

TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE. No. 7.

# FREMONT'S ROMANISM.

## Facts.

That John C. Fremont is, or until recently was, a Romanist, no fair-minded person can disbelieve, or deny, so long as the following facts, which have been established, remain unexplained or satisfactorily contradicted:

1. His father was a Roman Catholic from France.

2. He was educated at a Catholic Institution, by the charity of Roman Catholic ladies.

3. He was married by a Popish priest with whom marriage is a sacrament, not to be administered to heretics, and married in accordance with a license procured for the purpose, in which the name of the Popish priest was inserted at his own request.

4. His adopted daughter was educated in a Catholic school.

5. When in St. Louis he attended the Popish church, and Bishop Kendrick is his spiritual adviser, and daily visitor when sick.

6. He persuaded a Protestant in Washington to join the Roman Catholic church, and the name of the gentleman we have in our possession.

7. When offered a Protestant book by a friend, he refused to read it, on the ground of his being a Papist.

8. He was seen to dip his hand in holy water and cross himself in a Roman Catholic church, and he was heard to avow his belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation by a gentleman of high character and a member of the Methodist church.

9. Imitating other Roman Catholic explorers, and those alone, in his expedition to the Rocky Mountains in 1842, he made on Rock Independence the sign of the cross, a thing that no Protestant explorer ever did or ever would do. See his own words in Congressional document 166, of 1845.

10. A gentleman who slept for months under the same blanket with Fremont, declares that Fremont made to him no secret

of his being a Romanist, and that of the fact there could be no doubt.

11. When Fremont was in California, he used to ride to the Popish church regularly on Sunday in his carriage with his wife.

12. Some time before the meeting of the late Conventions, Col. Fremont himself declared that he did not see how the Americans could nominate him because of his religious belief, as he was a Roman Catholic. This was said to a lady who knew him, and who had attended the Catholic Church with him.

13. In one of his expeditions through Mexico he stopped the expedition a day to take part in some religious services of the Romish church.

14. The Troy Whig says:—"When the news of Fremont's nomination reached this city, an intelligent Catholic, whom we can and will name, if necessary, declared to a friend that Fremont was a Catholic, and that he was knowing to the fact."

15. We understand, and we aver that although Mr. Fremont's children may have been baptized by Rev. Mr. French of the Episcopal church in Washington, Mr. French never saw the Colonel at his church but on one occasion, and always supposed him to be a Romanist.

16. Mrs. Benton objected to Jessie's marrying Fremont because he was a Roman Catholic.

17. Fremont, after he was married, used to wait on his wife to a Protestant church door, and then leave and go to a Popish church himself on Sundays.

18. He ordered the American flag, which a patriotic sailor had nailed to a post in San Juan, on which was also a cross, to be taken down, saying that the placing it there was an outrage on the Christian faith, and should not be tolerated.

19. John F. Faltan, a leading member of the Catholic Church in Washington, told Mr. W. Watson, that Col. Fremont, if not now, had been a Catholic, and that he knew the fact. He also said to Mr. Watson, that

Col. F. was so rigid and bigoted that he (Col. F.) did not believe a *marriage was binding unless the ceremony was performed by a Catholic priest.*

### Raymond's Letter.

Henry J. Raymond, editor of the *New York Times*, has written a letter, in which he attempts to explain some of these charges; but Mr. Raymond studiously avoids stating that his explanations are by the authority of Col. Fremont. His letter is entitled to no more consideration, therefore, than his own word, uncontradicted, would be; and we must, therefore, examine the evidence adduced to arrive at the truth.

### Fremont's Marriage.

Mr. Raymond says:

"Col. Fremont's marriage was celebrated by a Roman Catholic priest, but this was in consequence of the difficulty, if not impossibility, of procuring any other clergyman to perform it."

Our readers will remember that the first excuse for the marriage of Col. Fremont by a Roman Catholic priest was that he was unable to obtain a license, and therefore was forced to apply to an unprincipled priest, who had not the fear of the law before his eyes, to perform the ceremony. *This was proven false.* The records of the Court at Washington were proven, and the certificate of the Clerk produced, showing that Colonel Fremont *did procure a license*, and the records show that the name of this same priest, Van Horseigh, was inserted in said license. Here is the certificate:

"District of Columbia, Washington County, to wit:

"I, John A. Smith, Clerk of the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia, for the County of Washington, do hereby certify, that on the 19th of October, 1841, a license was issued to join in holy matrimony John Charles Fremont and Jessie Ann Benton, as is manifest of record.

"In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name, and affixed the seal of said Court, this 21st day of July, 1856.

[SEAL.] JOHN A. SMITH, Clerk."

Driven to the wall by the testimony thus afforded, a new subterfuge was resorted to, and one too that it was supposed could not be found in the usual record of the law. It was simply such as is recorded in the above extract from Raymond's letter, that no Pro-

testant minister could be found who would perform the marriage ceremony. We repeat here that no other minister was applied to, and none other was ever intended to be applied to for that purpose. We do not make these statements without being able to produce the names of persons who are responsible, and perfectly worthy of credence in regard to their truth. S. C. Busey, a gentleman well known and of long residence in Washington City, furnishes evidence in proof of the above statement. He says:

"But there is another fact connected with this branch of the subject. All licenses issued in this district are directed to some clergyman, and the person obtaining the license from the clerk is required to give the name of the clergyman by whom the parties are to be married. While the clerk was preparing the above certificate this morning, a gentleman of character and standing stated to me in the presence of several others, that he was present at the time the license was issued, and heard the whole conversation which took place between Col. Fremont (who came to get the license) and Col. Brent, who was at that time Clerk of the Circuit Court. He says that the clerk asked Col. Fremont, in his presence, by what clergyman he expected to be married, and he replied by the Rev. Van Horseigh, and the clerk filled the blank in the printed license blanks with the name of Father Van Horseigh. Col. Fremont further requested that the date of the license should be left blank, as that he might fail in stealing "Jessie" on that day. The clerk (Col. Brent) replied to him that he could not, that the law required him to record the license on the date of its issue."

In addition to this the Washington organ states that many of the ministers residing in Washington in 1841, are still in that city, and F<sup>R</sup>E<sup>M</sup>O<sup>N</sup>T is *defied to produce the certificate of a single Protestant clergyman that he was ever applied to, to perform the marriage ceremony for COL. F<sup>R</sup>E<sup>M</sup>O<sup>N</sup>T.* So much for the marriage.

### Alderman Fulmer's Statement.

1st. That in 1852, he (Alderman Fulmer) and Col. Fremont were in Brown's Hotel, Washington city, together, and that then and there he (Fulmer) first saw Fremont, and saw him then and there, daily and repeatedly,—so that there could be no mistake as to identity.

2d. That he (Fulmer) being told that he (Fremont) was a Roman Catholic, doubted it for reasons not here necessary to name, and doubted it so earnestly, that it was affirmed and re-affirmed; whereupon he, himself, upon being informed proof of it existed in Col. Fremont's worshipping, on the Sabbath, in the Roman Catholic Cathedral, or Church, went to that Church to see and satisfy himself of the fact. He there saw Col. Fremont enter the Church, and by, or near the door, *cross himself with so-called Holy Water*, as he entered, and he (Fremont) then passed up the centre aisle of that Church, to a slip or pew not far from the altar, or place where the Priests were, *when he (Fremont) again crossed himself*, and took his place.

3d. That he (Fulmer) witnessed for some time the rites and ceremonies in the Roman Catholic Church, in which Fremont was then worshipping, and that he (Fulmer) stayed there till the boys with the censers, (so called) sprinkled incense, (so called) whereupon he (Fulmer) left.

4th. That on the same Sabbath he dined at the same public table with Col. Fremont, in Brown's Hotel—at a sort of oval table, at which he was distant from him (Fremont) only five or six persons; and then and there Col. Fremont, addressing those five or six persons unknown to him, (Fulmer) between him (Fulmer) and Fremont, dwelt upon the august rites and ceremonies of the Church he had been that day attending, as if with a view to impress them therewith,—and in so public a manner that he (Fulmer) felt it proper to ask him (Fremont)—

“If he (Fremont) believed in **TRANSUBSTANTIATION**,”—

—whereupon he (Fremont) asked,—

—“what I (Fulmer), understood by **TRANSUBSTANTIATION**?”

—when the conversation continued substantially as follows:—

Fulmer—I understand it to be the belief, that *the wafer which the Roman Catholics use in the Sacrament, is substantially converted by the Priests into the body of Jesus Christ*. Do YOU BELIEVE THAT?

Fremont—I do.

Fulmer—Did Christ ever have more than one body.

Fremont—No. He had but one body.

Fulmer—Do you believe that the body Christ was crucified in was laid in the sepulchre of Joseph's tomb?

Fremont—I believe it was.

Fulmer—Do you believe that body, after the resurrection, was the body he ascended to Heaven with?

Fremont—I believe it was.

Fulmer—Then what kind of a machine, book, or knife, or pressure, does a Bishop or Priest make use of to obtain the body of Christ, to convert at pleasure into wafers for the whole world?

Fremont—Excited and appearing angry, made no reply, and in seeming indignation left the table.

Now here are the points to take issue upon—and “by authority,” we affirm this conversation and this scene to be true. As the *Times* has spoken “by authority” of Fremont through the Editor, we await the reply of Fremont himself—when, if denied, we will substantiate these facts by oaths or affidavit, and thus add to them that sanctity.

#### Alderman Fulmer's Character.

The letter of Mr Raymond does not, and dare not openly deny the above statements. Mr. Fremont does not, and dare not openly deny them. On the other hand Alderman Fulmer plainly states:

“*That he (Ald. Fulmer) will subscribe to his statement on oath, if Col. Fremont will deny it himself, or by himself, authorize its denial through any of his respectable friends.*”

As regards Alderman Fulmer's reputation or veracity, it is substantiated by the testimony of the best men of New York city. In regard to it Mr. Raymond, in his *Gazette* letter himself says:—

“The Alderman, I am informed, is a man who would not be likely to make such statements unless he believed them to be true.”

As regards Alderman Fulmer, we will further add that the New York *Express* says of him:

“We can only say of him that he is a member, of good standing, of the Methodist Protestant Church—that he is an honest man, with a character for veracity that will compare with the very best of his assailants, and that he will, as we shall, before we have done with this matter, bring proof that will

make even the *Courier*, personal, vindictive and vulgar as it is, **HOLD ITS PEACE.**"

### Fraud exposed.

Mr. Raymond endeavors to explain away the possibility of such events having transpired, by a feeble endeavor to show that Fremont was not stopping at Brown's Hotel at the time specified. The same effort having been made before, Alderman Fulmer refers to the register of Brown's Hotel in order to prove the falsity of the statement as to Fremont's absence, and finds that the leaves of the REGISTER HAVE BEEN TORN OUT in order to destroy the proof. In regard to this, we furnish an extract from a letter from J. H. Kirkwood. He says:—

"The leaves of the Register at Brown's Hotel FOR THREE MONTHS in 1852, HAVE BEEN TORN OUT!—in order to tear out the fact, doubtless, that Alderman Fulmer was there, as he states, in that year."

Now we suppose that the defaced register would have shown that Alderman Fulmer, not only stopped at Brown's Hotel at the time specified by him, but also, that Fremont was there at the same time. But the register is destroyed, and it is supposed that the evidence is destroyed. Not so, however, Mr. Fulmer then produces his receipt for four days board at Brown's Hotel, proving as far as he is able, that he was there at the time referred to, and that the supposition that he was mistaken is without foundation.

Here then is the whole of Henry J. Raymond's letter, and it amounts to just nothing at all.

### The Proof.

The proof of Mr. Fremont's catholicism is before the world. It is for him to meet that proof, and either contradict or explain it. It matters not whether his religious belief is a thing for or against him, of itself considered. The question is a very different one. *Is he a Romanist?* That is the question, and the proof is that he is. Let that proof be contradicted by *him*, if it can be.

### Col. Russell's Statement.

We publish the following letter from the Hon. N. Sargent, formerly of Philadelphia and now residing in Washington City, a gentleman well known as of the highest character and respectability.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2d, 1856.

A. B. ELY, Esq.—*Dear Sir*: I have your note of the 28th July, inquiring where Col. Wm. Russell of Missouri resides, or may be addressed, and asking me what he has said, or will say, in reference to Col. Fremont's religious opinions?

Col. Russell's residence is at Harrisonville, Cass Co., Mo.; but I am informed that he is at present in Baltimore on a visit.

Col. Russell is a man who *will* say what he *has* said; and he has said to me that Col. Fremont was a Catholic when he was in California. I spent an evening with Col. R. at Brown's Hotel two or three weeks ago, and knowing that he had been much with Col. F. in California, and on very intimate terms with him, I asked him if he knew anything of Col. Fremont's religious views at that time? He replied that he did; that he was with him a great deal, and in fact might say that he had slept under the same blanket with him for eight months. I then asked him what Col. F. was? He replied, a Catholic. I asked him if he was sure of this? "Perfectly," he said; and then added, "Col. Fremont won't deny that he was a Catholic; everybody there so understood it, and he made no secret of it."

Further conversation occurred between us on the subject, but this is the sum and substance of it. I asked him if I might refer to this conversation and use his name? He replied "Certainly; you are at liberty to do so." But he again said, "Col. Fremont will not deny that he was a Catholic."

Col. Russell, you may not be aware, was Col. Fremont's principal witness on his trial before the Court Martial. Should Col. Fremont deny, over his own signature that he was a Catholic when in California, I presume Col. Russell will then speak for himself.

Col. R. is an old, ardent personal friend of Henry Clay, with whose family his own is connected, his daughter having married Mr. Clay's grandson.

I am very truly,  
Your obedient servant,

N. SARGENT.