

STAUNTON SPECTATOR AND GENERAL ADVERTISER.

Staunton Spectator.

STAUNTON, V.A.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1861.

The STAUNTON SPECTATOR having as large a circulation as any paper published in Western Virginia, has no superior in this section of country as an advertising medium.

We have been compelled, for want of space, to postpone the publication of a number of communications as well as congressional proceedings and editorial matter prepared for this issue.

We have been requested to state that Hon. A. H. H. Stuart will address the people on Monday next.

Look to it.

For the purpose of deceiving the people that they may accomplish their designs, the secessionists prefer to be the best friends of the Union, and are endeavoring to persuade the people that the only way to save the Union is for Virginia and all the other States to secede that they may intimidate the North by presenting a united front. This view is plausible and calculated to deceive those who are not acquainted with the game the disunionists are playing for the purpose of imposing upon good Union men. If they can inveigle the people of Virginia to consent to the secession of the State, it will never be in the Union again. The proper position for Virginia is in the Union, and there is where she can be of potential influence with some effect for its preservation or reconstruction. If she remains in the Union, she can exercise, as mediator, great influence with both the North and the South; but if she will go out her influence will be lost, and she will be irretrievably blotted to the eye of the Cotton States. There is a fixed purpose on the part of the secessionists to precipitate Virginia into immediate secession. We warn the people in that they may guard against their cunning machinations. "Never give up the ship," but stick to it as the mariner clings to the last plank when darkness and tempest close around him.

"A Crafty Legislator."

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

If the United States and the seceding States should become involved in war, the seceding States would be enemies of the United States; and those who would be engaged in levying war against the United States, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort, would be guilty of treason. The 3rd. section of the 3rd article of the Constitution of the United States says:

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them; or in aiding and abetting their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

The "Praeceptor" or Seybert's Gun.

When we saw the model of the wonderful gun, invented by Lorenzo Seybert, of this county, and patented by McCaugh & Seybert, we gave a noise of what it promised to be. A few days since we saw the gun as it was designed to be, and as it has been made at the factory in Harper's Ferry, and we may say that we believe it to be the best gun we have ever seen. It will shoot forty times in a minute, and Mr. Seybert says, will carry a half a distance of a mile with considerable accuracy and force. We do not desire to give a detailed description of this gun, or to review its many good qualities. The best report is given by the gun itself!

A Reflections Idea.

The idea that free trade would secure for the Southern Confederacy the friendship of England is fallacious. The "London Times," which expresses the sentiment of England, says:

"The free commerce which might be opened at Charleston or New Orleans would fail to produce cordial relations with a Confederacy which would be pledged to promote the indefinite extension of slavery, even if it were not tempted to revive the slave trade."

Virginia Commissioners.

The Legislator appointed Mrs. Wm. C. Birge, Mrs. G. W. Summers, Ex-President Tyler, Judge J. W. Brookesbrough and John A. Seddon Commissioners to visit Washington, to confer with Commissioners from other States on the 1st of February—the first two named are Union men, and the other three secessionists.

Scession of Georgia.

On Saturday last, the Observation of Georgia adopted an ordinance of secession by a vote of 260 to 80.

Hon. A. H. Stephens, Hon. Herschel V. Johnson, and Hon. Bell, the best men Georgia has, were opposed to the ordinance.

Conflicting reports have been made from the Select Committee of the House of Representatives, and Mr. Adams, Republican, has withdrawn his name to the majority report so as to prevent that the Southern members have shown any new willingness to accept anything that the North may yield in the way of compromise.

Our opinion.

Whichever contend to much space to highly important subjects that right we expect give our undivided attention. We regret that we have not been more fully informed.

What we have to vote, when a question of importance arises, is to determine whether it is

best to accommodate the South, or to stand by them in their opposition.

What we have to do, when a question of importance arises, is to determine whether it is

best to accommodate the South, or to stand by them in their opposition.

Mr. Simms, Jan. 17, 1861.

We the undersigned citizens of the Mt. Sidney District, being impelled with the alarming consciousness of the Federal Union, consisting of twenty states, and wishing Virginians to remain a constituent part of the confederacy which constitutes our country. Knowing the anxiety which all true patriots must feel in regard to the conduct of public affairs, I am impelled by a sense of responsibility to you, to give you such information, and such words of counsel, as seem to me appropriate to the occasion.

The first day of the session, Richmond has been the scene of unexampled excitement. The discussions from all parts of the State have been in full force, and have sought to bring every influence to bear to precipitate Virginia into succession and civil war. It will be for the people to determine, whether their efforts shall be crowned with success. It behoves them to be vigilant, if they value the peace of the country, and desire to escape the burthen of military service and girdling taxation. If secession takes place, in my judgment, civil war is inevitable, and the people who expect their taxes to be doubled, if not quadrupled. State bonds are now selling, in New York, at a discount of twenty-five per cent, and it is idle to talk of borrowing money. It must be raised, and raised in millions of dollars, by taxation. The newspaper informs us, that in South Carolina, negroes are, at the early stage of their struggle, taxed sixteen dollars per head, and that the government has resorted to forced loans from the banks and property holders. One case is mentioned, in which a merchant, with a capital of \$40,000, was compelled to loan to the State \$8,000.

Sooner or later, the burden must fall on the landholders. Slave stocks, bonds and other personal property, may be sold and converted, but the land must remain, to bear the brunt of taxation. It is proper that you should understand this, that you may vote intelligently on the questions which will soon be submitted to your deliberation at the polls.

I do not propose, in this brief letter, to enter into a elaborate discussion of the documents of the Convention, or to point out all the disastrous consequences that would flow from it. It will suffice to say, that it is a doctrine of New England origin. It had its birth among the Federalists of that section of the Union, during the war of 1812, and was nurtured in the celebrated Hartford Convention. In 1814, it was denounced by such Republicans as Speaker Roane, and Mr. Ritchie, as treason. While I do not endorse the language of the Convention to the last pluck when darkness and tempest close around him.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

The "Spectator" has a very silly and indefensible article under the above caption, in which the author, by nearly a unanimous vote, with having "pledged Virginia to fight the battles of South Carolina." This is all terrible, and an abominable attempt at raw-headed-and-bloody-bone to frighten the people.—Fiction.

We clip the above from the last issue of the "Vindicator." We will not discuss the propriety of the use of the epithets with which the "Vindicator" has covered its article. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* We think the "Vindicator" would have vindicated itself more successfully against the application of its own choice epithets if it had met the argument of the article it denounces, instead of contesting itself with applying epithets to it. The argument was this: If South Carolina (or any other seceding State) be, as she claims, a foreign nation to the United States, and she and the United States should become involved in war, that is Virginia, whilst still allies of the United States, should take up arms against the Government of the United States, they would be guilty of treason. On the contrary, if South Carolina (or any other seceding State) were still, notwithstanding her ordinance of secession, a member of the Union, her citizens were under obligations to obey the laws of the United States, and any armed resistance to their execution on the part of South Carolinians or Virginians, would be rebellion against their own Government.

