

## Communications.

FOR THE FREE PRESS.

### *A new plan to tend Cotton while young.*

Work a harrow of the following dimensions, (viz:) It is to be of an oblique triangular form, two feet long, with six iron pins each twelve inches long, placed in the following order, (namely:) the two front or foremost four inches apart; the two next eight inches apart, and twelve inches behind the two foremost; and the two hindmost twelve inches apart, and twelve inches behind the two middlemost. The above is to be worked in the form of a plough, the horse to go directly over the cotton, and the two front pins to straddle it. I am confident that all who may try the above plan of weeding their cotton, will find it to their advantage; as it thins the cotton, destroys the grass, and leaves the young plant in every respect in much better order than any instrument I have ever yet seen tried. The simplicity of this harrow, and the facility with which it enables farmers to clean their crops of cotton, are certainly sufficient inducements for trying the experiment. I wish all my friends to try the plan and judge for themselves.

DEMPSEY BRYAN.

Mr. Howard will confer a favor by inserting the above in the columns of his paper, as the assigner thinks it worth the attention of every farmer.

FOR THE FREE PRESS.

Mr. Howard—The following satirical effusion, at a late Exhibition in the Quanky Academy, was delivered by a young gentleman to whom was awarded the palm for speaking, by a committee chosen to assign the relative merits of the performers. The author of the production is well aware that atheism is a delicate subject for sarcasm. But as many, it is to be feared, are fatally drawn into this horrible delusion, by ridicule and sarcasm against religion; why may not these powerful weapons of swaying mankind be sometimes wrested from the enemies of truth and wielded against themselves? Then, from the Bible itself we have examples of the kind, as that of the ironical advice to those youth who might choose to foster practical atheism, found in Ecclesiastes, xi. 9, "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment."—Therefore, Sir, if you deem proper you can oblige one of your subscribers, and publish in your useful print—

### *How to become a thorough-going Atheist, even in a land enlightened by Christianity.*

Respected auditors: much pains and exertions are necessary to make good Christians and honest men. Many maxims of wisdom must be given to the young, and these must be carefully regarded

and wisely improved. Then in more advanced age, "line upon line and precept upon precept" must be given, received, practised and blessed to fit souls for immortal glory. But are no pains and exertion requisite to fit souls for the depths of perdition? Undoubtedly there are. But of a kind the reverse of those necessary to make men good and happy. A very different course of means must be used to make *thorough-going atheists*. But before noticing these means let us inquire: "What is an atheist?" Suppose we take a Scripture definition. It is contained in this passage: "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." An *atheist*, then, is a *fool*, a *wicked fool*, whose doctrine is that there is no supreme, intelligent, omnipotent Ruler of the Universe; that the sun, moon, and stars; this earth we inhabit, ourselves, and all other creatures in the universe exist by *eternal necessity*, or come into being by *chance*, and move on under the guidance of a *blind fatality*. A very comfortable doctrine, truly!! How do you like it, friends!—Well, if you like it, you can have it. The Bible teaches that you are at liberty to become atheists if you choose; or if any be already such, to remain and make advances in that sort of religion. Joshua, the ancient leader of the Israelites, declared to them the power of a choice. He said:—Choose you this day whom you will serve. And Christ, who taught as never man taught, declares, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." Intimating that men might serve either as they would choose. Now to serve Mammon is virtually becoming atheists: for atheism means literally *without God*. And to discern clearly to which of these services we would belong, let us remember there are two sorts of atheism; either or both of which we can embrace, but both equally *without God*. The devotees of the one believe or pretend to believe, or have the *faith*, that there is no God; no superior superintending power above us. These are called *theoretical* atheists. Those of the other sort according to a scripture definition "*live without God, in the world*." That is, without recognizing in a practical manner their obligations to serve and worship God. Who say by the habitual tenor of their lives, Who is the Almighty that we should serve him, or what profit shall we have if we pray unto him? Or they are those who *profess* to know God, but in *works* deny him. Would any here, then, wish to encounter the labors requisite to settle down upon the principles and practices of atheism? To such a one I would give the following directions: 1st. As to *faith*; how to believe. 2d. As to influence; how to be influenced. 3d. As to morals; how to shape the conduct. And 4thly, As to facts; or how to combat facts in regard to the effects of atheistical principles upon mankind.

1st. Then, as to faith. What! you say. An atheist have faith? We thought atheists gloried in the circumstance of *rejecting* all faith, and setting up, what they call *reason*, instead. True; atheists, as

well as deists, reject the faith of the gospel. Notwithstanding they have a faith—a faith stronger in degree but differing in *kind* from that of the Bible. It is *stronger* in opposition to greater difficulties; because, in accordance with reason and common sense, which evince that every thing useful, or curious made among men, is the product of design or intelligence, the Bible ascribes the beautiful fabric of the universe, and all living creatures in it, to God the supreme intelligence; but atheistical faith, in contrariety to every principle of reason and experience teaches to believe, that all things arose from one of two indescribable mysteries called, *chance*, and *eternal necessity*. Atheistical faith differs in kind from that of the gospel: for gospel faith is a faith founded on rational ground, or, on *evidence*, the common ground of all human belief. But, the faith of atheism is directly against evidence, and the dictates of common sense. Again, *atheistical* faith differs from that of the devils in hell, and even falls below theirs in point of *rationality*, but above in point of strength. For we are told that devils, doubtless knowing they exist not from themselves or by chance, believe there is a God, and tremble: but atheists, knowing they live in the universe by a *derived* being, with a front more brazen than even that of devils, seem to consider the universe *without* a supreme head, a creation *without* a creator. As reasonable, as if a man should see an elegant dwelling-house, and assert, in the face of experience and common sense, that it was never *built*, but come by chance, or existed by eternal necessity. In order then to confirm yourself in the above *rational* sort of faith, the more *sottish, immoral, and stupid* you are the better; but as to others, you must have recourse to some *show* of reason. For instance to reject the gospel, by a difficulty that runs directly into atheism, declare, with the semblance of candor and solicitude, as to external concerns, that there are so great a *multitude* of religious opinions in the world, that you are greatly perplexed to know the *true* one, and you think the best way is to believe all equally *true*; that is, mentally understanding them to be all equally *false*. Thus, by a sort of *refined* hypocrisy, you may lead others to adopt a creed, which adds *one more*, under the specious pretence of making the number *less*. But suppose, that one, whom you wish to proselyte to atheism, should charge home upon you this flimsy sophistry? Then, stiffly maintain that, although the *fool's creed*, viz: "No true religion, that is, no God's," is multiplying the number you just considered too great, yet as the atheistical faith indulges the *vanity* of soaring above the *vulgar herd* of mankind in point of belief, and as it is a *convenient* shelter from all responsibility to heaven, therefore the circumstance of its being among the multitude, should not lessen its credibility. To carry your cunning hypocrisy a little further, you must, when arguing against the divine existence, stiffly maintain that difficul-

ties confute *any* creed. Then, in allusion to the infinitude of the divine nature, ask, "Who made God?" And, as no one can give a direct answer, you must deny the existence of a supreme being on the same ground that a wise-acre might deny there was any *space*, because space is unbounded; or any time, because time *immersed* into *immeasurable eternity*. But should a wily antagonist turn your weapons of difficulties upon yourself, and ask you, "Who made your strange sort of creature *Chance*, or your eternal necessity?" you must *change* your note, and declare that difficulties attached to *your* creed disprove nothing. Or take a bolder tone. Allege that should atheism be all difficulty, yet it would be reasonable to believe it, because your creed; while *one* difficulty might set aside faith in the divine existence, because the creed of Christians.

So much has been said on atheistical faith, that we must dispatch the other points of our subject very briefly. And, in regard to influence—to confirm yourself in atheism, you must be under the control of the sceptical and licentious sentiments of all ages. Extract debasing infidelity from the writings of the Humes, the Spinozas, the Voltairs, the Paines, the Gibbons, and the Volneys; and adopt *their* notions on religious subjects as *yours*. On the other hand, disregard or scoff at the opinions and sage remarks of the Newtons, the Lockes, the Washingtons, and above all the Bible, and all who venerate its precepts. You must affect to consider all great and good men, under Bible influence, as *hypocritical* deceivers. But all the profligate and licentious, acting under the influence principles, you must consider to be actuated by the *purest* motives. Therefore, forego not any expense for sceptical books, and favoring men and things that have, as their tendency, the overthrow of gospel influence. While you must grudge a cent, and consider lost and worse than lost, all expenditures, for promoting the institutions of Christianity, and the benevolent operations of your day. Finally, as to morals and facts—Do any confront you with the declaration, that atheism, with all its kindred systems of faith, which teach men to live *without God* in the world, have a licentious tendency; while genuine Christianity promotes a sublime morality, under whose influence flourish the sciences, the arts, true liberty, and all that exalts mankind? Cut the argument short, by declaring that *your* opinion of good morals, is very different from that of *some* people—that refractory conduct against lawful authority, that profane swearing, drunkenness, Sabbath breaking, and the like course of conduct; that revenge, murder and assassination are all good traits of moral character, provided they are accompanied (as they generally are) with a *good heart*, or a benevolent disposition. Are you told that such sort of morals constantly produce evils among mankind? Reply, that these arise, not from your sort of virtue, but from the