

# THE LEWISTOWN GAZETTE

GEO. FRYSENGER & SON, PUBLISHERS,

LEWISTOWN, MIFFLIN COUNTY, PENN.

Whole No. 2782.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1864.

New Series--Vol. XVIII, No. 47.

## THE MINERAL.

From the Sunday-School Times.  
"WEEP FOR THE LIVING."

"Weep not for the dead," for he weepeth no more;  
No tear-drops are needful on you shining shore,  
Where he walks with his Saviour the regions all bright,  
And basks 'neath the skies where "the Lamb is the light."

"Weep not for the dead," for his sufferings are o'er;  
He sigheth, nor sinneth, nor sorroweth more—  
To that beautiful home, God prepared for the blest,  
The angels have borne him to enter his rest.

"Weep not for the dead," for he dieth no more;  
His conflicts are past, and his struggles are o'er;  
He hath entered on life, and commenced the new song;  
He hath done with the cross, and hath gotten the crown.

But "weep for the living," the sadly bereft,  
The deep-stricken mourner in loneliness left—  
The fatherless lying one, bowed in his grief,  
The orphaned, who sigh for the tear of relief.

Go weep with the living; bind up the torn heart;  
Go speak words of comfort, and soothing impart;  
Go tell them that Jesus once rested his head  
Within those dark portals, the grave that we dread.

Yea, weep with the living. The living alone  
Need the comfort that tears bring the heart-broken one.  
'Twill be sweet to be beckoned to yonder bright shore,  
Where the eye never weeps, and the heart grieves no more.

Newark, August, 1864.

## ORIGINAL ESSAY.

HUNTINGDON, Sept. 15, 1864.

Messrs. Editors *Lewistown Gazette*:—  
At the annual meeting of the Ministerial Association of the Juniata District of the East Baltimore Conference of the Methodist E. Church, held at Huntingdon, Huntingdon county, the 13th and 14th inst., the accompanying essay was read by Rev. S. Barnes, of your town. By a unanimous vote of said association, the undersigned were appointed a committee to request of Mr. Barnes a copy for publication. Having obtained the manuscript, will you be so kind as to give it an insertion in your truly loyal and excellent paper?

A. W. GIBSON,  
J. A. PRICE,  
JNO. GUNN.

## AN ESSAY

ON

Providential Indications as seen  
in our National Affairs.

READ BEFORE

The Ministerial Association of Juniata District, Sept. 14, 1864.  
BY REV. S. BARNES.

BRETHREN OF THE ASSOCIATION AND FRIENDS:—The Committee of Assignment has given me, as my theme, the following language, viz: "Indications of Providence in our National Affairs." Believing that by so doing we shall all better understand the sense intended, I shall take the liberty of inserting, in this language, two words, so that it shall read, "Indications of Providence AS SEEN in our National Affairs." As thus amended, my theme assumes that Divine Providence both has, in the past, and still does, perceptibly interfere in the affairs of our nation. And, further, that such Providential interference is designed to indicate to us, as a nation, the Divine purpose, will or pleasure concerning us.

Now, that God rules over nations, even as also he rules over individuals, every believer in the Bible will at once admit. It is always by his permission, and frequently by his direct agency, that a nation is born into distinct existence, i. e. into existence distinct from all other nationalities. When, also, a nation has come into distinct existence, by either the permission or direction of God, it is doubtless fair to infer that such existence is for some specific and wise purpose. For no work of God can be without a purpose, and no work of his can have either a vague or foolish purpose.

Now, if God, in raising up a nation, or permitting it to be raised up, has in such act a specific and wise purpose, and it such nation, as a community of intelligent and responsible individuals, is to accomplish such purpose by their voluntary acts, and are so held amenable to their Creator therefore, that he will prosper and build them up if they accomplish his designs, and hamper and pull them down if they accomplish not his designs, then it follows that, in justice to them, he should perceptibly indicate to them, in some way, what his purpose, will or pleasure concerning them is. Now this is precisely what we assume he does.

The question may arise here as to how he does this. We answer he must do it, either, first, by direct and written revelation, or, secondly, by Providential indication. Or, in other words, that in this respect he must deal with nations as he deals with individual men.

Now, in all Bible lands, God governs individual men by direct revelation. Individual lands however, where the Bi-

ble is not, he governs them by Providential indication, as in the case of individual heathens. Will any one pretend to say that God has no will concerning individual heathens? And that individual heathens are not responsible? But how can they be responsible, unless they are made acquainted in some way with their Maker's will? And how can they know that will, in the absence of the written word, unless by some kind of intelligible sign?

Now as with individuals, so with nations. As he rules one, so he does the other. And, where he does not reveal his will in the one way, he does in the other. And since no direct revelation of the Divine will has ever yet been given to any nation as such, except under the Jewish theocracy, it follows that it is intended, by the Divine Being, that nations shall understand his will by Providential indications, or, in other words, by observation and deduction.

Believing these principles to be sound, we inquire concerning our own nation.

1st. And briefly, as judging by this process,

Was it the Divine purpose and pleasure that we should be a distinct nationality of these shores, independent of the mother country?

I assume that such was his design. And maintain that this was indicated to our fathers,

1. By our distant geographical locality.

2. By the extent of our domain.

3. By the then ascertained character and sufficiency of our country's resources for an independent nationality.

Time will not allow me to be very minute at this point, and I will therefore only add that this design was finally demonstrated by our evidently God-given success in the war of the Revolution, for, without his aid, we know our fathers had failed in their resistance to the mighty power of the mother country. I assume,

2d. That, as indicated in the same way, it was the will of God that our form of government should be what it is, a republican form of government.

In confirmation of this, I think it is fair to presume that the Divine Being would assist our fathers to devise their form of government. And I so think, because they were religious men. Men who had come to these shores that they might have liberty to serve God according to his will, and who, for that purpose, had committed their all to him. Now, it is divinely written, "The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord." They were good men, and the formation of a republican form of government was one of their steps. Is it not fair, therefore, to infer that the formation of a republican form of government by them was ordered by the Lord?

This conviction is also strongly corroborated by the fact that when, for a long time, the convention which framed the Constitution had failed to agree, and finally adjourned to pray for Divine guidance, that, having come together again, they were able so soon to agree. Does not this fact indicate that they were Divinely directed to the results arrived at? Moreover, is it not an indication that God was pleased with our peculiar form of government, that for so long a time he deigned to give us, under it, such unparalleled prosperity? But,

3d. We have Providential indications that it was the Divine purpose that this country should be, and remain, one and undivided in its government, through all time.

These indications are,

1. The conformation of our country's geography. Does not the physical construction of a creature indicate the Creator's designs as to the use it is to be put to? Does not the construction of the horse, for instance, indicate that he was designed both for service and fleetness on the earth's surface? And do not the wings of fowls indicate that they were designed for flight through the air? And the fins of fishes, and the webbed feet of other fowls indicate that they were designed for the water, &c.

And so, upon the same principle, does not the direction of our broad rivers, our expansive valleys and our high mountains indicate that the division of our country into two governments, by any line running east and west, would be a direct violation of the Creator's designs?

2. To the same point also, are the character and distribution of our country's resources.

These resources are varied, and, in the aggregate, sufficient, and of a character, for any one independent nation's needs. But then, note their distribution. The great West is the nation's granary. The East is its workshop, near to which are its deposits of heavy and necessary materials, such as its ores, fuel, &c., while the South is its wide field for the production of its

lighter and more portable commodities. Now, as surely as the eye was made for light and light for the eye, so surely were these several parts of our great domain made for each other. Such are the unmistakable indications of the Maker's will. What God hath, therefore, even with river and plain and mountain fastnesses joined together, let no man, or set of men, put asunder, nor let them even so much as sympathize with such attempts, lest they be found fighting against God.

As preparatory to the position I shall next take, I may remark just here, that it seems to be admitted on all hands that the desolating war that is now upon us as a nation, is a visitation from God.

As a people, we are all so well versed in scripture theology, that we are at once ready to subscribe the maxim of the great historian who says, "There is a God in history." And also, that other saying, "Man proproseth but God disposeth." And also, this, "That there is a Deity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may." All these of course as regards the things of this life.

In keeping with these universally received maxims, it must be admitted,

1st. That this war has neither happened by chance, nor,

2d. That it is the result alone of the wicked plottings of fleeing Southern politicians, nor,

3d. That it could have resulted entirely from the abuses and aggressions of Northern Abolitionists, even if these be allowed to have existed, nor,

4th. From any wicked design of the acting administration, allowing that also, nor,

5th. From all these causes combined.

But hold, says one, are you not, by these sweeping positions, screening everybody and leaving everybody innocent of these great evils?

I answer, by no means. There are too many of us guilty. And God is punishing us for our guilt, and there is just where the trouble is.

But the question may be asked, could not this war have happened by the sinful plotting of wicked men, without any agency of God in it? I answer promptly, no. It could not have so happened. Men might "propose" war, and in so far, be guilty of war, and so be accountable therefor. But if God, loving those against whom such war was contemplated, was disposed to screen them from it, could he not screen them? Would he not so screen them? Has he not always so screened his innocent people? Has he not promised always to continue to do so? Need I tell you of Daniel in the lions' den, or of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego in the fiery furnace? Need I refer you to the "City of David," when menaced by Senacharib, that wicked and haughty Assyrian monarch, and the slaying by an angel in a single night of an hundred and eighty and five thousand of his chosen warriors, so that Jerusalem might not fall? "What shall we say then to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?" In such a case, therefore, would not God so "dispose" that all their wicked schemes would fail and that their "proposed" war would fall still-born and harmless to the earth?

Such my brethren are the incontrovertible and, so far as I know, universally believed, teachings of the Scriptures.

If these things be so, then I am right, and this war is of God, and is upon us of His wrath. And He hath hence, taken away his restraints, and given us up to confusion, and to our own hearts lusts, even that we might slay one another with the sword, and, because, as a nation, we have been wicked in his sight.

I am now prepared to assume my 4th position, which is, that, as indicated by Providence, this desolating war is upon us, because of one particular sin, and because of that alone. And that sin is slavery.

I am aware, that in opposition to this position, it may be said, that while the war which is upon us, is a new thing, slavery is not. That this institution dates back to the very beginning of our nation's history. And that notwithstanding its constant existence amongst us, we have enjoyed, all along, as a nation, until recently, the most marked evidences of the Divine favor and blessing. Why then, it may be asked, do assume, that the Divine wrath, now being poured out upon us, is in consequence of slavery.

I reply what though slavery has been amongst us from the first, yet, the sentiment and purpose of the nation concerning it, were not, at first, nor for many years, what, in more recent times, they have come to be. And that it is this change in the nation, that has produced our Maker's change toward us.

Let us examine into this matter a little.

1. Was not the almost universal sentiment of the nation, South, as well

as North, averse to slavery at the time of the formation of the government?

2. Did not our revolutionary statesmen universally execrate the mother country for having entailed upon us so troublesome an incubus?

3. Was not their failure to rid the country of the evil at the start, attributable alone to what they regarded as the impracticability of the measure, at the time then present? But, did they not all unite in looking forward to a coming time when they both hoped and expected it would be practicable to do so?

4. And in view of this, did they not most carefully guard the language of the Constitution, so as to keep it entirely free from any word or phrase which necessarily expressed the existence of the institution amongst us? When slaves were really referred to did they not simply call them in the Constitution, "persons held to service;" but whether so held by virtue of slavery or by virtue of a personal contract agreed upon between the parties, the Constitution saith not. Who can fail to see that this careful guarding of the wording of that instrument was specially designed so as to have its language appropriate when the time should come which they all hoped for, when the institution should exist amongst them no more.

Such, my hearers, was the anti-slaveryism of the fathers of our country.

Now, what was thus true of those revolutionary times, continued to be true through all the earlier years of the Republic, and down until within a score or so of years of the present.

In confirmation of this I would ask, did not Bishop Asbury, and anti-slavery Methodist preachers (for we have been strongly anti-slavery from the first) go, and continue to go, South as well as North, giving their voices continually against this evil, both in their private conversations, pulpit ministrations, and printed testimony in our book of discipline, which, as Methodist preachers are wont to do, they scattered broadcast, without let or hindrance, throughout all the land? And yet was not Bishop Asbury and those Methodist preachers everywhere received in the South up till 1844—some 20 years ago? And received too, without protest, even welcomed as messengers of God. And had they not a success, second to no other denomination, and that too amongst all classes in all the South?

So high indeed, did Southern anti-slaveryism run, not many years ago, that several of their States very seriously contemplated emancipation. And so late as 1832 Virginia, where Southern blood is now being poured out like water for the institution, was with one vote of breaking every yoke by her own law, and letting all her oppressed go free.

But need I be more specific? Is there any use that I should quote history, with book and page, to convince any here of these things? Are they not patent to everybody?

When therefore, in opposition to my position, it is claimed that during all the years of the past, until recently, God was favorable to our land, notwithstanding the constant existence of slavery amongst us; and that therefore, it cannot be claimed by any Providential indication, that he is averse to the institution, I reply that the reason of such favor then, was, that though the institution was amongst us, yet he saw that in our hearts we were averse to it, and that in our purposes we contemplated its final and total removal—and so, looking not at the external appearance, but looking at the nation's heart and intentions he pronounced us innocent, and hence, blessed us.

Take an illustration. Our Saviour hates depravity, and yet, when in the flesh, he took little depraved children in his arms and blessed them. Now why did he bless them, when he hated their depravity? Why? Simply because they had got their depravity from their parents and couldn't get clear of it yet, and so he reckoned them innocent, and blessed them.

Just so, our forefathers plead before God, before one another and before the world, that though slavery was amongst them, it had come down to them from the British, and that they were not to blame, and that they could not get rid of it yet. Well, God knew that all this was true, and so he accounted our young nation innocent, and took it, also, up in his arms and blessed it.

But, to continue the illustration, suppose that such, at first, innocent child lives; and that, when it comes to years of maturity, instead of ridding itself of its depravity, (as it might do through conversion) suppose that it now fosters, and cherishes, and comes to love its inherited depravity, and finally proclaims its intention to retain and maintain and permanently settle down in its sin? Will its Maker's love continue to it? Will he not rather change his regards and his conduct toward it?

Now my brethren, let me ask, did not our nation, like the apostatising child, change, in its attitude toward slavery? That we did so change is so universally known to be true, that I need scarcely affirm it here to-day. Commencing (at least in its outward manifestation) about the year 1832 so rapidly did a pro-slavery sentiment spread and prevail in the South, that in 1844 even the Southern wing of the Methodist E. Church had become so infected with it, that they seceded in a body from the old church and the old principles, which till then, they had themselves both held and propagated.

After this, no anti-slavery Methodist preacher durst open his lips in all their territory, on this question, under pain of personal violence. A small Methodist conference, which about a dozen years ago, was got together in Texas, while quietly holding its session, with our own Bishop Jones at its head, was violently assailed and broken up by a mob, composed in part of judges of the court and civil magistrates. Our own Bro. Buell too, because he would not bow the knee to this Baal, and proclaim slavery a Divine institution, was cruelly hung to the limb of a tree till he was dead.

So thoroughly indeed had the whole South changed on this subject, and so radical had they become, that all freedom, of either speech or the press, had passed entirely away. And finally, about the time of the breaking out of this war, even much of the North itself was rapidly drifting in the same direction.

Thus, like the sinless and God-approved babe, changed into the sinful and God-cursed man, had we as a nation changed, and were rapidly changing more and more.

And now, what were the concomitants of this fast spreading change? Why, first, indications of a gathering storm; next, the mutterings of distant thunder; then, the blackening of both the political and providential heavens; and then, three years and a half ago, the bursting upon us of the fearful storm of this desolating war.

Now, if we have changed in our attitude toward slavery, has not God changed in his attitude toward us? And is it not fair to conclude that he has changed because we have changed? Who can show that God ever yet changed toward a people for the worse, without a cause, and who can show any other change in us, for the worse, corresponding to God's change toward us for the worse, than in slavery?

Am I told that we are great sinners in other respects, and that it is our other sins that have brought down upon us the vengeance of God?

I answer, we were no greater sinners in other respects when this God-sent war broke out upon us, than we were all along before. We had not changed in these respects toward God, for the worse, and consequently he could not, for these things have changed toward us for the worse.

Nay, I am prepared to show that in other respects than slavery, we were not only had not changed for the worse, but that we had changed and were constantly changing, more and more, for the better, up until the very time this God-sent war burst upon us.

Why, I shall only affirm what all know to be true, when I say that never before, in the history of our country, were our churches so strong, so numerous, so pure, so active. Millions of dollars, and with a constant increase, were annually being given for the printing and distribution of the Bible. Other millions were annually being given for the conversion of the world through missionary operations. While sinners at home, by thousands and hundreds of thousands, were being converted in all the land. New churches, filled with anxious and devout worshippers, were being daily multiplied. Institutions of mercy and benevolence, such as infirmaries and asylums, for the young, and the old, and the poor, and the blind, and the deaf, and the insane, were springing up on every side. Righteousness was prevailing more and more. So that, with all our other sins, we were a better people when this war broke out than we had ever been before.

Having changed therefore for the worse, only in regard to slavery, this war must be upon us because of slavery and because of it alone.

Now this point and conclusion I know is plain, and cannot be plainer. And yet, not by way of strengthening its truth, but simply to show its propriety, let me add, that the sin of slavery is like no other sin, and therefore its proper punishment is like no other punishment.

All other sins are personal, and committed upon personal responsibility, and upon that alone. We have no State or National law which upholds, justifies and protects men for lying, swearing, stealing and such like crimes. On the contrary, our public laws are against all these things, and even pro-

vide for their punishment. So that however guilty even the majority of the individuals composing our nation might be, in respect to those crimes which the public laws condemn, yet would the nation, as such, be innocent. Nor in such a case would it be just in God to punish the nation.

In view of this, suppose I were to admit, what is not however true, that in respect to lying, swearing, stealing, sabbath-breaking, drunkenness, murder, and the like, we had become, just before the war, worse than we had ever been before. What then? Would God curse with a desolating war the innocent nation for these crimes, when by her laws she was all the while condemning and punishing them? Or would he hold individual sinners accountable for them, who, in defiance of the laws of the State and the nation, had committed them upon their private responsibility and upon that alone.

Surely he would punish such individual sinners in their private capacity, and in that capacity alone.

But in respect to slavery, the case is different. Here, the Public law, instead of as in the other cases condemning and punishing the crime, upholds, justifies, and protects it. In this way, the State—the Nation makes the sin its own, assumes the responsibility, and becomes guilty before God; and hence must bear, yes, and is now bearing, the punishment of *Ua sin*.

So that it makes no difference in what light we view it, whether by that of Providential indication or by that of justice and propriety, we arrive at the same conclusion, and can arrive at no other, viz, that this war is upon us because of slavery and because of slavery alone. Our last point is

5th. Concerning the ultimate object Divinely designed to be accomplished by the war.

I argue that the Providential indications are,

1st. That such object is not the establishment of the Southern Confederacy. For,

1. Such result would accomplish what we have already seen was never Divinely designed to be accomplished, namely, the division of our domain into two governments, by an imaginary line running east and west. And,

2. Such result would sanction, by its more permanent establishment than ever before, the very institution which, by the war, as we have already seen, it is Divinely designed to condemn and punish. I argue,

2d. That the Divine object designed to be accomplished by this war is not merely the preservation of the Union as it was before the war commenced.

To claim this would be,

1. To charge God with foolishness. For why bring upon us a war simply to preserve what, but for the war, both was not and never would have been in danger.

But to claim this would be,

2. To charge God with cruelty. For if the war only puts things back where they were before it commenced, and nothing more, and if God designed this before he brought it upon us, then what does he gain by it but simply the wreaking upon us of a bloody vengeance?

Why, my brethren, is it not sacrilege to ascribe to God an object in this war which would result only in the indiscriminate slaughter of hundreds of thousands of his blood-bought creatures?

Nay, my brethren, God has other and higher objects in our chastening. He has no such bloody hate, as simply such an object would suppose. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth."

This brings me to claim,

In conclusion, That the only object which the Divine Being has in this war, is to cause us to renounce and give up the sin for which he is chastising us. I argue this,

1. From the fact that the admitted object of all punishment, both human and Divine, is, (in this world at least,) the reformation of the punished and the prevention of further crime.

Believing that this premise will not be questioned, I will not dwell upon it as I might do, by argument and illustration drawn from parental, civil, ecclesiastical and Divine government.

Upon this point therefore, I will only further add that the idea of all chastisement is the infliction of only enough of it to cause the chastised to quit himself of his vice, and that when this is done, the chastisement will always cease.

I argue this Divine purpose,

2. From the long continuance and incidents of the war.

Who ever believed, either North or South, or anywhere else, or could have believed when this war commenced, that it would last so long. Has not the nation been most strangely led in this matter?

Again, who would ever have believed at the beginning of the war, that, with the sentiment of the North what it was on the subject of slavery, that