

The Anderson Intelligencer.

BY E. B. MURRAY & CO.

ANDERSON, S. C., THURSDAY MORNING, JUNE 10, 1886.

VOLUME XXI.—NO. 48.

TEACHERS' COLUMN.

J. G. CLINKSCALES, EDITOR.

TEACHERS' INSTITUTE.

The time for holding the Teachers' Institute is now fixed for July 10th. It will run two weeks. Let all our teachers make their arrangements to attend. It is surely not necessary to argue the importance of being present from the beginning to the close. No earnest teacher can afford to miss it. If you are teaching a subscription school, see your patrons at once and beg to get off at that time. If you are in earnest, it will not take long to convince them that it will be to their interest, as well as yours, to let you come. Don't fail to come!

We have frequently invited the teachers to call at this office and examine the different educational journals sent here. Some have done so and have gone away determined to have a paper devoted exclusively to the interests of education. Copies of several papers will be sent us for distribution among the teachers and others attending the Institute.

The average attendance of white children in the Richmond schools for last year was 96 per cent.; average for colored, 98 per cent. We asked the principal of one of the schools how he accounted for the difference. His opinion was that the negroes send their children regularly in order to relieve themselves of the burden of providing fires for them in the winter. If the negroes in the cities are as fond of going to school as they are in the country, his answer was only partially correct.

All teachers rejoice at the success of their pupils in school and in the trials and difficulties of life. It gave us pleasure, while in Richmond, to meet Miss Nannie Landrum, our brightly-pupilled ten-year-old. Miss Landrum is now a teacher in the Richmond Baptist Female College. She is a daughter of the late Rev. J. G. Landrum, of Spartanburg County, S. C. The timid, studious girl has developed into the dignified, accomplished young lady, competent to teach in any of the best female schools of the land. We felt highly complimented and gratified to have our former pupil, not one of the best teachers in Richmond, come around to the Conference room in search of us when she saw our name on the list of delegates. Such thoughtfulness is appreciated. Teachers live in the memory of their pupils.

How often have we heard it said, "Our teacher is a woman; we want a man next session," attributing failure to the sex of the teacher. My brother, if you are honest in the opinion that a woman can't teach, you are asleep. Go to the best regulated schools in the cities, and you'll find the best work done by women. Our own opinion is that ladies consecrated to the work are the best teachers for primary classes, and not infrequently, the best for advanced classes. Ladies can enter more fully into sympathy with the children and can more easily understand the wants of their nature. We notice that the teacher of elocution at Montague this summer is a lady. We mean sometimes think we know just how a class ought to be taught: let the writer be candid enough to say he felt "mighty little" when he heard and saw a lady teach a class of boys and girls to read in the Richmond High School. If he ever had any doubts as to the ability of a lady to teach young pupils, he left them all beyond the "Jeems."

One is charmed by the strict adherence to order and system in the Richmond schools. Every thing moves like clock work. Indeed, there the clock is an indispensable part of school furniture. (How many school rooms in Anderson County have clocks?) Order is one of the first lessons to be learned by the pupil. The manner in which he enters and leaves the room is suggestive of discipline. What a nice thing it is to see the children in a school of six hundred moving around almost noiselessly! Friction is reduced to a minimum, and it may be so in our own schools.

We are confident that thoroughness was aimed at in all the schools it was our pleasure to visit. Children are not hurried over first principles just to satisfy their own whims or gratify anxious parents. Acting upon the theory that one book learned well is worth more to a child than many poorly learned, they are laying the foundation securely. Promotion from one school to another depends upon a thorough mastery of the book in hand and the pupils know it. In our schools the child is, not always thought generally, put into whatever book happens to suit the fancy of his parent, and the consequence is that, in many cases, much time and money are wasted in futile efforts to build without a foundation, and a human mind, unmeasured in its possibilities, is maintained for life and for eternity.

We were written on nicely ruled slates, each little fellow passed his slate to his neighbor for inspection. Children are severe critics. They looked anxiously for a misspelled word. After the mistakes were noted the slates were returned to their owners, who made the necessary corrections. This finished, the children were required to stand and spell after the old-fashioned way, pronouncing the words distinctly before attempting to spell it. The exercise was quite interesting, and held the attention of the children throughout. This we noticed, too: the recitations were short, not lasting more than ten minutes. A child under six years of age is easily tired; hold him to a recitation until you weary him and you begin to discount the good

already accomplished and do him a positive damage. In so large a school as the Richmond Central, there are several, of course, under six years of age. These are divided into two classes. Each class is kept in school only half the day, and that means two hours and a half, the daily session being five hours. Class No. 1 is dismissed about half-past eleven o'clock, when the other takes its place. The principal observed, and we think wisely, that it is cruel to keep a little child in school five hours a day.

Wasn't Particular About Wages.

Year before last a bright looking young man entered our counting room in response to an advertisement for an assistant shipping clerk. He told the usual tale of how he desired a position more than wages for the time being, and was willing to accept a nominal salary to start on. The old man was feeling in particularly good humor that afternoon, and said pleasantly to the newcomer: "Well, sir, what would you consider a nominal salary? What would you be willing to accept in beginning?"

The young man picked at the lining of his hat with his fingers, and deferentially replied: "I want to show you, sir, that I mean business, and I will work for one cent the remainder of this month, providing you think it would not be too much to double my salary each month thereafter."

"That's a novel proposition, surely," said the old man with a smile. "Do you know what you're talking about, my dear boy?"

"Well, sir, my principal aim is to learn the business," responded the young fellow, "and I would almost be willing to work for nothing, but I'd like to feel and be able to say that I was earning something, you know."

"I'll take you," remarked the old man. "One cent, two cents, four cents, eight cents," he enumerated. "You won't get much for awhile," he added.

He took him up to the cashier. "This is John Smith," he said. "He will go to work as assistant shipping clerk tomorrow. His salary will be one cent this month. Double it every month from now on."

"In consideration of my working for this small salary I might ask you to assure me a position for a definite period?" inquired John Smith.

"We don't usually do that," replied the Governor; "but we can't lose much on you anyhow, I guess, and you look like an honest fellow. How long do you want employment?"

"Three years, sir, if agreeable to you." Well, by Jove, the old man agreed and young Mr. Smith, on pretense of wanting some evidence of stability of his place, got the Governor to write out and sign a paper that he had been guaranteed a position in the house for three years on the terms he has stated.

He worked along for six months without drawing a cent. He said he would draw all his earnings at Christmas. The cashier one day thought he'd figure up how much would be coming to the young man. He grew so interested in the project that he kept multiplying for three years. The result almost staggered him. This is the column of figures he took to the old man:

First month.....	01
Second.....	02
Third.....	04
Fourth.....	08
Fifth.....	16
Sixth.....	32
Seventh.....	64
Eighth.....	125
Tenth.....	256
Eleventh.....	512
Twelfth.....	1024
Thirteenth.....	2048
Fourteenth.....	4096
Fifteenth.....	8192
Sixteenth.....	16384
Seventeenth.....	32768
Eighteenth.....	65536
Nineteenth.....	131072
Twentieth.....	262144
Twenty-first.....	524288
Twenty-second.....	1048576
Twenty-third.....	2097152
Twenty-fourth.....	4194304
Twenty-fifth.....	8388608
Twenty-sixth.....	16777216
Twenty-seventh.....	33554432
Twenty-eighth.....	67108864
Twenty-ninth.....	134217728
Thirtieth.....	268435456
Thirty-first.....	536870912
Thirty-second.....	1073741824
Thirty-third.....	2147483648
Thirty-fourth.....	4294967296
Thirty-fifth.....	8589934592
Thirty-sixth.....	17179869184
Thirty-seventh.....	34359738368
Thirty-eighth.....	68719476736
Thirty-ninth.....	137438953472
Fortieth.....	274877906944

Total salary for 3 years.....\$552,554,255.65

The Governor nearly fainted when he understood how, even if he was twice as rich as Vanderbilt, he would be ruined in paying John Smith's salary. He concluded to discharge the modest young man at once. Smith had figured up how much would be due him, and reminded the old man of his written agreement. Rather than take chances in courts and see everybody know how he had been duped, the Governor paid Smith \$5,000 and bade him good-bye.

A Colored Man's Suicide.

There was a most unusual occurrence to occur near our town last Friday. Mattison Antney, colored, who has been living with Mr. N. H. Young, for a year or so, about 1 1/2 miles south of Prosperity, committed suicide by hanging himself to a tree in the pasture. He had some trouble with his wife Friday morning, and threatened to cut his throat with his razor. He left the house saying he was going to kill himself; but no one thought of it. He came home and he had to work, it was thought that he had gone to his father's. He was found Monday morning, and coroner Bass was telegraphed for, and came down and held the inquest. The jury found a verdict that the deceased came to his death by hanging at his own hand. The razor was found upon his person when examined. It was evident from the struggles that he endeavored to save himself after stepping off the fence, as he was astride the fence when found, and his face showed that he had a struggle, as it was scratched up considerably where it had come in contact with the body of the tree.

—Cherty is a first mortgage on every human being's possessions.

DISCUSSING EVOLUTION.

Dr. Woodrow Before the Presbyterian Assembly.

DR. ARMSTRONG AGAINST EVOLUTION.

From the form in which God has seen fit to give his revelation to us it covers in many cases the same field as science. God has given his revelation to us in a form in which the most educated man in the world can study it with interest, and a babe can study its blessed truths. It is made up of biographies, historical statements, the Psalms and prophecies, the life of his incarnate Son, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the glorious Revelation of the future. It must give biographies of good men and bad men, and must in many instances cover the same ground as that covered by science, both physical and metaphysical. The first chapters of Genesis tell us that God created the heavens and the earth and man. God wisely embodied this in His revelation; it is a religious fact. Science covers the same ground. It may be just as truly religious as science, or it may be wholly religious or wholly scientific. When it is said, therefore, that when science attempts to cover certain ground that because the church covers the same ground it is intruding upon the domain of science, the claim is wholly unwarranted. Within the last century something that is called science has come forward. There is a great deal that claims to be science that is not science, that claims to determine some of these questions that the church has always considered settled by revelation. They say don't bother this, when it belongs to the church, and has been ours since time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. Science comes in and squats upon our territory. [Laughter.] The cheek of the thing is monstrous. [Laughter.] These things may be studied as strictly religious or strictly scientific. If you will confine yourself to true science there is no possible conflict between revelation and science. The book of Nature and the book of Revelation are both by the same God, and he is a true God, and there is no conflict in the testimony.

In deciding the question before us I would impress on you that this belongs to the Church, that it is a fundamental religious truth. We can confine ourselves to the strict religious aspect of the question, and we do not infringe upon the field of science. We have attempted in the majority report to give an exposition of our standards. They may be right or wrong but they are to us Presbyterians an authentic exposition as to what the Scriptures teach. Our paper only gives the evolution of man. Language cannot be made so clear that some man is not ingenious enough to pervert it. Now in what sense must we understand it? What must govern us in our interpretation? We must interpret them in their historic sense. My conclusion is that in the interpretation of creeds and covenants, we must interpret them in the sense that we believe those who framed them meant them. We don't claim for our Confession of Faith the authority of inspiration. There is but one divinely inspired book. What am I to do if I cannot understand them in their historic sense? When they ordained me they called upon me to accept the Confession of Faith as the system of religion of our church. Now I may not believe fully every point in that confession in its historic sense. If I can establish my error to be not a dangerous or vital one they tell me to go ahead. I had a doubt about the length of the six days in which the world was created. I do not doubt that in its historic sense it meant six days of 24 hours each, but I do not know if I am prepared to accept that belief. Neither do I know if I believe that it means six years or long periods of time. I don't know now which I believe. Again, our confession teaches that a man must not marry any person nearer of kin to his deceased wife than he could marry if kin to himself. That is, he might marry his deceased wife's sister. I do not believe this. Now the church allows a certain liberty within rational bounds. What then is to determine if this historic interpretation of this question is to be received? The church, if I cannot receive them, I can appeal to the Presbytery, from this to the Synod, from that to the Assembly. They decide in this a fundamental error likely to do harm. If not then they say go on, your error in belief is not dangerous or hurtful to the church. I have thus tried to define for you the limits of liberty allowed to personal belief.

The word "create" in the account of the creation of man, can have but one meaning and that is immediate creation. That is what our creed teaches; that is what our confession of faith teaches, and that is what our confession of faith teaches. The rule is inflexible that we must interpret them historically, but our book provides for certain liberty of belief. It must be shown that my error of belief or practice is a mischievous one before I can be dealt with. For this majority report I ask your careful consideration. Its language is peculiar. It has been carefully prepared by the committee. It is not my paper, nor Dr. Smoot's paper, nor Dr. Junkin's, nor Dr. Strickler's, but it is the joint work and united wisdom of all. We ask that you not make captious objections to its verbiage.

Don't make captious objections to this report. It is the best we could do. We have used plain language rather than scientific technicalities. Science is now held by the sheet which Peter saw lowered down from the heavens; it is filled with animals of every kind and all sorts of four-footed things. [Laughter.] By organic dust we mean mold vegetable or animal mould as contradistinguished from sand or clay. Adam's body was made of organic dust. The Bible doesn't say it was created of clay, but of organic dust. But when a man says he evolved out of organic dust, I can't agree to that; I don't know what he means. Evolution is defined as "descent with modifications." Where have we an illustration of natural evolution? Plants and animals, under the fostering care of man, are offered as examples. The Jersey cow is said to be an evolution from an inferior grade. But evolution necessarily implies life from which the animal

came, and also life in the evolve state itself, if I may use a mathematical term. Now let us consider evolution from inorganic dust. Suppose your cow dies and becomes partly decomposed. There you have your dust; what will you give me for the calf you can evolve from that dust? [Laughter.] If you talk about evolution from organic dust we must put a different meaning on organic dust.

We say in our report that he was created without any natural parentage, and in a manner to preserve proper race unity? What do we mean by race unity? That there was no pure blood in Eve than in Adam, or vice versa in the ground work for proper race unity. This is simply the statement of what we believe. The deliverance is what we understand our standards to mean when they formulated these doctrines. This is no new doctrine. I have said when you come to decide on limits of liberty, it must be determined if the error is one that strikes at the vitals of religion and is liable to do harm. We say these teachings of evolution are dangerous errors, because they endanger the plenary inspiration of the scriptures, and leave the Bible no longer worthy to be called the Word of God. These old ministers who have been grounded in the Word of God for twenty-five years are not intended by the teaching, but the young men, if they adopt the same doctrine, are swept away. I don't believe in evolution in any sense and I am glad I don't; but if you do, don't let it carry you to the belief that it refers to man made in the image of God. It will necessitate giving up the doctrine of the fall. According to evolution, man was at his lowest stage, just evolved from a brute—how could he fall? He was already low as he could get. [Laughter.] I want to hold on to the first chapters of Genesis. I believe the garden of Eden had a true and distinct location as the city of Jerusalem. It is all history to me. It is a book plainly inspired; it is the word of God.

DR. WOODROW ON EVOLUTION.

It has been truly said that I am simply one of the members of this body. I am not entitled to anything that ought not to be extended to any other member. I have been truly said that I have no more interest in this matter than any other member of the Assembly or church. Yet I am not surprised, when I see that sense of courtesy and propriety which marks this body, that you have done what you have in granting me two hours in which to address you. I have been pushed into the forefront of the battle that is now raging and disturbing the whole church. I wish to express my deep regret if I might ever be placed in antagonism with the venerable father in the church who addressed you this morning. I heartily agree with the greater part of what he said. God forbid that I should differ from it! In greater parts they were my sentiments. And if I have been supposed to believe otherwise, I have been greatly misunderstood. Anything that could lead to a doubt of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures should not be entertained by this Assembly. There is no human being living who believes more fully than I in the plenary inspiration of every word of the Scriptures. And if any doctrine I hold can be shown to be in opposition to that which is revealed in the Scriptures, I am in opposition to any "this sacred Word," I instantly abandon it. There is not one word in my belief that does not directly or indirectly impugn one sentence in that Sacred Word. I think I can show it to be so. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind of the perfect historical accuracy of the first chapter of Genesis and of every other chapter.

Dr. Armstrong properly called attention to the fact that this question is fully before you, and you have the right to discuss it. But it is not always our duty to do that which it is our right and which I believe. Again, our confession teaches that a man must not marry any person nearer of kin to his deceased wife than he could marry if kin to himself. That is, he might marry his deceased wife's sister. I do not believe this. Now the church allows a certain liberty within rational bounds. What then is to determine if this historic interpretation of this question is to be received? The church, if I cannot receive them, I can appeal to the Presbytery, from this to the Synod, from that to the Assembly. They decide in this a fundamental error likely to do harm. If not then they say go on, your error in belief is not dangerous or hurtful to the church. I have thus tried to define for you the limits of liberty allowed to personal belief.

Dr. Armstrong properly called attention to the fact that this question is fully before you, and you have the right to discuss it. But it is not always our duty to do that which it is our right and which I believe. Again, our confession teaches that a man must not marry any person nearer of kin to his deceased wife than he could marry if kin to himself. That is, he might marry his deceased wife's sister. I do not believe this. Now the church allows a certain liberty within rational bounds. What then is to determine if this historic interpretation of this question is to be received? The church, if I cannot receive them, I can appeal to the Presbytery, from this to the Synod, from that to the Assembly. They decide in this a fundamental error likely to do harm. If not then they say go on, your error in belief is not dangerous or hurtful to the church. I have thus tried to define for you the limits of liberty allowed to personal belief.

Turn your minds to the truth and the facts in the case. Where damage has been done in one instance by the intrusion on the part of science, thousands and thousands have been pushed down to hell by those who have done the work of God has been entrusted and who imagine, therefore, that all the field of science has been left to them. You have been told—and rightly told—that an oath is to be taken in the sense in which it is understood by the imposition of the oath. Whether you will take all He says about the historic sense when we have His own example in turning his back upon it, I do not know. He tells us man was created, not of sand or clay, but of organic dust—a sort of mud. Did any of you have any idea that it was that sort of dust? You and I never dreamed it was other than sand or clay. He comes and says, "oh no, that won't do, I can show you that won't do, because there are all sorts of subtle acids, etc., in these which do not appear in the composition of man."

These component parts are declared to exist in sand or clay by science. Now, I would not, on any account, subordinate the word of God in this way to the teachings of science. We have a conspicuous example from the distinguished gentleman who addressed us this morning, who tells us it is science and we must accept it. He says the catechism must be taken in the sense of those who wrote it. It teaches that in six days God created Heaven and earth. What did those people mean in the sixteenth century by Heaven and earth? They meant those bodies circling around the earth. When you accept that teaching in the sense of those who wrote it they meant by the heavens those things that were floating above us. I apprehend if you began to examine your faith along with that of the men of the sixteenth century you would find many differences that never occurred to you.

I accept as you accepted, and I now accept every word in this story of the creation contained in our standards. I believe that He created man from the dust, and woman from the rib taken from the man's side. If I had full power to rewrite our standard I would not wish to change a sentence, word or letter from that which already exists. I must therefore beg that you rid your minds of the idea that I oppose the grounds taken by Dr. Armstrong. The great difficulty is that these entertaining ideas differing from the majority report are misunderstood. This whole subject is a new one. It was not in existence until a comparatively late period. It must pass through many periods before it reaches an easily understood shape. You have been called on to condemn the heresy of evolution, without any qualification, and then in so far as it relates to man. Let me read to you from Dr. Armstrong. He sets out a scheme of evolution thus: The oak passes into the silk worm, the silk worm into the frog, the frog into man. I never saw any one who ever came in a thousand miles of believing such a caricature. Is it strange you should say, "Out of my way" with such absurdity? If this profound student of half a century errs thus in representing evolution, what can we expect from those who have had no such opportunity for study? Again, Dr. Armstrong has announced in this book a fact that is a most important step in geology of the last half century, if true. And he asserts it upon his own observation. It is absolutely new to every geologist in the world. He says that on the Western flank of the Alleghenies in Virginia grow corals and sponges of the same character as those upon the Florida coast. There is much doubt hanging over new sciences, and we ought not to be too hurried in the expressions of our opinions. It is desirable that the church should take more time before giving a definite utterance of its opinion upon evolution. I do not want to reflect on our predecessors, but wherever the church has undertaken to decide any question showing the relation of science and religion, she has always been totally wrong, invariably and dreadfully wrong. Fifteen hundred years ago the church taught that the idea was not only ridiculous, but contrary to the scriptures that the earth was round. In the sixteenth century the mobility of the earth and fixedness of the stars system was condemned by the Christian church. The law of gravitation was condemned as taking away from God the power He had of controlling His universe. Shall we learn anything or not? Shall we not learn that we must take a little time to decide these questions?

This question is too new for us to speak authoritatively upon. You are told that it is dangerous. The established principles of interpretation have led to the views here antagonized. The infallible word of interpreting Scripture is not clear in themselves are elsewhere sufficiently explained to give proper understanding. The Scriptures principally teach what man is to teach concerning God and what God is to teach concerning man. Not only they principally teach this but they teach nothing else. The Bible was not intended to teach the relation between things, but between God and man. You are requested to say that Adam and Eve were created by an immediate act so as to preserve the perfect race unity. Now, if you are going to explain you ought to make things plainer. What do you mean by immediate? Do you mean without media? There were the dust, the rib as media in this creation. It cannot mean, therefore, without media. It must mean, then, instantaneous. Who told you it was instantaneous? Did God? Does He tell you how long He took to make man? He says He did it. He did it with dust of the ground. But does he say He did it instantaneously? There is no hint, however slight, that it was so. Neither these standards nor the word of God affirm it. You are adding to the word of God and requiring those under you to believe that which God has not spoken. That Adam's body was directly fashioned by Almighty God our standards nor the Bible say anything of the sort. The Bible is absolutely silent as to mode and time. If you assert that you know you err. You assert that which you will not find authority for in the word of God. This majority report affirms that this pair were created without any natural parentage. How do you know this? They were created, it is said, from dust. How long had this dust been created? Some will answer that it was created a few days before. Others, that it was created ages—long geological ages—before. Now, what changes occurred in those ages? You do not know. If you adopt this report you will be adding not only to our standards unlawfully, but you will be adding to God's word that which he never taught or that which it is nowhere intimated he meant to teach. We have no right to interpret God's thoughts. Are we fit to say what God's will would be? God leads His children through a path beset with pain and agony. When our children ask for bread, we give it them. But God says, get your bread by the sweat of your brow. His thoughts are not our thoughts. His ways are not our ways. There are many things we have no capacity that we cannot understand. What was

Courting.

There seems to be something impressively sweet in courting. There are charms in it that need to be felt to be appreciated. To be able to open the heart and affections to one beloved is indeed one of the dearest delights of earthly existence. There is not much in one person holding the hand of another, but just that union of palms and digits be as it is poetically called a "golden aorta," and what a change of cause and effect! Hands of friends are shaken; of near and dear relatives, of brother, sister, mother, or even mother-in-law, and thrill of joy shoots through the frame. How different—how wildly different, says the engaged girl, when you lay your hand to rest in the palm of him who is to be your Siamese twin for ever and ever. The moon may be glimmering on the scene, or it may be under less beautiful influences, in a room dimly lighted by a struggling flame—"all day long"—as almost-eyed John would say, juxtaposition to what fairy magnetizes, is a situation of exquisite bliss, which, to the woman who goes to her grave without feeling, is a loss of immeasurable immensity. Married-life cares may come, as come they do, but matters not; that eventful period of every woman's existence, who has been gathered into "the fold," is returned to with sensations that break in upon dark days, like a flood of light, or as come the sweet, first approaches of dawn, with dimpled cheeks and rosy finger-tips, the curtain of the night is drawn aside, while her smile falls on the sleeping flowers. No matter where 'tis done—down doors, without doors—the charm is the same for it is darkness is invested with light, and light softened and subdued. It awakens an interest in every variety of wise. What fellow is there who has "been there," who does not know to what an intense degree the emotions have been excited by some tender letter given on Sunday night—its value may have been little, and paradoxically has speaking its bulk small, the effect was the same; it made the heart glow and the battery whole body electrifying the entire "antony and trimmings." Music is said to have excellent charms, such as can wake a sigh or scatter a cabbage. Be it so, but believe, ye who have not tasted, that courting has beauties that have not their counterpart on earth. —*Charleston Dispatch.*

Work if You Would Rise.

Soon after the great Edmund Burke had been making one of his powerful speeches in Parliament, his brother Richard was found sitting in silent reverie, and when asked by a friend what he was thinking about, replied: "I have been wondering how Ned has contrived to monopolize all the talents in our family. But then I remember that when we were doing nothing, or at play, he was always at work."

The lesson to all is, if you would succeed in life, be diligent; improve your time; work. "Sic ut non, sic non habet," diligent is his own man," says Solomon; "diligent is his own man," shall stand before kings; he shall not stand before them; he shall not be ranked with—"mean men."

NOT ALL FLOWERS.

What a Texas, who is a Native of Anderson County, Thinks of Florida.

We take pleasure in laying the following letters written by Mr. M. J. Dean, formerly of this County, but for a number of years a citizen of Texas, before our readers. They were written for the *Tyler Democrat and Reporter* and are republished at the request of Mr. Dean's friends in this County:

I promised several of your subscribers, before leaving Texas, that I would give a sketch of my trip and what I saw. I boarded the Texas and St. Louis train at Tyler, at 2:40 p. m., Feb. 1st, and ran out to Big Sandy, at the rate of 30 miles an hour. I tell you the T. & S. L. is a daisy since they have put on the heavy steel rails. At Big Sandy I laid over till 8:30 p. m., for the T. & P. train. While there I formed the acquaintance of Mr. Sanford, of Boyce, La. Mr. S. had been to Tyler prospecting, and was so well pleased with our country and Tyler that he located his family there, and was on his way to Louisiana for a car load of Jersey cattle. He contemplates establishing a permanent ranch, and also a dairy and creamery, at or near Tyler. Mr. S. is a very pleasant traveling companion, and I hope will succeed. I also had the company of our old townsman, W. G. Cain, as far as Mansfield.

My trip from Big Sandy to Boyce was during the night; consequently I did not see anything of the country. Boyce is about fifteen miles above Alexandria, and in my old war stamping grounds. I noticed several places that looked familiar. But the country has undergone considerable changes since free labor came in vogue. South of Alexandria cane planting was the order of the day. They were breaking and bedding the ground with six-mule plows.

At 6:50 p. m. we landed in New Orleans; and I would here say to your readers if they want to be headed up and shaken together, take a trip on the T. & P. Road, for it is just what you do. The roughest road extant. After leaving my friend Sanford, I formed the acquaintance of Mr. Y. M. Whitlock, of Union County, South Carolina. Mr. W. was returning home from Texas, via Florida. We stopped two days in New Orleans, and took in the exposition. The best description I can give of it, it is a failure in every respect. They have a table of the destruction of Pompeii which is exhibited at night, but the weather was so cold and unfavorable that it was not exhibited while we were there. We left New Orleans on the L. and N. West, at 7 p. m., and landed in Pensacola, Florida, next morning at 6 o'clock. Pensacola is a city of considerable note on the Gulf coast. It is in a very poor country. It is supported by its shipping interests, principally lumber. From there we started for Jacksonville, via Chatsahoochee, on the Apalachicola River, over the Pensacola and Atlantic Railroad, and the Savannah, Florida and Western, arriving at Jacksonville at 9 p. m. From Pensacola to Jacksonville, a distance of about 500 miles, is as poor country as I ever saw anywhere. From Pensacola to DeFurk Springs, 126 miles, there is not an acre in cultivation, nor a settlement except in the little villages at the stations along the railroad. The land is as poor as "Job's turkey." The growth is scrubby long leaf pine and poverty grass. The balance of the trip through Southern Georgia and Northern Florida is but little better. We spent Friday night at the St. Charles Hotel, Jacksonville. On Saturday morning we took a steamer for Palatka, a distance of 75 miles up the St. John River—fare, two bits round trip. There is war among the transportation companies, and they almost pay you to ride. We were on the Eliza Hancock. The Sylvan Glen, the opposition boat, left the wharf fifteen minutes ahead of us, but we overhauled her at Ticoi, 60 miles, and passed her. For the next ten miles we had the hottest race I ever saw. The Hancock kept about half her length ahead, and was gaining ground, when some of the ladies became frightened for fear of an explosion, and demanded the Captain to check up. The engineer shut down the throttle and let the Glenn run ahead, but we arrived at Palatka in three minutes after she did, so we claim the victory.

St. John River will average four or five miles wide from Jacksonville to Palatka; is very clear, and dotted with driving tows. The growth along its banks is palmetto, magnolia and pine, draped with long moss. From Palatka we took the Florida Southern Railway to this place, 45 miles. It is a narrow gauge, with heavy iron rails, and runs like lightning. This is in the Hammock lands, and is the only part of Florida I have seen that I would have. They cultivate nothing but oranges and vegetables in this section. They have the advantages of the railroad and Orange Lake, navigable for boats and schooners. I am in a settlement filled with South Carolinians, and you may guess I feel very much at home. I received a special invitation last night to take dinner with Capt. W. D. Evans to day. I have not met him yet, but will surely accept the invitation. And as it is nearly time to start, I will close for the present.

Will write again next week, and let you know how I like Florida. When I last wrote I was in Evinston, Florida, and had received an invitation to dine with Captain Evans on that day. You have been with me at good dinners enough to know how I enjoy such things. The Captain and his family were all strangers to me, but when I sat down to that dinner I decided at once that the Evans family were not strangers to good eating. To tell all the good things that were on the table would be too tedious, but it was a superb dinner. And I found the Captain and family just as clever fellows as can be found anywhere. I spent several days with them, and can safely say I never met kinder people. And I would not forget John Kirk, Dr. Little, Joe Reed, Dr. Montgomery and the Emerson boys, all of whom treated me as if I were a brother.

Tuesday morning I boarded the Florida Southern train for Palatka, on St. John's River. From there I went to Ticoi by boat; then by rail to the city of St. Augustine, the oldest city in North America, reaching there at 9 p. m. the same evening. It is situated on the Atlantic coast, thirty-six miles from Jacksonville. For history and dates I am indebted to Bloomfield's Historical Guide: St. Augustine, Florida, is said to be the oldest city by forty years in the United States. Juan Ponce de Leon is supposed to have been the first one who landed in Florida, on the Sunday before Easter, in 1512. The event of founding St. Augustine did not take place until 1565, fifty-three years after the first landing of DeLeon. On the 8th day of May, 1565, Pedro Menendez de Aviles, at the head of some of Spain's most valiant knights, landed on the shores of Florida, and planted the banner of Spain, proclaiming Philip II. the ruler of the whole continent of North America. I was up early Wednesday morning, ready to "take in" the city. The first place I visited was old Fort Marion, which stands at the Northeastern end of the town. The walls are twenty-one feet high, with bastions at each corner. It was begun in 1696 and completed in 1756, being the oldest fortification in the United States. Its first name was "San Juan de Pinos," afterwards changed to "San Marco," and upon the change of flags, in 1821, to its present name. The fort is built of coquina. The Appalachian Indians were employed upon it for more than sixty years. The Fort occupies about four acres of ground. The main entrance was by a draw bridge. Over the doorway of the entrance is sculptured on a block of stone the Spanish coat of arms, surmounted by the globe and cross, and a lamb beneath. Immediately under the coat of arms is this inscription in Spanish. (I give the translation in English as I find it in Bloomfield's Guide): "Don Ferdinand the VI., King of Spain, and the Field Marshal Don Alonzo Ferdinand de Horeta being Governor and Captain General of this place, St. Augustine and its province, this Fort was finished in the year 1756. The works were directed by the Captain-Engineer Don Pedro de Brossary Gary."

On entering, you find yourself in the court or parade ground, one hundred feet square. Inside there are twenty-seven casemates thirty-five feet long and eighteen feet wide. These casemates were used for different purposes. The casemate in front of the sally-port has on each side as you enter it a niche that was used for holy water vessels, and at the end is an altar; above the altar is a niche where was at one time an image of some saint or martyr of the church. This was the chapel where service was held. In another bomb proof is a raised platform; this is supposed to have been the judgment hall where court-martial was held. Under the north east bastion we find a dark, gloomy dungeon, twenty feet long, six feet wide and nearly five feet high, where not a ray of light can penetrate. This was once built up and cut off from all communication with the rest of the fort. There are two other dungeons. If walls could talk, no doubt they could tell some wonderful tales. There are rumors that iron cages and human bones were found in those dungeons years ago, but I can't vouch for the certainty of the rumors. In 1665, when Captain Davis, the English pirate, plundered St. Augustine, the fort was constructed of wood, octagonal in shape. History says that on the arrival of Mendez, in 1665, he immediately constructed a wooden fort. It was demolished by Sir Francis Drake in 1586. Gov. Moore, of South Carolina, captured St. Augustine in 1702, and held the town for three months. Before he withdrew he burned the city. He, however, failed to capture the fort. Gen. Oglethorpe demolished the fort in 1740, but did no injury beyond a few scars on its sea-front, the marks of which are yet visible.

The Spanish cathedral, Governor's palace, old slave market, plaza with Confederate monument, city gates, pyramids where the remains of Major Dade and his one hundred and seven comrades who were massacred by the Indians are interred are all places of note, but I have not time to say more of them. At 11:15 Thursday morning I took the train for Jacksonville. This beautiful city (the Indian name "Wacca Piliatka," meaning "cow yard") is on the north bank of the St. John's River. Its present name was given