

Democratic Matchman

BELLEVILLE, CENTRE COUNTY, PENNA., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1859.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY S. S. REELEY & J. S. BARNHART.

TERMS: \$1 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE. VOL. IV.—NUMBER 46.

Terms of Publication.

TERMS—\$1.50 per copy within three months; \$2.00 if delayed; and \$2.50 if not paid within the year. These terms will be rigidly adhered to. ADVERTISEMENTS and Business Notices inserted at the usual rates, and every description of JOB-PRINTING EXECUTED in the neatest manner at the lowest prices, and with the utmost dispatch. Having purchased a large collection of type, we are prepared to satisfy the orders of our friends.

Business Directory.

H. J. BUCKHART,
SURVEYOR AND CONVEYANCER
BELLEVILLE, PENNA.

JAMES A. REAYER,
REAL ESTATE AGENT
BELLEVILLE, PENNA.

WILLIAM H. BLAIR,
ATTORNEY AT LAW
BELLEVILLE, PA.
Office in the Arcade, second floor.

THE ABOLITION TREASON.

STARTLING DEVELOPMENTS.

The disclosures made by Col. Forbes, in reference to the Abolition Treason, are of too startling a character to be passed over without comment.

Hugh Forbes is a Scotchman by birth. Served in the British army for some years. Is a revolutionary soldier from inclination. He enlisted under the Garibaldi in the defence of Rome, then came to this country. He was engaged in the New York Tribune office for some time, where his character became fully known. Being somewhat experienced in guerilla fighting, he was engaged by the Abolitionists to go down to Kansas to assist Brown, and to learn the secrets of the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Society, the art of war. He is the author of a manual now in possession of Brown. The Abolitionists, however, did not come up to terms as he promised, but treated Forbes in a shameful manner, and he now turns upon them. Forbes is deep into it, being an agent, also, of the Abolitionists of England, to whom he now appeals for support.

Forbes and Brown pulled together well enough, until there came to be a misunderstanding in regard to the pay. Forbes appealed from Brown to the general Abolition agent, but found that he was doomed to be cheated all round. Greely fell back on the strict rigor of the law and pleaded that he was not bound by Forbes' contract with Brown. Sanborn, who was the Secretary of the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Society, and Howe, a well known Abolitionist of Boston, kept patting with Forbes until, in the words of one of his own letters, his family's credit was stopped at the French restaurant where they used to get their meals. Forbes became indignant against Brown and the humanitarian, as he styles them, and denounced them all in pretty rough terms. But still the troubles of his family did not leave him altogether from the work to which he had lent his hand. On the contrary, he devised a plan which he submitted to his Abolitionist friends North to perform (the title of the "Kansas work" that Greely speaks of in his letters).

Forbes' plan was simply an organized system of stampeding slaves along the border States. Brown's project was defeated, so long as May, 1858, to be identical, that which has had such a miserable failure at Harper's Ferry. Forbes was too experienced a stager not to see the inevitable result of such a treacherous project, and much of his correspondence that has fallen into our hands is taken up with denunciations of Brown's crazy idea, and of Appeals to the leading Republicans to stop Brown or to stop him. But they refused to do it.

It appears beyond all peradventure, by this correspondence, that among the persons to whom he denounced the Harper's Ferry project, a year and a half ago, was Senator Win. H. Seward. He had an interview with that Senator in Washington city in May, 1858; and, as appears by one of his letters, he went fully into the whole matter. Again he had interviews with Sumner and Hale, also in Washington, and, in fact, it appears that all the leading Republicans and abolitionists of the country were fully cognizant of the plans of Brown, and if they did not actually identify themselves with him, they did not denounce him to the authorities. On the contrary, they kept him furnished with money and arms, and carried on correspondence with him.

Forbes' letters show another thing. They show that it was not a mere feeling of philanthropy, nor even a political motive, that led these New England and New York abolitionists to encourage old Brown. Something more was at the bottom of the movement. And what? Speculation in the rise of cotton. Old Brown told Forbes that a member of the house of Lawrence Stone & Company, (celebrated for the \$87,000 free-wool movement in Congress, a few years ago.) had promised him \$8,000 if he succeeded on his Harper's Ferry dash. But Forbes, like a blunt soldier who had gone into the thing as a military speculation solely, could not understand making a commercial speculation out of it; and so he denounced the project.

PROMINENT REPUBLICANS IMPLICATED.

We present from the published correspondence of Col. H. Forbes, such facts as would appear to connect many prominent Republicans with the operations of the notorious Capt. Brown. These letters were addressed to F. B. Sanborn, who is, or was, the Secretary of the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Society. This Col. H. Forbes was connected with Garibaldi in the defence of Rome in the revolution of 1848. Coming to the United States, he seems to have been employed by the Abolitionists in connection with Brown to operate in Kansas and elsewhere, as it might be deemed advisable. Col. Forbes, it appears, was to receive funds from his employers to be transmitted to his family in Europe in consideration of his services; but it turns out that the contract made with him by the Abolitionists was not performed on their part, and the consequence was that his family was greatly impoverished.

The first letter is dated in New York on the 9th of January, 1858, and recounts the sufferings of his family, and the non-performance of his employers in the matter of pay, &c.

THE ANSWER HE GOT FROM HORSE GREELY.

In this same letter to Sanborn, Forbes says that Mr. Greely told him that he (Forbes) was started to learn that he ought to have known the money promised would not be paid, and although Mr. Greely believed in the higher law, there was no way in which he (Forbes) could obtain redress by the lower law, and in this way excused the non-performance of the contract which has been made with Forbes.

REFERENCE TO SENATOR SUMNER AND AMOS LAWRENCE.

You express surprise at my letter to Mr. Sumner, and that were the first you ever heard of the subject. Now, then, last summer, did you write from Massachusetts to Capt. B. at Tabor, Iowa, telling him that I had a few days previous been in Davenport on my way to join him? You say that Mr. Amos Lawrence probably never heard of my name. How, then, did he give Capt. B. a copy of my "Volunteer's Manual?" I repeat that every effort to shuffe off the responsibility makes the matter worse, and every hour of delay in forwarding and aggravates the crime. Ordinary savages would not behave so brutally. The very cannibals do not feed on the women and children of their own party—they devour only such of their enemies as they can catch.

H. FORBES.

The next letter is to a person, and is prefaced by the following head note—
On the 15th January Mr. Sanborn replied to mine of the 9th. He explained that he had done much to aid the cause, that he had caused \$5,000 in money and arms to be given to Capt. B. also \$5,000 to be voted for by the Chicago committee, of which he had received \$500, and had done many other things of a similar nature—\$4000 recently for a "secret service," adding that, if he had known of the engagement between Capt. B. and myself, he would have supported my wife and children, rather than allow what has happened to take place.

When I thought, though entirely anxious, that my family had had considerable cause to be angry at the letters I had in October sent to Greely Smith had explained the urgency of sending quickly success to Paris. Also, I felt a certain assurance that the one sent to Mr. Joseph Bryant, of New York, had convinced him that he ought to be allowed in forwarding assistance. But on reaching the farm of young Brown, of Ohio, (where I was most kindly received) I got a letter from Mr. Morton, informing me that Mr. Smith having been very ill had not yet opened any of his letters. Mr. Bryant did nothing. I also received there a letter from Paris dated November 1st, already alluded to in my last, and then I saw that my letters had been exaggerated or unfounded. A captain B. had almost persuaded me that they were.

In the letter of January 10th, to Sanborn, he refers to Capt. Brown, in this wise:—
JOHN BROWN'S ACCOUNT WITH THE ABOLITION TREASURY.
There certainly is one error, and there may be others, in your letter of the 15th, respecting the sums received by Captain Brown. The National Committee, which promised \$5000, sent \$150, (not \$500 as you supposed,) and the person who brought the \$150 charged \$40 for expenses, leaving \$110 only. This was all for Captain Brown, had when I joined him at Tabor. I am sure that he would have given me money if he had it. (The other supposition is out of the question.) I cannot blame him for believing in the force of moral obligations. Truly think that he was not sufficiently energetic in insisting upon their fulfillment. They are optional to make, but once made are sacred. Mr. Tidd sent on a financial mission, may have brought more in November.

SECRET SERVICE MONEY.

The \$500 for secret service you speak of as being enough for the purpose, is not enough. This is another error, and a serious one.

INTERVIEW WITH SEWARD.

WASHINGTON, May 6, 1858.—To Dr. S. G. Howe, M. D., Boston, Mass.—On Saturday (1st May) I had an interview with Senator Win. H. Seward, of New York, having been introduced to him through a letter from a leading Abolitionist, Dr. Bailey, of the Era. I went fully into the whole matter, in all its bearings. He expressed regret that he had been told, and said that he, in his position, ought not to have been informed of the circumstances. In part I agree with him and in part I differ. I regret that the mis-conduct of the New Englanders should have forced me to address myself to him; but being now enlightened on the subject, he cannot well tell this business continue in its present crooked condition, instead of causing it to be "put straight," both as regards my children's situation as well as the cotton speculation of the humanitarians.

Forbes next mentions an accidental meeting with John P. Hale, but such was distress of his family that he did not then refer to Brown's plan.

Dr. S. G. Howe, M. D., Boston, Mass.—The letter referred to in the above is dated at Washington, D. C., May 14, 1858, and addressed to S. G. Howe, Boston. This letter gives his own and Brown's plans of operating in the Southern States. Forbes' plan was to organize along the Southern slave frontier a series of slave stampedes. But the following is more to the point:—
BROWN'S PLAN.
Brown had a different scheme. He proposed, with some twenty-five or fifty colored and white men, well armed, and bringing a quantity of spare arms, to buy up a slave quarter in Virginia. To this I objected, that no preparatory notice having been given to the slaves (no notice could, with prudence, be given them) the invitation to rise might, unless they were already in a state of agitation, meet with no response, or a feeble one. To this he replied that he was sure of a response. He calculated that he could get, on the first night, from 200 to 500.

Half of them, of this first lot, he proposed to keep with him, mounting 100 or so of them, and make a dash at Harper's Ferry manufactory, destroying what he could not carry off. The other men, not of this party were to be subdivided into three, four or five distinct parties, each under two or three of the original band, and would beat up other slave quarters, whence more men would be sent to join him.

BROWN TO BE STOPPED AND DISARMED.

For these and many other reasons I call on you and your associates to stop Brown, and to take from him your arms, &c. I have a right to exact this, and I do exact it. To your assertion that to stop Brown, I would denounce and betray, I feel what the Abolitionists here say, that if you do not, by a long from him your arms, &c. stop him, you betray them, for this concerns the Abolitionists, and they have a right to be heard.

BLACK REPUBLICAN COMPLICITY IN THE HARPER'S FERRY INSURRECTION.

The evidences of the complicity of such leading Black Republicans as Senator Sewall and New York; Senators Wilson and Sumner, of Massachusetts; Senator Hale and Ex-Governor Fletcher, of New Hampshire; Governor Chase, of Ohio; Hon. Greely Smith, ex-member of Congress; Rev. J. W. Lunt, of New York; Horace Greely, of N. Y.; and others, in the Harper's Ferry insurrection, are daily accumulating. And when the evidence shall have risen upon all the facts, no one will doubt that Brown's noble and bloody plot was known and approved by them for at least a year past. That the expenses of the conspirators were paid by Black Republican contributions, and that Kansas was but the training ground for these insurrectionary forces. The effort to make Brown appear a madman, since he has failed, and to regard the whole thing as a joke, has not diverted attention from the great facts developed and evidenced that exist of the aid derived by Brown and his associates even from Black Republican Senators and Governors. The developments made by Col. Hugh Forbes, the military tutor of Brown and his associates, have brought out a long letter from Horace Greely, of the Tribune, which, thro' a letter of general denial, admits substantially all the main allegations, and shows both Brown and Forbes to have been abetted agents throughout the whole Kansas strike.

HORACE GREELY'S CONFESSION—HE KNOWS—SEE BELOW.

As Forbes professes to be a capable and experienced military officer, especially qualified for guerrilla or border warfare, and as he had always claimed to be an earnest Red Republican and foe of every form of human Slavery, I thought his resolution natural and commendable. Knowing him to be poor, I gave him \$20 as he was starting; others gave him larger sums; how much in all I do not know; but I think his total receipts from friends of Free Kansas, on account of his resolve, cannot have fallen below \$700. He went—was absent seven months—came back—that is all I know of his services to the Free State cause in any shape. Whether he was not needed, or was not trusted, or was found incompetent, I do not know—I only know that he did nothing, and was practically worth nothing. I believe he spent part of the money given him in printing a pamphlet embodying his notions of guerilla or partisan warfare—of course, no dollar ever came back.

To this hour, I have never learned who Brown (or any one else) promised Forbes, nor how far the promise referred to here the right to commit others. I do not believe that John Brown ever wilfully deceived him or any one else. I am very sure that no one was ever authorized to engage the services of "Col. Forbes" in behalf of the Free State men of Kansas, on condition that said Forbes should be authorized to charge his own price for those services, and draw at pleasure on some responsible party for payment. I have never heard any one's version of the matter but Forbes; and I confidently infer from this, that if there was mutual misunderstanding and disappointment in the promises, the employing party had decidedly the worst of it.

Had Brown been anyhow indebted to

Forbes for services to the Free State cause, I cannot doubt that he (B.) would have settled with him and at least acknowledged the obligations in writing. Had Brown stipulated that either should pay him the money, he (B.) would at least have settled the account, and given him (F.) an order on the person who was to pay it.

Mr. Greely fully admits the "agency" of Brown and his authority to bind others in his arrangements. nor does he, in this regard, show as a madman. It was only after the failure of his bloody plans that he became "mad." Neither does it appear that at any time since 1856, Mr. Greely has either lost confidence in Brown, or refused to aid him in his injurious and treasonable work.

MASSACHUSETTS OFFICIALS INVOLVED.

The following is from a letter received by a gentleman in Charleston on the other day:—
MAIL CAR. BALTIMORE AND OHIO R. R., Oct. 25, 1859.—I have been at Mr. Merrill's, and Shafer's, and Maloney's hardware dealers, in Baltimore, and have ascertained, beyond any doubt, that Francis J. Miriam is the man who purchased the ammunition on last Friday, one week ago, and received via Adams & Co.'s Express, six hundred dollars from a party in Boston, all in gold coin. And this man Miriam, is the man who sent the following "despatch" to a party in Boston.

HARPER'S FERRY, Oct. 15, 1859.
LEWIS HAYDEN, 77 South street, Sec't of State Office, State House, Boston.
Order—disobeyed—conditions broken—Pay \$, immediately balance of my money.—Allow further expense. Recall money advanced if not spent.
Signed, FRANCIS J. MIRIAM.
I think I can, if authorized, find out the names of the parties who sent this Miriam the six hundred dollars via Adams & Co.'s Express.

THE COMPLICITY OF BLACK REPUBLICAN LEADERS.

Since the complicity of Joshua R. Giddings with the insurrection attempted at Harper's Ferry has been demonstrated, the Black Republican papers are endeavoring to deny his connections with that party. This question, however, is put to rest by the fact, which we learn from excellent authority, that Mr. Giddings now is, and for some time past has been Chairman of the Central Republican Committee of the State of Ohio, assigned to that position by the Republican Convention of that State. He was one of their leading orators in the late canvass. He was for many years one of their representative members in Congress. He is one of their most favorite lecturers on the slavery question, and may be regarded more emphatically as a leading representative of the Black Republican party of the country than any other person except William H. Seward.

Under these circumstances, when the logical result of the doctrines avowed by Mr. Seward and Mr. Giddings has been carried out in practice by an attempt at servile insurrection, it is too late for the Republican party to disavow Mr. Giddings, one of their great champions, unless at the same time they repudiate Mr. Seward. This is the true test of the professions now made by a portion of the Republican party of their hostility to servile insurrection. Do they or do they not repudiate Mr. Seward and his doctrines, which necessarily lead to violence and bloodshed? If they do, they may be regarded as proving their faith by their works; but if they do not, and still adhere to him and his sanguinary and atrocious principles, they must not complain if they are justly held responsible for complicity in the criminal designs with which he is clearly identified.—Constitution.

INDIGNANT AND CHIEF.

A distinguished jurist says, and very truly, that "if the young men, who are to be the future men of the country, were brought up to a more decided heroic rule, and compelled when compulsion was necessary—to devote themselves to the acquisition of skill and some useful and respectable vocation, there would be less occupation for courts and juries. The engagements and habits of the boy will cling to the man, and upon his education and training under the domestic roof will depend his standing and character, and his usefulness or the reverse in life."

Correspondence between Mrs. Child and Gov. Wise.

In Wendell Phillips' last fiery speech at New York, he alluded to Mrs. L. Maria Child, the authoress, who had written to Governor Wise, asking to be permitted to nurse Captain Brown, the leader of the Harper's Ferry insurrection. The Richmond Examiner, of Saturday last, contains the correspondence between Mrs. Child and Governor Wise. She addresses the Governor as follows:—
"I, and all my large circle of Abolition acquaintances, were taken by surprise when news came of Capt. Brown's recent attempt; nor do I know of a single person who would have approved of it, had they been apprised of his intentions. But I, and thousands of others, feel a natural impulse of sympathy for the brave and suffering man. Perhaps God, who sees the inmost of our souls, perceives some such sentiment in your heart also. He needs mother or sister to dress his wounds, and speak soothingly to him—Will you allow me to perform that mission of humanity? If you will, may God bless you for the generous deed!"

"I have been, for years, an uncompromising Abolitionist, and I should seem to deny it, or apologize for it, as much as John Brown himself would do. Believing in peace principles, I deeply regret the step that the old veteran has taken, while I honor his humanity toward those who have his prisoners. But, because it is my habit to be as open as daylight, I will also say that if I believed our religion justified men in fighting for freedom, I should consider the endeavor, everywhere, as best entitled to that right. Such an avowal is a frank expression of my sense of natural justice. But I should despise myself utterly if any circumstance could tempt me to seek to advance these opinions, in any way, directly or indirectly, after your permission to visit Virginia, had been obtained on the plea of sympathy with a brave and suffering man. I give you my word of honor which was never broken, that I would use such permission solely and singly for the purpose of nursing your prisoner, and for no other purpose whatsoever."

The subjoined reply of Governor Wise is eminently characteristic.—
"Richmond, Va., Oct. 29, 1859.
Madam: Yours of the 26th was received by me yesterday, and at my earliest leisure I respectfully reply to it that I will forward the letter for John Brown, a prisoner under our laws, arranged at the bar of the Circuit Court for the county of Jefferson, at Charlottesville, Va., for the crimes of murder, robbery and treason, which you ask me to transmit to him. I will comply with your request, in the only way which seems to me proper, by enclosing it to the Commonwealth's attorney, with the request that he will ask permission of the court to hand it to the prisoner. Brown, the prisoner, is now in the hands of the Judiciary, not of the Executive, of this Commonwealth. You ask me further to allow you to perform the mission of mother or sister, to dress his wounds and speak soothingly to him." By this, of course, you mean to be allowed, to visit him in his cell, and to minister to him in the offices of humanity. Why should you not be so allowed, madam? Virginia and Massachusetts are involved in no civil war, and the Constitution which unites them in one Confederation guarantees to you the privileges and immunities of a citizen of the United States in the State of Virginia. That Constitution I am sworn to support, and am, therefore, bound to protect your privileges and immunities as a citizen of Massachusetts coming into Virginia for any lawful and peaceful purpose. Coming, as you propose, to minister to the captive in prison, you will be met, doubtless, by all our people, not only in a chivalrous but in a Christian spirit. You have the right to visit Charleston, Virginia, madam, and your mission, being merciful and humane, will not only be allowed, but be respected if not welcomed. A few unenlightened and inconsiderate persons, fanatical in their modes of thought and action to maintain justice and right, might molest you, or be disposed to do so, and this might suggest the imprudence of risking any experiment upon the peace of a society very much excited by the crimes with whose chief author you seem to sympathize so much; but still, I repeat, your motives and avowed purpose are lawful and peaceful, and I will, as far as I am concerned, do my duty in protecting your rights in our limits. Virginia, and her authorities would be weak indeed—weak in point of power—if her State faith and constitutional obligations cannot be redeemed in her own limits to the letter of morality as well as of law, and if her chivalry cannot courteously receive a lady's visit to a prisoner. Every arm which guards Brown from rescue on the one hand and from Lynch law on the other, will be ready to guard your person in Virginia. I would not permit an insult even to woman in her walk of charity among us, though it be to one who whetted knives of butchery for our "mothers, sisters, daughters and babes. We have no sympathy with your sentiments of sympathy with Brown, and are surprised that you were taken by surprise when news came of Captain Brown's recent attempt." His attempt was a natural consequence of your sympathy, and the error of that sympathy ought to make you doubt its virtue, from the effect on his conduct. But it is not of this I should speak.

CLIPPINGS.

When you arrive at Charlestown, if you go there, it will be before the court and its officers, the Commonwealth's attorney, sheriff and jailor, to say whether you may see and wait on the prisoner. But, whether you are thus permitted or not, and you will be if my advice can prevail, you may rest assured that he will be humanely, lawfully and mercifully dealt by, in prison and on trial.
Respectfully,
HENRY A. WISE.
To L. MARIA CHILD.

R. Shelton Mackenzie is to deliver a lecture before the Standing Stone Literary Association, Huntington, sometime during the November Court.
Christmas and New Year will occur on Sunday this season. The festivities incident to the holidays will probably take place on the day following.
Why is the star spangled banner like the Atlantic ocean? Because it will never cease to wave.
Somebody says that physicians are the nut crackers used by the angels to get our souls out of the shells that surround them.
A man is a brute to be jealous of a good woman—a fool to be jealous of a worthy one; but a devil to feel to cut his throat for either of them.
Persons who are always cheerful and good humored, are very useful in the world; they spread an atmosphere of peace and happiness around them.
A man down East has invented a machine to renovate old barrels. Out of a good sized, fat, greasy, old bachelor, he can make quite a decent man, and have enough left for two small puppies, a pair of leather breeches and a kettle of soft soap.
It is an old and true saying that a man should not marry unless he can support a wife. From some examples that we have seen we are beginning to doubt seriously whether a woman can prudently marry unless she can support a husband.

In a neighboring town lives a person who has always refused to give anything towards the support of religious worship. A few years ago a new church was built, and the gentleman, to the surprise of all, gave a bell for the new structure. On being asked the reason, he said he never put his money where he could not hear it ring.
More than a million of francs worth of snails are to be consumed annually by the Parisians, by whom they are regarded as a most exquisite, generous and nutritious article of food. We suspect some of our subscribers must feed on snails, judging from the cleanliness with which they respond to our frequent calls for "material aid."

A gentleman relates an anecdote of the Mexican war, which has never been published.
"When the American army was forming line for the battle of Buena Vista, General Lane was riding up and down the line of his Indian regiment. The Mexicans had stationed some small guns on a neighboring height, which were blazing away most furiously on General Lane's regiment. But as their guns were badly aimed, the balls in every case passed over their heads, but sufficiently near as to cause the men as they heard the peculiar whiff of the balls, to involuntarily duck their heads."
"General Lane happened to notice this, and in his rough, stentorian voice he bawled out—
"Indiana regiment! No dodging!"
In about five minutes after, the tremendous whiff of twenty four pound shot passed close by the head of the gallant brigadier, and in an instant involuntarily he bobbed his head. The men saw this, and commenced a glittering along the line, which the old General saw. Turning around with a sort of quizzical expression, he thundered out:—
"Indiana regiment! Dodge the big ones!"

The Polly of Pride.

Sidney Smith says: Take some quick moment of life, and add together the two ideas of pride and man. Behold him, creature of a span, stalking through infinite space in all the grandeur of littleness. Perched on a speck of the universe, every wind of the universe, every wind of heaven strikes into his blood the coldness of death; his soul is safe from his body like melody from the string, day and night, like dust on the wheel, he is rolled along the Heavens through a labyrinth of worlds, and all the creations of God are flaming above and beneath. Is this a creature to make for himself a crown of glory, to deny his own flesh, to mock his fellow, spring from that dust to which they both will return? Does the proud man die or? Does he not suffer? Does he not die? When he reasons, is he not agitated by difficulties? When he acts, is he never tempted by pleasure? When he lives, is he free from pain? When he dies, can he escape the common grave? Pride is not the heritage of man; humility should dwell with frailty, and atone for ignorance, error and imperfection.

A Methodist and Quaker having stopped at a public house, agreed to sleep in the same bed. The Methodist kept down and prayed fervently, and confessed a long catalogue of sins. After he rose the Quaker observed: "My friend, if thou art as bad as thou sayest thou art, I think I dare not sleep with thee."