msa_sc2901_scm2353-0263 ©Maryland State Archives

THE KENT NEWS.

Frustra, laborat, qui omnibus, placere, studet---"He labours vainly, who endeavors to please every one.

BY E. MANSFIELD. CHESTER TOWN, Md. $1 50 PER ANNUM, in advance.

VOL. 14. SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1854. NO. 44.

THE KENT NEWS.

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER,

Devoted to Agriculture, Politics & Gen'l News

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY.

EDWARD MANSFIELD,

PROPRIETOR.

TERMS:

$1,50, payable in advance—$2 at the expiration of the first six months, or $2,50 at the end of the year—5 copies for $6—10 copies for $10. No subscription received for a shorter period than six months, and no paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid.

Terms of Advertising.

Advertisements not exceeding twelve lines will be inserted three times for $1, and 25 cents for each insertion thereafter. Larger ones in proportion. A liberal deduction will be made to yearly advertisers. Advertisements must have the number of times marked, or they will be published till forbid, and charged according.

All communications must be post-paid.

POETICAL.

THE WORTHLESS CHARM.

BY FRANK LEE.

"I give them to the winds;
Fit treasury for all thy gifts."

Come not to me with gentle words,
Their magic now is o'er;
You cannot rule my altered heart,
As in the days of yore.
Come not to me in luring smiles,
Their power now is vain,
You cannot charm my wayward soul,
With witchery again.

I lived upon thy lightest glance,
Mine every hope was thine—
You coldly flung in scorn away
That proffered love of mine.
Come not to me with gentle words,
Think on the days of old,
And marvel not my trampled heart
Is hardened now and cold.

Have I not borne in silence long?
Think you I love thee yet?
Go, bear the weight upon my soul,
You never can forget!
Have I not borne in silence long?
With scorn, contempt, neglect?
Have I not had my heart-strings wrung,
And every feeling wreck'd?

Go breath into another ear
The vows of long ago,
They cannot move my frozen heart,
Their falsehoods well I know,
Go press upon another lip
The kiss I wipe from mine,
Within this hour I break the spell
My spirit caught from thine.

Go seek another worshiper—
My soul no more is stirr'd,
I listen calmly to thy tones,
Nor tremble at each word
A prison'd bird let loose from thall,
All madly spurns his chain;
As proudly I reject the gift
I never shall wear again.

COMMUNICATIONS

For the News.

"BALLS."

MR. EDITOR:—

Although you and your readers are no doubt as weary of the subject as our opponent is of the word "Balls" at the head of our articles, and which, like "Banquo's Ghost," rises up to disturb his visions of pleasure, permit us, not for the sake of having the last word, but for the cause, to send you a short article. He complains that our signature is inconsistent with the caption, because the objections of Landholders are *secular*, as to *place*, and the term "Balls" would imply *sentiment*. It is the first time we have heard that Landholder cannot have *sentiments* in regard to moral subjects, and that *place* is their appropriate sphere. This is about on a par with the defence of the writer for violating the logician's rule of discussion, preferring to charge an opponent with a want of sincerity, rather than "unfamiliarity with the rules of unity in argument." Can the writer see in this the "tweedle dum" or "tweedle dee," or would it not require the aid of the strongest optical glasses to see any just distinction where so much labor has been expended to raise artificial ones. The writer "denies that he raised any collateral issues." Did he not introduce Ethiopeans, Mesmerisers, Jugglers, and all the et ceteras, that tradition has handed down since the erection of the public buildings? Let any one refer to his voluminous writings, and they will discover the "collateral issues" as abundant as the grapes which Moses' spies carried from the brook Eschol.

In our last we shew, for illustration, some of his inconsistencies, but he has labored hard to defend them. Let us see with what success. In his first communication he asserts, without qualification, "The fact that it is a public building at large, gives to each and every respectable section of the community, *the equal right to use it for any purpose they may deem proper.*" Now here is no qualification or condition. Having shown that the right could not exist, and would lead to ridiculous consequences, and to collisions; in his second article the *right* is abandoned, and the privilege is to be "*allowed!*" We shew the inconsistency of the two; and in the third article it is alledged that he "no where contended that any set of individuals, however respectable, have the absolute unconditional right to occupy the buildings," and then adds: "Each and every respectable section has the *equal right* to use it, for any purpose which they may deem proper." What is a *right*? Webster, the great philologist, (excuse us for referring to the standard rather than to every one's notion of common parlance) defines it as a "just claim, legal title, ownership, enjoyment." These are the appropriate definitions where the use of property is involved,—but we are told the word "*equal*" removes the difficulty! The word "equal" refers to the enjoyment of the same *right* by more than one—the *thing* is not changed—the *right* exists in several—but how can a *right* exist in any, where it is a use only "granted" or "allowed?" The superadded words, "An equality of right or privilege," confounds the two, and is a virtual surrender of the argument, and an admission that the *right* is *no "right,"* but a mere use by courtesy and permission, which the rightful authority can withdraw at any time.

Again the writer persists in the error that Balls are public and not private, because he laid down the proposition, that the use of the house must be *public* to be rightful; and hence his allusions to Colleges, Masons, Odd Fellows and Sons of Temperance. Can it be unknown to the writer that these very cases cited by him as public bodies, are essentially, in their character, regulations and *in law, private*? That they are when incorporated "*private?*" But what says the great American Lexicographer, whose authority we defer to in preference to any assumed "popular estimation" in a matter of this kind? He says "public" means "open to all; notorious; regarding the community; directed to the interest of a nation, state, or community; open for entertainment, as a public house; open to common use, as a public road," &c. Do any of these definitions apply to "Balls?" They are in their origin and management, radically and properly "*private.*" It is a "private" and not a public matter, and neither the "place" nor the "association" can change the nature of the thing.

The tickets are paid for and limited—no one has a right to attend without one—they are intended to be restricted, and not scattered promiscuously through the community. The object is for the personal gratification and pleasure of those who are *invited!*. The argument then, according to the writer's own showing, excludes Balls—because they are "private," and not "public."

It is no pleasure to us to exhibit the inconsistencies of any one, but we are constrained to do so, that the public may know how to estimate the views of a "ready writer," in defence of what we conceive to be detrimental to the public good. For instance; in the first article he says: "We admit the proposition, that Taxpayers and citizens of the county have a right to express their sentiments as the *use of the buildings;* we claim that, for ourselves, &c." In the last article the same writer says: "We deny the right of no man to object to balls, but let his objections be to the *thing* itself, and not to *the place where the thing is done.*" The right to express our sentiments as to the "*use of the public buildings*"—but not to the "*place*" where Balls are held, though in the 'public buildings!' Will the writer call this the making of a "man of straw," or is it not a veritable "raw head and bloody bones" to his consistency? In his first communication he professes respect for the opinions of that class of the community whose moral sense is opposed to Balls and in this age of freedom of speech and of conduct, the opinions of "their advocates shall be respected." He proceeds to examine our reasons of policy, &c., against the use of the House, considers them fallacious, and that our real objections is founded in opposition to Balls, and says "he fears that the community will not regard our strictures as dictated by a lively interest for the public good, but as flowing from that *general sentiment against dancing, &c.*" In his last article he says—"Had we commenced this discussion by an argument against Balls or dancing in *general*, we should never have desired a hearing through your columns" He considered the argument as to the *place* unimportant, and our real attack against Balls—with this he elaborates three long essays, and concludes the last with an admission that takes from him the merit of his former productions. In one he respects the motives of those who oppose Balls, and concedes the right of opinion and the press—in another he yields only the *abstract* right to hold opinions about Balls, and rebukes us for expressing them. He asserts "that had we commenced our argument against *Balls or dancing in general*, he should never desired a hearing, &c.," and yet in the same article, only separated two columns, in speaking of our several communications, he says—"We appeal to your readers whether the tenor and burthen of our (first) communication, as of all the subsequent ones, has not been a tirade against *dancing in general*, without regard to *place time or circumstances.*" In the same communication he condemns us not for writing against Balls, but the *place* where they are held; add yet he complains two columns distant that we have issued our *tirade* against *dancing in general, without regard to place!*" Does not some writer say "Consistency is a jewel?" The fact is, that whenever a writer undertakes to defend a bad case, he should be like one who is going through an unknown and extensive forest, who *marks the trees* in his progress, that he may not lose his way on his attempted return, and find himself at last in a dilemma, from which he cannot be extricated.—The result of the argument is this—You may write against Balls, but you must not do so prior to holding of one, nor after one is held, lest you be invidious or personal—you may write about the public buildings and their use, provided you do not allude to Balls. In fact, you must be *abstract*, not practical—"time, place, and circumstances" must not be referred to.

We have shewn that the use of the buildings for school exhibitions, Temperance associations, the meeting of the people in their primary character, and lectures upon scientific subjects, are not immoral, and cannot be compared to uses of a different character. Our opponent asserts that these might be objected to, because some deem them sinful and of bad tendency. We suppose some may be found who would condemn the Bible, all religious associations and Courts of Justice—there are ultraists everywhere; but who would make the opinions of such a rule for the government of a community? What respect shall be paid to the opinions of men who think every thing or nothing sinful, as their whims or caprices may dictate? Why then introduce illustrations which have no relevancy, and prove nothing or prove too much? If the public buildings have been used for Ethiopean Serenaders, we have not attended or sanctioned such uses, even under the immediate vigilance of the keeper, and our "whispers," as the writer calls them, have been as loud as articulate sounds against such uses, although he undertakes to judge us in a matter of which he must be ignorant.

Having shown the former quotations, of an opponent from the Bible, to be utterly irrelevant and inapplicable to the subject matter and not pertinent, even by any forced construction, we congratulate him that his Biblical researches have furnished him with a quotation from 3 Eccles. that there is "A time to weep and a time to laugh—a time to mourn and a time to dance." We presume this is the sum of all the Bible authority, which the writer can produce. In the same chapter he will find it said "A time to kill and a time to heal—a time to love and a time to hate—a time of war and a time of peace," &c. Will the writer say, that this, is an authority to *hate*—an authority to *kill*—and a license to *war!* Does he not find these in the same category? The author of the Book, is speaking of the things that are done—not justifying them—the occurrences that take place from the "cradle to the grave"—not commending murder—hatred and war—Dancing and the pleasures of the world. The qualifications of the christian are opposed to these things, as any one may see by reading the Gospel and Epistles. This is old Testament scripture, and the writer askes us for authority from the New.—The Decalogue we believe is in the Old, and we believe it is binding—but if he is disposed to be merry, we will refer him to the Apostle James, who says, "Is any merry! let him sing Psalms,"—(not dance at balls.) He admits that many moral and religious persons are opposed to balls,—then we commend to him the language of Paul, "Abstain from all *appearance* of evill,"—"Give no offence, neither to the Jews nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God," by using a building in which they have an interest, against their wishes, and for a purpose offensive to them?

He asks us to show a specific charge against Dancing in the New Testament? Does he mean to insinuate that everything is permitted, that is not enumeratee as reprehensible. To what would it lead? Public Horse Racing—Public Gambling—Faro Banks.—The selling liquor to drunken men, who have wasted their property and substance in dissipation, and various other things of a kindred hue. Where is any explicit denunciation by name, against these vices? Does the writer mean to assert that all things not specifically named in the New Testament, are *indifferent* and allowable to the christian! Does he not know that the scriptures strike at the *heart*, the fountain of evil—that it establishes a high and exalted standard of morality, commands the constant exercise of all the virtues, and enjoins duties, which necessarily render their opposite sinful. If the command be to *love* thy neighbor as thy self, the passion of *hatred* is as strongly prohibited as if it were specified. The principles and graces which are essential to a christian, his life, habits and spirit, are as inconsistent with the indulgence of vices and the pursuit of worldly pleasures, as light and darkness. The practice of the graces—the fulfilment of the precepts of the Bible make it impossible, in the nature of things that he should be sinless if he engaged in public racing, gaming the destruction of the inebriate and the attendance upon low theatrical performances, as if these things were expressly forbidden?—things uncongenial and discordant in their moral elements, cannot exist together—oil and water will not intermix.—*The possession of the graces is an exclusion of the vices.*

We have shown that "Balls" are the amusements of the world—not of christians—a worldly pleasure—and quoted the command, "Be not conformed to the world,"—that the love and enjoyments of pleasure excludes the solemn thought of death and the judgment, that the love of the world and its pleasures are inconsistent with the life and profession of the pious. St. Paul says, 'Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world—if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him."—We have shown that the spirit of pleasure and amusement, such as "Balls," create, are inconsistent with that constant preparation of the heart for death, enjoined in the scriptures—with that *perfection* and HOLINESS, which are essential attributes of the truly pious. St Paul says "Rejoice ever more—*pray without ceasing.*" Are not these duties and this spirit utterly at variance with the spirit of "Balls" The shortness of human life, crowded with duties, and responsibilities, temporal, moral and religious, is too apparant for such indulgences.

"Between two worlds life hovers like a star,
Twixt night and morn, upon the horizons verge."

The Bible says, "There is but a *step* between us and death"—that our life, is a "shadow," a "vapor," &c., and the saviour said, 'Let your loins be girded about and your *lights burning*, and ye yourselves, like unto men that *wait for their Lord*—that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately." What are the obvious and momentous duties growing out of these truths? that the "*step*" to the grave should be in the path of wisdom, and not on the platform of pleasure that this vapory and shadowy existence which is but as a dials point, should be used in self denials of pleasure—in the performance of christian duties—and in that moral discipline and training which secure the indispensible qualifications for future enjoyment. In having the "weding garments" constantly on, the light of a clear conscience, "void of offence," always shining, and with a watchful spirit, always at the post of duty, and ready for the approach of the "bridegroom." St. Paul says, "Giving *thanks always for all things* unto God and the father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Did any one ever hear of a "Ball" being opened, with "thanks," to the deity?—Was any minister ever called to officiate on such an occasion, or did any votary of pleasure, whose soul was in the dance ever stop, to ask a blessing upon the performance?

For the correctness of our views we appealed to the United Christian Clergy, who, by their example and preaching, denounce the pleasures of the "Ball"—to Dr. Beechers (although unknown to our opponent) lectures to young men, eulogized by Justice McClean of the Supreme Court of the U. S., and distributed as premiums for scholarships in schools. To the voice of the great Massillon and of Chalmers and of Clarke, whose united sentiment is decidedly against them—to the book of Job (a man in the Bible said to be perfect and upright,) to the Old and New Testament scriptures—to the qualifications and experience of the pious—and the numerous injunctions to holiness, purity and a renunciation of the world and all its pleasures, which Solomon pronounces "vanity of vanities" We have discarded the standard of the man or of the moralist, and have planted ourselves upon the "Bible."—Many other arguments could have been urged, strong and forcible against 'Balls' but we have preferred leavisg them to the minister and religious press.

We have endeavored to maintain our positions—that the public buildings, should not be used for Balls—because of their locality—their injury—the abuses to which such uses might lead—the danger to the public records, and the repugnance of such uses to the moral sense of a large portion of the community. We have assigned our reasons for these opinions—we have endeavored to do so, respectfully to others, and in consonance with our own relations and responsibilities to the community. To that community, intelligent and just, we defer—regretting only that so much of the paper has been occupied, in the discussion, but we hope not unprofitably. Life is described by Bailey.

"We live in deeds, not years—in thoughts, not breaths—
In feelings, not in figures on a Dial;—"
We should count time by heart-throbs. He most lives
Who thinks most—*feels the noblest—acts the best.*"

This feeling and action spoken of is illustrated by St. Paul, when he says—"Walk worthy the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness, meekness, and long-suffering. *Make straight paths for your feet;* follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord," and by St. James, in the passage—"Pure religion and undefiled, is to visit the Fatherless and the widow in their affliction, and to *keep himself unspotted from the world.*"

LANDHOLDERS & TAXPAYERS.

For the 'News'

NEBRASKA.

MR. EDITOR:—

The most casual observer must perceive that the introduction of Judge Douglas's bill for the territorial establishment of Nebraska, in which the Missouri Compromise is sought to be repealed, is about to produce much anxiety in the public mind. The question arises, whether this Administration measure is in accordance with the wishes of the people, and is calculated to strengthen the concord and perpetuity of the Union? The advocates of its repeal with their conscientious scruples of its unconstitutionality, confide but little in the judgments and sagacity of Clay and Webster, and a host of other distinguished statesmen and jurists, who have always endorsed its legality and propriety. Judge Douglass, it appears, at first was afraid to incorporate in his bill a provision for the repeal of the Compromise of 1820 in ipsissimis verbis, but being charged by its friends with evasion, he has boldly amended it so that there can be no further misunderstanding. The quietude of the country is scarcely restored by the healing measures of 1850, before the great dominant party is willing to loose again the demon of discord, whose breath may infect this body politic with sectional strife and dissolution. The funeral knell of the illustrious Clay has scarce departed with the universal regrets for his irreparable loss, before his paternal advice is disregarded and dispised. The North has scarcely had sufficient time to evince its loyalty and attachment to the compromise of 1850 in allaying the apprehensions of the South by a faithful execution of the fugitive slave law, before it is called upon to vote for a de facto law to introduce slavery North of 36° 30' where it is now prohibited?

If the South believe the protestation of this section that slavery is an institution founded in oppression, and that they desire its abolishment constitutionally by the States wherein it exists, how can they reasonably expect it to vote for a bill whereby its area may be extended! The magnanimity of the North was certainly exhibited in the enactment of this Compromise which Judge Douglass's bill proposes to rescind. The North could have easily prevented the introduction of slavery in Missouri by an express prohibitory clause in the bill for its organization, but desirous of establishing some permanent basis upon which all territories might be admitted, conceded that slavery might be introduced South of 36° 30'. The advocate of this measure was Mr. Clay, and every one must admit by the zeal he manifested that he deemed it not only a National boon, but Northern concession to Southern interests.

The utility of this enactment has been frequently exemplified by the quiet admission of several States, without any congressional interferference whether slavery is recognized or prohibited in their respective constitutions. But if the South has gained the prosperous and extensive State of Texas, which doubtless in time will be subdivided into four slaveholding States If our territorial acquisitions continue as our spirit of aggrandizement seems to increase, may we not yet possess by our "manifest destiny," Cuba, the Sandwich Islands and the whole of Mexico. Without a rescission of this compromise, slavery will not be interdicted in these countries.

If we repeal it, we open wide the door for unjust and illiberal legislation. If we cannot demonstrate the propriety of its repeal we ought to be governed by the wise maxims "nulla vestigia retrorsum." Suppose Judge Douglass's bill shall become a law, can we justly expect it will result in the admission of another slave State? We think not. Experience shews that slavery is unproductive and profitless in severe climates where neither tobacco, rice, sugar or cotton can be cultivated. It is attributable to this fact and not to any instinctive philanthrophy that induced the Northern States to liberate their slaves. The free States being more populous (the white population exceeding our own two to one) emigration will be necessarily greater from that quarter; whilst the immense foreign influx we are daily receiving, wend their way enmasse to new territories, all of which are opposed to the introduction of slavery. Slaveholders who are landholders cannot at all times dispose of their lands to advantage or remove their stock and slaves with facility and economy. The many chances of escape and the impossiblity of their recapture in all new settled countries, render this species of property dangerous and insecure. For these reasons we believe Nebraska can never become a slave State. Our interests and duty demand then that we should preserve inviolate the solemn compacts of 1820 and 1850 whose adoption restored peace and harmony to our distracted land.

We cannot be too guarded against the designs of political demagogues, whose time-serving policy may bring discredit upon our land, and embroil us in the worst of all calamities—an intestine war.

QUAKER NECK

What are Fashionable Young Men?

A young lady over the signature of "Kate," sends the following spirited article to the New Orleans True Delta. We think she gives fashionable young men a well merited rebuke. Her remark, "It will never do to commence the work of reform entirely on one side." is worthy of consideration. She entitles her article "How to Educate Young America."

I read in a paper, she says, the other day, that some ornamental branches in young ladies' education were coming out soon—"*Cook*-ology, *Spin*-ology, and *Weave*-ology." All honor to the projector of such a happy improvement; but allow me to ask, when our young Misses become such pattern housewives, in what "circles" they will look for suitable companions? Not in upper-tendom could they be found. Just fancy one of the be-whispered, mustachioed exquisites, in companionship with one of Solomon's maidens, who layeth her hand to the spindle, or playeth the flying shuttle, or compound the rare cookery. What affinity would there be between them? The same that exist between the butterfly and the honey-bee—one all glare, and frisking movements, the other all patient industry and sooriety.

I cannot think of a more useless article, or one more out of place, in a room where work is progressing, than a fashionable young man. He knows so little about matters and things, I feel in pain till he is safely lodged in the parlor, among other things of "more ornament than use," annuals and bijouterie.

It will never do to commence the work of reform entirely on one side. I propose three branches more to be added to the list of studies for *finishing* young gentlemen fashionably: *Saw*-ology, *Chop*-ology, *Split*-ology, and that, in addition to the requisite number of "sheets, towels, spoons and napkin rings," each promising pupil be furnished with a new wood saw and axe well sharpened, and daily exercise with them to be practiced. It will supersede the necessity of gymnasium.

In our onward march to perfection, and in taking up the accomplishments of our grandmothers, we earnestly beg that some provision be made against being cut off from the "best society," and such would be the result, unless the lords of creation are willing to keep pace with us. Their lilly hands would scarcely, with present views, be willingly united with those which bear marks of labor; and what a dreadful state of affairs would occur in upper *snob*-dom, if one of the *first families* were to marry beneath their dignity.

Hasten then, the glorious era, when walking-sticks shall be converted into hoe-handles, crothet-hooks into knitting needles, and quizzing glasses and flirtations be known no more.

ADVERTISING.—A little man behind a big rock with a platter full of pearls, at only one cent a piece and keeping his own council, would probably sell nothing. It is of one great importance to make yourself and your goods known. A frog in the night attracts more attention than an ox, for he cries aloud and spares not. The profit arising from advertising are not conceived by those who have not tried it. To those who have we need not say a word, for they will never discontinue the custom.—*Louisville Democrat.*

☞ A Yankee's description of a steamboat:—'It's got a saw mill on one side and a grist mill on t'other, and a blacksmith's shop in the middle, and down in the cellar's a tarnation great big pot biling all the time.'

☞ A singer who led the psalm at a meeting a short time since, finding that his concluding word, which was Jacob, had not syllables to fill up the music adequately, ended thus:

'J-a-a-a—J-a-a-a—fol-de riddle—cob!'