msa_sc2901_scm2353-0259 ©Maryland State Archives

KENT NEWS.

CHESTER TOWN, Md.

Saturday Morning, February 25, 1854.

The Concert and the Poor.

The Concert of Mr. B. School was prevented by the snow. It is to take place on Wednesday next the 1st of March. Let the attendance and contributions be liberal. The weather and the snow combine to make the loudest call upon public sympathy.—The poor are without fuel, and they need other supplies.

Wood.

The almost unparalled fall of snow, its depth and banks, have rendered the roads impassible for vehicles unless some extra efforts be used—our town absolutely needs wood; many families are without it and the little that neighbors can supply will be soon exhausted. Wood must be had! Will our country friends cut their way to town aud bring fuel? and if necessary use sleds? It is badly wanted and no time should be lost—we have the poor among us, they are without fuel.—Bring in wood and it will be purchased promptly and gladly; let no family have more than is actually necessary and much suffering may be relieved. Capt. Frisby Taylor arrived here on Thursday last with a cargo of wood, and to his praise be it said, was distributed among the needy in small quantities, and at moderate prices.—Let others follow the noble example!

THE GOVERNORS APPOINTMENTS. The appointments of Governor Ligon, we find in the Baltimore papers of Thursday. The Governor has not adopted the principle of "rotation," as many of the old officers hold over. Among the Guagers and Inspectors of liquor, we notice the name of Geo. Gale, Esq. of this county. The following are the county appointments:

Coroners—John W. Carroll, Arthur B. Wheatly, E. Crouch, Lambert Wickes. Notary—James Arthur.

THE LIQUOR LAW.—The House of Delegates on Saturday last passed the bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in this State. The bill is to be submitted to the people in November next for their ratification or rejection, and if a majority sanction it, then to be in operation on the 1st day of May 1856. When the Senate votes upon the bill we shall publish it at length.

SNOW.—The Snow on Monday last is believed to be the heaviest that ever fell here; its average depth is about twenty-two inches.

THE MAILS.—We have no mails from Baltimore or Philadelphia since Monday last, the snow completely blockading the roads and rendering travelling impossible.

For the News.

MR. EDITOR:—If yourself and the community are not already weary of the discussion in reference to 'Balls,' &c. which has engrossed the columns of your journal for five weeks past, it argues a degree of patience which we at least cannot claim. We can only promise that this article shall be more brief than *some* of its predecessors, and that, so far as we are concerned, it shall be the last. We regard the true merits of the controversy, originally elicited by the article of your correspondent Landholder, as long since exhausted, and, although we were induced to attack some of the side issues from time to time started by him, we have no disposition to follow him into that labyrinth of Theology, Philology, &c., with which he now seems disposed to embellish the subject.

One word in personal explanation.—The signature of "Harmony," as appended to our last article was an error resulting either from our own inadvertence or from the haste under which your corps of compositors were necessarily compelled to publish it. We preferred from the first to adopt no anonymous signature, and now make the explanation to avoid any misunderstanding which might result from the use of the term. In this connection we may remark upon the want of Harmony indicated in the title, the signature, the avowal and the practice of your correspondent. His caption 'Balls' would imply an attack upon dancing in general. Yet among the first paragraphs of his first article he disclaims any *argument* against Balls as irreligious, expensive, or generally pernicious, and expressly agrees to leave such discussions to the pulpit, press, and fireside circles, and to confine his objections to the use of the "place." We next find him adopting the signature of Landholders & Taxpayers, a signature entirely consistent with his avowal first referred to, because the objections of landholders, &c., as a body, would of course be *secular*, involving the use of the *place*, and not affecting the *sentiment*. But this signature is in direct conflict with the import of the caption "Balls," for the latter, as we have already shewn, implies an appeal to the *sentiment*. And again, notwithstanding this pointed disavowal, voluntarially made, we find upon examining his elaborate articles that the great burthen and song of the discourse—the leading idea expressed and reiterated, urged by every variety of appeal, and by every diligence of scriptural and religious research amount to an invective against the sin and danger of Balls in general. And yet Landholder gravely claims the merit of consistency for his argument, and complains that we have charged him with a disingenuous appeal to the religious sentiment of the community.—Why, sir, we could arrive at no other conclusion than that your correspondent was either unfamiliar with the rules of unity in argument, or that he was urging an objection not earnestly entertained, or that prejudice had so obscured his mental vision as to blind him to the contradictions into which he had clearly fallen We rejected the former, of course, and had to choose between the two last. We have referred to these inconsistencies in our previous communications, but we desire to reiterate them in order to counteract the sectarian feeling which it is their tendency to produce.

We deny that *we* have raised "collateral issues." The whole course of the discussion will demonstrate that the collateral issues have been raised on the other side, and that in our reply and rejoinder, we confined ourselves strictly to the multiplied points from time to time presented. It was our aim to do this as thoroughly and yet as briefly as possible, for had we adopted a different course by replying elaborately to the arguments direct, and the argument by innuendo, to the appeals secular and the appeals theological, urged by Landholder, we should have filled your journal to the exclusion of *all other* matter.—We have at present neither time, space or patience to review all the points throughout the controversy pro and con, but we confidently appeal to your intelligent readers, whether our discussion of the matter has not been legitimately limited to the ideas advanced by our opponent?

We again affirm that the rule quoted by Landholder has exceptions, and that the principle cited by us in reply is a correct one. Our response to his first article was designed as an *invective* against the spirit of sectarianism, illiberality, and exclusiveness exhibited in his objections, and as a demonstration to the community that he had slumbered quietly under a series of evils infinitely worse than those which so promptly and violently elicited his objections. It was the very essence of our purpose to shew this, for we regarded his assault as unjust, gratuitous and inconsistent with itself, as involving a personal indignity to every gentleman and lady who attended the Ball and as a violation of those social rights which guarrantee to all honorable classes of the community, an exemption of their conduct and motives from wanton and unprovoked censure. Such was the spirit under which our reply was penned. But your correspondent has disavowed any purpose of offering indignity to any individual, and we freely and frankly accept the disavowal, while at the same time we must declare that his first communication naturally elicited a spontaneous sentiment of injured right in the minds of all those who were interested in the assembly in question.—Had Landholder confined himself, as he promised "to the place" this feeling would have been less decided but when it became apparent that an amusement in which ladies and gentlemen chose to engage, and which they regarded as unexceptionable, was to become the subject of criticism through the public press, and by the agency of a self constituted "censor morum," then they regarded their clearest social rights as wantonly and injuriously invaded. In other words, it was regarded as an uncalled for interference, to which they could not submit We have thought it proper to say this much in explanation of the feeling created by this unexpected communication of your correspondent and of the sentiment under which the reply was penned, for we desire to avoid all misapprehension either as to our purposes or our motives.

Landholders, attemps to point out a supposed inconsistency in our use of the words "right" and "allowed." In this particular he has certainly set up a valiant man of straw, and as valiantly has he knocked him down. Now in in response to his philologic discussion we would ask "whether there are not many classes and degrees of rights; are there not abstract and absolute rights." Had he observed our use of the word "*equal*" and italicized that instead of the word right, the riddle might have been solved. We have no where contended that any set of individuals—however respectable have the absolute unconditional right to occupy the Public Buildings. Did we not in the onset refer to the County Commissioners as their peculiar guardians. If so was not their authority even them clearly conceded? Our meaning was doubtless sufficiently obvious to your intelligent readers. Each and every respectable section has the *equal* right to use it, for any purpose which they may deem proper. An equality of right, or privilege. One respectable class has as much right as another. Were we not so understood?—Did we not in the same connection allude to its occupation for purposes of every description and upon this fact materially base our claim? Where then is the inconsistency, save in the prolific brain of Landholder, between the two declarations which he quotes, viz the one above recited and the other: "That as long as the House is granted for promiscuous purposes it must in justice and propriety be allowed to any well known respectable and responsible class they bring judges &c." We think your readers will see the "Harmony" of the two.

But again he comments upon our use of the word "public" and private, and inquires triumphantly if a Ball is not private. Here as before he defines the words in question according to a simple isolated view. *Public* is an extensive term, as we shewed *right to be*.

The voters at an election are in the largest sense the Public. A church, though its purposes are specific and confined to particular individuals is a public institution. So is a College, though its ends are defined and its privileges not common to the whole community. A Masonic Lodge is a public association because open to the public under certain restrictions and conditions.—An order of Sons of Temperance is a public institution, though its proceedings are secret, because by conforming to its requisitions, any one of the public may become a member. So with the public Ball; a company of gentlemen associate, and under certain conditions and restrinction invite their fellows without regard to sectional or political or religious limits, to unite with them, for a *temporary* purpose, yet, because temporary not the less public. It is not a private party given at a private residence by an individual host, but public by the fact of general association of members by the choice of the place, by the common right of each to invite whom he pleases, by the very name specefically universally given to it, "a public assembly," and in the popular estimation which so regards it. When we use the word 'Public' or any other word (without restriction) we use it as employed in "common parlance" and not as your correspondent in its refined or philologic sense. If a company of individuals one two or a dozen form a partnership for purposes of trade, their association is *private* because though banded together, the end of each is to promote his own personal individual private interest, and he onploys the principle of association, for the better accomplishment of his individual private purpose.

Does your correspondent perceive the distinction? To our mind it is clear, and we think will be to your readers.—Where is the inconsistency?

Is your correspondent one of these refined logicians, whose skill can split a hair twixt West and N. West side.

"Strange such a difference there should be,
Twixt tweedle dum and tweedle dee."

Landholder, in speaking of himself, says: "We started with the proposition that Balls were in the eyes of many religious persons, sinful, and therefore should not be held in the public buildings on account of their scruples,"—the locality of the house, &c., and that these constituted the subject matter of the first communication. *We* appeal to your readers whether the tenor and burthen of that communication, as of all the subsequent ones, has not been a tirade against dancing in general, without regard to place, time, or circumstances, and yet he alledges that *we* have diverted the public mind by remarks in reference to other and former uses of the *house*. Was this any diversion of the public mind? Was it not legitimate that we should shew that this objection had never been urged before even by Landholder, though the house had been used during time immemorable for porposes which the whole religious community must regard more iniquitous than that against which the outcry is now made.

What would have been the effect of Landholder's argument and position in the popular view, if we had omitted the line of argument to which he objects? Why evidently this,—That assemblies of negro minstrels, Millerite divines, Phrenological or Mesmeric Lectures, &c., were commendable, or at least admissible, while the late assembly of ladies and gentlemen for a dance was a most iniquitous sacrilege of the dead, and a most villainous outrage upon the living. The former uses of the house had never, so far as the community were advised, met even his WHISPERED censure; the latter called forth his *most bitter and sweeping indignation*. We commend the inference to your intelligent readers.

Landholder next says: "If the Ball had been held elsewhere, our voice would not have been heard through the secular press. But when we heard it associated with the Temple of Justice, and that a series of dancing parties were to come off in the same place, then we availed ourselves of the privilege of avowing our sentiments." How did he hear that a series of such parties were to come off? Certainly from no one authorized to make such a statement. He was as grossly misinformed in this particular, as he has shewn himself mistaken as to the characteristics of the gathering itself. No such purpose was at all contemplated, though, as we have said, while ever this building is appropriated to promiscuous uses, we shall claim its use for any purpose sanctioned as this was, by a large and respectable class of the community. We are most cordially in favour of many exhibitions which are held in the Court House, and are not so panic stricken as to apprehend fire and destruction from every use of the building after night. We most earnestly approve of the gentle and beneficent purpose of the young ladies who propose at an early day to give a concert for the benefit of the poor of the community, and will accord our moderate contribution towards that noble and truly generous enterprise. Again, but for the *place* he would not have been heard through the secular press. We have almost too often *already* inquired, why Landholder did not then confine himself to the discussion of the place *as he promised to do*. But we will ask him, "whether upon an impartial review of his own objections, he does not find that they are levelled tenfold more earnestly at the dance in general than at the place where the dance occurred?" He speaks again of the jeopardy to the building and records, but fails to answer the interrogatory propounded in our last, therefore we will now state the proposition as intelligibly as we can—If the danger to this building, from the introduction of light, is so *imminent* and so *alarming*, ought not its use at night be prohibited for *all* purposes? Would it not be better to forbid all Academic exhibitions, Temperance meetings, Philosophic investigations, Political discussions, &c., rather than subject the community at large to this *incalculable hazard*. These gatherings at night are not *essentially absolutely vital* to the welfare of the community. They cannot be compared in importance to the salvation of the Records. Landholder defends such gatherings, and yet cannot and does not deny that they lead to the introduction of lights within the building, and involves the same species of hazard as that which he so pathetically deplores; yet for ten, fifteen or twenty years he has probably *attended* such gatherings after night in the Court House, *and yet it was only when he heard that this building was jeoparded by the introduction of lights for the holding of a dance* that the idea of immediate and irretrievable hazard occurred to him! We omit comments, except to add, that the *forbearance* which he characterizes as "*charity*," had certainly ceased to be a virtue, and that although we admit his charity to have been "*long suffering and kind*," so far as the strolling adventurers and harlequins of the county were interested, we can not say as much for it in the case of his own countrymen and countrywomen, who imagined that in obtaining the use of the Court House, thus offended no law, precedent or propriety.

The application which we gave to the term "charity," was very remote from that ascribed to it by Landholder.

We consider it no charity to delay and forbear our opposition to great public evils, for so soon as they are developed, they should be averted; and we should regard it as the bounden duty of any citizen to exert *immediate* and unremitting effort to protect the public of which is a member, against impending hazard. It would be no *charity* to permit an insignificent class of his own community, much less a band of irresponsible adventurers, to subject his fellow citizens to incalculable loss and calamity. The charity of which we spoke was that inculcated by the great Apostle, viz: a forbearance of condemnation or censure towards those acts which are sanctioned by many of his fellow beings whose lives and conduct are as blameless, as pure, and admirable as his own.

We said in a former article and we say now, that many *professing christians*, whose external conduct is as much in conformity with the profession as that of Landholder can possibly be, not only allow dancing but permit it within their own families, and, we ask if he can claim that cardinal virtue of charity, when he assumes to place this large class of his fellow christians under the ban?

Does Landholder doubt their sincerity? Does he assume that they in their hearts believe dancing to be *damnable and soul destroying*? Then if they do not, "*to them it is a non-essential*," *and the very author from whom he quotes (Dr. Clarke,) commenting upon the very sentence* which he quotes viz: "For God hath received him" says "both being sincere and upright, and acting in the fear of God, are received as heirs of eternal life, without any difference on account of their religious scruples or prejudices." Why did not Landholder after having quoted the text and the commentator, also quote the comment? Is he prepared to deny to that large body of christians who sanction dancing the merit of sincerity and uprightness? Is he prepared to deny that they regard dancing in itself as inocent and blameless. If so as his arguments would indicate. I ask how he conforms to that enlarged and beneficient principle of charity which the apostle inculcates?

We "deny the right of no man, to object to balls." It is his right to object and ours to respond. But let his objection be to the *thing* itself, not to the place where the thing is done. We all have a *civil* right to use the press for any purpose save certain interdicted by law as *personal libel &c* But though we have the civil right we may far overstep the bounds of expediency, propriety, *charity* and good taste, in *expressing* our objections.

And if so then our delinquences in these particulars may be pointed out.—From this rule no one can claim exemption. Landholder says. "How can any man determine the moral character of an action without trying it by the Bible. We defer to the Bible."

Will Landholders point out to us one passage in the New Testament in which *dancing* is condemned?

The Saviour himself, and the illustrious apostle St. Paul frequently recite the vices and crimes against which the vengeance of Heaven shall be expended. They are recited in detail and repeated over and over again. Can he shew us any such interdict against dancing? If such a heinous crime, would it have been omitted? But *we* have authority, if he has not. The inspired writer "Ecclesiastes 3 ch. 4 v. says: But there is a time to weep and a time to laugh, a time to mourn and a time to *dance*." If *dancing* had been regarded as a sin so *direful* and soul *destroying*, would not the Messiah and his apostles have included it among their detailed catalogue of crimes?

Had this simple act of dancing been forbidden either expressly or by implication in the oracles of God, would any professing christian presume to sanction it? We think not.

But Landholders says, "How apply the words to those who make no profession of religion &c."

We do not ask him thus to apply them. But if those who thus indulge, have been reared by parents, as much entitled to respect for christian virtues as any parents in the community, then we ask his *non-interferance at least*. But was this his motive at the start? Did he seek to shew the damnable tendencies of dancing? or did he base his objections on the place? Does he seek to persuade or convert to his way of thinking, and by accusation and disparagement those who saw fit to *dance* on a certain occasion? Does he expect to persuade any of those thus engaged into his way of thinking? or is he one of those "who would compass Heaven and Earth to make one proseiyte?"

Landholder concludes by an elaborate discussion of the sinfulness of Balls.—As we have before said we respect his opinion and we claim our own.

Had he commenced this discussion by an argument against Balls or dancing *in general* we should never have desired a hearing through your columns, for it is a matter of opinion and all the *polemic* discussions in the world would never succeed in converting one of the cause assailed to the other belief.

But the objections were urged to the use of the place. This was legitimate ground and as such we assumed it The argument on the part of Landholder has as we before said merged into a religious sectarian and clannish discussion, which as we *now* perceive can only produce discord, ill-will and bad-feeling in the community.

This has already been its obvious result, and the protraction of this controversy can only have the effect to strengthen and embitter it. For this as for other equally potent reasons we intend to make no rejoinder to any response which may fall from your correspondent.

Therefore whatever may be his own feeling—whether he may choose to claim or to avail himself of the first and the last communication or not, we shall not reply.

The field is open Sir. We regard the true merits of the discussion as exhausted leng ago, and we cannot repeat and re-repeat what we have so often urged and which have been as often unanswered. We thank you most sincerely and your readeas for the indulgence, and announce

THE END.

Baltimore Grain Market.

Baltimore, February 22, 1854.

Wheat, white	1 94 to 1 97	bsh.
" red	1 90 " 1 95	"
Corn white	82 " 83	"
" yellow	80 " 83	"
Oats	49	"
Rye	$100 " 101	"
Cloverseed	$6,50	"

Chester Town Price Current.

Chester Town, Feb. 25, '54.

Turkeys—8 to 10 cts. per lb.
Geese—7 do
Ducks—25 to 31 per pair.
Wild do. —25 to 75 do
Butter—25 cts. lb.
Eggs—12½ doz.
Potatoes—$1 bush.
Dried Peaches—$1 75 bush.
Corn Meal—$1 do
Buckwheat—4 cts. lb.
Beef—5 a 6 cts. by qr.
Hides—4½ cts. lb.
Beans—$1
Oak Wood $4,00 cord.
Hickory " $5,00 "

Notice.

The Steamer "LADY WILMER," (now in the course of repairs) will resume her trips between Philadelphia and the various stopping places on the Sassafras River, up to Wilmer's Point, early in March.

Further notice of her runnings will be given hereafter.

Feb. 25, 1854.

JUST received and for sale 300 lb. shoulder Bacon prime, a lot of fresh ground, extra, and super Flour.

WM. BACCHUS.

feb. 52th, '54.

No. 1, 4, 8, 9, shot for sale. Hats, caps and fleice cotton for sale.

W. BACCHUS.

CONCERT FOR THE POOR.

THE above Concert by the Young Ladies of Mr. Bassford's school is postponed until WEDNESDAY EVENING, March 1st.

Feb. 25th, '54.

A SAWYER WANTED, for terms apply to

WM. BACCHUS.

Chestertown, feb. 25th, 1854.

LUMBER
AT LOW PRICES
FOR CASH
AT
Wilmer's Point.

W. ADDISON LONG, Agent.

GUANO, FISH, FLOUR, | PLASTER, SALT, PLOWS,

AND PLOW CASTINGS.

W. ADDISON LONG, Agent, Wilmer's Point.

Grain Wanted
AT WILMER'S POINT,

Apply to

W. ADDISON LONG, Agent

Feb. 25, 1854.

The Fast and Superior Steamer

CHAMPION!

CAPTAIN WILLIAM NORMAN,

HAVING been put in complete order with improvement in her speed, and newly fitted throughout in the best manner, will commence her

Spring and Summer Route,

March 3rd, to Chestertown, Centreville, Kent Island and the different Landings on Chester River, leaving Baltimore from her wharf, Light St., at 7 o'clock every

Tuesday and Friday Morning

Returning the same day at an early hour.

FARE ONE DOLLAR.

HENRY J. STRANDBERG, Proprietor.

Feb. 25, 1854.

VENDUES,

The 8th and 16th March 1854.

THE subscriber intending to change his residence, will offer at public sale, on *WEDNESDAY*, the 8th of March next, if fair, if not on the first good day thereafter, on the farm he now occupies near Chester Town, his entire stock consisting of

Horses, Cattle, Sheep and Hogs, two Wagons, Horse Power and Thresher, Fan, Cutting Bench, Corn Shellers, Gears, Grain Cradles and Rakes, Harrows, Ploughs, Cultivators, Rollers, Grass Schythes; also one and a half tons of Guano, together with many other things too numerous to name.

And on THURSDAY, the 16th day of March, next, he will offer at public sale the whole of his

HOUSEHOLD AND KITCHEN FURNITURE.

Comprising a fine assortment of Beds, Bedding, and various other articles needless to be enumerated.

The terms will be published at each sale, and to commence at 10 o'clock, A. M.

JOSEPH GOUFF.

Feb. 25, 1851.

Dentistry.

ROBERT P. GIBSON,

OF Easton, Md, will be in Chestertown on Saturday (to-day) and on Monday 20th of February. It is requested that those desiring his services, should leave their messages promptly, (at McDaniel's Hotel) as his visit will necessarially be short.

N B.—He attends persons *in the country* without charging for going to them.

He refers with their consent to the following gentlemen:

Dr, Wroth, Geo. Vickers, Esq., Col. Jos. Wickes, } Chester Town.
Dr. Earle, Rev. Mr. Crane, W. I. Gibson, Esq. } Centreville.
Dr. C. C. Cox, Rev. Dr Mason, Hon. S Hambleton, } Easton.
Dr. A. H. Bayley, Dr. F. P. Phelps, F. J Henry, Esq., } Cambridge.
Hon. J. R. Franklin, Hon. T. Townsend. } Worcester Co.

Feb. 18, 1854

Lost,

BETWEEN the residence of George Vickers, Esq., and the M. Church, on Sunday last the 5th inst. a GOLD LINKED CHAIN, in the form of a bracelet, a locket attached containing some hair and a basket.—The finder will be very liberally rewarded by leaving it at this office.

Feb. 18, 1854.

BRANDY and Old Holland Gin for sale

WM. BACCHUS.

Nov 12, 1853.