msa_sc2901_scm2353-0251 ©Maryland State Archives

KENT NEWS.

CHESTER TOWN, Md.

Saturday Morning, February 11, 1854.

☞ Advertisements &c. omitted today will appear next week.

FOREIGN NEWS.—The mail steamer Pacific arrived at N. Y. Feb. 9th at 4 o'clock, bringing Liverpool dates to the 25th January. Breadstuffs have further advanced. The Czar has rejected the combined note, and war is inevitable.

FIRE.—The Granary, Stabling, stack-yard, and fodder-house, belonging to Isaac Gale, Esq. in Broad Neck, together with all the farming implements, corn, (about 1200 bushels,) carriages, fodder, &c. upon the premises, was destroyed by fire on Monday last. Mr. G's loss is between 4000 and $5000—no insurance. It is supposed that the fire was caused from a negro boy playing with matches.

THE LEGISLATURE is now engaged in discussing the Liquor question—several amendments have been suggested to Cockran's Bill; it is conceded that this subject will be referred to the people.

Tuesday next is the day fixed for the election of U. States Senator and State Treasurer. Mr. Pearce and Dr. Claude were the nominees of the caucus, and of course will be elected.

(BY REQUEST.)

The Late Col. Wm. R. Stuart.

The life of a good man is a living lesson to his companions, and a heritage to be prized by those who come after him. Such was the life of Col. William R. Stuart. The author of this tribute to departed merit had the good fortune to know him from his childhood to his grave, and, during most of the time, intimately. He was born in Kent County Md., on the 20.h of April, 1780, and died at the residence of his son, in New Orleans, on the 21st of August, 1853.—His father, Doctor Alexander Stuart, was an ardent, active, and useful officer in the Revolutionary army of '76, and took with him into his domestic circle, something of the soldier's habits of discipline. After completing his education at Washington College, Chestertown, the subject of this notice, entered a counting house in Baltimore, and industriously and faithfully performed the duties of his place. At an early age he married a most excellent and amiable lady, the daughter of the then late Capt. Charles Frazier, and grand daughter of the late estimable major John Dames, with whom she resided at the time of her marriage. The major, in a short time, induced him to become an inmate of his family, and soon after surrendered to him the entire control of his valuable estate. His peculiar fitness for political life did not escape the notice of his fellow citizens, and popular favor was the sure reward of his kind deportment and unblemished reputation. He was accordingly, on many occasions, elected to the legislature, from Kent, and also from Queen Ann's Counties, to the last of which he removed, and in which he passed the largest portion of his days. During a senatorial term of five years, he was the President of that body with complete satisfaction to its members, amongst whom were were gentlemen who have adorned some of the highest posts in the American Government—He subsequently held most responsible executive appointments, and it is believed, was never, in a single instance, the object of the slightest imputation as to malversation in office.

His faithfulness was the result of a higher and nobler principle than the fear or the favor of man. In early life he made profession of religion. His amiable wife, with a living exemplification "of the beauty of holiness" continually present to her observation, also "chose that good part which could not be taken from her." Religion, with him, was not a profession which was satisfied by certain conventional compliances, as the proofs and all the proofs of its existence. It was an inward, vital, active spring, whence issued incessantly living, perennial streams, that watered and cherished all the thoughts and intents of his heart, animated his soul with unbounded gratitude to his God, and with benevolence and charity to his fellow men. In advanced life he was called to experience a reverse of fortune, not unusual to men who have more distinguished themselves by their generous and liberal kindness, than by a disposition to accumulate wealth. But unlike many—alas, how large a proportion!—the loss of his property occasioned no diminution in the esteem of his honor and purity of his personal friends, nor in the universal estimate of his honor and purity of character. His strict adherance and conformity to his religious professions, during all his intercourse with the world, and amidst his exciting political occupations, had kept him prominent in the Methodist Church, to which he attached himself, and on the occasion of its separation he was called to preside over the first session of the seceding portion of it. His beloved wife died in 1825, after living many years in the enjoyment and reciprocation of as large a share of conjugal affection as mortals may expect, unmixed with the little dissentions or bickerings which are too often allowed to disturb the smooth current of domestic harmony, or the more serious feuds which sometimes convert the nearest, and what should be the dearest, relations in life into a condition of unceasing disquiet and wretchedness.

The writer of this has frequently been a visiter at his hospitable dwelling, when it was a most delightful privilege to unite in the morning and evening oblation of prayer and praise; and listen to the earnest and animated outpourings of joy and peace, in the sweet, swelling tones of a favorite hymn, appropriate to the opening or closing day, in which wife, children and servants united, with notes so cheerful that life's woes or cares seemed strangers in that happy circle. Few men have ever more effectually made a pious state of mind habitually control and direct every action of life. He never appeared to forget, that all things were ordered by unerring wisdom and mercy, and ever maintained a firm faith, in the benevolent care of a God, full of love to his creatures, even in his chastisements, and never doubted or feared the ultimate effect of his Master's dealings with him. The love of God was the especial attribute of the Deity, on which he delighted to dwell—love to all—to every perishing sinner. The last letter he wrote, on the day previous to his sudden attack, concluded thus: "To our heavenly Father I commend all my wants, may He bless you, and all relations and friends, and all and every soul on earth, with peace and joy and hope and faith; above all, with love: for God is Love." It was an answer to an urgent appeal from his son to leave New Orleans, where the fatal fever was raging fearfully. But he said no; duty required him to remain, and his trust was in him who he served. To such a soul death could present no terror. It came as a messenger from his father in heaven, to invite to a perpetual feast of joy and love, with saints and angels gone before. He asked no delay. He was robed in the wedding garment, his loins girded and his feet shod with the preparation of the gospel. His willing spirit enters the dark valley, but the rod and the staff are there, to support and cheer him on his way, and ministering angels to conduct him to that land of everlasting rest and peace, where sorrow never comes, and where faith and hope are exchanged for blissful fruition.

For the News.

MR. EDITOR:—Your correspondent, who assumes the signature of Landholders and Taxpayers, having again appeared in your last edition, and in an article most *painfully* elaborate, we are again constrained to seek the use of your columns, in vindication of the undoubted rights of a most respectable section of the community. He begins by expressing his surprise that we should have consumed so much of your space in our refutation, while it will be observed that his rejoinder is considerably more lengthy than our reply. But this is a matter of no importance for the intelligent community, will discriminate as to the merits of the discussion without regard to the length of the respective articles.

We thank your correspondent for his encomium upon "the style and diction of our article" and from his apparent courtesy in this behalf, coupled with his confident threat of a "dissection," we were led to expect, some new and original view of the topic, which he had chosen, some analysis more keen and profound than any foreshadowed by his former productions, some skilful and learned portrayal of the pernicious tendencies of dancing, and of the prodigious outrage inflicted upon the community by its indulgence.

We regret to say that in this we have been disappointed and we think that your readers must have experienced a *kindred* sentiment. The community will judge of the fairness or unfairness, strength or weakness of the discussion. No allegation of unfairness on the one hand and especial force on the other can effect the merits of the controversy. By a just and impartial judgment they must be determined—so much for your correspondents preliminaries.

After complaining that we have made against him the charge of incincerity, he accuses us of a violation of the rules of logic. We admit that as among logicians and in the conduct of a simple discussion, that is a rule. But this rule as all others, is liable to exception of time, place and circumstances.

It is a rule of *Rhetoric*, that a writer or speaker, in order to influence the minds and win the affections of his auditors, must carry with him that appearance of earnestness and sincerity, which shall demonstrate to them, that he is himself convinced of the truth of that, which he utters. If he evinces such an earnestness and sincerity, he gains thereby a power which no skill or labor of argument can otherwise furnish.—For if they believe him to be honest, and have confidence in the diligence and ability of his investigations, they are irresistibly compelled to the admission of his theories.

But if on the other hand it shall appear that the disputant has not been consistent in the advocacy of his theories, that he now asserts a right, or inveighs against an evil which he has never before thought worthy of assertion or invective, though occasions have frequently before arisen, then, for such assertion or invective, we are driven to the conclusion that he is not sincere in his theories, not actuated by a lively regard for public good, but impelled by some motive perhaps not impure, yet at least misunderstood by himself. Then by the rules of Rhetoric, if we can show this apparent lack of consistency and earnestness, it is our undoubted right to refer to it as an evidence of the weakness of his argument, and as a warning to the public against its influences. If he can gainsay this reasonable principle we will agree to admit that under all circumstances we are bound to assume *the* fairness of our adversarys theories.

In reply to the analogy which he draws between himself and any other citizen who might oppose the use of the place, without reference to the general objection against balls, we have simply to say that when a disputant, in the *onset*, studiously and pointedly disclaims an appeal to sectarian or religious considerations and agrees voluntarily to leave such objections to the "pulpit, press and fireside circles," reserving his objections to the use of the *place*, we reasonably expected him to confine his argument to the line designated and not to excite public prejudice in a way which he has expressly disclaimed.—We appeal to his first article, whether we have not construed him rightly, for we cannot consume your space by repeating *verbatim* what he then said.—We regarded it as a sectarian appeal, and as such we felt constrained to reply to it. Had any other individual raised objections on account of the use of the *place* without making reference to the *religious* sentiment, we should have said that he confined himself to his chosen line of argument—that he "stuck to his text;" a credit which we could not accord to your correspondent.

In short, though he may not have designed them, his allusions to the sentiment were in fact arguments by *inuendo*, but did not for that reason less demand consideration.

He complains that we have charged him with having compared the recent use of the house to loose festive gatherings, with the banjo, &c. We must confess our surprise at this item of complaint. He certainly classed the recent cotillion in the same connection with the banjo &c. and argued that because it was so used upon that occasion it might be used for dances with the banjo. Was not this his argument? If so, then we ask whether he did not in fact associate this ball with negro dances, or with others equally loose and disorderly. Is not the banjo (whatever your correspondent may think of its power) peculiarly and emphatically a negro instrument? If ever used otherwise is it not used for the "jig," "stag dance," "shuffle," "reels" or some other species not indulged in by gentlemen when in the presence of ladies? Your correspondent is singularly ignorant of the circumstances under which ladies and gentlemen assemble in this community if he can compare their proceedings with banjo dances, and as equally uninformed as to the popular estimation of such gatherings of ladies and gentlemen, if he can claim as perfect a right for the occupation of the public buildings by the former as by the latter.—And he is emphaatically behind the public sentiment if he can ascribe such a degree of doubt to the definition of the word "respectability", as to assert that it is a matter of *opinion* which of the two is the most respectable. Yet is not this the obvious deduction from his reasoning?

We deny that we used any attempt to subject him to the prejudice of a portion of the community. If he has incurred any such prejudice it was but the necessary deduction of the popular mind from that which seemed to be the clear import of his language. But we are gratified most sincerely, Mr. Editor, that your correspondent thus unequivocally disclaims any purpose of offering such indignity, as we had been led to ascribe to him. We were indeed (as expressed in our last article) loth to come to such a conclusion, but the language left us no other inference.

Your correspondent comments upon our reply to his objections touching the grave yard &c. ascribed to us a desire to see tombs and oblisks, etc. erected, recites, in attempted ridicule, our feeble tribute to the departed; concludes by charging us with assuming "the seat of the judge," and criticising his own motives, asks if we perceive no difference between the emotions of a man of business and those of a devotee of pleasure. The truth is, Mr. Editor, that the original allusion to the grave yard, impressed us as extraordinary and far fetched, and we knew of no better reply than to ask him whether he, as a man of piety, possessing chastened and solemn feelings, mindful of death and eternity, always regardful of a momentous future, had ever found his religious sentiments stimulated by an entrance into the building. We anticipated his reply in the negative, should he vouchsafe any reply whatever. He has given no response, hence we think that your readers will infer, as they would have naturally inferred apart from any allusion to the matter that *he* cannot claim any such salutary influence in his own case. And I ask, if he under the pressure of legitimate business, pursuing the sober avocations of the day, with his moral sentiments already chastened and disciplined by a religious training, cannot recall the occasion upon which his feelings of reverence were thus stimulated, how can he expect it in those who profess to be at times the votaries of pleasure?

If he believes that dancing is productive of all the evil tendencies which he describes, it is his duty to discourage it by all proper means in his power and under no circumstances can he indulge himself, but if he truly respects the opinions and appreciates the rights of his fellows, as guaranteed by common sense and common law, he will be willing in some degree to respect their opinions and to forbear uncalled for assaults, upon their conduct. While at the same time if he admits the truth of the precept laid down by the Great Apostle, he will remember that though "all things may be just all things may not be equally expedient" and that the most effectual method of reforming error and inculcating virtue; it is not the violent effort to *drive* one class of the community into the train of opinion entertained by another class. If balls are improper they are so to all who are *reflectively* of that opinion. If they promote irreverence they will have that effect no matter where held. If they are regarded as innocent by a class of the community they are innocent *to them*, whether in a Court House or a private residence.—Let each determine for himself, "Who art thou that judgeth another mans servant; To his own master he standeth or falleth?"

We very much question, Mr. Editor despite the glowing and classic portraiture of dancing (Byron being the delineator) whether your intelligent readers will ascribe a *greater degree of reverential feeling* to the Judge, Juror, Lawyer, or visitor who enters the Court House on business, than to those who, with a conscience "certainly void of offence," saw fit to appropriate it for the uses of a ball.

Your correspondent next introduces our inquiry to him, "Wherefore he did not upon previous occasions, such as negro exhibitions, &c., proclaim his dissent," and asserts that he was not aware of its use for such a purpose.—Who, Mr. Editor, is your correspondent? We are at loss to devine! Has he resided in this community during any considerable period without being aware of the facts above stated? If not, when he heard of this recent foul desecration, did he not inquire whether the House had ever been previously used for any improper porpose? Was it not natural he should do so? Was it unreasonable that we should presume that he was either personally cognizant of these facts or had been apprized of them? Would not any reader of your paper have drawn the same inferences which we did?

Your correspondent says that Mesmerism, Millerism, Phrenology, &c., enter into the mental arcana, and are therefore proper subjects of discussion. Doubtless some are of this opinion.—Many others differ, and regard such discussions as idle and pernicious delusions. Who shall determine between these dissenters? In what spirit shall the decision be given? Certainly in that of liberal indulgence, a respect for opposite sentiments—a sufferance of those who being just, moral, and respectable in the general departments of life, see fit to hold and enjoy such opinions. We only ask the same social privileges for those who sanction dancing.

Your correspondent lays stress upon my use of the words "pious and moral." This was a superfluity. It is well known that many individuals of undoubted "*piety*" permit dancing in their families. We care not whether the term is "moral or pious." No man can be truly moral, unless true to his God and his neighbor, and this will entitle him to equal respect with his fellow, who may by a choibe of terms be styled "pious,"

A distinction is then drawn between the use of the Hall by the sufferance of the keeper of the House and its use upon the recent occasion. We are not aware, in the first place, that the fact of its having been let to travelling adventurers, for a *fee* by which the keeper was compensated for his care in preparing it, &c., detracts aught from the *desecration* of the place. And we are under opinion that its use by irresponsible strollers, caring nothing for its preservation, having no interest in the community, and no regard for the public property, though guarded by the vigilance of a single individual, viz: the keeper, is not less dangerous than its use by citizens of the County, Landholders and Taxpayers, members of the Bar, officers of the Court, all personally interested in its protection, having individually the strongest personal stake and responsibility; especially when to this was superadded the tried and proven vigilance of our esteemed County Clerk, himself having at least *as large* a responsibility as the keeper. Would any citizen of the county, because 100 or more citizens were assembled, regard the latter class of safeguards inferior to the former? Does not your correspondent's argument imply a degree of recklessness in the officers of the County and the Court, and the citizens thus assembled, which reason does not justify; or their known characters warrant.

He errs in saying that "lights were entrusted to servants." Had he not informed himself in this particular?—The lights were under the guardianship of the managers and members of the ball, and protected by the Clerk and his aids. Lights and fire were not multiplied, nor in as dangerous situations as when negro minstrels have erected curtains and drapery for their *select* performances. We are happy to correct him in these particulars.

He next propounds certain inquiries whose relevancy, not to say *force*, we are at a loss to discern. Why was the Declaration of Independence not issued sooner? Because the circumstances which called it forth had not demanded it sooner. British tyranny and usupation rendered it necessary; and so soon as the American people felt or perceived the wrong, they opposed and avenged it.

The Federal Constitution followed as a corollary from the War of the Revolution, and was devised so soon as its necessity was felt and its provisions matured.

The Constitution of Maryland was reformed so soon as a majority of the people could be induced (we beg to think unwisely) to demand its reform.—Railroads were projected as soon as the idea of applying steam to land carriage had been elicited. The Legislature enacts new laws, civil and criminal, so soon as they see fit or exigences demand. And we we presume that if the circumstances of injustice and oppression which produced the Revolution had been developed 100 years sooner, say 1676, our ancesters would not have delayed their Declaration for a century. So with all the other analogies of your correspondent's series. Where is the parrallel? If he knew that the use of the Court House 10 years ago, was a foul desecration, a social outrage, a public hazard, could he, as a man of sense, delay until now? Could he witness the danger of destruction to the building and records, day after day, month after month, and yet as a good citizen, remain silent? Could he see foul violation offered to this Grave Yard *so venerable*, and yet hold his peace. We think that "his forbearance had ceased to be a virtue." We think that examples above quoted are most unfortunate, for he certainly has not emulated the promptness and boldness of his *prototypes*, the signers of the Declaration of Independence. They appealed to the just public sentiment—the same to which your correspondent appeals, and having done se, they commenced *action*. He was restrained by a fear of opposition by his fellow citizens. Suppose some strolling herd of mountebanks had, during this forbea-ance, set fire to the public buildings? How would he have upbraided himself for the delay?

We do most sincerely think, sir, and we can but believe the community will bear us out in the opinion that your correspondent, either through ignorance of the fact, or misapprehension of the necessity, has, by his silence, suffered this place to be subjected to uses much worse *in themselves*, much more injurious in their *tendencies*, much more hazardous to the *buildings* than the *recent* occasion. If this has resulted from ignorance, we cannot restrain the impulse again to inquire, Who your correspondent can possibly be? for the use of the Court House as stated, the danger from fire, the disorder within and without had (as we supposed) become *notorius*, to every citizen of the Town, *almost* to every resident of the contigious county.

Your correspondent quotes Henry Ward Beecher and his lecture to young men. We fear that this is a most unfortunate quotation, coming as it does from one who holds scarcely anything in common with the Evangelical or moral community, (a brother to the famous Mrs. Stowe, and fully sympathises with her. We have never before heard him quoted as a lecturer, either to *young* or to *old* men. Admit the quotation for what it is worth. If he has as good a right to criticise pleasure as we to enjoy—the converse is also true—we have as good a right to enjoy as he to criticise, and then an equal right to criticise his criticism, vindicate the purity and propriety of our conduct, and to arraign the *consistency* of his criticism.

Your correspondent cannot perceive the analogy between the objects of political, religious, temperance assemblies &c., and those which characterize a Ball. Objects may be different, but right of opinion are not thereby forfeited. As we said in our last communication, many regard certain classes of the former as pernicious and yet sanctions the latter. Who in a country of equal laws and equal rights, shall presume to say that one class of opinions shall be respected by civil tolerance, and the other class placed under the ban? Have we any established religion to which all shall conform? Have we any fixed and settled system of politics? Is Temperance a National Institution?—Then who shall say that because a class consider Balls pernicious, therefore they shall assume to deny to others the right to enjoy them, if they see fit? Will your correspondent illuminate us on this point?

"But the County Commissioners are a new body." One of the members has certainly been for years a most intelligent and worthy member of the Board. The others are men of sagacity and experience, and certainly must be presumed, duly to appreciate their duties and responsibilities. If they did not, why did not some zealous friend to the public give them a hint.

We are asked—Who is to determine the criterion of respectibility? We answer; the good sense the community at large. Your correspondent must have known that in claiming the use of the Public buildings, *equally* for every respectable section of the community, we referred to their *public* occupation, not to their use by members of a particular trade or profession, but for such uses as large, influential, respectable classes of the public are willing to sanction. Yet he sagely illustrates his idea by supposing that the Lawyer, Tailor, Shoemaker, Druggist, Carpenter, Chimney sweep, Soap boiler, Tallow Chandler, may with equal justice appropriate them. Are these *public* uses or private enterprises? Are they projected for the benefit or employment of the community? or for that of an individual or partnership of individuals? We did not anticipate sube a series of sagacious reflections as these, and think it time to dismiss them.

In drawing a distinction between Religious and Temperance assemblies &c. your correspondent says, "we believe that upon such matters freedom of opinion is guaranteed by law," and are at a loss to discover the analogy between such gatherings and a Ball at night.—Does he deny that freedom of opinion is guaranteed by law, in social matters, as fully as in political and religious. Is not the right to hold balls thus guaranteed. Then the distinction must be one not of legal right but of social propriety, suppose that a body of Atheists visit our community for the propagation of their infamous opinions or that a party of Fourirites or Socialists seek the use of our public buildings, for the utterance of their vile social heresies, or that a band of abolitionists congregate to utter their incendiary theories. The latter indeed may be handled by the strong arm of the law, for any overt act of interference with a certain class of the population. But these parties, however dangerous and vile their purposes awowed, yet be acting in pursuance of political and religious rights guaranteed by law, and were this the criterion to the right of occupation of the public buildings they could not be restrained. If the question then be one of social propriety we ask whether assemblies such as for the propagation of Millerism stand on any stronger foundation of right, in any particular, whatsoever, than assemblys such as the recent one, for a dance.—Would the former, bring any greater degree of public influence, or public sanction? We think not. Then what becomes of the assumed guarantee.

Again we are told that the opponents of the use of the Court House are comprized of three classes. "Those who are opposed to Balls, those who are indifferent, and a number who countenance them." In reply we have only to say that however numerous the classes may be, the numbers in the two latter classes must either be very small, or exceedingly *indifferent* as well to Balls as to the use of the House.

For as we stated in our former article we have yet to hear of one positive ardent opponent of the use in issue save your correspondent. There may be, we admit some who are opposed to the use of the Court House for any but its primary purpose—the "administration of Justice" but, they do not sympathize with the present moment, or regard this as the proper time to raise the objection. On the other hand as we before remarked it is notorious that among those interested in the recent Ball were comprised as large influential wealthy and patriotic a body of citizens as usually combine for any ordinary purpose. We doubt whether your correspondent can exhibit so many of those elements arrayed in such marked support and prosecution of any local enterprise. These gentlemen acted reflectively, understand their responsibilities, and will not shrink from the consequences of their acts in this behalf.

He then indulges in a most pathetic homily upon the dangers of fire. We admit them all—even had he increased his fearful catalogue an hundred fold.

We have already acknowledged that the loss of this building would be a great public inconvenience. Why continue to play on this single string? Are not *private* buildings too destroyed? Perhaps even your correspondent may have suffered by fire; very few have escaped. The question now under discussion is one of sanctioned right—the right of classes—Courts are sometimes held at night, Collegiate and Academic exhibitions; Mesmeric and Phrenologic exhibitions are held at night, and lights used as carelessly as upon the occasion in question. Your correspondent *defends many* of these exhibitions, and yet has turned with fearful apprehension from "such terrible hazards." Why, in the name of common sense, reason and propriety did he not speak out before.—It was not of *vital* importance that they should be held, however proper, they were not intrincically essential to the public good. He was not ignorant of their existence. How then did he hold his peace. I for one, am utterly at a loss to understand!

Your correspondent closes by solemn discussion of Balls, their evils &c. We are most heartily ready to guarantee his right of opinion. We admit the high authority of Massillon, &c. But we must again repeat, and we are very averse to repeat so often, a voice so tenaciously elicited by your correspondent. Though we may be wrong, grant us our opinions. Do not attempt to coerce us into good morals. Allow us some show of free agency.

And while your correspondent continues his reseaches into that great chart of faith and conduct, the Book of God, allow us to invoke his consideration to the Divine precept of him who spake as never man spake: "Judge not that ye be not judged." And to the precepts of the apostle—"Let not him that eateth deprive him that eateth not &c. And let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth."

And to those other inculcations of truth and benevolence—"Though I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels and have not *charity*, I am as a sounding brass or a tinkling symbol, though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and have not *charity* I am nothing, *charity* vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up &c. thinketh no evil, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things,