Port Tobacco Times

AND CHARLES COUNTY ADVERTISER.

VOL. XVII. PORT TOBACCO, MD., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1861. NO. 42.

ENOCH PRATT BALTO. FREE LIBRARY

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,

BY E. WELLS,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—For one year, if paid in advance or within six months, $1,50; if not paid within six months, $2.00.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.—For plain matter, one dollar per square for the first insertion. For rule and figure matter, two dollars per square for the first insertion. For each insertion after the first, twenty-five cents per square. Twelve lines or less constitute a square. If the number of insertions be not marked on the advertisement, it will be published until forbid and charged accordingly. The privilege of annual advertisers extends *only* to their immediate business.

Announcements of candidates for office, $1.00 per month, to be paid in advance.

Obituaries, tributes of respect, calls upon persons to become candidates, &c., inserted as advertisements, at the usual rates.

Communications, the effect of which is to promote private or individual interests, are matters of charge, and are to be paid for at the rate of 50 cts. per square.

COMMUNICATIONS.

To "Smallwood:"

Respected and renowned sir, in the *Times* of the 17th of January, there appeared over your signature, an article addressed to an humble individual, "S," and in that article you have not only attempted ridicule but have used terms not a little harsh. The harshness may well be excused, as it is only in keeping with that *rabies* or rage for which your organization has long been distinguished, and you know the maxim is pretty generally true that out of the abundance of the heart the mouth will speak. A great and gifted man, owing to the *rabies* with which he was possessed, once breathed out threatenings and slaughter against a holy and just cause—the cause of God's long established government, which traitors and rebels had overthrown, and which God was trying to restore.

There is another maxim, which it would have been well for a man of your wisdom and learning to have observed—"A wise man should never wrestle with a fool, or he may be thrown by folly." You, I have no doubt, supposed, that by writing over your fictitious though renowned signature, your identity would not be detected; but in this you are mistaken; for every one has an identity, in gait, voice, gesture, or style that must sooner or later unfold his reality; and this none ever more truly understood than that shrewd animal and unerring critic the fox. A marked instance of the peculiar tact and capacity of this animal is recorded in the following simple though significant language: "An ass having put on a lion's skin, roamed about frightening all the *silly* animals he met with, and seeing a fox, he tried to alarm him also. But reynard, hearing his voice, said, 'Well, to be sure, and I should have been frightened too, if I had not heard you *bray*.'" So you see you cannot assume a character which does not belong to you, without being detected by the instinct of perception and the accuracy of habitual criticism. There was a marked difference too in the phiz of the animals, which, I am sure afforded valuable suggestions to reynard—the ass had long ears.

But, to return to more serious subjects, in that call, which, if I am not mistaken, you signed, this language is used: "But it is not necessary to refer to examples. A *Sovereign Convention* of the people can be called and held by the people *at any time they please*, without regard either to Governor or Legislature. It is an *inherent* and *inalienable* right of which no power can deprive them. It is their great safeguard against misrule and oppression, and the great reserved power which no free people can ever part with;"—and then the invitation is to vote "whether they will or will not have a Sovereign Convention;" and then to illustrate the truth and propriety of the proposition Texas is referred to, where, it is said, a "Sovereign Convention" has been called without the interposition of Governor or Legislature. That Convention there called, if it has not already done so, will certainly vote Texas out of the Union. Was such your intention on proposing this call?

Recently, in this movement, you have given every overt evidence of co-action with South Carolina. She has been applauded. One portly-looking, well fed gentleman, of considerable age, is said to have been wearing the secession emblem or badge; boys, (I ask their pardon for not saying they were great and important men,) have habitually, in the midst of shouts and exultation, worn the badge or emblem. These straws show which way the wind blows. These straws floated along as they were blown from the mouths of older men. A man is known by the company he keeps. If it is known that he has kept company with a certain association, and that association turns out to be confederate in a specific purpose, as in the purpose of disunion, is it not a presumption he intended the purpose of association as a confederate? Did not South Carolina, and other States, down in that neighborhood, long ago denounce the accursed Union? Has she not recently declared she wants no settlement of the question—she intends and wishes alone to occupy the position of a foreign State in relation to the General Government? Alabama has, through her Commissioner to this State, declared the purpose still more explicitly. It is to establish a Southern independent and permanent confederation. The Commissioner, in letter to Gov. Hicks, says: "With Alabama, after patient endurance for many years, and earnest expostulations with the Northern States, the reluctant conviction has become fixed, there is no safety for her in a hostile Union, governed by an interested sectional majority. I trust that between Maryland and Alabama and other States, having a homogenious population, kindred interests, and an inviting future of agricultural, mining, mechanical, manufacturing, commercial and political success a *Union*, strong as the tie of affection and lasting as the love of liberty, will soon be formed, which shall stand as a model of a free, representative, constitutional, voluntary republic." You will thus see what has been and is the determination of these seceding States. Now it is clear from their conduct and declarations, before and since the act of secession, and from all the concurring circumstances, that they never intended and do not now intend to return unless some unforseen event should arise to compel them to do so. After their scission of, and extraction from the Union is complete, we find the leaders of the movement parcelling out place and power for themselves. The Roman power divided up the empire by a tripartite division, and it is not improbable when they first started in their work of treason, disorganization and distruction, they had no definite plan in view, but were to move along in the current of events. So it may be here. Selfishness is the first law of our nature; it begets treason, inordinate ambition, disorganization, civil strife, and is the prolific parent of all those base and destructive passions which destroy and vitiate human society. You may rest assured that even if the leaders of this exit from the Union, intended at first a return, when they found their work was so easy, the instinct of selfishness, working inordinately, would cause them to set up for themselves; and the result has vindicated the correctness of the proposition. I believed it from the first. Now it so happens you have co-acted with the movement, and the rule of presumptive evidence, if I am rightly informed, would make you to have had a full knowledge of what was intended and a confederate.

This may be a proper place to notice the imputation made by you, that I intended to seek an office at the hands of the incoming administration, and to thereby become a sucker of the government pap. Now here, you see, you are braying Did you ever seek that pap under another name or power? I suspect you did. I never did. Those who have been guilty themselves are most likely to suspect others. The ass would not have put on the lion's skin had he not known what it was to fear the king of beasts.

But let us return to the other part of the proposition quoted from the call—that the rights of the people are inherent and inalienable, and therefore they can call a "Sovereign Convention" when they please. Now, sir, you are aware, from what you have seen heard and known, during the period of a pretty long and not inactive life, that it is often much easier to refute a man than it is to silence him—and this will depend again upon the share of the reasoning faculty he may possess, or the extent to which he is interested on the other side. Interested partizan leaders have no intention of acting upon conviction, where it is their interest to act otherwise, and their subordinates have not reason enough to render them capable of a conviction. Now, what are the inherent rights which you say are inalienable, or cannot be parted with, or cannot be bound? They are simply the man with his faculties of mind and body, and possibly property might be placed among them, as it is the result of the action of the other two. I learn from a speech before me that free government is a compact between the members of the community, and consequently there is an equality of both *rights* and *obligation*. This compact forms an unqualified guarantee of the protection of life and liberty and works a forfeiture of either or both for a violation of the terms of the compact. Now, the very basis of this is, you shall not violate these inherent rights of your neighbor; but suppose you do so by committing treason against the government, and consequently against all the members of the community, would you then find that these rights of life and liberty were inalienable—could be bound, or given up? Hanging is the penalty for treason, and have you not generally found, in the course of your reading and experience that a man holds neither life nor liberty when he is hung? Are life and liberty then inalienable? If the guarantee is to the extent of the protection of life and liberty without a limit, must it not be equally to the extent of a forfeiture of the same? The government founded upon this unlimited guarantee of the protection and forfeiture of the inherent, and what may be forfeited or alienated rights, belongs equally to *each* individual to the utmost extent of the guarantee; and for private citizens or a majority of the people to call your "Sovereign Convention," without the forms and sanction of the law, is to perform an inorganic act and to subject each and the minority to an unqualified power without any guarantee of protection and without any obligation on their part to submit. This very proposition is an illustration of that very condition when individuals and minorities have a right to resist; for when the agents or trustees of government have transcended their power, they are no longer agents or trustees of government, but have become a collection of private individuals and usurpers ouside of the government, acting upon their own individual authority, and each individual, or a minority, can resist their action by virtue of their right to the government which was instituted for the good and protection of each or of the *whole*. This process of calling a "Sovereign Convention" without the forms of law is exactly on the principle of the abuse of power by trustees or agents of government, when they have undertaken to do what the government and law does not authorize to be done. Time and space will not permit me to elaborate.

The clause in the Constitution, as to the time and mode of change, was not placed there as an imperative power, but the *basis* of the insertion is the *time* when it should be called or invited, in obedience to a *notion* of Jefferson, that every ten years or thereabouts the Constitution should be changed, that the current of the progress of popular opinion and improvement might be conformed. But, sir, even on this point the Convention thought the Legislature the legitimate tribunal to make the call or ask the will of the people. This very Sovereign Convention thought the Legislature the proper depository of the power or trust.

But was it necessary to say in the Constitution that the Legislature should call a Convention? The Legislature is the embodiment of the sovereignty of the people; and that embodiment of sovereignty was deposited there by the Convention, to be exercised in wise and judicious manner for the protection of life, liberty and property, until, according to the mode prescribed in the instrument, another Convention should ordain another mode of organic action. The Constitution does not point the specific mode in which life, liberty and property shall be protected; yet laws are passed for this purpose—as crime is punished by law, although it is not said any one even shall be punished in a particular manner. Can you find the punishment for murder in the Constitution; or do you find it in the law enacted by the Legislature? Where do you get the specific power to enact the police bill of Baltimore? The power to do whatever is necessary for the protection of life, liberty and property is implied from the guarantee of protection, or follows the grant of unqualified legislation for protection; and all this is in the hands of the legislative department, to be exercised in a *mode, manner* and at a *time* judgment, discretion and the exigency of the case may demand; and that tribunal is to be the judge, in its exercise of a sound discretion, when a Convention should be called, based upon reasons declared to the people. The Governor by the act of the Convention, in framing the Constitution which has been put in operation by a direct vote of the people, occupies the same position, in the exercise of a sworn judgment and discretion, as to when the occasion is such as to demand a call of the Legislature. But I cannot elaborate

If, sir, your organization had been as zealous and as earnest, from the first, in the maintenance and execution of the supremacy of the law, as they have been in enforcing this disorganizing doctrine of inherent and inalienable rights, the condition of our once loved and glorious Union would be very different from what we now find it It is true that sovereign conventions, in nearly all the States, under the force of the inorganic action of your party, has overturned nearly every State government against the palpable provisions of the organic law. In this State it was done against the convictions and warnings of some of our wisest and most conservative citizens; and it has been this mob law and disorganizing action which we have warred against, and which has brought all this trouble upon our once beloved and happy country. Religious fanaticism at the North and fire-eating treason at the South, have seized upon your example as a precedent, and have used it to achieve its hellish purpose at the North by assaults upon the civil authority and by raids upon the South; while in the execution of the same disorganizing action the South has overturned our once glorious and free government—contrary to the express provisions of the Constitution of the United States. Disorder begeteth disorder; disregard of law and order begeteth disregard of law and order; one evil example becomes the prolific parent of many similar examples.

You say you have *heard* of illegal elections of Representatives to Congress, to violate the wishes of the people of Maryland—of temples burned down—of religious associations of females broken up, their property destroyed and they turned out helpless upon the world, and no compensation having been made them. You see you will bray; but I fear reynard will be too shrewd for you.—Have you not heard and read how the navy-yards and government works have been used to control elections? Have you not heard and read how your organization has from its foundation practiced proscription upon, and denounced all who differed from it, and has acted throughout its whole career upon the rule that to the victor belong the spoils? Have you not heard and read how, in the exercise of a most lawless and wanton tyranny, peaceful and inoffensive citizens were shot down in cold blood in the streets of Washington? Have you not heard and read how your organization has sunk to the bottomless depths of corruption, bribery, peculation and plunder? and how elections have been controled by direct bribery and votes have been bought? Have you not heard and read how thousands of native-born citizens have been turned out of office and out of employment to give place to a pack of worthless Dutch and Irish? And lastly, and high over all, have you not heard and read how your organization, having lost its power under our once blessed Union, has effected a secession and disruption of that Union in the execution of the grandest scheme of treason ever enacted on this earth, and which finds no parallel except in that rebellion which assaulted the Omnipotent of heaven and dethroned this portion of God's creation? But even if the allegations you make of mobs and riots, against what you intend to intimate was the American party, were true, do you think that would furnish you with a justification?

Sir, that party erred in many respects; but it was patriotic and has done a great good: it saved this State from your ruthless grasp, and except for its influence in our beloved old State, we might now, at your hands, have had civil war raging all along our borders. Small it is, but firm and patriotic, and devoted to our once great and glorious Union; and every member, if need be, will cheerfully lay down his life in defence of that Union and not in the enactment of treason; nor, sir, is that small but patriotic party to be despised, for its concentrated vote has the balance of power here and may tell fearfully in some of the coming results

But it is easy to understand the object of your reference to that party in this form. There are among us a certain class of citizens called Catholics, and in this allusion you intend to hold again to them the dish out of which you would invite them to take a fresh sop. You know an illustrious personage was sopped with by his betrayer; Judas Iscariot was a cold-blooded hypocrite. This firm and patriotic class of our fellow-citizens will be found, in the main, firm in support of the Union they love, and stern in beating back the religious fanaticism of the North and the fire-eating treason of the South. They begin now to understand the wolfish cry. Here another event of history, recorded in simple though expressive language, may not be inappropriate: "An old lion having become stiff, so he could not well hunt, feigned sickness and confined himself to his den, and sent word to all the beasts of the forest that they should visit him and administer to his wants. Suspecting nothing wrong, they visited him continually and none returned, for he *devoured* them all. Here reynard's shrewdness was too much for the old lion; and approaching the mouth of the den, he bid good morning to his majesty; his majesty invited him in but he declined and declared he was in a hurry. 'Why, said his majesty, the other beasts have visited me! Yes, said the shrewd and critical reynard, 'I see tracks going in but none coming out—good morning to your majesty!" I am in a hurry.

Now for the practical application of this fable. In all the territory heretofore acquired, by conquest or purchase, the Catholic religion and power were in the ascendency at the time of the conquest or purchase; now both are prostrate in the dust. If this Southern Republic is formed agreeably to the policy of your party, which has the ascendency there, there must be annexation, by men, fair or foul, perhaps to Cape Horn, with Cuba thrown in for good measure; and in less than fifty years after the happening of the event there will not be, in all that region of country, Catholics enough to make mile stones for your party. It is not improbable a large portion of this class of our fellow-citizens have discovered, that heretofore, their tracks have all been going in and none coming out.

A brief allusion again to the imputation that I was seeking to suck the government pap. Here retort is cogent and at hand. I have shown you the seceding States do not intend to return, but will set up for themselves a "voluntary republic," as they style it. Have you co-acted with this movement, and if so, do you expect to suck the pap of this voluntary republic? Who will be its first congressman from this district—or may be its first Governor of this State?

It is astonishing how the rabies or rage with which your party is possessed acts upon its individual members. A mad dog is thrown into spasms by the sight of water, and I have seen members of your party thrown into spasms through the force of that rage with which they seem possessed, at the bare expression, "The house is on fire!" I heard of one who declared, that unless the fire was extinguished by the secession of the State he would go to the South—as if the community would not be relieved by the emission of such material and be glad to be rid of it, just as the whale was relieved when it vomited up Jonah—for I have no doubt Jonah was a most unpleasant inmate of the whale's belly.

I discover I am a long way ahead of you, I will therefore conclude and wait for you. For the purpose of ridicule and contempt you have been pleased to compliment me with a nice piece of poetry—may I reciprocate the compliment:

"Is there not some chosen curse,
Some hidden thunder in the stars of heaven,
Red with uncommon wrath, to blast the man,
Who owes his greatness to his country's ruin."

S.

MR. EDITOR:—In my last communication, I promised not to trouble you again *soon*, unless with a better cause in hand than I then had. Whether this promise is *broken* or not, is for *you* to decide. In discussing the *dogma*, that "*all* men are *created free* and *equal*," I dwelt entirely upon the doctrine of *equality*, without noticing the other member of the sentence,—*universal freedom*. It has since occurred to me that it is *equally* capable of profitable *dissection*. And in doing so, I shall *not* conform my arguments to the *modern idea*, of *endeavoring to escape* the sentence pronounced upon *Adam* after his *fall*, "that in the *sweat* of thy *brow*, shalt thou eat bread,"—but deal with men and things according to the *facts* and *realities*, known and *felt*, by every inhabitant of this *sin-troubled* world, *since that fall*. *Webster* defines the word *freedom* to mean, "a state of *exemption* from the *power* or *control* of another,"—this perhaps is as good a definition, as could be given;—and, if it be *true*, then we are *obliged* to conclude, that, as *no* man is *entirely* "exempt from the *power* or *control* of *another*," the term *freedom* has only a *limited* and *relative significance*. "*No* man liveth to *himself*," we are *all* surrounded and *controlled* by the circumstances of *wants*, *desires*, *comforts*, *convenience* and *happiness*, so that no man will dare to say that he is *absolutely* and *entirely free*,—that he is "*full* and *lacketh* nothing." And he that from *inexperience*, or other cause, should set out in life, upon the *assumption*, that he has all the *means* of *existence* and *happiness* within the compass of his *own powers* and *capabilities* and *despises* the assistance, and power and control of others, will, before he reaches *middle* age, be compelled to *feel*, that he is battling against *counter-currents*, which will sweep him on to early ignominy and destruction;—that he is not *free* and *independent* of his *fellow* men;—but, conjointly with them, a *servant* to a *law written* in his *nature*—the *law* of a *divine* appointment, by which it is *intended* to *discipline* him for the *enjoyment* of a *better life*.

I shall not discuss the question whether "*all* men are *created* free;—it is of little consequence whether they are *created* free, if they do not *remain* so. The *practical* part of the question, I shall treat, and leave the other to *hair-splitting theorists*. Without, at present, referring to any *law*, *human* or *divine*, bearing upon, and *deciding* this question of *freedom*, I shall endeavor rather to inquire into the *causes*, which from the *constitution* of the world, and the *nature* and *requirements* of man, *rendered* such a law *necessary* and *proper*. And, as from what I have said, I think it will be *admitted*, that *no* man, however *high*, or of whatever *station*, is *positively* and *absolutely free*, or "exempt from the *power* or *control* of another," but *free*, only *relatively* and *conditionally*, so it must be granted that *no* man, however *low* or *obscure* is *absolutely* and in *every respect*, *subject* to the "*power* or *control* of another,"—from which it will appear that *freedom* and *servitude* are entirely *conditional* and *limited*. And, as from the *exigencies* of the construction of human *society*, there *must* be *different grades* and *conditions* of men, to fulfil the different *offices indispensibly* requisite to the *well-being* and *success* of social existence;—as *governors*, *teachers*, *artisans*, as well as "*hewers* of wood and drawers of water," so it follows as a *natural* consequence, that *they* should fill these several positions, who are by *nature*, *best fitted* for them. And, if by the *spontaneous* operation of *natural causes*, it should appear that any *particular race* of men, is *better fitted* for any given *occupation*, it follows that *that* position is its *peculiar sphere* of *action*. And, if it should also be found that an *inferior race* is by *nature adapted* to an *inferior position*, it only proves the *unerring wisdom* of the *Great Maker* of *nature's laws*, by which a *fitness* and *propriety* is *maintained*, between the *agent* and the *work* to be *performed*.—And a *law*, granting this *agent*, or *instrument*, *all* the *conditions necessary* to his fulfilling his assigned position, and *subjecting* him to the *control* and *government* of other *agents superior* in station, and *capacities*, is no *injustice* or *hardship* to him, no *violation* of the principle of *particular agents* performing their *natural* and *appropriate parts*. And further, if it be found to be for the *benefit* of both the *superior* and *inferior* agents to *change* their *relations* to *each other*, from a *general*, to an *individual dependence*, it is also no *violation* of the law of *propriety*, or the *adaptation* of *mutual benefits* to the *agents employed*.

If I have succeeded in making myself *plain* in the foregoing remarks, it will appear conclusive, that the *civilization*, *enlightenment*, *sustenance* and *christianization* of the world, required the *most efficient organization* of the *agencies* for the *attainment* of their *ends*. And if experience and history have demonstrated that the *colored race* has proven to be by *nature* best adapted to the *inferior* station in life, and *most effective*, under the *individual control* and *management* of the *superior*, or *white* race, it is no abuse of the *principle* of *adapting* the *means* to the *end*. I will not here use, the often enforced argument, of the *benefits* resulting to that race, by redeeming it from *heathenism*, *brutal degradation*, and the oppressions practised upon it, by its own color and kindred. But, I said that *freedom* is *relative* and *conditional*. The word *freedom*, in the *general* and *popular* acceptation of the term, carries with it the *idea* of *happiness*, *contentment*, *abundance*, and the *possession* of *all* the *wants*, *desires* and *comforts* of life, without its *cares* and *labor* and *evils*, and this *idea* is *specious* and *natural*. But what are the *stubborn facts* and *realities* in reference to *multitudes* of men, who *claim* and *hold* the title to *nominal* freedom both *black* and *white*. *Degraded*, *ignorant*, *despised* and *literally* "poor and blind and naked"—they are objects of *charity* and *sympathy*, and they almost *alone* are the subjects for enlightened, christian *benevolence*, as being cut off from *individual* care and attention.

And, what also are the undeniable facts, in reference to that class, who excite the sympathies, and crocodile tears of our modern pseudo-philanthropists? Are any poor? No. Are any starving? No. Are any naked, and unhoused and unprotected? No. Are any beggars? No. They are free from want free from care,—free from sudden changes from abundance to abject poverty. They have secured to them a regular and constant supervision of their necessities so that not one is found begging, but has always somewhat to give. Who then is practically free? and who positively a slave in these cases,—surely it must be admitted that he is free, whose wants are supplied before he asks;—and he a slave, whose only experience it is to want and crave what to him, and perhaps a dependent and helpless family, there is never a supply of,—even the commonest necessaries of daily life. If it is objected that in this argument, I have assumed the inferiority of the African race, without adducing proof, to establish the same, I answer, that such proof is abundant and sufficient. And in offering this proof, I shall use such evidence as is generally satisfactory to practical men, in a practical world, and to make the testimony more clear and conclusive, I shall resort to the very common and recognized practice of analogy. A father, having a large family, among them, two, three or more sons, naturally feels a deep concern for their welfare and success in life, and therefore gives to them all the advantages of his equal and impartial, instruction, admonition, and worldly goods, and very justly expects their success to be proportionate to his solicitude, and the means of advancement he has accorded to each—but, if in the course of time, he should discover that one or two of them, have outstriped the rest, and attained to honor and distinction, while the others are stationary, or have retrograded from the first condition, he must perforce conclude, that his successful sons were superior in their national abilities, or habits of energy and enterprise, and the others inferior and deficient in all the elements of success, and advancement in life And, as of individuals, so of nations, or races of men, the analogy holds good, and is considered fair and just. Here then to come from a supposed case, to a real one, there was an old man (Noah) having, we are told, three sons—and we may reasonably conclude that they received at his hands an equal share of kindness, attention and instruction, and other advantages,—and he no doubt expected each to make his mark in the world. It is not necessary for my purpose to notice but two of these sons. What is the record of history in reference to them? One has made his mark, and all adown the track of time, he and his posterity have left monuments of their superiority in all the elements of advancement;—monuments of success in civilization, the arts, and sciences and whatever conduces to the elevation of the human family, from the level of mere animal existence. And they have also brought down with them a record of themselves and the world, and but for them, the world and its history would have been to-day, as dark as the waves of oblivion, and as disordered as the dominions of Chaos. Has the other son made any mark? Yes truly,—but it is such a mark, as makes darkness invisible—black with the evidences of his own inferiority, his degradation, his heathenism, and the proofs of having descended in the scale of being to only one degree above the status of the mere brute Are not these proofs sufficient to establish the inferiority of the African race, without noticing the fact of his color, which in itself must be evidence of something; and if from history and experience, it cannot be evidence of equality or superiority, it must be prooof of inferiority, as being the only thing to which it can be applied as evidence.

So much then for the practical and natural disposal of the question;—let us turn now to the "law and the testimony," which will not be found deficient in this case.—But this "law and testimony" has been so often cited by writers, and every one must be so familiar with it, that it will not be necessary for me to quote it here in detail; but refer to it only as a fact admitted and settled. In the history of the Jewish nation, no condition of life was more definitely fixed and defined by law, than this very question of freedom and servitude; by a law too, it must not be forgotten, emenating and authoritatively announced from the very fountain, source and centre of all law, knowledge and light,—even from the Great Jehovah himself. And if this is so, does it not seem the grossest presumption to argue for or against a matter disposed of by authority so high and unapproachable? I will pursue the argument no further, for fear of incurring the judgment of being "wise above what is written" and rendering myself unconsciously obnoxious to the "curse" of "adding to or taking from" the "words of the prophecy" of that Book.

Then, sir, if I have been successful in the arguments of this and my last communication what becomes of this favorite, and to them, vital dogma of the Black Republican party, that "ALL men are CREATED free and equal." It would be presumption in me to say that it is demolished—but this I will say, that to my conceptions, it is a doctrine "whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the TRUTH." And in conclusion, we may, I think, wisely leave this question where it has been settled by a higher than human authority, and like Gamaliel of old, conclude that if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, they cannot overthrow it; lest haply they be found even to fight against God." Yours, &c.

CIVIS.

Pomonkey, Feb. 3, 1861.

DON'T DO THAT TILL I AM DEAD.—On the day of the meeting of the Secessionists at Kington, Ga., a revolutionary soldier returned to his residence in Cobb county, though his eyes were so dim he could not see well. He was told they were trying to get the people to dissolve or secede from the Union. Whereupon he dropped his withered face and seemed to be in deep distress for one or two minutes, after which he raised up his head, and, with a faltering voice, said, "Oh, don't do that till I am dead!" While he uttered these words the large tears chased each other down his worn cheeks.—He was told that a great number of men would try to prevent it; to which he replied "Don't let them do that till I am dead!"

☞ A little boy one day nonplussed his mother by making the following inquiry.

"Mother, if a man is a mister, ain't a woman a mistery?"