CHALLENGE AND REPLY.

From W. L. M'Calla to Miss Frances Wright.

Miss Wright: That you received the letter which you have since published, and that you really believed it to be a challenge written and sent by myself, I cannot doubt, but I sincerely assure you that I never wrote that or any other challenge to you, and had no thought of any other person writing one in my name, until I received your acceptance of the challenge through the mail. Even then I did not feel at liberty to act in the business, because I thought it quite probable that the letter addressed to me in your name was a forgery. The statements contained in the spurious letter concerning the Moderator and the building, are not only incorrect at present, but are likely to remain so. It is also essentially defective in inviting a discussion, without proposing any definite subject of debate. As I am far from loving disputation for its own sake, this is a matter of indispensable importance. As your letter declares that you are "most willing to meet" me "as proposed" in the spurious invitation, that is on the whole ground of difference between us, you will, probably, have no objection to such a selection of topics as will greatly facilitate and curtail the discussion. I therefore propose the following questions.

1. Do the *Presbyterians* aim at the legal establishment of their *Church*?

2 Do the *Liberals* aim at the legal establishment of their *Temple*?

Among the *Liberals*, I embrace those editors and others who make loud professions of their love of liberty, and who accuse the denomination of Christians to which I belong of aiming at an ecclesiastical establishment. Under the word *Temple* I embrace your *Halls of Science*, and other parts of your system of *reformation*. These questions will permit me to say as little as I please, and you to say as much as you please. If the subjects meet with your approbation, I hope and believe that the terms of meeting will give but little trouble. Miss Wright's answer will oblige

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, Aug. 20, 1829.

To the Editor of the Democratic Press.

Sir, The letter of Mr. McCalla as given in your paper of the 21st inst, is calculated to excite some surprise, not only in myself but in that portion of the Philadelphia public who attended the discourse pronounced against me and the "system of knowledge" he supposed me to advocate, a few weeks since in the church where he presides.

Upon that occasion, Mr. McCalla, at the close of a philippic of whose style I shall say nothing, and to which the public journals and he himself (by means of a correspondence in your colums) have given additional notoriety —at the close of that philippic Mr. McCalla gave a public challenge to me or to any of my friends to enter with him into a public investigation of the subject he had that day professed to discuss, namely my "system of knowledge." In consequence one of my friends waited upon Mr. McCalla, and asked him whether he was really disposed to hold to his proposition; that, if so, he might communicate it to me. He replied distinctly in the affirmative. In consequence, the gentleman wrote to me communicating this confirmation of the public challenge of which I had previously received information from another quarter.

Before the receipt of this invitation (conveyed with Mr. McCalla express consent) I had perused, in your paper of August 15. Mr. McCalla's reply to those journals who had commented on the style and matter of his pulpit attack on my character, (for, it would appear, my views had been left out of the question.)

I refer you, Sir and the public to that communication (in your paper of the 15th inst.) as sufficient explanation why I did not think proper to accede to the offered meeting, when no security was given for the style and behaviour of the challenger in the discussion.—Abuse I never resent; to rudeness I never reply; but neither do I ever voluntarily expose myself to either. Nor, in my character of a moral teacher, would I ever willingly afford an opportunity for the public to hear intemperate language, nor a temptation to a misguided fellow creature to give utterance to it.

I had consequently, determined to let the matter pass unnoticed, when I received the letter which Mr. McCalla pronounces spurious, and which conveyed exactly the same challenge which had been given by him in public and in private, but supplied the additional information that Doctors Ely and Janeway would preside on the occasion. The name of Dr Janeway furnished an assurance, that decorum would not be violated; individuals opposed to him even in opinion uniting with the voice of his private friends in pronouncing him, in manners and mind, a gentleman. Fully satisfied on the only point which could have made me decline a challenge on such a ground as that proposed, that is to say, *the investigation of my own views as expressed in my public discourses and writings*, I answered in acceptance of the challenge, as tendered *by Mr. McCalla himself from the pulpit*, no less than by the writer of the letter which Mr. McCalla disavows.

Why, then, does Mr. McCalla, in disavowing the letter, profess ignorance of the grounds of the challenged of which my reply expressed acceptance? He says, too, that the letter which he disclaims "is essentially defective in inviting a discussion, without proposing any definite subject of debate." This, with respect to the letter, from whatever quarter it came, is incorrect. It distinctly states the ground of the challenge to be the same as that Mr. McCalla had proposed for the topic of his late discourse, publicly advertised in the Philadelphia papers, and which reads in the advertisement, as follows;

"Miss Frances Wright's 'system of knowledge' will undergo a candid examination, in the 8th Presbyterian church by the pastor of that church, on the afternoon of the 26th July, at half past 3 o'clock."

At the close of the discourse Mr. McCalla challenged me by name to investigate with him *the subject had professed to canvass*—my "system of knowledge." The disclaimed letter prefers a similar challenge on a similar ground—a deeper investigation of my views as exhibited in my lectures and writings. Nothing could be more clear than all this. The letter, let it be written by whom it may, does not affect the question of the challenge, nor the subject it proposed for investigation; although it might well affect my acceptance of it, from the reason above mentioned. Let Mr. McCalla supply, what it professed to declare, the presence of suitable moderators; and I will meet him upon the ground he himself proposed from his own pulpit in the ears of his congregation. He then impeached my principles and the system of knowledge I had developed, and challenged me to their public investigation. As I said before, so do I now repeat, I am ready on that ground to meet him—in church or theatre, market house or public square. Truth is truth, whether stones and mortar surround us or the free air of heaven.

The principles I have developed have rung in the ears of a large portion of the American nation. The Free Enquirer has also weekly an extensive and attentive perusal. The seeds I have sown as a lecturer and a writer are now germinating in the public mind. East and West, North and South have I labored, and (if life and strength remain to me) shall I labor, to multiply and foster the seeds already sown. If my views be unsound, of high import is it that their error should be exposed.—This nation at large are interested in the exposure, and I no less than the nation.

I will meet Mr. McCalla, with the security of suitable moderators, on the ground he first proposed. Should he shrink from that ground and propose to substitute another, or other (as I regret to see he has attempted in the letter which I find addressed to me in your paper of the 21st inst.) the public will of course conclude that, upon reflection he has found himself unequal to the task of refuting what he has found it easy to abuse.

FRANCES WRIGHT.

NEWS.

New-York, Aug. 1829.

Assault and Battery—Samuel Sandford, aged 64, was indicted for having beaten Elisha Elles, whose age appeared upon a par with the defendants.—A Mr. Bennet who witnessed the transaction, stated they were both drunk, & one as much to blame as the other.—Verdict, Not Guilty.

The Columbian Gazette, a paper recently established in the district of Columbia, edited by Mr. Homans, late clerk in the Navy department, alleges the following striking instances of the President's want of acquaintance with the things pertaining to his high station —to say nothing of his orthography. We state, says the editor, "what came within our own knowledge and observation:"

Col. Samuel D. Harris, the Marshal at Boston, having heard that another person had applied for his office, was fearful he might lose it; he therefore wrote to his friend Col. Towson, who sent his letter to Mr. Van Buren, knowing that Marshals held their office under the State Department. Mr Van Buren in turn sends the letter to the President with a line or two hastily written and scarcely legible; after pondering over the matter two or three weeks, the President endorses, either on Col. Harris' letter or Mr. V. B's scrawl, 'referred to the Navy Department.'

Among the one thousand and one applications which the President has doubtless received since his induction into office, there was one for the appointment of Naval Officer at some port, and another for the command of a Revenue Cutter; certainly any clerk in any one of the Departments, and probably many school boys, could have told him that these appointments were made by the Secretary of the Treasury; but he, in his wisdom, endorses on each of these applications, 'referred to the Navy Department.' Yet these same letters passed through the hands of his Secretary of the Navy without the error being detected. The President might have thought that a Revenue Cutter belonged to the Navy and a Naval Officer was an Officer of the Navy, but we will not undertake to interpret his thoughts.

GINGER BEER.

Take of loaf sugar ½ lb.—White ginger bruised 1 oz.—Cream and Tartar ½ oz.—Boilingwater 1 gallon.

The yellow fever prevailed to an alarming degree in N. Orleans in the middle of August. From thirty to fifty persons are said to be carried off daily.

Mysterious.—On Wednesday morning last, a new born babe, a male, was found before the door of a dwelling of a door in this borough. The little fellow was bundled up quite comfortably, and cried out lustily for assistance. As yet the inhuman parent has not been discovered.—*Easton Argus.*

HORRID TRANSACTION.

Elizabethtown, Ky. Aug. 10.—We learn by a letter, that a fatal transaction took place in Hancock county, on Saturday the 16th ult. The following are the particulars as detailed in the letter, and as we received them from a gentleman of this county who passed the neighbourhood of the occurrence since the act was committed.

A difficulty had arisen on Saturday between a man by the name of Robert Hogg, living on the bank of the Ohio river, and a Mr. Lowery M'Cully, who lately resided in Grayson county. The parties separated on Saturday in anger, but no violence passed between them. On Sunday night following, M'Cully collected a parcel of select friends and repaired to the private dwelling of Mr. Hogg, for the purpose of satiating his vengeance upon its inmates. The first act of depredation committed by them was killing the trusty dog who warned his master of their approach. They next shot through the window into the house: then attacked the door, through which they fired 15 or 20 musket shot. By this time, it appears Hogg thought them really in earnest and determined to stop their unhallowed career. Accordingly he levelled his rifle and fired at one of the besiegers, which proved to be M'Cully himself. The shot took effect and passed immediately through the centre of the body, which caused instant death.

The affair then terminated. The besieged escaped uninjured, and the assailants retreated with loss of a companion in wickedness, promising themselves no doubt, never to engage in an affair of the kind for the future. It is truly lamentable, that reason and deliberate reflection, had not been permitted to exercise their influence, before the commission of this unlawful outrage. Let this be another, to the almost numberless warnings, of the impropriety of perpetrating, and the just decrees of Providence in punishing such rash and inconsiderate crimes.

Hogg delivered himself up to the proper authority and plead self defence; was tried by an examining court, and honorably acquitted.

"Talking of storms," said an honest Irishman, to-day, to a friend of ours, at Wilmington last summer, we had the heaviest I ever saw in my life, considering the size of the town.

An Irishman's idea of Insurance.—A recently "caught" son of the Emerald Isle, was "being," (as the phrase is) lighted to his lodgings in the cockloft of one of those Babel-like Hotels so common in New York. After ascending some dozen flight of stairs, Pat came all at once to a dead stand still. "Now, by the powers hinny," said he addressing his guide, who was likewise an Irishman, I dos'ent budge anither inch; for look you, should the edifice take fire, what is to become of Patrick O'Flam, roosting half way up to the moon; No, no, I'd rather hang on a peg, in one of the lower rooms—so I had! Now, did you ever hear the beat o' that said he with the light talk of the house burning up when it is *Insured*? That's an Irish bull, shure enough! "*Insured!*" cried Pat, why did'ent you tell me that before? So then pull a-head, my hearty and I'll follow you, an'ye like it, to the top o' the chimney.

From "Madden's Turkey, Egypt," &c.

Comforts to Fig Eaters.—The misfortune of the Society of the Merchants of Smyrna is, that the subject of figs is ever the fruitful theme of conversation. You ask about the gardens of Baurnabut, and you hear that figs abound there; you inquire about the curiosities of the place, and they lead you to the fig mart. You solicit information on politics, and you are told that figs are low; and when you seek no further intelligence, you are told that figs are flat. In short, go where you will, the eternal topic is figs! figs! figs! and the very name I apprehend, will be found written on their hearts at a decease.

A more disgusting operation than the picking of figs I never witnessed. In an immense warehouse, the fruit lay strewed over the floor, and fifty or sixty squalid women with mewing infants set squatted on the heap, picking and stretching the fruit, and overcoming its tenacity with saliva and manipulations I saw the dirty children mauling the figs, and got out of the way as quickly as I could, lest I should witness any thing worse! I made a vow against figs!!!

Anti-Societies.—The following are but a small number of the Anti-Societies recently formed or proposed.

Anti-dunning-a-man-to-death-Society.

Anti-going-to-sleep-with-a-candle-burning-society.

Anti-eating-too-much-society.

Anti-use-too-little-exercise-society.

Anti-snuff-and-chewing-tobacco society.

Anti-ladies'-lace-yourselves-too-tight-society.

Anti-go-to-sleep-at-church-society.

Anti-going-to-church-more-with-the view-of-seeing-and-being-seen-than with-the intention-of-listening-*to* or—profiting-*by*-the-admonitions-of-the—preacher-Society.

The Sunday Schools of Baltimore recently assembled in Howard's Park, where religious exercises were performed. The number of Teachers & Scholars present, amounted to about 5000!

Communications.

To Mr. JOHN LEEDS KERR, Esq.

IN your usual gasconading style, in the outset of your hand bill, you attempt to denounce all "anonymous scribblers against you as utterers of *falsehoods*." If by this mode of treating the expression of facts and opinions you expect to awe into silence, or to hush the deep toned sentiments that pervade the district against you, you will be egregiously at fault; and if persisted in, you may call forth an epithet or two, that you will find it no easy matter to digest. That no other manin the district except yourself could be found with sufficient "effrontery" to proclaim all the charges against you, en masse, *false* and unfounded, whilst upon the same paper you in as many words admit our most aggravated charges and labour through *five columns* of a long hand bill to obviate and explain away, will readily be admitted—Thus you convict yourself in your own hand bill, of that *falsehood* which you would fain saddle on others! One charge against you was that you cautiously withheld the *publick* expression of your sentiments on all subjects of vital feeling and interest to the people, and you admit it by saying "you did communicate them to some of the leaders" of the party. Now these communications no doubt were made to leaders separate and alone, so that there could be no comparison between what you said to one, with what you said to another. Was this mode of conveying your sentiments designed or not, to shield you from being clearly and unequivocally understood? And if it was not, why not come out *publickly* and let every man judge *alike* of your sentiments! It is now obvious to every one that when you are compelled to make a feint of coming out with the decided expression of your sentiments (whether by anonymous scribblers or others) you couple your commendation with such an insidious insinuation against the peculator, as leaves the doubting yet in doubt, whether you are yet decisive, and not disposed to cast a general censure on what you profess to commend.

You seem to rely much upon our omission to note particular votes or acts of yours in congress which are excepted to, whilst consoling yourself with this reflection you seem to forget that a single article of ordinary length would not contain more than a bird's eye view of your intricate & devious course. If, just for the same reason suffice for the present that we present only one or two '*specific*' points of objection, and when you shall have attempted a specific explanation of these we may perhaps find it not very inconvenient to trouble you with a few more.—None we trust can be found more ready than we, to concur with you that members on the floor of congress ought to hold themselves above the low *abuse* & slang of electioneering against a presidential candidate, nor should he play the lawyer & oppose on grounds which he does not *believe true* & strictly tenable—so ought not every honest & respectable citizen every where, whether in congress or out of it. But it is the bounden duty of every man when he has formed opinions of men or measures upon grounds which are not likely to be erroneous, to be frank, decisive, & bold in the expression of those opinions—This course is useful to aid & secure the right conduct & safety of those who have not as good opportunities of gathering correct information & extensive knowledge as those we put into high offices, where they have all the facilities and opportunities of getting such information.—It is essential when candidly & honestly uttered, to guard us against the falsehoods & deceptions of designing men. He who shall hold a doctrine contrary to this, is a canting hypocrite & an insidious enemy to the *real* people, instead of their friend.

Now Sir you have been in congress four years, possessing all the facilities of light that could be thrown on the subject, with every opportunity that any other man in the country could have—you saw a party organized avowedly to pull down the late administration "although they might be as pure as the angels of Heaven"—you heard on the floor of congress charges of the deepest dye—of bargain & corruption, of wasteful & profligate expenditure of the publick money, of every crime almost in the catalogue of sins against the late administration—Did you believe them guilty? then how could you remain their friend? Did you believe them innocent of those foul charges? then why refuse to utter such belief? why remain *unlike* every other man in Congress, silent as the tomb? Is this your mode of serving the people, the "real" people? I fancy it will be determined that in thus acting you looked to serving yourself alone!—It was of the last importance to us to do right in the selection of a president; we might lose our liberties by making a mistake in this important choice, *we had a right to your testimony*, to the truth or falsehood of those allegations made in this eventful case—you now affect to think that your independence & dignity would have been seriously involved had you appeared before the "real people" in this great trial—important to their well being, their happiness, & the enjoyment of those liberties which have thus far been sacredly handed down to them. There is in truth so much sophistry in this, that we are compelled to believe that your "real" reason was a fear, that at the end of the contest you might find yourself on the weak side!

You profess to be friendly to the late administration; then why did you vote for the Jackson instead of the Adams speaker of the House.—you will not deny that the appointment of a speaker favourable or unfavourable to the existing administration is calculated to promote or retard by the arrangement of committees, the measures of any administration, in an eminent degree—This we presume you will not have the "effrontery" to deny—Then were you friendly to Mr. Adams's administration & hostile to the *measures* of his administration? If so, you are in a dilemma which we again should be glad to see your ingenuity taxed to extricate you from. Perhaps you may have been actuated by some private pique against the man, because he may not have estimated sufficiently high your dignity & independence"—we can hardly suppose you proposed to embarrass the measures of your friend's administration, because of any insignificant personal pique against the man who was a speaker.—On your assumed ground of liberality towards any president, you ought to have been anxious to give to Mr. Adams's measures, had you ever been opposed to him as president, a fair & prompt report & hearing of his proposed measures by sustaining a speaker who would so advance them—then why were you so extremely inconsistent as to vote for a speaker, who you know was violently opposed to Mr. Adams & who would avail himself of his office, as he did, to cripple in their incipient conception the measures of your friend's administration, by throwing in the back ground on the committees such of his friends as were able to do most justice to them & who so organized the committees as to throw every obstacle in the way of a fair report & view and consideration of them! these are a few of your acts of inconsistency, with your professions to the friends of Mr. Adams, for which no sound motive can be seen; & if you can reconcile them it is perhaps more than any other intelligent man in the district can do—when you shall have done so, we will propose some others, which you will be called on to notice.

We set out with the alligations that you never have acted for the *benefit* of the people in any office you have held, and we will add, whether, as a member of Congress, or as the holder of the fattest office ever held in the State of Maryland, with but one exception—that you never have nor never will express your sentiments *publickly* on matters of vital interest and feeling to the people, where the final issue is *doubtful*. You have as yet offered no evidence of any *service* you have ever rendered the people; the "real" people, unless flattery be a service, and you have in your late hand-bill, admitted our second charge, and have further proved that while playing the balance master between parties, if you elevate one side with *one hand*, how nicely you can depress it again with *the oth r*.

ONE OF THE MANY.

Sept. 9th 1829.

Centreville Times,
& (E. S.) PUBLIC ADVERTISER

MEN AND MEASURES.

Centreville, (E. S.) Md.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1829;

☞ Our kind Correspondent of the Easton Gazette, informed us by mail, on Wednesday last, that Mr. Goldsborough, declines the nomination to Congress. And in a notification to the Chairman to that effect, assigns his reasons.

☞ There was no nomination of a Jackson candidate for congress, at Hillsborough, last Thursday.

The Camp-Meeting held by the Associated Methodists for Kent Circuit, this week, was a most excellent one—it concluded on Tuesday.

The President and several other preachers of high character were there. And we witnessed more engagedness in singing and in prayer, then at any other Camp-meeting we were ever at. Much good was done, and some fifty or sixty persons professed to find the pearl of great price.

The whole of the two last nights was consumed in singing and in praying and there were witnesses arose with the Sun to tell the power and the godness of Almighty God.

AN OVERSEER,

Wanted, for the next year, a single man, or a middle aged man, he must be well acquainted with the management of hands, his recommendations must be the best.

THOMAS HEMSLEY.

Sept. 12, 3t. Head of Wye.

WANTED,

IMMEDIATELY, A MILLER, to take charge of my Mill—To one who can come well recommended for capacity, sobriety, honesty, &c. liberal wages will be given.

SAMUEL RINGGOLD, Jr.

Near Chestertown, Md. }
Sept. 4th 1829. }

☞ The Delaware Journal and the Centreville Times, will publish the above notice 4 times and send their accounts to the subscriber for payment.

Sheriff's Sale.

BY Virtue of 3 Writs of Vendi. Exps. Issued out of Queen Ann's County court, to me directed, one at the suit of Garrett Garrettson and Thomas Walker, trading under the firm of Garrett Garrettson & Co. use of Thomas Walker; and one at the suit of Valentine W. Devorix, and one at the suit of George Meginnis, use of William Warner, against Vincent Benton, will be sold on

Saturday the 3d day of October next,

Between the hours of 10 and 5 o'clock of that day the following property to Wit:—

One Tract of Land, called SARAH'S PORTION,

Containing 100 Acres,

more or less.

Seized and taken in Execution and will be sold for Cash, to satisfy the above mentioned Writs, Debt, Interest and Cost, due, and to become due, thereon.

Thos. Ashcom,

Sept. 12th At *Sheriff.*