

Newbern Sentinel.

BY JOHN A. BACKHOUSE.

NEWBERN, N. C.

LIBERTY...THE CONSTITUTION...UNION.

WEEKLY

VOL. XXI.—No. 9.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1837.

TERMS.

The Sentinel is published weekly at \$3 per annum, when paid within three months after subscribing; when paid within six months, \$3.50; when not paid within one year, \$4.00.

Advertisements, by the year, \$15.00 for two squares or less; and five dollars for each additional square. By the number, 75 cts. for the first insertion, 37 1/2 for each continuance.

On all letters addressed to the Editor, the postage must be paid.

WAR DEPARTMENT, January 25, 1837.

RULES in relation to **CLAIMS** provided for by an act of Congress passed 18th January, 1837, entitled "An act to provide for the payment of horses and other property lost or destroyed in the military service of the United States," prescribed in pursuance of the 4th section of the said act.

All claims under the provisions of this act must be presented at the office of the Third Auditor of the Treasury Department, before the end of the next session of Congress, and each must be substantiated by such evidence as is hereinafter designated, with respect to cases of the class under which it falls.

FIRST CLASS OF CASES.

By the first section of the law it is enacted:

"That any field, or staff, or other officer, mounted-militiaman, volunteer, ranger, or cavalry, engaged in the military service of the United States since the 18th of June, 1812, or who shall hereafter be in said service, and has sustained or shall sustain damage, without any fault or negligence on his part while in said service, by the loss of a horse in battle, or by the loss of a horse wounded in battle, and which has died, or shall die, of said wound, or being so wounded, shall be abandoned by order of his officer, and lost, or shall sustain damage by the loss of any horse by death, or abandonment, in consequence of the United States failing to supply sufficient forage, or because the rider was dismounted and separated from his horse, and ordered to do duty on foot at a station detached from his horse, or when the officer in the immediate command ordered, or shall order, the horse turned out to graze in the woods, prairies, or commons, because the United States failed, or shall fail, to supply sufficient forage, and the loss or shall be consequent thereon, or for the loss of necessary equipment in consequence of the loss of his horse aforesaid, shall be allowed and paid the value thereof. *Provided*, That if any payment has been or shall be made to any one aforesaid, for the use and risk, or for forage after the death, loss, or abandonment of his horse, said payment shall be deducted from the value thereof, unless he satisfied, or shall satisfy the paymaster, at the time he made or shall make the payment, or thereafter show by proof, that he was remounted, in which case, the deduction shall only extend to the time he was on foot; *And provided also*, if any payment shall have been, or shall hereafter be, made to any person above mentioned, on account of clothing, to which he was not entitled by law, such payment shall be deducted from the value of his horse or accoutrements."

To establish a claim under this provision, the claimant must adduce the evidence of the officer under whose command he served when the loss occurred, if alive; or, if dead, then of the next surviving officer; describing the property, the value thereof, the time and manner in which the loss happened, and whether or not it was sustained without any fault or negligence on the claimant's part. The evidence should also, in case the claimant was remounted after the loss, state when he was remounted, how long he continued so, and explain whether the horse whereon he was remounted had not been furnished by the United States, or been owned by another militiaman or volunteer, to whom payment for the use and risk thereof, or for its forage, whilst in the possession of the claimant, may have been made; and if it had been thus owned, should name the person, and the command to which he belonged. And in every instance in which the claim may extend to equipment, the several articles of which the same consisted, and the separate value of each, should be specified.

SECOND CLASS OF CASES.

The second section of the law enacts: "That any person who, in the said military service, as a volunteer or draughted militiaman, furnished or shall furnish himself with arms and military accoutrements, and sustained or shall sustain damage by the capture or destruction of the same, without any fault or negligence on his part, or who lost or shall lose the same by reason of his being wounded in the service, shall be allowed and paid the value hereof."

Each claim under this provision must be established by the evidence of the officer who commanded the claimant when the loss happened, if alive; or if dead, then of the next surviving officer; describing the several articles lost, the value of each, whether or not the same were not furnished by the claimant, in what way, and when the loss occurred, and whether or not it was sustained without any fault or negligence on his part.

THIRD CLASS OF CASES.

The third section of the law enacts: "That any person who sustained or shall sustain damage by the loss, capture, or destruction, by an enemy, of any horse, mule, or wagon, cart, boat, sleigh, or harness, while such property was in the military service of the United States, either by impressment or contract, except in cases where the risk to which the property would be exposed was agreed to be incurred by the owner, if it shall appear that such loss, capture, or destruction was without any fault or negligence on the part of the owner, and any person, who, with-

out any such fault or negligence, sustained or shall sustain damage by the death or abandonment and loss of any such horse, mule, or ox, while in the service aforesaid, in consequence of the failure, on the part of the United States, to furnish the same with sufficient forage, shall be allowed and paid the value thereof."

To establish a claim under this provision, it will be necessary to produce the testimony of the officer or agent of the United States, who impressed or contracted for the service of the property mentioned in such claim, and also of the officer under whose immediate command the same was employed at the time of capture, destruction, loss, or abandonment; declaring in what way the property was taken into the service of the United States, the value thereof, whether or not the risk to which it would be exposed was agreed to be incurred by the owner, whether or not, as regarded horses, mules, or oxen, he engaged to supply the same with sufficient forage, in what manner the loss happened, and whether or not it was sustained without any fault or negligence on his part.

The sixth section of the law enacts: "That in all instances where any minor has been or shall be engaged in the military service of the United States, and was, or shall be provided with a horse or equipments or with military accoutrements, by his parent or guardian, and has died or shall die, without paying for said property, and the same has been, or shall be lost, captured, destroyed, or abandoned, in the manner before mentioned, said parent or guardian, shall be allowed pay therefor, on making satisfactory proof that he is entitled thereunto, by having furnished the same."

A parent or guardian of a deceased minor, will, therefore, in addition to such testimony applicable to his claim as is previously described, have to furnish proof that he provided the minor with the property therein mentioned; that the minor died without paying for such property; and that he, the parent or guardian is entitled to payment for it, by his having furnished the same.

The seventh section of the law enacts: "That in all instances where any person, other than a minor, has been or shall be engaged in the military service aforesaid, and has been, or shall be provided with a horse or equipments, or with military accoutrements, by any person, the owner thereof, who has risked, or shall take the risk of such horse, equipments, or military accoutrements on himself, and the same has been or shall be lost, captured, destroyed, or abandoned in the manner before mentioned, such owner shall be allowed, pay therefor, on making satisfactory proof, as in other cases, and the further proof that he is entitled thereto, by having furnished the same and having taken the risk on himself."

Besides the testimony in support of his claim herein before required, every such owner, therefore, will have to prove that he did provide the horse, equipments, or military accoutrements therein mentioned, and took the risk thereof on himself; and that he is entitled to pay therefor, by having furnished the same, and taken the risk thereof, on himself; and this proof should be contained in a deposition of the person who had been so provided by him with such horse, equipments, or military accoutrements.

In no case can the production of the evidence, previously described, be dispensed with, unless the impracticability of producing it be clearly proved, and then the nearest and best other evidence, of which the case may be susceptible, must be furnished in lieu thereof.

Every claim must be accompanied by a deposition of the claimant, declaring that he has not received from any officer or agent of the United States, any horse or horses, equipment, arms, accoutrements, mule, wagon, cart, boat, sleigh, or harness, (as the case may be,) in lieu of the property he lost, nor any compensation for the same, and be supported, if practicable, by the original valuation list, made by the appraisers of the property, at the time the same was taken into the United States service.

All evidence other than the certificates of officers, who at the time of giving them, were in the military service of the United States, must be sworn to before some judge, justice of the peace, or other person duly authorized to administer oaths, and of which authority, proof should accompany the evidence.

B. F. BUTLER.

Secretary of War ad interim.
APPROVED, Jan. 24, 1837.

ANDREW JACKSON.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Third Auditor's Office, Jan. 27, 1837.

Each claimant can have the sum, which may be allowed his claim, remitted to him directly on his signifying a wish to that effect, and naming the place of his residence; but if the money is to be remitted or paid to any other person, a power of attorney to him from the claimant, duly executed and authenticated, should be forwarded with the claim.

To facilitate the requisite searches, and avoid delay in the adjustment of the claims, each claimant should name on his papers the paymaster or other disbursing officers, by whom he was paid, for the service of himself, horse, wagon, cart, team, boat, &c.

PETER HAGNER, Auditor.

Editors of newspapers, in which the laws of the United States are published, in the several States and Territories, are requested to publish therein, the foregoing rules once a week, for four weeks, and send their accounts to the Third Auditor for payment. 7-4

DR. CHAPMAN

HAS just received, per Schooner Perseverance a fresh supply of
DRUGS AND MEDICINES
Newbern Oct. 20th. 1836.

Slavery and the Abolitionists.

From the New York Evening Post.

As a champion of free discussion you lend your columns to the defenders of abolitionism; may I use them for its exposure?

PLAIN TRUTH.

To the Reverend Dr. William E. Channing;

Sir—I have read with attention your letter of 1st November last, addressed to Mr. James G. Birney, but perhaps intended to answer the double purpose of a pastoral letter to your disciples of the abolitionist school, and of an appeal to the sympathies of the public in their behalf.

In the former light I have nothing to say to it. You may deserve, as you appear to assume, the office of their bishop; and certainly they need both chastisement and instruction. But when your classic pen invokes respect for the principles, and compassion for the penalty of their offences against society, the attempt calls for a reply. I feel compelled to the task, regretting that it has not fallen into abler hands.

You hold up the partisans of immediate emancipation as persecuted Christians, and if any of them should chance to be knocked on the head in an abolition riot, you would doubtless proclaim them Christian Martyrs. I undertake to prove that neither the principles nor the measures of the abolitionists are sanctioned by the Gospel; on the contrary that they are in direct contravention of its precepts.

I pass by the express institution of servitude in the Old Testament, not out of deference to the too common error of undervaluing the maxims of the former economy, but for want of space, and because the doctrine of the Old Testament on this subject is illustrated by the clearer light of the new.

Occasional allusions are made in the Gospels to the relation of master and slave; and in no instance did the Saviour or his apostles intimate the smallest censure of it, though it must have been continually before their eyes, and indeed pervaded the world. When we consider Christ's habit of rebuking crimes that fell under his observation, and of engraving his doctrine upon particular cases, as they arose, this silence has the force of a positive canon. For as he spared no sin, so he never wasted words in multiplying ordinances.

In the Epistles, we find the duties of master and slave treated in connexion with the other domestic relations, and as clearly defined, and put upon the same ground of moral obligation, as the duties of husband and wife, and of parent and child. Not bare submission is inculcated, which might have been construed into a politic expedient, adapted to the unfortunate condition of disciples in bondage, and conducive to the favorable reception of the Gospel; they enjoin the most sincere respect, and the most faithful obedience, "not with eye service as men please, but in singleness of heart, fearing God," and that as well "to the lordward" as to "kind and gentle masters." Nay, more, and what shuts up the argument, the relation was held to be equally binding between Christian and Christian, as where the believer was slave to an infidel. Allow me to quote, with a running comment, one passage, which sums up the whole doctrine with a force that cannot be evaded or misunderstood.

St. Paul, in his first epistle to Timothy, writes thus: "Let as many servants as are under the yoke"—slaves in the strictest sense—"count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God, and his doctrine, be not blasphemed." Disrespect, therefore, in Christian slaves, not only open disobedience or revolt, but any thing short of profound and heartfelt reverence towards their masters, would expose their religion to reproach; and to attribute such conduct to the teachings of the gospel, is, in apostolical judgment, blaspheming God. "And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren; but rather do them service because they are faithful [believing] and partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort." Here the tie of Christian brotherhood is urged as a strong bond of master and slave. If the holding of men in bondage had been regarded by the Author of Christianity, as the accursed thing which it is held to be, by our new light reformers, would it not have been, at least to those who embraced the faith, forbidden? Would this institute have been left on record for perpetual observance? "THESE THINGS TEACH AND EXHORT." Vain is the pretence that it is a Christian duty to denounce slavery as a deadly sin; and that at the hazard of the most awful calamities upon those against whom the denunciation is pointed! So far as the Gospel is concerned, the question is settled as plainly as language can settle any thing. Abolitionists may talk about human rights and Christian benevolence; but the record is against them. Their pretensions to scriptural authority are mere words; with about the same truth, and much to the same purpose, that you, sir, cry "The Cross! The Cross!" while you deny the power of the cross; while, in the pride of your heart, you disown the character of "a child of wrath by nature," and redemption through the blood of atonement; while you deny Christ "God made manifest in the flesh," "to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," and thus solving the mystery of a God of inexorable justice, forgiving iniquity, and exalting transgressors to a participation of his nature and his throne.

Pardon this digressive illustration into which I have been led by your ostentatious affectation of the Christian faith. The apostle continues: "If any man teach otherwise"—"he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting [literally, sick, diseased] about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmises, perverse disputings, of men of corrupt minds; and destitute of the truth." Judging from the energy of this rebuke, and the fact that this and parallel passages are confined to the later epistles, it would seem that the patterns of our brawlers about slavery, had already sprung up in the church, and that the last quoted clause was intended for their especial benefit. How graphically the description is of modern abolitionists! of their swelling self-conceit, their disputatious ignorance, their intolerant and reckless fanaticism; and of the jealousies, the dissensions, the heart-burnings, with which they have afflicted, and yet more threaten to afflict our country.

No, sir; The abolitionists are not sufferers for righteousness sake; and be assured, if you fall in the cause, you will not obtain the glory of martyrdom. But let me tell you what they are. They are busy-bodies, seditious intermeddlers with other men's matters; and their practices tend to the dissolution of the government under which we live, and of the solemn league which unites this vast confederacy into one people. Here, again, they disobey holy writ, which enjoins peace and submission to "the powers that be." I am not speaking of the right of revolution, the right of a people to remodel their form of government; but of the conduct of a faction in one quarter of the country, seeking to embroil the whole nation in order to compel an alteration of the laws of another quarter.

No argument can strengthen the proposition, that, except where restricted by the Federal constitution, each State has a sovereign right to manage its own internal affairs, and slavery among the rest, without any foreign interference. It is equally clear that slavery is not forbidden by that instrument. It is even recognized as the basis of representation and union between the North and the South. The right to hold slaves is therefore stronger, than if the States were disunited, or if Congress, possessing jurisdiction, had declared the right by express enactment. Then it would in the one case rest on the general principles of international law; and in the other case, it might be revoked; and the abolitionists would have some show of reason to endeavor to procure the repeal of an obnoxious law. But the right now stands as one of the terms on which the States came together; and it cannot be touched, without a violation of the compact, nor in all human probability without dissolving the confederacy. And if I rightly understand the general tone of the anti-slavery writings, and especially a political address put forth by the leaders of the party during the late Presidential canvass, they abjure the Constitution of the United States in this respect, as "an accursed compact," not binding on their consciences. Neither do you, Sir, deny the tendency attributed to their measures; but you evade the point, on the flimsy truism, that innocent causes may chance to produce fatal effects, and noble projects are often calumniated. Your argument even seems to imply, that the danger, though real, should not deter your friends from their course.

The avowed object of the abolitionists, is to break up slavery at the South; but, say they, we will do it, by moral suasion, and therefore we cannot be prevented without a breach of the liberties of speech and of the press. Do I not state the design and argument, fairly?

Your sagacity, sir, cannot fail to perceive, that this mode of reasoning is a *petitio principii*, as to the right of interference, and shielding their error behind a privilege dear to the heart of every freeman. If the object is unlawful, will you maintain that it is sanctified by the means? On the contrary, do not the means, whatever they may be, become infected with the guilt of the intent? It is an abuse of the sacred freedom of speech, to make it subservient to an illegitimate end. That is a right of defence, the palladium of our own liberties; it does not extend to cover assaults on the rights of others. Were a State in its corporate capacity to turn abolitionist, and to attempt by moral suasion or otherwise, to constrain the South to give up their slaves, it would be justly deemed an impertinent and offensive act. And what better right have the citizens who compose a State, or any part of them, to attack the institutions of her neighbors? Is rightful power generated by division? May we, with propriety, do that as individuals, which would be good cause of war, if done by us in the aggregate? I challenge your learning and rhetoric to point out any solid ground of distinction between the two cases.

But say these incendiaries, we do not mean to interfere with the rights of the Southern States; not at all! We do not go there: we reason with our fellow citizens at home. True, the terrors of Lynch Law, and Statute Law, seem to have abated their missionary ardor in that direction. Your flock for the most part imitate your paternal example, and hurl their firebrands from afar. But to what purpose is their zealous system of propaganda in the North,—their five hundred travelling agents, their groaning press, and boasted revenue, if it be not to accumulate a power of feeling and prejudice here, which shall tell upon the South? How, or to what extent, God only knows! We have no slaves to liberate. The sin, if sin it be, does not pollute our soil. It would hardly be spoken of, were not the subject forced upon us by incessant agitation. There is no conceivable object, but to force the South to give up their negroes. For to imagine that they will do it voluntarily, until there is a radical change of circumstances—that the Southern people will relinquish their property, and let loose upon themselves a horde of blacks far more numerous than the whites, is as absurd as to suppose they will set fire to their cotton field, and drown, (if they could,) their rice plantations. The natural and inevitable tendency of the agitation of this subject, has often been shown to be, to arouse the spirit and apprehensions of the slave-holding States, and to aggravate the evils the abolitionists pretend

to deplore. And experience proves the justice of the reasoning. For instead of being induced to abandon slavery, the Southerners are the more closely wedded to the system, and have abridged the privileges of their negroes in order to counteract the intrigues of these mischievous fanatics. Yet this, sir, is the philanthropy, and such the firmness that you laud and would commend to our admiration. Were the advocates of emancipation inhabitants of the southern states, and their lives and fortunes bound up in the same bundle with theirs, we must honour their devotion, whatever might be thought of their judgment. But that patriotism, is very suspicious, which is to be indulged at the expense of others; and modesty as well as good sense ought to teach us to leave the connection of social evils to those who are principally concerned. The rage or fashion of abolitionism, however, or whatever else you please to call it, is restricted by no limits of place. We are lectured with equal zeal and authority by an emissary from Europe, as by oracles of native growth. The disease is also specific in its nature. Neither red, white or copper colour affects its eye. Black is the only fancy. The serfs of Russia, the exiles in Siberia, the slaves of Turkey, and the millions of Great Britain and Ireland in a state more degraded than that of slavery, move little or no sympathy; nay, England riots in the wealth of plundered and subjugated India, while all the British benevolence of the day is alive to the misfortunes of the Africans in this country, though they are incomparably better off than one half of the population of that kingdom.

The conduct of this faction would only move laughter, did we not tremble for the consequences of their madness. It is painfully ludicrous to see with what assurance and perfect self-complacency, a crowd of half-bred clergymen, silly women and weaker men, scarcely one in a thousand of whom know the true state of things at the south, or comprehend the bearings of the subject, will dogmatize about a problem, which the wise fear to contemplate. If you believe them, there is no difficulty at all in the matter. They would free all the negroes at once, and make their masters richer, better and happier by the change. The whole south cries out with one voice that the experiment threatens them with ruin. "Oh no!" coolly answer these sapient quacks—"There is no danger. We emulate the example of the English in the West Indies. Let us alone and you shall presently see how your condition will be improved." "But consider," say the southern people, "that the military force of the British empire is pledged for the protection of her colonies, and her wealth has paid the slaveholders for their property: besides the success of the operation is yet problematical." "Property!" exclaim the Abolitionists: "you have no property in your slaves; you already owe them more than you are worth. Don't mention compensation: it shocks our principles. If the English have not quite succeeded, it is because they did not make the negroes free enough. We understand the thing better. But danger or no danger, dear friends, we must practice upon you for the benefit of mankind." "We cannot," reply the southerners in a rage, "suffer you to tamper with our lives and fortunes. You shall not disseminate your poison here. If we catch any of your itinerants we will give them a coat of tar and feathers." "Unreasonable men," rejoins these paragons of meekness, "negro-drivers! men stealers! dealers in human flesh! tyrants! persecutors! you violate the liberty of speech in our persons!"

You may ask, sir, whether I justify the lawless violence which has been inflicted on abolitionists! I frankly answer No: neither do I sympathize with its victims. The majesty of the laws must be respected for their own sake, and for the good order of society. But no punishment can be too severe for those who wantonly disturb the peace and union of our country, and urge on a catastrophe, which, if ever it happens, must be finished in the blood of our southern brethren. This crime I charge upon the anti-slavery leaders. While I condemn the occasional outrages which have been committed in a community provoked by pestilential demagogues, (the more unpardonable, because they profane a sacred right,) I cannot but regard this phenomenon as an extraordinary effort of nature to expel a disease, which the ordinary functions of the body politic are unable to resist. And the symptoms indicate the cure. Let the cause be removed, and these extravagancies will cease. Give over—I address you, sir, as the representative of the sect—give over your pertinacious efforts to excite a fever which your fellow citizens apprehend may endanger their political fabric. Be content to entertain your own opinions, without forcing them down the throats of the community, and you will hear no more of abolition riots. It is the best service, believe me, that you can render to the liberty you profess. But, so long as you persist in your mad career, you have no right to claim pity because you are burned by a fire of your own kindling.

You have, reverend sir, essayed a classification of the opponents of your faction. Permit me to answer the catalogue, by substituting the great body of sober and intelligent men, who love their country, their whole united country, and to group for your contemplation, a counter list, of the characters of some, who swear with you by the same standard. You have the disappointed moon-struck statesmen; restless innovators, ambitious of notoriety; visionary enthusiasts—men of weak heads and corrupt minds: crafty politicians who embrace any cause to strengthen their influence; and the mass of ultra new light professors in religion, who hold "for doctrines the commandments of men."

The conduct of this faction would only move laughter, did we not tremble for the consequences of their madness. It is painfully ludicrous to see with what assurance and perfect self-complacency, a crowd of half-bred clergymen, silly women and weaker men, scarcely one in a thousand of whom know the true state of things at the south, or comprehend the bearings of the subject, will dogmatize about a problem, which the wise fear to contemplate. If you believe them, there is no difficulty at all in the matter. They would free all the negroes at once, and make their masters richer, better and happier by the change. The whole south cries out with one voice that the experiment threatens them with ruin. "Oh no!" coolly answer these sapient quacks—"There is no danger. We emulate the example of the English in the West Indies. Let us alone and you shall presently see how your condition will be improved." "But consider," say the southern people, "that the military force of the British empire is pledged for the protection of her colonies, and her wealth has paid the slaveholders for their property: besides the success of the operation is yet problematical." "Property!" exclaim the Abolitionists: "you have no property in your slaves; you already owe them more than you are worth. Don't mention compensation: it shocks our principles. If the English have not quite succeeded, it is because they did not make the negroes free enough. We understand the thing better. But danger or no danger, dear friends, we must practice upon you for the benefit of mankind." "We cannot," reply the southerners in a rage, "suffer you to tamper with our lives and fortunes. You shall not disseminate your poison here. If we catch any of your itinerants we will give them a coat of tar and feathers." "Unreasonable men," rejoins these paragons of meekness, "negro-drivers! men stealers! dealers in human flesh! tyrants! persecutors! you violate the liberty of speech in our persons!"

You may ask, sir, whether I justify the lawless violence which has been inflicted on abolitionists! I frankly answer No: neither do I sympathize with its victims. The majesty of the laws must be respected for their own sake, and for the good order of society. But no punishment can be too severe for those who wantonly disturb the peace and union of our country, and urge on a catastrophe, which, if ever it happens, must be finished in the blood of our southern brethren. This crime I charge upon the anti-slavery leaders. While I condemn the occasional outrages which have been committed in a community provoked by pestilential demagogues, (the more unpardonable, because they profane a sacred right,) I cannot but regard this phenomenon as an extraordinary effort of nature to expel a disease, which the ordinary functions of the body politic are unable to resist. And the symptoms indicate the cure. Let the cause be removed, and these extravagancies will cease. Give over—I address you, sir, as the representative of the sect—give over your pertinacious efforts to excite a fever which your fellow citizens apprehend may endanger their political fabric. Be content to entertain your own opinions, without forcing them down the throats of the community, and you will hear no more of abolition riots. It is the best service, believe me, that you can render to the liberty you profess. But, so long as you persist in your mad career, you have no right to claim pity because you are burned by a fire of your own kindling.

You have, reverend sir, essayed a classification of the opponents of your faction. Permit me to answer the catalogue, by substituting the great body of sober and intelligent men, who love their country, their whole united country, and to group for your contemplation, a counter list, of the characters of some, who swear with you by the same standard. You have the disappointed moon-struck statesmen; restless innovators, ambitious of notoriety; visionary enthusiasts—men of weak heads and corrupt minds: crafty politicians who embrace any cause to strengthen their influence; and the mass of ultra new light professors in religion, who hold "for doctrines the commandments of men."

PLAIN TRUTH.