

# THE TIMES.



VOL. VI, NO. 35.]

GREENSBORO, N. C., AUGUST 24, 1861.

[WHOLE NO. 288

## THE TIMES.

JAMES W. ALBRIGHT,  
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

### Terms.

The Times is published weekly in Greensboro, N. C., at \$2.00 in advance. No paper sent unless the money accompanies the order, and the paper will be discontinued at the expiration of the time paid for.

### Notice to Subscribers.

Subscribers receiving their paper with a cross-mark are notified thereby that their subscription has expired, and, unless renewed within four weeks, the paper will be discontinued.

### To Advertisers.

The Times is a good medium for advertising. None but legitimate advertisements will be admitted. The following is our regular schedule of prices:  
The first insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... \$1 00  
The second insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 2 00  
The third insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 3 00  
The fourth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 4 00  
The fifth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 5 00  
The sixth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 6 00  
The seventh insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 7 00  
The eighth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 8 00  
The ninth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 9 00  
The tenth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 10 00  
The eleventh insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 11 00  
The twelfth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 12 00  
The thirteenth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 13 00  
The fourteenth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 14 00  
The fifteenth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 15 00  
The sixteenth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 16 00  
The seventeenth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 17 00  
The eighteenth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 18 00  
The nineteenth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 19 00  
The twentieth insertion of ten lines, one insertion..... 20 00  
Special Notices a third higher.

### WRITTEN FOR THE TIMES.

#### WANE TA.

Infant Daughter of H. S. and M. D. Hazell, died August 12th 1861, aged ten months and one day.

BY GRACE MILWOOD.

Another little form asleep,  
Two more eyes that never will weep,  
Two more feet have reached the shore,  
Pain and suffering ever o'er.  
  
Two more little hands now hold  
In their clasp, a harp of gold;  
And her little voice to sing,  
Praises to our Saviour King.  
  
A crown upon another brow,  
One more Angel's sacred morn,  
To our Saviour's infant kind,  
In their robes of right they stand.  
  
Another flower in Heaven to bloom;  
Death had no sting, the grave no gloom;  
A ray of light to us was given,  
To show how bright—not earth, but Heaven.  
  
And though no more we press that form,  
To our fond hearts, so true and warm  
It leans upon our Saviour's breast,  
Fading there eternal rest.  
  
Thy little Angel, child of God,  
Sleeping sweetly 'neath the sod—  
Thy dark eyes so soft and bright,  
Now shine on with Heavenly light.  
  
Eyes of a lover, eyes of love,  
Like a little nestling dove;  
To what love on earth was given,  
Thou hast borne with these to Heaven.  
  
WANE TA—Angel—intercede,  
For us who grace and pardon need;  
That we may say to Father, Son,  
"Thy will be done, not ours but thine."

### An Irish Voice in Indignant Protest against the Murderous Policy of Lincoln.

We have been publishing what France and England think of our jumbroglio; let us now have a little Irish thought:

#### From the Dub in Nation, June 8.

#### THE FRATRICIDAL WAR.

As the news from America flows in, the language of the Northerners and of their journals tends more and more to disgust and outrage all who hold the sacred faith of human freedom, and to make them weep with poignant mortification and deep despair. Well may we despair of popular liberty in presence of the sight the world sees to-day. A republican people, whose liberties were won by a rebellion, whose independence was achieved by a secession, parrot as glibly as any minions of old world tyranny "rebel" and the "rebellion" as phrases of abuse and reproach! Those who profess to hold sacred the popular will, to reverence the desire for self-government, promising to drown the popular will in blood, and to answer for self-government by butchery and slaughter.  
If what is now passing in America took place in any of the old world empires, it would be at least intelligible. If the citizens of nearly half of an empire five times as large as all Europe, with an unanimity never surpassed, and rarely equalled, determined, by free poll, in open day, by uni-

versal suffrage, that their interests and their feelings demanded the substitution of the Imperial Government, by one of their own choice; and the Imperial Government marched its armies to crush the demand in the blood of the rebels, it would be nothing new among the despotic systems. But in a great confederation of Republican States, in a system based on the will of the people—based on the right of rebellion—that all this should happen that we now see—that no tyranny or despotism of all Europe ever drew the sword more savagely to put down the "rebellion" and trample upon the voice of the people, than this same Central Government of a Republican Confederation—it is enough to wring the heart of any man who believed in the greater humanity and toleration of popular governments. Well may the despotic monarchy laugh in bitter mockery at those who believe that a people ruling themselves would never spill blood in popular subjugation, and such murders were done by kings and despots of Old Europe!

It is a hideous sarcasm of Republicanism to hear the journals of the Northern States yelling for the blood of "rebels" for their utter subjugation and destruction! "We mean to conquer them," says the New York Tribune, "not merely to defeat, but to conquer, to subjugate them." "But when the rebellious traitors are overwhelmed in the field, and scattered like leaves before an angry wind, it must not be to return to peaceful and contented homes. They must find poverty at their firesides and see privation in the anxious eyes of mothers and the rags of children." Were ever more hellish sentiments uttered? Where, in the annals of despotism or the records of butcheries, shall we seek for a parallel to this? Where—even against rebels who had not a particle of justification! If the subjects of the most legitimate sovereign that ever held a scepter had acted as the Southern States have done, would these sentiments not be infamies if uttered on his part? Yet, in fancy of infamies are they when uttered by Republicans against brother Republicans—uttered by the descendants of '76 against men who, with far greater unanimity, now demand the self-same right those rebels claimed—self-government.

We shall be told that the South had no right to secede; therefore, the war upon it is justifiable. When England made war on her rebellious American Colonies, she said they had no right to "secede," and that, therefore, that war was justifiable. We shall be told that the South can exhibit no wrongs to justify rebellion. The same was held by those who sought to crush the colonies in their struggle for self-government. But why should we be called upon by Republicans to consider these points at all? Have we not been told, as the Republican principle, that the subjects of a State themselves, and no one else are to be judges, whether they have provision, justification or right.

Yet, let us consider that the case of the South as regards its right to secede, is far stronger than was that of the American Colonies to rebel. Under the old monarchical system no such right was ever tolerated—no such principle ever heard of—as "the voice of the population" determining the justice, legitimacy or duration of a Government. The American Colonies originated under the monarchical system. They had never claimed or possessed the attributes of "independent sovereign States;" nor had their connection with the English crown originated in a compact having for its object mutual benefit and defence. What, on the other hand, is the position of the Southern States in the present case? They are not mere colonies, counties or districts of any State, kingdom or empire. They are a number of "Sovereign Independent States;" so styled in law and so proved in fact. Their political system—the system of the whole United States of America—is based on the fundamental principle of the right of rebellion determinable by the voice of the people. These several independent sovereign States, of their own free choosing, and for the purpose of their own and the

common welfare, interest and protection, federates with certain others to this end. A number of these States declare that faith has not been kept with them in the compact of Confederation; and that the cause and purpose of their Federal associations with others no longer urge its continuance, but on the contrary, demand its termination. Whether they possess the right so to terminate the connection, is neither asserted nor denied by the deed of Union. This silence is claimed by each side in the quarrel as favorable to its own case. Upon which side in the construction may be said to weigh, is no doubt a nice and intricate question for political doctrinaires and hair-splitting controversialists. But what we have to say is this: that it is something more than mournful, it is monstrous, it is an outrage and a disgrace to humanity, that on a point which may be ruled either way, the shocking spectacle must be seen of torrents of blood being made to flow in the conquest—the subjugation—of those independent States, who merely ask for self-government and freedom to decide their own destinies! We say that, in the face of such a unanimous determination for secessions—right or wrong, according to construction of constitutional technicalities—this bloody war to force union on the Southern people at the point of the sword—to saber them into brotherhood, and drag them into "liberty"—is a blot to humanity. We cannot pause to weigh the niceties of the rival constructions of the silence of the deed of Union with reference to the right of secession. We turn in disgust from all this, denying that the proof at best can be plain enough to reconcile us to this butchery—let us remember not by kings, or autocrats, but by republican advocates of popular liberty—themselves the offspring of rebellion! We have often enough and clearly enough declared our anxiety that the great Republic of America might be saved from dismemberment; but far greater is our anxiety—for the sake of the hideous reproach it involves to popular liberty—that it may be saved from the horrible crime of forcing its Federal embrace upon any State at the expense of ruthless slaughter by fire and sword!

### A Matter of Taste.

A fair correspondent, whose communication will be found elsewhere, expresses her pointed indignation at the practice (limited heretofore, we think, and to be still more limited hereafter, we hope) of passing by the lovely and warm-hearted girls of the South, and going for wives to the overstocked matrimonial market of Yankeeedom. There are some vices that bring their own punishment. There are some follies of such a nature that we feel much more disposed to pity than to deride those who commit them. Justice, perhaps, would be amply vindicated, if we left the eccentric class to whom our correspondent refers to the consequences of indulging a perverted taste. We would be sorry to think that they were coveted by Southern women, whose charms they had overlooked, or covied by Southern men who were not in the same situation. —V. O. Delta.

M. Keeker's wife having left his bed and board, he publishes the following lines in a Western paper. It is quite plain to see that the lines emanate from a bleeding heart:

My wife has left her Bed and Board,  
For a few days, for a few days;  
She left of her own accord,  
When I was out from home;  
I caution all to this amount,  
Now a days, now a days,  
Don't trust her on my account,  
For she's never coming home.  
Martin Keeker.

In London the weather has been fine.

### Generals Beauregard and Johnson.

The fame acquired by these illustrious Southern chieftains, by their victory on the desperate but brilliant field of Manassas, thereby preventing the enemy from reaching, and in all probability sacking, the Capital of the Confederacy, is destined to become world wide and endure for ages. The praise of the science, skill and consummate generalship displayed by them on that memorable day is not alone confined to the South. Even the Northern journalists—at least so far as we have observed, and we have read many of their statements—in their frenzy of disappointment and rage at the result of the great battle, cannot withhold their meed of praise of the superior generalship of Beauregard and Johnson; indeed, the leading excuse of these writers for the defeat that befell the Northern army on the 21st, is the superiority of the Southern over the Northern Generals.

In regard to Beauregard and Johnson, whose abilities as military commanders the North has acknowledged, and whose valor and prowess caused them a defeat which they will never forget, we present the subjoined article from the Memphis *Acalauche*:

Gen. Beauregard combines the exactitude of science with the impetuosity of the hero—the calm judgment and skill of the consummate strategist, with the headlong valor of the warrior. Great in planning a battle, he is equally brave and invincible in fighting it out. In the artillery arm of the service, which is his special department, he is without an equal on the continent. In the construction and arrangement of batteries, he has displayed a masterly science, and unerring judgment and foresight, which will establish his reputation as one of the first officers of artillery now living. Master of the entire science of military defenses, of fortifications and projectiles, which has been brought to such perfection in modern times by the great strategists of Europe, Beauregard brings it to bear with the exactness of a mind thoroughly trained in mathematical science. Gifted with the learning of his profession, he is able to avail himself of all the lights which science and universal experience in the art of war can furnish.

The rare combination of qualifications possessed by our Southern General bears a striking resemblance to that possessed by the great Napoleon, who excelled in the science and practice of artillery, was thoroughly versed in all the details of military science, and super-added to these essential advantages of education—a dauntless soul and heroic courage, which in the heat of battle bore down all opposition and wrested victory from the wavering hand of fortune. In the rare and felicitous combinations of exact science and impetuous valor, Beauregard exhibits the true Frenchman, the military genius of the martial race from which he springs.

Gen. Johnson also displays the highest qualifications of a great commander. He is eminently gifted with that comprehensiveness and accuracy of judgment, that clearness and width of perception and promptness of decision which fit a General to plan campaigns and direct the complicated movements of armies. Like Beauregard, too, he combines all the science and skill of a thoroughly educated and accomplished officer, with the dauntless valor, the iron-hearted courage of a hero. He is the man, when his column wavers, to seize the standard of his country, to rush into the thickest of the fight, and by the sublime example of his own personal bravery, rally the hesitating courage of his troops, and lead them to victory, as he did in the recent battle. The profound strategy with which he outmaneuvered Patterson and effected a junction with Beauregard, without the knowledge of his adversary, is unsurpassed in the annals of war, and extorts

the mingled grief and admiration of the enemy.

The praise and gratitude of the South are equally bestowed upon her two favorite Generals. The brilliant victory of Bull Run was their joint achievement. They commanded and fought side by side, and history will link their names together encircled with the same halo of glory in its recital of the story of that heroic achievement.

### Starving Women and Children in New York.

How long will it be before the cry of "Bread or Blood" is heard in New York city, when already such scenes as are described below, by the *Journal of Commerce* of the 16th, are witnessed in the streets of that doomed metropolis!

A large number of hungry women with babies in their arms, gathered on Monday in front of the branch office of the Union defense committee, No. 14 Fourth avenue, expecting aid from the committee. That office not having been reopened, the half-famished creatures marched, two by two, to the City Hall in search of the mayor, who was not there. Tired with their long walk, and ravenous for food, they became wild with disappointment on learning that the mayor was not in. One of them threatened to drown herself and child.—Another said she was willing to starve, but her baby should have food ever if she stole it. A third stated that she would never have allowed her son to enlist (in the Mozart Regiment) if he had not been promised that his mother would receive \$2 a week from the city.

These frantic expression of grief and rage were at last silenced by one of the mayor's clerks, who directed the poor women to the rooms of the Union Defense committee, in Pine street. Thither they went, and rushed into the apartment, crying out "We are starving, we want money." General Wetmore, secretary of the Committee kindly explained to the clamorous crowd that there was no money on hand but that several gentlemen were trying to raise some, and would probably be ready to relieve them in a day or two. He advised them to go home. This advice, though undeniably well meant, did not fill empty stomachs, and the poor women continued to plead for money and food, alternating their entreaties with execrations upon the war, the committee and the city authorities for a long time. Finally, finding that their implorations availed nothing, they one after another withdrew from the committee's rooms, to seek for cold charity in the streets or to go home and starve.

### ELOPMENT.—

On the 8th of July, Mrs Emma Amelia Scott, the wife of a rich merchant in New York city, eloped with a Mr. Newton St. John, one of the fast young men that abound in that metropolis. The relations of the lady were almost frantic at her sudden disappearance, and two New York detectives were sent in her pursuit. They arrived in St. Louis a few days since, and left the miniatures of the runaway couple with the Chief of Police of St. Louis, who had them arrested. Previous to starting on their journey, Mrs. Scott drew \$300 from the Bank, and also took with her \$1,500 worth of jewelry. When arrested she stated that it was useless to take her back to New York, and the home of her husband, as, added to the shame of fleeing those she had injured, she loved the man with whom she had fled, and was determined to live with him. —Louisville Courier.