed of the fathers in the ministry, and of delegates of age and experience,—men known and respected for their piety, prudence and sound judgment, by all the Churches. And yet with all these facts staring them in the face, they give their members who come to us, such libellous letters! When Mr. F. was advised to commence a civil prosecution against Mr. Allen for signing such a letter, he replied, "No; Mr. Allen is a kind-hearted man; and to spare his feelings, I omitted to publish in my pamphlet the letter which he sent down to Edgecomb, believing that he was instigated to do it by my enemies. He has only put his name to the letter to gratify the deacons and those under their control. I would not make him suffer loss for such an act; for it was not done through malice prepense. I would rather "turn to them my other cheek" than to go to law. Besides, it will injure them much more than it will us. Good will come out of it. We know the persons who come to us with these letters; and we may safely receive them."

One of their letters contains the following preamble:—

"Although a Council have met and professedly installed Mr. Fairchild over the 'Payson Church,' since we took action in a similar case, we see no reason for yielding the positions then advanced,—especially as they have since the passage of our vote, been concurred in by nearly all the Orthodox Congregational Pastors in this city and the adjoining towns, as also by the Moderator and Scribe of the Council which deposed Mr. Fairchild; and seeing also, that the recent Council did not attempt to restore Mr. Fairchild to the ministry, but based their proceedings upon their own *opinion* that he was already restored—an opinion whose correctness is denied not only by us, but by the pastors aforementioned, by the officers of the Council which deposed Mr. Fairchild, and as far as we can ascertain, by every member of it that voted for his deposition."

This boyish and libellous preamble was written and signed by Rev. William W. Patton, the former pastor of the Phillips Church; the same young man who wrote the letter to Deacon Drake giving him that important information which came from on ship-board, and which Mr. Adams communicated to his Church for the purpose of opening their eyes to Mr. F.'s "consummate wickedness." We should think that the man who could write such a preamble, was the very man to write such a letter. However, we hope that the venerable doctors in divinity, who voted to install Mr. F., will not be so frightened when they read it, as to feel themselves in danger of forfeiting their doctorates on account of their "imbecility"!

We have another scene to describe, which is any thing but creditable to the actors in it. Soon after Mr. F.'s acquittal, the annual parish meeting of the Phillips Church Society was holden. Mr. F.'s friends were a decided majority of the legal voters. They designed, therefore, in the exercise of their unquestionable rights, to have appointed those to office who were friendly to him,—most of the then officers being unfriendly. Having done this, their object was to say to his enemies,—"Buy or sell; we are ready to do either." Those in office were empowered, by the rules of the Society, to sell pews; and knowing how the majority would vote, they defeated them by actually deeding away twelve or fifteen pews of little value, in the gallery, only a few hours before the parish meeting, though assurance had been given a day or two before by the Clerk of the Society, that nothing of this kind should be done. And yet it *was* done, and the deeds were signed by Deacon Alvan Si-

monds, conveying the pews for the avowed purpose of making voters for that occasion ; and some, we are told, had pews thus conveyed to them who never pretended to belong to the parish, or to make that house their place of worship. Mr. F.'s friends, getting knowledge of this shameful transaction, met at a neighbor's house, and on consultation, came to the conclusion, that they could not, as gentlemen, go into a meeting made up of such men, and by such means. And when Deacon Simonds was asked, what he meant by such conduct, he only replied "that it was an extreme case." We think that they have often found themselves in "extreme cases," since they commenced their attacks on Mr. F., and we predict that if they pursue him much longer, they may find themselves "IN EXTREMIS."

Here then are men holding that meetinghouse, the control of which has been thus obtained, whose whole property in it does not probably amount to twenty-five hundred dollars. Why, Mr. F. himself, through the aid of his friends in Boston, has expended on it and its appendages, more than double that amount. Well, we quietly withdrew, not envying them the enjoyment of any advantages obtained in this way. We have a new and pleasant Hall in which to worship, sufficiently capacious for about four hundred persons. It is usually so well filled on the Sabbath, that Mr. F. cannot have many more hearers, without a larger place for their accommodation. We trust that ere long some wealthy and generous friends may help us to a lot of land on which to erect a new meetinghouse, feeling confident, as we do, in our own ability to meet the expenses of the building. But for the present, we are satisfied to remain where we are, trusting in the Lord to provide for the future.

Opposition was to have been expected from those who were our avowed enemies,—from men, the history of whose residence among us, is but a dark catalogue of litigation, contention, discord, and slander—men who had sworn to pursue our pastor with vengeance to the end of their lives, and then bequeath the feud as a legacy to their children. These men and their associates have raised the cry of "mad dog" against Mr. F. so long and loud, that some have been made to believe that he *is* mad. But we trust that the public will ere long see that *he* is not mad, but *they*. As says the poet—

"But soon a wonder came to light,
That showed the rogues they lied ;
The man recovered of the bite,
The dog it was that died."

Opposition like this we expected, and were prepared to meet it,—an opposition which we knew would cure itself by the superabundance of its own malignity ; and, like the scorpion, when surrounded with flame, destroy itself in the madness of its phrenzy. And had we no other opposition to encounter, we should have pursued the "even tenor of our way" in quietness and peace. But when we find members of a Christian Church so lost to respect for themselves,—so lost to the holy principles of Christianity,—so forgetful of that "charity which thinketh no evil," which would rather suffer wrong than do wrong,—and so unmindful of Christian courtesy and kindness, as to send a letter to us containing three libellous assertions, and then joining the hue and cry against us ; and more than this, when we find ministers of the Gospel of love and good will, who should have been, of all men, the last to "take up a reproach against a brother,"—when we witness all this, and behold these clergymen joining such men in their wicked scheme to crush us and our pastor, we feel constrained to speak out with plainness and boldness, that the world may see who are our enemies, and that they may be held up to merited indignation and scorn, and serve as "an everlasting rock with a lighthouse on it," to warn others to avoid the place on which they were wrecked.

We have never yet seen any thing to impair our confidence in Mr. Fairchild, whom we have long known and esteemed. We have ever loved him for the uniform kindness and goodness of his heart,—confided in him as a

neighbor and friend,—and we still honor and respect him as a minister of the Gospel and an exemplary Christian, with an ardor undiminished, and a constancy unchanged. In the midst of his late severe trials and persecutions, when summer friends deserted him, and avowed enemies exulted in his supposed downfall, our confidence in his integrity was undiminished. And when the dark cloud which gathered around him and threatened to overwhelm him, cleared away, a thrill of gladness vibrated through our hearts, known only to those who have been restored to friends supposed to be dead, yet found to be alive again. We clearly saw that no guilt had been proved against him, and therefore felt bound to regard him as innocent, wondering how any human creature could have a heart to add another grain to his load of suffering, or inflict one fresh wound upon his wife and children. We deem him one of the most injured and persecuted clergymen which the history of this country can furnish. He has truly been hunted “like a partridge upon the mountains;” and this too chiefly by the professors of Christianity, which everywhere enjoins charity, kindness and forbearance; and all because he will not acknowledge himself guilty of crimes which he never committed, and make “a confession to justify the opinions and conduct of those” who saw fit to accuse him, and who seem to act as if they thought that *his destruction* was necessary to *their salvation*.

But, thank God, he still lives and is again restored to us, and laboring among us with his former faithfulness and success; and we shall still cluster around him and sustain him “through evil report and good report.” Sink or swim,—come weal or come woe, we pledge ourselves to cleave unto him,—“his people shall be our people, and his God our God.” A kind Providence blessing us, neither he nor his family shall suffer from cold, or hunger, or nakedness. True, we are not rich; but we will do what we can. And we believe that there are sympathizing men and women of ample means and generous hearts, who will gladly supply our deficiencies. Here have we fixed our abodes in this world,—here have we erected our family altars; and with the broad ægis of the law around us, we would worship the God of our fathers in quietness and peace. Many of us were, through the instrumentality of Mr. F., aroused to a sense of our guilt as sinners, and were pointed by him to “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world;” and we still love to listen to the words of truth as they fall from his lips. It calls fresh to our minds scenes of joy that are past, and on which memory loves to dwell.

Since we have been organized into a Church, originally numbering fifty-six, (or rather since the present year commenced,) our little, but united band has nearly doubled. We seek not to annoy or molest our neighbors; but are willing that they should worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. All we ask is that we should be let alone,—left in the hands of him “who doeth all things well,” and who will never leave nor forsake those who humbly trust and confide in him.

EBENEZER HAYWARD,
WM. A. AIKEN,
NATHANIEL D. VOSE,
DANIEL TRACY,
CALVIN WALTON.