



COLUMBIA DEMOCRAT.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, BY LEVI L. TATE. IN BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA. OFFICE

At the new Brick Building, opposite the Exchange, by side of the Court House. "Democratic Head Quarters."

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION. \$1.00 in advance, for one copy, for six months.

\$1.75 in advance, for one copy, one year.

\$3.00 if not paid within the first three months.

\$2.25 if not paid within the first six months.

\$2.50 if not paid within the year.

No subscription taken for less than six months, and no paper discontinued until arrears are paid.

Advertisements inserted conspicuously at one dollar per square, of 10 lines each, for the first insertion, and seventy-five cents per square, for every subsequent insertion, until ordered discontinued.

Job Work of every description, neatly and cheaply executed at the shortest notice.

Original Poetry.

For the Columbia Democrat.

THE CONTRABAND DARK-KEY.

BY GEORGE WIGNALL.

The negro ran away, from old Virginia's shore, And come to Mass. Linnam; I'll tell you what 'tis for: I heard that Massa Linnam and his cabinet had sed, Dat all de darkey contrabands should be clothed and fed.

And now, Massa Linnam, I have come to see What you will have to say to a runaway like me; I hope dat Massa Linnam will take us 'neath his wing, For I do not like to work—I'd rather dance and sing.

Some told me dat da hard good Massa Linnam tell, If de darkey came to him, he'd keep dem berry well; De should live upon de best, and have no bills to pay, For Massa Linnam's rich, and will pay another day.

I'm sure dat Massa Linnam is a mighty king, Don't care for constitution or any such a thing; He make a proclamation dat de niggers all an free, For he's Massa of de country, as you may plainly see.

He's making heaps of money and can buy us all a farm Where we may live in clover and not take any harm; We'll get de better white trash de cotton for to lace, And have a darkey overseer for to make 'em go.

I guess dat Massa Linnam will dress us berry fine, And be de colored ladies we'll cut a mighty shine; We'll play a pon de harp, and rattle on de bones, And dance till niggers' heads all harder den de stones.

We'll be voted to de Congress and to de Senate too, And in de great oration for equality we'll go; We'll sit wid Massa Greeley, and wid Sumner we will talk, And de grand parade wid Massa Linnam walk.

Lor' bless Massa Linnam for what he's made of me, For now I live in Washington, and more den dat, I'm free; I thank dat Massa Linnam is a berry clever man, 'Cause he's gived to us darkeys all de favors dat he can.

State of the Country.

A BIBLE VIEW OF SLAVERY.

BY HON. AMOS KENDALL.

We take the following from the National Intelligencer, in which paper it appeared as one of a series of "Letters to the President."

To Abraham Lincoln the President of the United States:

RESPECTED SIR:—My object in these letters, be it distinctly understood, is not to commend slavery as a desirable institution, nor to mitigate in the least the crime or the penalty of the Southern rebellion; but it is, by the light of truth, to disarm, in some degree, a set of Northern fanatics, whose insane hatred of slavery make them equally hostile to our glorious Constitution. It is to show the honest people of the free States that, as a political question, they are not responsible for it, and have no rightful control over it, and that, as a moral question, there is nothing in it which justifies their interference by virtue of any "higher law" than the Constitution of their country.

Rebel masters may be divested of their right to the labor of their slaves as a punishment for their treason, just as far as they may be divested of other analogous rights, and no farther; but for the United States to abolish the institution because individual slaveholders rebel, would be as gross an usurpation as a sweeping act to divorce all wives from their husbands and all free all children from their parents in all slaveholding States for the same reason.

Not from any other motive than to bring home more vividly to the minds of the reader the Bible truths developed in my last letter, I address myself to a Reverend representative of a class.

I say to him, do you, in common with all or most Christian teachers, recognize Noah as a prophet of God who spoke by inspiration? If so, it was God himself who doomed the descendants of Ham to perpetual servitude. If, therefore, slavery be a sin, God in this case is responsible for it; and when you attempt on that ground to rescue the African from slavery you assume to be more wise and just than God! Is it not so?

Abraham bought servants with his money, and had hundreds 'born in his house.' He was a special favorite with God, who not only leaped blessings upon

him, but chose him to be the father of his peculiar people, and the progenitor of the Savior of mankind.

You denounce the buying of men and women with money as sinful, and its toleration in our country as a great national sin, which has brought down upon us the judgment of Heaven. Abraham did the same thing, and Heaven showered blessings upon him. Our fathers and brothers did the same thing, and were blessed as Abraham was, until the reformers of God's moral law, by their impious assumptions, disturbed the peace of the country, and aided in bringing down upon it the calamities under which it now mourns.

You denounce slavery as a sin. God says, (Exodus 21, 2.) 'If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve. That is slavery, or involuntary servitude, by the command of God. Who knows best what is sin, you or God?

He may become free at the end of six years; but if he choose, he may be made a slave forever, by means of a ceremony prescribed in Exodus 21, 6, and Deuteronomy 15, 17. He had no further option on the subject; but says God, he shall be thy servant forever.

But you may say this is voluntary servitude. Not only certainly for the first six years; and according to your principles, a man cannot alienate his liberty.—If so, this voluntary slave, after he has become so voluntarily, may change his mind and resume his freedom; but God says he shall be a servant forever. Is God a sinner?

But if he accepts his freedom at the end of six years, his sons and daughters, if born of a wife given him by his master, (doubtless herself a slave,) shall be her master's; and he shall go out by himself in other words, they shall not be free on the seventh year, but shall remain slaves forever. This is God's order. Is it a sin, Reverend Sir?

You say there cannot be ownership in man. God says the women and sons and daughters in this case shall be her master's.

In the 21st chapter of Exodus, after directing that if a master beat his slave to death he shall be punished, God says, verse 21: 'Notwithstanding, if he continues a day or two he (the master,) shall not be punished for he (the slave,) is his money.' Is not a man's money his property? You, Reverend Sir, say that a man's slave is not his property. God says he is; which shall a Christian believe?—I would like to hear you preach a sermon from these words of scripture, 'For he is his money.'

'Thus saith the Lord,' in Leviticus 25, 44, 'Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids which thou shalt have shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.' Give us a sermon on this text; also, and show us how acts which God expressly authorizes can be sinful.

'Thus saith the Lord,' in the next verse (Mourner of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy and of their families that are with you, which they beget in your land, and shall be your possession.)

Another good text, Reverend sir, from which I should like to hear you deduce the conclusion not only that buying these children was a sin, but that 'possession' here does not mean 'property.'

'Thus saith the Lord,' in the next verse 'And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever.'

Your Bible tells you, Reverend sir, that these are the direct words of God. God himself authorizes the buying of slaves; God himself authorizes them to be held as 'a possession'; God himself declares that they shall be 'an inheritance,' passing from father to son; God himself declares that they shall remain in this relation 'forever.'

Yet you teach that slavery is itself a sin that the buying men and women for money is a sin; that holding them as 'a possession' is a sin; that their transmission as 'an inheritance' from father to son is a sin; and that holding them in bondage 'forever' is 'the sum of all villainies.'

What is the inference? Either that you do not believe the Bible, and assume to believe it only as a mask to enable you to lead astray ignorant men and 'silly women,' or you believe that God himself legalized sin among his chosen people.

Take which horn of the dilemma you please; you cannot escape both.

Let us now review the subject in the light of the New Testament.

If slavery be 'the sum of all villainies,' Reverend sir, is it not strange that Jesus

Christ did not denounce it as a sin, though it existed all around him? Is it not stranger still, that the Apostles instead of denouncing it a sin, recognized it as a lawful relation, involving certain Christian duties? Let us examine the difference between the Gospel which they preached and the Gospel which you preach.

The Gospel taught by Paul and Peter, enjoins upon every man to be content in the position where Providence has placed him. 'Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it,' says Paul, Corinthians I, 7-12. Your Gospel teaches the servant discontent and rebellion.

The Gospel taught by Paul and Peter enjoins servants to be obedient to their masters, whether kind or cruel. 'Servants, be obedient to those who are your masters according to the flesh,' says Paul, Eph. 6-5. 'Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters as worthy of all honor,' says Paul, I Tim. 6-1. 'Exhort servants to be obedient to their own masters and to please them well in all things,' says Paul to Titus, 2-9. 'Servants, be subjected to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward,' says Peter, I Peter, 2-18. Your Gospel teaches that servants owe no obedience to their masters, whether they be 'froward' or 'good and gentle.'

The Gospel taught by Paul and Peter, enjoined upon servants to serve their masters with 'good will,' Eph. 6-7. 'Not with eye service,' Col. 3-22. 'To please them well in all things, not answering again, not murmuring, but showing all good fidelity,' Titus 2-10. 'To endure grief, suffering wrongfully,' I Peter 2-19.

Your Gospel teaches servants that it is not their duty to serve their masters at all, nor to please them in anything; to be more eye-servants, and faithful in nothing; to perjure their master's property, and run away when they can, and to cut their master's throats if necessary to gain their own liberty.

What motive or end does the Gospel taught by Paul and Peter hold out to servants as inducements to be obedient and faithful to their masters? That it is 'doing the will of God,' Eph. 6-7; 'That the name of God and his doctrines be not blasphemed,' I Timothy 6-1; 'That they may adorn the doctrines of God our Savior,' Titus, 2-10; 'That is acceptable to God,' I Peter, 1-20.

And what motive does the gospel you teach hold out to the poor black man for seeking to escape from the position assigned him by God through Noah, and violate all the duties specially enjoined upon him by the Gospel of Christ? You promise him liberty, not the liberty of 'the Lord's free man,' which looks to eternity as in Christ's Gospel, but the groveling liberty which looks only to time as in your gospel; a liberty which knows no equality, not even with yourself; liberty to exist a degraded being among another race of men who exalt him from all civil, social and domestic relations; liberty to live and die a miserable outcast on earth, without that cheering hope of eternal liberty and equality in Heaven which Paul and Peter promise to the obedient and faithful servant.

St. Paul was a good painter of character and somewhat prophetic. He seems to have foreseen the anti-slavery crusade of this day and described its leaders. After having emphatically directed Timothy to teach servants to honor and serve their masters, I Timothy, 6-12, he adds, in verses 3, 4, 5, the following picture of anti-slavery teachers, viz: 'If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even to the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but dotting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmising, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.'

This passage, be it remembered, follows directly after Paul's injunction to Timothy to teach servants to honor and serve their masters, 'that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed'; 'these things teach and exhort,' says he, and then proceeds to say, 'if any man teach otherwise,' &c., 'he is proud, knowing nothing,' &c. Hence it appears that this description of character was designed for just such anti-slavery teachers as yourself and your associates of the present day. And how true the picture! What 'strife,' what 'envy,' what 'railings,' what 'evil surmising,' what 'perverse disputings,' have your teaching of other doctrines produced! Nay more; what hatred among

Christians, what divisions of churches; what sectional antipathies; what excitement and commotions; and, finally, what desolation, bloodshed and mourning have your unchristian teachings aided in bringing upon our lately powerful, prosperous and happy land!

And, not content with the aid you have given traitors in involving your country in a devastating civil war, you are now moving earth and hell to prolong it, to render it more bloody, and perhaps insure the success of the traitors—certainly to afford them the only chance of success—by converting the war for the Constitution into a war against slavery. You are as hostile to the Constitution as the rebels themselves, and you prefer their success to the preservation of the Government transmitted to us by our fathers, simply because the Government recognizes an institution which God has sanctioned, and the rights of masters and the duties of servants, as prescribed by the apostles of Christ. In short, you are not willing to live under a Government which protects slaveholders, though it does not know them in that character, and has no power over the institution.

I wonder that you do not openly rebel against the government of God because he 'sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust.'

To be consistent you ought to object to living on the same earth and under the same sky with slaveholders, to being warmed by the same sun and breathing the same air. And surely you will pray for a heaven by yourselves; for those who think that a slaveholder cannot be a fit associate for them in a Christian church cannot be happy in a heaven peopled with such slaveholders as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses, David and Solomon, and such associates of slavery as Paul and Peter. How can you be happy in that heaven where that God who expressly authorized his people of old to buy slaves and hold them in bondage forever; or that Christ, an essential part of whose religion is the cheerful obedience of the slave to his master?

Yes, in your 'dotting about questions and strifes of words,' you not only promote revolution and bloodshed in your country, but you are sapping the foundations of your country's religion. When you prove that slavery is in itself a sinful relation, you prove that the Bible is false, that the God of the Bible is a God of sin, and that Christianity, as taught by the disciples of Christ, is but a cloak for 'the sun of all villainies.' Truly has it been said on another occasion, 'It is hard to believe such men sincere. If not infidels already, they are on the highway to that bourne.'

Now many weak minds, having been first imbued with the dogma that slavery is in itself a sin and a crime, when they come to find that from Genesis to Revelation it is recognized as a lawful and not unchristian institution, will be induced to reject the whole Bible as a fable, and the God of the Bible as an imaginary being.

AMOS KENDALL.

General Franklin.

The following from the New York Times, an administration paper, is a caudid tribute to General Franklin.

'We publish in another column a statement of the conduct of General Franklin at the battle of Fredericksburgh, in reply to an impeachment of it contained in a letter from the Editor of the Times, written at Washington on the 24th of January. In that letter the impression was given, as our correspondent states, that Gen. Burnside intended his main attack to be made by our left wing, under Gen. Franklin, and that the battle was lost by Gen. Franklin's failure to make that attack, with the force and vigor contemplated by his orders, and which were essential to success.

'It is due to Gen. Franklin, as well as to the public, to state that we have seen the orders, reports and other documents referred to. It seems to us clear, after examining these papers, that Gen. Franklin not only performed all the service enjoined upon him in his orders, but that he did more than was contemplated by them in pushing the attack upon the enemy in his front. It is to be presumed that the Government does not consider his conduct in that affair obnoxious to censure, or it would have given him a Court of Inquiry, and if this is the case, he ought to be relieved from any implied censure and placed in a position where the country can again have the benefit of his unquestioned ability in the prosecution of the war.'

Communications.

Ink Drops—By Raven.

NUMBER ONE.

COL. LEVI L. TATE:—Our Government was founded, by our forefathers, to perpetuate our blood-bought liberties. It was a small matter to have gained our independence, and to have broken off the yoke of tyrants abroad, if we were to put on one equally heavy at home; to refuse to bow down to strangers, and then become the slaves of our friends. And revolutionary blood was spent in vain to gain our liberty, if that liberty was to run into licentiousness. Hence, that unborn generations might enjoy the fruits of the great struggle, it was necessary not only to maintain our independence of foreign nations, but to guard against anarchy and despotism at home. A government was, therefore, necessary to protect the people from oppression at home and abroad. A republican form of government, with good laws, faithfully administered, might have accomplished this end, but the close of no revolution ever found a people so peculiarly situated as were the Americans at the end of the war. Here were thirteen States, having joined together to gain their independence. In this object they made common cause, but this obtained, each one fell back to enjoy its share of the independence gained. No one was willing to be governed by the other, and all were unwilling to consolidate and bury their independence in one nation. Yet all saw the necessity of some kind of union for mutual protection, a protection of each against all of the rest, and the protection of all against foreign foes.—This then was the question that came before the framers of our general government: How to form one great nation out of many, and yet preserve the identity of each; how to protect the rights and privileges of all and yet not encroach upon any? There was one thing more that added to this already herculean task.—These States were situated in different parts of a widely extended territory, and had been settled by people from all parts of the world, bringing with them, more or less, of their native tastes and habits.—Some were situated favorably to commerce, some to manufacturing, and others to agricultural pursuits; these last the most numerous, embracing different degrees of climate, and varying greatly in their productions according to their locality. This variety of interests was to be protected and watched over. Besides all this; there were large territories to be peopled and States to be made. These were to be provided for, and brought in as they arose, and to be placed precisely on an equality with the rest. Here then were the elements of a great nation, if they could only be harmonized and made to help each other. And this was the task of the framers of our government. To accomplish this it would seem that human wisdom was inadequate, but it was done, and that it was done would seem to argue Divine assistance. Confidently they threw their banner to the breeze, and its opening folds revealed to a waiting world *E Pluribus Unum*, as the result of their arduous labors. The great experiment of human liberty, on a gigantic scale, began.

NUMBER TWO.

The Constitution of the United States contained the principles it was intended should govern the country. It contained the sum of the power delegated by each State for the good of the whole, and there the delegation ended. The remaining powers were 'reserved to the States respectively, or to the whole people.' This reservation of power to each State, is limited to its own internal affairs. The Constitution defines the powers of each department of government, and limits each to its own sphere of action. All laws made by the legislative department of the general government must be within the range of the powers given by the Constitution. The judicial is to explain and define the powers of the Constitution, and determine whether the acts of Congress are according thereto. And the executive is to give a practical application to these laws, and thus execute the will of the people as expressed in the Constitution. It would seem that the government of the United States is plain and simple after all, and it needs only that each State and each department of government understand its duty and do it. The only difficulty there can be in applying the principles of the Constitution to the extended and varying

interests of the country; for, while the Constitution lays down the principles, the circumstantial application has a wide latitude. Here is where men have differed. Two lines of policy have been adopted.—The one straining the Constitution to justify the exercise of doubtful powers, the other holding to the evident meaning and intent of that instrument, and a strict adherence to its requirements. The one to concentrate the powers of government in certain departments; the other to preserve its constitutional distribution. The one locking to the interests of certain classes or sections; the other to the good of the whole country. The one tending in its very nature to despotism; the other to original democracy. The different policies have found embodiment in different parties. These parties have been in the majority or minority according to the changes that have taken place in the popular mind. These parties too, have assumed different names, according to the object they have had in view. The one has been known by a variety of names, as Federalists, Whigs, Republicans, &c.—The other has always retained the name originating with the party. There are really but two parties. All organizations on outside issues belong to the same parties, separating, it is true for awhile, but converging again when a united effort is necessary to accomplish some principal object. They have all aimed to accomplish some one of the objects stated above. The parties stand now, Republican and Democratic, and to every thinking mind the question arises, which of these parties is right, and to which shall I attach myself? For no man can love his country, with the right of suffrage, as we all possess in this country, and not feel more or less obligation to use that suffrage for his country's good. Nor is it necessary to be booked up in all the minutiae of politics in order to determine which way to vote, for there are certain general principles, the operation of which is to decide which line of policy is best.

NUMBER THREE.

From the positions taken in the foregoing 'Ink Drops,' we come to the following conclusions:

1st. The object had in getting up the Government was the good of the whole country.

2d. Good laws, well administered, are essential to the prosperity of any country.

3d. Unparalleled prosperity for a long series of years, proves the correctness of the principles in operation.

4th. The United States have prospered beyond a parallel in the history of nations.

5th. And the fact that the Democratic party and their policy have governed the country most of the time, proves their principles to be correct, and that they are adapted to the prosperity of the country.

I am a Democrat, for these reasons:

1st. I believe that the Constitution of the United States contains the only government adapted to the country, and the Democratic party has always been and still is the constitutional party.

2d. That the more nearly we can carry out the plain intentions of the Constitution, the greater will be our prosperity, and the Democratic party has always been in favor of adhering strictly to its provisions.

3d. The more closely each State attends to its own business, and to the development of its own resources, without meddling with the rights of others, the better will it be for each State and the whole country, and this the Democratic party has always contended for.

4th. That while the identity of the States and their rights are maintained, the more closely they are united on general principles, the better for each and for all; and the Democratic party has always been and is now a Union party.

5th. The more closely each department of government confines itself to its own legitimate power, without assuming the prerogatives of either of the others, or of the whole government, the better it is for all; and this is a cardinal doctrine of the Democratic party.

6th. The calm, considerate voice of the people is the voice of God, and the voice of the people has been in favor of the Democratic party.

7th. That whenever party leaders have persuaded the people that a change was necessary, the term of four years was sufficient to remove the deception.

8th. The object and the tendency of the opposite party has culminated in the present administration, and the result is the dismemberment of the States and the ruin of the country.

9th. The Executive has assumed powers that belong alone to Congress.

10th. Both the Executive and the Legislature have assumed powers that are not delegated by the Constitution.

11th. They have disregarded the Judiciary, and have made and executed laws contrary to the decisions of the Supreme Judges.

12th. They have assumed fearful powers under the plea of military necessity, and trampled the laws and the Constitution of the States under their feet.

13th. And finally, they have from the manner in which they have used power, proved themselves incapable of so high a trust, and if let alone would rule the country with blood-bought and highly prized liberties.

QUESTIONS FOR THE EDITOR OF THE "SMUT MACHINE."

MR. EDITOR:—The flippant facility of the editor of the *Republican* in answering questions induces me to ask—

1st. Does the editor of that paper denounce all as copperheads who think and declare that it was impolitic, unwise and unjust to remove Gen. McClellan from the command of the army?

2d. Does he class among the copperheads all who believe and declare that Gen. Geo. B. McClellan will be the next President of these United States?

3d. Does he denounce as copperheads all who disapprove of the low jests, the vulgar jokes and the fecklessness of President Lincoln, as undignified and improper?

4th. Does he include among the copperheads all such men as have denounced as pitiful, mean, contemptible and tyrannical, many of the acts of the Secretary of War of these United States?

These are specific and direct interrogatories; direct answers to which will not only show what Dr. John means by a copperhead, but also who are included in his frequent denunciations.

A DEMOCRAT.

Reading the Signs.

Henry J. Raymond, editor of the New York Times, (Abolition) in a recent speech, said:

'We are about played out as a party. We played the "Maine law," a good enough Morgan for the time being—but it was played out, and so Abolitionism is played out. It may last Lincoln's time out—but if we hold on till then, there is not one of us living, that will ever get into public life again. Weed is wisely getting out of the scrape. Greeley is fit enough to hang on, is to keep on the war until the Union is so thoroughly split up, that it never can be got together again. A reunion with the South on any terms is death to all this generation. But, at any rate, the taxes, which the people have not begun to feel; the debt, and the conscription, not yet begun, but to come, will damn every man concerned in levying them.'

RIVERS OF BLOOD.—The circulation in the system is not unlike the flow of rivers to the sea, which move smoothly until they are clogged or obstructed. But when drift wood or alluvial dams them up, then comes the tearing devastation that follows the obstruction of a force which cannot be stayed. So the blood circulates insensibly through the system until it becomes clogged by disease; then burst out the ulcers, sores and disorders which follow that condition. Take Ayer's Sarsaparilla and purify your blood, to save yourself from the floods, freshets and deluges which sweep unnumbered multitudes upon that shoreless sea which swallows all mankind.—Lancaster (Pa.) Register.

Bishop Clarke, of Rhode Island, closed his discourse two weeks ago last Sunday in these eloquent words, referring to our national troubles:

'Blow from the South, O winds of God, and bring us tidings of reconciliation and love! Blow from the North, O winds of God, and carry back the message of fraternity and peace. Scatter the darkness, roll away the clouds, and give unto us all once more the sunshine of tranquil rest! Under the shadow of thy wings we make our refuge. O God, give us peace!'

A letter from "Parson Brownlow," dated at Nashville on the 6th instant, among other things, says:

'I told the people of the North in my speeches, as thousands of them will recollect, what I now repeat—that is to say, one half of all the slaves in the seceded States will fight for their owners, and fight to perpetuate their own bondage.'