

12345	6789	1011	1213	1415	1617	1819	2021
22	33	44	55	66	77	88	99
100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170
180	190	200	210	220	230	240	250
260	270	280	290	300	310	320	330
340	350	360	370	380	390	400	410
420	430	440	450	460	470	480	490
500	510	520	530	540	550	560	570
580	590	600	610	620	630	640	650
660	670	680	690	700	710	720	730
740	750	760	770	780	790	800	810
820	830	840	850	860	870	880	890
900	910	920	930	940	950	960	970
980	990	1000	1010	1020	1030	1040	1050

CENTRAL EXPRESS



The National Democrat
 The greatest weekly Democratic newspaper in Washington and the Express
 No. 176. The Democrat will serve you in national politics while the Express will serve you in State and local politics.

"IF A MAN DIE, SHALL HE LIVE AGAIN?"

University Magazine.

Although, philosophically speaking, the most natural, yet in ordinary contemplation the most mysterious thing in this world is death. It comes so strangely, and sometimes apparently so unnecessarily and cruelly, as to utterly confound and astonish us.

What does it mean? The answer of physical science is easy enough to understand. It is this: The human machine is either worn out, or so overworked by fever, or clogged by congestion, or broken by external violence, as to stop working; and its vital force ceasing, it immediately begins to decay and is rapidly resolved into its original chemical constituents and disappears. All this is a matter of daily observation; so familiar that every child knows it; and yet, alike to the child as to the sage, there is an insuperable and passionate desire to know what it all means. That it has a meaning, the universal human conscience testifies; that this meaning reaches far beyond the mere physical phenomenon, the naked savage and the wisest scholar agree.

The Materialist affects to deny this ulterior meaning, but when pressed with the multitudinous argument for immortality he is driven to the cave over whose gloomy entrance is written *Agnosco*—"I don't know." They who seek refuge there are those who demand proof of all things, and who are, therefore, without faith as to anything. To them the declaration of Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," and of Paul, "I know in whom I have believed," are mere rhetorical expressions of religious fervor, unsubstantiated by any sufficient proof of knowledge of the facts alleged, and are, therefore, valueless as statements of truth.

It is certainly right to disclaim knowledge which we really do not possess—to say frankly that we do not know, when we do not know—but it is a cardinal maxim, even in human government, that "ignorance of the law excuses no man;" and when, in addition to ignorance of the law, a man shuts his eyes to the most palpable facts, it can hardly avail him as an excuse to say, "I don't know."

Every child knows that death is in the world, and very early discovers that every living thing is subject to death. It is accepted as a matter of course that we shall die; and yet, whenever death strikes near us, we are startled into a realization of its profound mysteriousness, and the old, old question is suggested, "If a man die, shall he live again?" The answer of the Materialist, already referred to, is a modest one, and sounds better and more polite than the blunt "No" that used to be given. Perhaps it means the same thing, but it appears to be merely non-committal, clothed, as it is, in some such phraseology as this, "Really, my friend, I couldn't say, I never saw anyone live again after dying, and never knew any person who had. I do not say it is impossible, but I have no knowledge on the subject; I don't know."

If the testimony of scripture as to the Resurrection of Jesus is mentioned, the reply is that it will not stand the test of critical analysis which scholarship has applied to it, or that, as Hume said, it was like any other miracle—incapable of proof by any amount of testimony.

One strange thing about the whole matter is, that men should consider it with no more interest, apparently, than any other physical problem when the truth is that upon it hang all the hopes of mankind. If the grave is the end for time and eternity, then indeed is life a mockery; and a conviction of the truth of that proposition in every mind would wreck the moral world and reduce the race to the lowest condition of savagery. Of this no sane man can entertain a doubt.

Another strange thing is, that those who demand proof of continued existence after death, and regard faith in it without such proof as not only unscientific, but as mere unreasoning superstition, should forget or ignore, the fact that a very large proportion, if not a vast majority, of what are called established truths of science are nothing more than pure idealizations, based upon improved and improvable phenomena and therefore necessarily requiring faith for their acceptance as truths. Science can no more exist without faith than religion can. The basis of most of it is mathematics, and nothing can be more purely ideal, or further removed from the operation of the senses than geometry, algebra, or trigonometry. As a distinguished man of science, Mr. G. H. Lewis, says, in discussing the

philosophy of Aristotle: "The fundamental ideas of modern science are as transcendental as any of the axioms in ancient philosophy."

These men of science do not pretend that, even in what are called the exact sciences, more than approximately accurate results are obtained, and they are obliged to admit that many of their postulates do not rest on ascertained facts, but are mere creatures of the scientific imagination. They are pure assumptions, and these assumptions have been continually changed as further knowledge has been acquired.

If it be said that, although science believes many things that are beyond the reach of the senses, still she only deals with such things as are conceivable, whereas religion requires belief in matters which are utterly inconceivable and inconceivable, the reply is that this is not true, so far as science is concerned. She believes for instance in the force of gravity, which is not only inconceivable, but as the great Faraday says, involves "inconceivable inconsistencies." She asserts that matter was created; that there never was a time when it did not exist, and that it is indestructible; and she speaks confidently of force always persisting in unchanged quantity, &c.—and there is not one of these things that is not absolutely inconceivable. They are beliefs and nothing more. They involve, too, the very same ideas for faith in which religion is accused of unreasonableness, namely, the immaterial, the infinite and eternal. The moment that science gets beyond what is known, it ceases to be science, and becomes speculation or metaphysics.

Now, death is a tremendous fact in the economy of nature, and this fact of death itself powerfully presents the idea of the duality of flesh and spirit. It irresistibly forces the conclusion that the animating principle—the something that gave energy, force, vitality to the now inert and senseless body—has left it, and that this severance of connection between them—this absence of the vitalizing force—has produced the awful change in the material part. Its disappearance from our sensible perception is not proof that it has ceased to exist, nor is it possible to prove it, or even to find any—the slightest—evidence of its destruction. The simple truth is that death, in its relation to the spiritual part of man, is not a possible subject of scientific investigation, as such, may very justly say, in regard to that relation, *Agnosco*—"I don't know." But, as the possessor of that faculty, for which the evolutionist has never yet found a place in his system—*conscience*—and with those other phenomena which belong to the mental or spiritual world as a basis of inference, he is not justified in saying that he is without any evidence upon which to rest a conclusion. Certainly he does not know, as a fact ascertained by experience, that a man lives after death, and so likewise, he does not know, as a fact, that one in one hundred of the postulates of physical science is true.

This argument leaves out of view both the evidence of Scripture and all those striking analysis of nature so well used by Bishop Butler. The latter are not considered, because in Butler's day science admitted, or was supposed to admit, a God of Nature but denied a God of Revelation, while now it recognizes neither, but substitute force and matter. My attempt is to meet the Materialist on his own ground. He says that thought—the mind—is the result of, and inseparably connected with, the structure of the brain—that it is, in a word, a mere manifestation of a certain form and combination of matter; and by way of illustration, he cites the absence of it in an idiot, or person with a diseased or injured brain; but inasmuch as he also insists that the matter of the brain, like all other matter, is indestructible, why should this manifestation of it, which he calls the mind perish? He also insists that evolution is the law of Nature; that there is ever an ascending scale of being. Why, then, should he presume to fix a limit to the soul's existence, and make that limit the moment of its separation from the body? The soul is certainly either a material or immaterial force. If it is a material substance, it is of course, according to his doctrine, indestructible; and if it is an immaterial force, it is according to his doctrine again eternal in its nature and not subject to decay or death.

To my mind, the most marvelous result of scientific reasoning is this: that matter is self-existent and imperishable, but that the immortality of that immaterial thing called the mind or soul, which reasons out

the process by which this conclusion is reached, is so uncertain as to justify science in saying, in regard to it, *Agnosco*—"I don't know!" The man of science knows that matter cannot be destroyed, but whether the soul, if it exists, does or does not cease its existence when the body dies, he "really cannot say." The truth is, that he really knows as much (or as little) of the immortality of the soul as the other. He also knows that his personal happiness, or that of others, is not all dependent upon the indestructibility of matter, while the establishment in every mind of a conviction that the soul dies with the body, would produce moral chaos in the world. Of course I speak only of the Materialist; pure and simple, who is a fit yoke-fellow of the blind religionist and bigoted fanatic to whom all science appears to be inimical to religion. The number of each class is small, and will not probably, increase in due proportion.

The great mass of humanity, enlightened or ignorant, have abiding conviction, an inborn consciousness, that every soul is endowed with the quality of immortality, and that death is a mere usher—albeit a most solemn and mysterious one—who heralds our entrance into larger mansions. The consciousness is entirely independent of any external evidence, furnished either by Scripture or Nature. Its existence has been denied, and the case of a certain savage tribe, who had no conception of a supreme being, or of the immortality of the soul, has been cited to disprove the universality of the idea; but a thorough investigation of the facts has been made, and it appeared that with this tribe, as with the rest of mankind, in all ages, and in every land, the idea, although of the rudest kind, had its place. There is no way to explain such a phenomenon, except by a process unrecognized by physical science. It exists as a fact in human experience, however, and being a fact, it ought to be accounted for. It is, too, perhaps the only idea, not based upon material experiment, which is common to all mankind. There are all sorts of conceptions of a Supreme Being, and of the conditions of a future life, but that there is a future life, of some kind is a fundamental irradicable human belief, which has always existed and which must always exist. The discussion of it began with the dawn of reason; it was a favorite theme with the earliest philosophers of whom we have any knowledge, and the libraries of the world are full of books about it. "This believing instinct," says one who wrote exhaustively on the subject of a future life; "this believing instinct, so deeply seated in our consciousness—natural, innocent, universal—whence came it, and why was it given? There is but one fair answer." And elsewhere the same writer says: "Man is the lonely and sublime Columbus of the creation, who, wandering in this Spanish strand of time, sees drifted waifs and strange portents borne far from an unknown somewhere, causing him to believe in another world. Comes not death, as a ship, to bear him thither?" Science may, and probably will, modify religious beliefs in the future, as it certainly has in the past, but it can never destroy the faith of mankind in the immortality of the soul. It does not wish to do so; but on the contrary, will rejoice in continuing to be instrumental in enlarging men's views of the universe, and thus faith in the infinite wisdom and goodness of the Creator, who entertained into their very being the assured consciousness of a future life.

A. M. WADDELL.

THE SUB-TREASURY SCHEME.

It would be injurious to the Farmers.

Mr. W. R. Davie, of Landsford, S. C., has published in the *Charleston News and Courier* the following review of the bill urged by the Farmers' Alliances.

I have just read a copy of Senate bill 2806, entitled "A bill to establish a system of agricultural depositories for the accommodation of farmers and planters and for other purposes," introduced (by request) by Senator Vance of North Carolina.

The bill proposes to inaugurate what is known as the sub-Treasury scheme, and as it has been endorsed by the county and sub-alliances in this State, and presumably in others it may be well to call the attention of our farmer friends and the public generally to its most extraordinary provisions, its tendency and effect. It provides that there may be established in each county of each State in the United States agricultural depositories or warehouses, which shall be under the control of the United States Treasury Department, upon compliance with the following conditions.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

First. When it shall be duly certified by the oath or affirmation of the clerk and sheriff of the county that the average gross amount per annum of cotton, wheat, corn, oats and tobacco produced and sold in the county for the preceding two years exceeds the sum of \$500,000 at current prices in said county at that time.

Second. Provides that upon the petition of 100 or more citizens of said county, and the donation of lands for site it shall become the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a United States agricultural depository in such county, and appoint a manager of same. The manager to give such bond as the Secretary of the Treasury may require, and shall receive as a salary for his service not less than \$1,000 and not more than \$2,500, to be determined by the Secretary in proportion to the business of his depository.

Section 2. That any owner of cotton, wheat, corn, oats or tobacco may deposit the same in the depository nearest the point of its production and receive therefor (presumably from the manager) treasury notes, hereinafter provided for, equal at the date of deposit to 80 per centum of the net value of such product at the market price, said price to be determined by the manager of the depository, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, based upon the price current in the leading cotton, tobacco and grain markets in the United States.

Section 3 provides for the preparation by the Secretary of the Treasury of such treasury notes as may be required.

Section 4 makes such notes full legal tender.

Section 5 requires of the manager of the depository to give warehouse receipts for all deposits, showing the amount and grade or quality of such cotton, tobacco or grain, and its value at date of deposit, the amount of Treasury notes the depository has advanced on same. "That the interest on the money so advanced is 1 per centum per annum," expressly stating the amount of insurance, weighing, classing, warehousing and other charges that will run against such deposit, and that all such warehouse receipts shall be negotiable by endorsement.

Section 6 provides for the redemption by the holder of the warehouse receipt of all deposits, by the surrender of the warehouse receipt, payment of advances, with interest and payment of all charges.

Section 7 requires the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules and regulations necessary for the management of the depositories, and shall provide rules for the sale at public auction of all cotton, corn, oats, wheat and tobacco that have been placed on deposit for a longer period than 12 months after due notice published, the proceeds after payment of advances and charges to be held subject to order of warehouse receipt.

Section 8 provides for the erection of the depositories.

Section 9. That the profits, if any from the charges for insurance, weighing, &c., shall be paid into the Treasury.

Section 10. That the term of office for a manager of depository shall be two years.

Section 11. That the sum of \$50,000,000 be appropriated, or so much thereof as may be found necessary to carry out the provisions of this bill.

Section 12. That so much of any and all other acts as are in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

THE SCHEME IS PREPOSTEROUS.

Now, Mr. Editor, after reading the bill we no longer wonder that the honorable Senator was careful to state that it was introduced "by request." So staunch a Democrat, so true a patriot, so astute a politician would not care to accept the paternity of such a measure, and it is safe to predict that it will never, in its present shape at least, pass into a law, either by the help of his influence or his State. Crude in construction, illogical, unfinished and refreshingly generous in dealing out Uncle Sam's millions upon one ill-digested experiment, it quietly ignores the Agricultural Department of the Government and converts the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States into the responsible head of a gigantic commission business charged with the details of building, insurance, storage, commission, shipping, weighing, sampling, classifying, grading and pricing all the surplus product of cotton, wheat, corn, oats and tobacco in this great country of ours.

AN ARMY OF REPUBLICAN OFFICERS.

It goes further and organizes the Secretary to prove unnumbered millions of dollars' worth of Treasury notes, to be paid out by appointees of his own selection under rules prescribed by himself alone, as advances upon the products stored in the depositories. It creates an army of office-holders, amounting in number to not less and perhaps to many more than 10,000 men. Armed with more money and more patronage than any set of officials ever appointed in this country and of course at the present time every man of them a Republican, it establishes and fixes for two years at least a good working centre of Republican influence in every agricultural county in the United States, supplied with unrestricted and unlimited money to loan at 1 per cent. per annum to all holders of cotton, corn, wheat, oats and tobacco, with power to grade, classify and price the products offered and to decide upon the amount of loan and the charges to run against the product in the warehouse. Who can measure the weight of such influence, the possibilities for good or bad, incident to such opportunities? What can we say or think of the action of a Southern Farmers' Alliance indorsing such measures and adopting resolutions asking their Senators and Representatives in Congress to favor the passage of such a bill? It would, perhaps, be more charitable than complimentary to say that they had never read or understood it.

A WESTERN SCHEME TO FLEECE THE SOUTH.

Leaving out all hereditary tendencies towards State rights, free trade, Democracy and all that sort of thing, one would have thought that self-interest would have dictated opposition to such measures. The average cotton farmer has cotton to sell, and corn or wheat or flour or oats or meat to buy. Now, it is a fact that of all American products cotton is to-day the dearest, bears the largest relative value, and that grain, abnormally low. So that our generous and patriotic Southern cotton farmer is joining heart and soul in the effort to enable the Western corn, wheat or meat producer to export him a larger price of Western produce. Such a scheme as this would enhance the price of corn and wheat and oats, and of meat and flour, for they are perishable and must be consumed within a given time. They are necessities of life and must be had regularly. It would not and could not permanently enhance the price of cotton, for if protected it would not decay. Weevils will not injure or destroy. We cannot eat it ourselves nor feed to stock, and the spinner smiles at all our efforts to "corner" it, knowing full well that to the spindles it must come at last, and the gain in price of our crop would be more than offset by the loss in value to the next by reason of "carried over" stock. Such action on the part of the cotton planter is pure nonsense and a suicidal folly.

AN UNJUSTIFIABLE PREFERENCE.

And Mr. Editor, I would like to ask what pre-eminence claim have cotton, wheat, corn, oats and tobacco to this bounty and fostering care of the Government? Why not include sugar, rice, wool, hay, wines, silk, peanuts, turpentine, cotton seed oil, petroleum, phosphate, the fruit of the looms and the product of the mines—anything that is produced by the sunlight of heaven or the glow of the furnace, by the dew

of the air or the sweat of the brow in the smiling fields fanned by life-giving breezes or in the dark caverns of the earth filled with gasses dangerous as dynamite? Each and all these products and the busy millions toiling to produce them are as much entitled to the aid of the Government they help to support as are the few agricultural products mentioned in this bill, and should this pass into a law, will not defer asking for it.

A COTTON AND GRAIN TRUST.

This measure means, if it means anything, that cotton, wheat, corn, oats and tobacco are produced in this country in excess of remunerative demand; that the farmers and planters cannot, in the open market and usual channels of trade, get what they deem sufficient profit for their production; that, from their standpoint, it is desirable to enhance the selling price of these products; that this can be done in only two ways—first, by reducing the production, or second, by withdrawing from the market such part of the product that the remainder will increase in the selling price; that it is impracticable to reduce the yield, and that it is impossible for them without the omnipotent aid of the Federal Government, to withdraw enough from market to materially affect the market value; and, therefore, it having been determined to form a trust, in order to maintain or enhance prices in defiance of the law of supply and demand, the Government is called upon to put up the capital and assume the management of it for their benefit. A wise, promising Republican, centralizing, paternal Government programme, truly worthy of the combined efforts of Reed and Boutelle, Blair and Hoar, Andrew Carnegie, James G. Blaine and the *New York Tribune*; and to think, Mr. Editor, that a Southern cotton planter would endorse such a scheme.

To carry this class of legislation to its legitimate results, and with justice to all classes, would be to enact: That hereinafter when any man or set of men in this country see fit to produce anything of any kind in excess of remunerative demand the Government should on application build a depository or depositories for such product, and advance to the producer 80 per cent. of its market value in money at the rate of 1 per centum per annum.

If the producer did not see fit to redeem it in twelve months, or if, as might very frequently happen, the price of the product should in twelve months be reduced in the open market by twenty or more per cent., the Government would then sell the product at public auction for what it could get, pocket its losses and by such forced sales break down the prices and market which such unwarranted and mischievous legislation was designed to support.

READ THE BILL.

I do hope that our Alliance friends will get this bill, study it carefully as I have done, and I am certain that as sensible men and Democrats they will see the folly of supporting such a measure.

W. R. DAVIE.
 LANDSFORD, S. C., April 16, 1890.

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

The Remarkable History of the Methodist in America.

Atlanta Constitution.

The meeting of the Methodist General Conference, at St. Louis, will be the eleventh quadrennial session of the Methodist Episcopal church, south, and in many respects it will be the most important religious gathering that has been held for many years.

The history of the Methodist in America is a remarkable one.

The first Methodist society in the United States was organized in New York in October, 1776. Eight years later the first conference, which embraced ten preachers, representing a membership of 1,160 was held. Now the M. E. church alone has a membership in this country of nearly 3,000,000, and the M. E. Church south, has in the neighborhood of 1,500,000. Up to 1844 there was no division among the Methodists in the United States, and one general conference represented the church from north, south, east and west. But at the Conference held in that year a separation was brought about by the difference of opinion between the northern and southern delegates on the slave-holding question.

Bishop James O. Andrews, of Georgia was the owner of a number of slaves and because he refused to part with them the eastern and northern members of that body succeeded in having him suspended from his high office in church.

This created a dissatisfaction among the Southern members who straightway prepared to withdraw from the general jurisdiction and from a conference of their own. This was successfully accomplished, and the first meeting was held in Louisville, Ky., in May, 1845. There was built the foundation for the present large and successful organization known as the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and it is to the able and earnest divines that steered the church through those critical periods that the present prosperity is due.

Since then ten quadrennial conferences have occurred, and the benefits resulting therefrom are known to the world over. In view of the stand taken by the representatives of this body on the question of slavery, there is one significant fact in relation to their work that is not so generally known as it should be when the division occurred the missions which had been instituted and carried on by the United church were taken up and vigorously prosecuted by the northern branch under the direction of Bishop Capers, who had made the subject a special study and for a long time gave the matter his undivided attention: During the twenty years following 1845, the church spent over \$1,000,000 in this work of endeavoring to convert the plantation slaves. At the close of the war, when the colored race established an episcopacy of their own, all their church property was transferred to them gratis, and they are still being largely aided by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, especially in the establishment of institutions for the education of candidates for the ministry.

Since the first assembly in Louisville, there have been ten general conferences. Two of them were held in St. Louis, but the importance attached to the former gatherings hardly compares with the significance attaching to the one now in preparation.

There will be ten or twelve standing committees, which will have in review respectively missionary, publication, educational, church extension, Sunday School, and other departments in the work of the church. Rooms have been rented in the exposition building for the sessions of these committees.

The opening session of the conference will be held Wednesday morning, May 7, at 9 o'clock. Bishop J. C. Keener, of New Orleans, senior bishop of the church, will preside and start the meeting to work. The number of delegates will be 290, composed in equal numbers of clergymen and laymen. They represent forty conferences including the conferences in Mexico, Brazil and China, together with the representatives of the church in other foreign lands where the missions have not yet organized into conferences. The representation is based on two delegates one lay and one clerical, for every thirty-six members of each annual conference. This general conference is the legislative body and the supreme power in the church. It has unlimited authority except as restricted by certain rules which guard the integrity of its doctrine and perpetuate its itinerant system of ministers and the rights of the members. In addition to looking after all the interests of the church, there will come up for adjudication before this body all matters failing to be amicably settled in the annual conferences. One subject of considerable importance to be attended to at this meeting will be to provide for an acceptable disposition of the surplus moneys on hand secured in profits from the church's publication institutions. At present this money is used in creating a fund for the maintenance of worn-out preachers, their widows and orphans. It is intended to appropriate a part of this money in the future toward the spreading of biblical literature and cheapening the cost thereof.

This assembly also chooses the bishops for the church, and it may be that two will be elected at this meeting. How long it will take to complete the work of the convention is not known, but the session will continue for three weeks anyway, and it is not probable that the final adjournment will occur before June 1.

Oxford Day: Dr. J. M. Hays saw Dr. Wm. A. Hammond, the distinguished physician, at Washington, a few days ago, and was assured by him that he would attend the meeting of the State Medical Society in Oxford, and will deliver a lecture on the profession on "Spinal Diseases." Dr. Hammond ranks easily first in this branch of practice. Other eminent physicians from abroad have indicated their intention of being here during the meeting.

Senator Beck was a Scotch- Presbyterian, and "before the war" was a Whig.