

# GREENSBOROUGH PATRIOT.

"THE IGNORANT AND DEGRADED OF EVERY NATION OR CLIME MUST BE ENLIGHTENED, BEFORE OUR EARTH CAN HAVE HONOR IN THE UNIVERSE."

VOLUME I.

GREENSBOROUGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1830.

NUMBER 45.

## THE

### GREENSBOROUGH PATRIOT.

Is printed & published every Wednesday morning, by  
**WILLIAM SWAIN.**

At Two Dollars per annum, payable within three months from the date of the first number, or Three Dollars will be invariably exacted immediately after the expiration of that period.

Each subscriber will be at liberty to discontinue at any time within the first three months, by paying for the number received, according to the above terms; but no paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid, and a failure to order a discontinuance will be considered a new engagement.

Those who may become responsible for Ten copies shall receive the 11th gratis.—An allowance of ten per cent will also be made to authorized agents for procuring subscribers and warranting their solvency or remitting the cash.

### ADVERTISEMENTS,

Not exceeding 12 lines, will be neatly inserted three times for one dollar—and twenty-five cents for each succeeding publication—those of greater length in the same proportion. All letters and communications to the Editor, on business relative to the paper, must be POST-PAID, or they will not be attended to.

### COMMUNICATION.

"But still remember, if you mean to please,  
To press your point with modesty and ease."

FOR THE GREENSBOROUGH PATRIOT.  
A SPECULUM

FOR JOHN P. DUNCAN AND DANIEL D. DUNCAN.

Messrs. Duncans: We have, without "astonishment or regret," read your bombastic production under the head of "English Grammar fifty days book!" You affect much pity and "regret" on our behalf. We would advise you to keep your tears for yourselves, your deluded pupils, and your defrauded employers. We ask not your sympathy; we regard not your malevolence; your friendship we would not accept, even were it tendered without the hard condition of "repentance and reformation;"

"Who friendship with a knave has made,  
Is judg'd a partner in the trade."

If an "all-wise Providence," in bestowing many gifts and benedictions, has thought proper to withhold from us any, we doubt not but he has done it for an "all-wise" purpose,—a purpose wiser than that of making vain pretenders weep. Were we not shielded by conscious rectitude, we might feel that we had once acted without due discretion, that is, when we counsel you to arms, and placed ourselves in the range of your missiles. Though your darts are barbed and pointed with malign acrimony, dipped in the venom of slander, and hurled with infuriated violence and mortal aim; we can assure you, they glance unheeded by, or fall

"Like harmless thunders breaking at our feet."

We did not engage in this warfare without first "counting the cost." We did not calculate to expose an imposture without incurring the wrath and unjust recrimination of the impostors. Therefore, we do not shrink at your first brunt; nor do we view our situation in a light so mortifying as to be ready to cry out in the tender pathos of the poet, "we own your sentence just." Were you our judges, we should scarce expect a just sentence; for, when interested and malicious accusers are the judges, justice is seldom done.

"We will," say you, "at all times, and on all occasions, bow with respect to the will of the people. Such a bow as we can make, is always at their service." Though ye are, no doubt, a supple, obsequious, cringing tribe, when it suits your turn so to be, yet it may be justly questioned whether men, who strive to mislead the people's judgment, have any real respect for their will. It is scarcely necessary to inform you, who know so much about "the principles of matter and thought," that the act of judging precedes volition; and that men will discreetly or indiscreetly, according to the correctness or incorrectness of the information on which their judgment is formed.

Speaking of our assertion, that "men have been traversing this section of country, offering to teach the English Grammar to perfection, in fifty days," you say, that this remark is false in relation to you. If our assertion did not apply to you, it had no relation whatever to you, until you claimed kin with it, for we did not particularize you. Your eagerness to repel a charge, in which, if ye have not been guilty of the thing alleged, ye were not implicated, gives a strong suspicion that ye are guilty. You go on, "it is manifestly contradictory to the universal sentiment of all enlightened men." "This remark," as you call it, being a matter of fact, cannot be a matter of sentiment, either universal or particular, of the enlightened or the unenlightened. "No person," you say, "possessed of common intelligence, would affirm, that a perfect knowledge of a science so complicate in its parts, so superficially understood and so much degraded by an unqualified barrister and ostentatious schoolmaster, could be obtained, in fifty days." With out being able to conceive, how the degradation of a science by an unqualified barrister and ostentatious schoolmaster, or their superficial acquaintance with

it, can retard the progress of others in acquiring a knowledge of it, we admit the truth of the main assertion in the sentence just quoted. Do you mean, by this, to say that you never offered to teach the English Grammar in fifty days? What then is your meaning when you say, "we are what we pretend to be, teachers of English Grammar, in fifty days?" Possibly you intend to quibble about the word "perfection." But such an attempt cannot avail you much, as it will be only a quibble. If you have never intentionally induced the belief, that you could impart an adequate knowledge of the English Grammar in fifty days, nor used any other misrepresentations, but have always stated fairly and openly what you could do, and what you could not do, then we have not made the most distant allusion to you in our remarks; and your furious repulse of charges never made,

"Resembles ocean into tempest tost,  
To wait a feather, or, to drown a fly."

Whatever may become of your evasions and shufflings, we are fortunate enough to possess abundant proof of our assertion. We rationally infer, and therefore believe, that you are implicated. Otherwise, why does "your situation call loudly for defence?" Moreover, you have been employed, and at the price of \$10 for fifty days. We infer from this that you must have promised great things, for our good citizens have seldom shown themselves liberal in the encouragement of learning. Again, though we have not a very high opinion of your abilities, either natural or acquired, yet we scarcely believe you to be so absolutely inflated, as to attempt the defence of so contemptible a cause, in which you are not engaged. We gave intimation that an imposture was planned on the publick. You step forth and father it; and yours it shall be.

You say, "we are extremely sorry, that we cannot obtain recommendations from so learned and influential characters as Messrs. Swain and Reynolds." We doubt not, but your sorrow is both extreme and sincere. And we cannot repress a smile, when we reflect what different sort of Swain and Reynolds we should be, in your estimation, had we not been "accompanied by the disdainful bigotry and unblushing perversity of opinion," as you call our firmness, which constrained us not to connive at your shameless pretences. Had we been temporizing enough to have recommended the "short system," "without knowing why or caring wherefore," none would be more "learned and influential" than we. We would not be the men who "make Adverbs, Adjectives." No, no; in that case, if we had called them adverbs, adverbs they would be; if adjectives, they could be no less. Speaking of one of us, you say, "who says that the Proposition *unto* always follows *like*." We deny the verity of the statement as made by you; yet, admitting it, we consider our ground as tenable as yours, when you say that the proposition *unto* is never understood after *like*; and more tenable than yours, when you say the sentence, "He is like him," is incorrect, because the pronoun after *like* is in the objective case; or when you say the pronoun *me*, in the phrase, "give me leave," is governed by the verb give.

After quoting from our remarks, what you are pleased to call a "transcendently moral sentence," you commence, "we think" &c. as if the publick, or even ourselves, care what you "think," so long as your thoughts are not conclusions deducible from facts or reason. To hear you prate about "Socratical virtue," with the insinuation annexed that your vain selves possess such virtue, would make a "Socratical" dog howl in derision.—Speaking of "tame and silent submission," you say, "it is not regarded by us, and we hope by no other person;" that is, and we hope it is not regarded by no other person.

Your invitation to meet you, for the purpose of being shown that our "knowledge of Grammar is entirely superficial, and that ye are what ye pretend to be, teachers of the Grammar in fifty days," we have a strong inclination to except. Accordingly we will meet you, at any place it may appear mutually convenient, at any time, when we shall be able to procure the attendance of impartial men, possessed of more grammatical knowledge than either party, to act as umpires; and a moderator, who may insure us the opportunity of speaking and hearing in our turn;—when we shall be convinced that any good can result from our convention with men whose predominant characteristics are *intrusive impudence, obstreperous garrulity and fatulent self-conceit*; men who have not the humility to discover, nor modesty to own, that they are not infallible, nor the magnanimity to admit the possibility that others may be right; who submit to no authority, ridicule and disparage that most highly approved, and set their own conceited opinions above all:—when these things shall happen together, we will meet you unreluctantly, both to be shown, (if it can be shown,) "that our knowledge of grammar is entirely superficial, and that you are what you pretend to be," &c. And further, should any set of parents, within any reasonable distance, be weak enough hereafter to employ you, influenced by your persuasions that you can make their children grammarians in fifty days;—if, at the expiration of the term, they will call upon you to examine the class, we will "then and there," show you that you are what we esteem you, impostors.

You seem much elated with the idea that you altogether exculpate yourselves from the charge of imposture, by promulgating the terms on which you obligate yourselves to teach. We happen however,

to know that the universal impresson of both employers and scholars is, (to use their own language,) that a perfect knowledge of grammar is to be imparted, in fifty days; or in other words, that the scholars are to be made complete grammarians, in that time. We are well fortified with testimony of this fact. Now, there is no rational way by which to account for this impression except that of supposing it derived from your misrepresentation and flatteries. Moreover, in support of this supposition, we have the testimony of their own words. No doubt, you calculate it will be difficult to account for the fact, that you generally obtain your pay, without admitting that you give general "satisfaction." But, having seen the business managed once, we can easily see how it is possible for you to give satisfaction without rendering value. When your school is made, your imposture is only begun; as your school advances, and your pupils begin to have a smattering knowledge of many things, you applaud and magnify their progress to their parents; and inflate their own vanity. They perceive they have obtained some knowledge, and believe it to be all.

"While from the bounded level of their mind,  
Short views they take, nor see the lengths behind."

"The eternal snows appear already past,  
And the first clouds and mountains seem the last."

In the interim, no opportunity is omitted by you for decrying the grammatical acquirements of all around, or for striving to infuse the highest contempt for all knowledge of this sort, acquired in the old way. When the time has elapsed, the scholars are examined, often, no doubt, by men very incapable of doing it thoroughly. These men, after a short examination, perhaps by you alone, pronounce them grammarians. This accords with their own belief; and their parents who are no judges, (for no man who understands the science himself will be thus duped,) express their satisfaction, and hand over the "fee." You laugh, in your heart, at the success of your artifice, despise your unfortunate dupes, take courage and try again.

But, on the other hand, if those engaged as examiners are adequate to the task, and have the firmness, or, as you have caricatured it, have "the disdainful bigotry, and unblushing perversity of opinion," to perform the duty assigned them with uncompromising integrity, the affair becomes serious, and a noisy scene ensues. You, seeing yourself in danger of being set at naught, like Demetrius the silversmith, raise an uproar, and cry, "for about the space of two hours," *Great is the way by Curtation*. You attempt, by much vain babbling and contradictory vociferation, to impose the belief on the bystanders, that the examiners are ignorant and prejudiced. You back the scholars in error, and strive to harden them to obstinacy in the belief that they are grammarians, and that the examiners are ignorant and partial. Finally, when a regard to truth and good faith, compels the examiners to perform the delicate task of pronouncing the class inadequate grammarians, a declaration so unflattering to their vanity, mortifies their feelings, and they are easily persuaded that injustice has been done them. The parents, in this case, believing their children have derived benefit, at the same time that they say, they are under no absolute necessity of paying, conclude to pay you, or, at least, compound with you, for the sake of peace.

Before we leave you to your silent meditations, we wish you to take a glance at your production *en masse*. Men who speak so contemptuously of the abilities and acquirements of others,—who prate so pompously and pedantically, (please loan us the use of the word a moment,) about "a knowledge of the English Grammar as connected with the principles of matter and thought," might be expected to be masters of composition. But, alas! instead of the flowers of rhetoric, we gather the henbane, detraction. In search of the brilliant flashes of wit, and the lively strokes of genius, we find nothing but fulsome rant, and the abullitions of malignity. Instead of logical reasoning, and demonstrative conclusions, we are put off with dogmatical assertions, unsupported and incapable of being supported by facts. In stead of coming out openly and manfully in your defence, ("for your situation calls loudly for defence,") you crouch down between contradictions, and hide your faces behind ambiguities, that you may, if possible, avoid being eye-witnesses of publick scorn. Can you not see, what is so evident to every one else, that your grammatical acquirements, of which you make so vainglorious a parade, are of no practical avail; that they are as useless furniture to your minds, as we should suppose them to be to your "storehouses," the "prisons?" 'Tis almost unmerciful to exhibit to you the deformity of your offspring; for it is no doubt, a child of self-love, which it has cost you many a thoughtful day and sleepless night to torture from your sterile crania. You have ransacked all Billingsgate for opprobrious appellations and epithets, with which to calumniate men,

"The very head and front of whose offending,  
Hath this extent."

—they gave public intimation that a fraud was going on; of which fraud you have gratuitously acknowledged yourselves the authors.—However, in conclusion, we bid you be of good courage, and inflict on the publick another series of assertions and ambiguities; for, though "sincere endeavors are never hopeless," yet that "incerit," of which nobody is conscious but the possessors, may be successfully decied. Moreover, we like that kind of sport which combines

pleasure with duty; and it is equally our pleasure to show you the awkwardness and futility of your attempts at exculpation, and our duty to expose  
BENJAMIN SWAIN.  
W. L. REYNOLDS.

### AN ADDRESS

To the people of North-Carolina, on the evils of slavery.  
By the friends of liberty and equality.

(Continued from No. 42.)

In the Constitution of Delaware, though a slave-holding State, they are fully set forth thus:—"Through living goodness ALL men have by nature the rights of worshipping and serving their Creator according to the dictates of their own consciences; of enjoying and defending life and liberty; of acquiring and protecting reputation and property; and in general, of attaining objects suitable to their condition without INJURY OF ONE TO ANOTHER." And a Declaration of the rights of the citizens of North-Carolina, which, by the 41, Section of our Constitution, is declared to be a part of the Constitution of this State, says in Section 19: "That all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of THEIR OWN CONSCIENCES." While other parts of the above mentioned Declaration of Rights, as well as some subsequent acts of the General Assembly, seem to show in a very high degree, the conflicting influence of humanity and prejudice in the Councils of N. Carolina. The 22, Section of our Declaration of Rights, which, as we have shown above, is a part of our Constitution, says that, "No hereditary emoluments, privileges, or honors ought to be granted or conferred in this State." And by a parity of reasoning it may and ought to be said, that "No emoluments or privileges," the right to enjoy which, being vested in the individual or individuals possessing them, by the law of nature, "ought to be taken away in any case, either in this or any other State in a hereditary manner." But are not both these rules violated in this State? The son or daughter, in this State, falls heir to all, or a proportionable part of the "born sheds" belonging to the estate of his or her Father; and that too without any bequest or other instrument of conveyance, except the mere provision contained in the Law of the state. And this principle of descent is a hereditary principle. Now if the circumstance of one man's holding another in absolute slavery, and of enjoying all the benefits of his sweat and toil, are "emoluments and privileges," then it must be granted that the "hereditary emoluments and privileges" conferred in this state are many, very many, notwithstanding the constitution of the state to the contrary. And our "common law," which is a primary ingredient in the "law of the land," mentioned in Section 12, of our declaration of rights, is said to be founded on "reason and the divine law," and is held to acquiesce in them in every instance, any former usage or decision to the contrary notwithstanding. The common law of this state, must therefore acquiesce in the provisions set forth in the law of nature, in all cases, when the "law of the land" is not rendered otherwise by some statute or special act passed either by the General Assembly of North Carolina, or by Congress; and that too, according to the Constitution of our State, or of the United States, as the case may be, since the law of nature is evidently a divine law, and as such, must be supposed to harmonize with all other laws of divine origine; as it would be absurd to suppose two divine principles, opposed the one to the other. The law of nature, the law of reason, and consequently the common law of this State, (as we have shown,) all declare liberty to be the "birth right" of every human being. Now it is a well known, and universally acknowledged point in law, that every man stands acquitted until the contrary appears in good and lawful evidence; or in other words, that the Law presumes every man to be innocent, or clear from any alleged charge, &c. until the same be proved by good and lawful testimony. Let us then briefly examine our slave system with respect to this particular. There is one man claiming to hold another as his slave, which claim the alleged slave is not disposed to admit. Now in this trial for liberty, on whom should the weight of evidence rest? We answer—according to the above principle, it should always rest on the claimant. This opinion is fully corroborated by the sentiments of the honorable George Wythe, one of the signers of the Declaration of American Independence, and since chancellor in Virginia; who laid down as a general position "That whenever one person claims to hold another in slavery, the ONUS PROBANTI (burthen of evidence) lies on the CLAIMANT. This sentiment," he continues, "is strongly inculcated in our political catechism, the bill of rights, and accords with that self-evident principle which makes liberty the birth-right of every human being." Sentiments like these are honorable—they are the native sentiments of an uncorrupted understanding, and a mind superior to avarice and self-interest, &c. From the view we have taken of the subject, it follows that in the supposed trial for liberty referred to, the alleged slave has only to plead, (not to prove,) that he is a human being, born free according to the invariable law of nature; and that he had not, at any time, either forfeited or relinquished his title thereto. Now it devolves on the person claiming to prove that the alleged slave is not a human being; that the law of nature does not entitle every human being to liberty, and that the alleged slave is one of those unfortunate creatures for whom it has made no gracious provision: or that he has personally forfeited,