

CHARITON COURIER.

C. P. VANDIVER, Editor and Proprietor.

MAN WAS MADE TO HUSTLE.

TERMS: 1.00 A YEAR IF PAID IN ADVANCE. IF NOT PAID IN ADVANCE, 2.00.

VOLUME XXVI.

KEYTESVILLE, MISSOURI, FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 1897.

NUMBER 22.

I Doubt It.

The editor of the COURIER thinks that he knows what he is talking about in the matter at issue between him and myself, but there is wide room for doubt yet. The main issue was presented by my critic as follows: "Only bitterness and neighborhood divisions are their fruits." This assertion as to debates pertaining to a matter of fact, and must stand or fall upon testimony. Having had wide experience and large observation I stated that I had not observed these alleged fruits. How does my critic try to offset this testimony? Listen: "From the gentleman's own confession he has a bad case of 'theological habit' and is not in a position to consider the subject from an unprejudiced standpoint." Shades of Hamilton! Experience and observation disqualify one to testify as to a matter of fact involved in his experience and observation! If lack of experience and observation qualify one to testify, my critic is a most competent witness, for he does not pretend to have either. His opinion is purely a matter of prejudice, unsupported by any of the factors necessary to enable one to form an intelligent judgment. He ought to present some evidence or admit that he spoke hastily and from prejudice.

But I am detected in two errors.

Firstly: My quotations are not exact. And here the preachers generally are given the benefit of quite a lecture on the importance of always citing the exact language of scripture. Now, unfortunately, my critic was born too late in the world's history for his wisdom to be effective. He should have been present when the Savior and his apostles lived to correct their "haphazard" way of quoting the "written word." Many of the New Testament quotations from the Old Testament are substance quotations and not word for word quotations. I hide myself among my illustrious predecessors and let the CHARITON COURIER'S censure fall upon them.

Secondly: I inadvertently credited Jude's language to Paul. Now, is not that awful?

My critic does not condemn contention for principle, and says that he was contending for principle in the campaign last fall. Is it possible that he regards a question in politics as out-ranking in importance the will of the Lord Jesus Christ? The master's controversies with the Jews pertained largely to their traditions which made void the commandments of God. My contention is that sprinkling and pouring are human inventions and traditions which can not be traced in history beyond the middle of the third century, and that they make void immersion which is Christ's command I contend also that infant baptism is an invention and tradition of men which can not be traced beyond the last quarter of the second century, and that it makes void Christ's command to baptize believers. Thus it is seen that the matter involves a vital principle of vastly more importance than the money standard, or any other question pertaining to human government.

I contend also that "orthodox" teaching as to the pardon of sin makes void the design of Christian baptism as set forth in the scriptures. My critic expresses his negative theology on this subject as follows: "But not that by, in or through, the act (of baptism) by any mode, the sins of any human being have ever been or ever will be washed away or remitted." Reciprocating my friend's kindness I advise him to restudy the foregoing statement in the light of the scriptures. "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"—John 3:5. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark 16:16. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts 2:38. "And now why tarriest

thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."—Acts 22:26.

This is enough for one lesson and I hope my friend will read, reflect and digest. As long as human teaching contradicts the plain word of God as contained in the foregoing passages, I feel constrained to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints." When men contradict the "written word" a vital principle is involved by the side of which all merely earthly questions pale into insignificance.

I am sorry that my critic resorts to the old editorial chestnut of charging me with exhibiting "choler." It is no uncommon thing for a secular editor to accuse a preacher who puts him into a "hole" of being "mad." The ruse is hardly creditable to journalism, and will not work. Especially is it not the proper thing when the article which is made the occasion of the charge, is withheld. I was as calm as a May morning when I wrote my former critique, and really wrote in the spirit of amusement.

Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for the courtesy of the use of your columns, I am, Respectfully,
J. B. BRINEY.

Moberly, Mo., June 21st, '97.

Criminal Matters.

The case of the state vs. Grant Littleton, the 11-year-old son of N. J. Littleton, who lives on the Samuel Dismore farm about four miles southeast of town, was tried before 'Squire DeMoss last Tuesday. He was charged, on the complaint of Richard Hayes, col., with destroying public property by breaking the window glass at the colored school-house in the Hurt district. Hayes detected the boy in the very act, and the defendant also confessed his guilt to Albert Smith, another white boy. The Littleton boy was accompanied by Alonzo Coy, a white boy of about his own age, when he committed the depredation. This young vandal has been causing people in that vicinity considerable annoyance for a year past by repeated depredations, in the way of pillaging water-melon patches, opening gates and other specie of bad boy deviltry. The case was tried by the court without a jury and the defendant was fined \$5 and costs. In view of the tender years of the boy and the further fact that the payment of the fine and costs would work a hardship to defendant's father, Prosecuting Attorney Collet as an act of humanity recommended and consented that defendant be released on his good behavior, but that if, at any time within six months, he should be guilty of any similar acts of mischief, then execution on the present judgment might issue against him.

John McKean, who was charged with disturbing the peace of Jos. L. Guffey, had his trial before 'Squire Sam'l P. Allen at Sumner last Saturday and was acquitted.

The preliminary hearing of Henry Miller, had before 'Squire Sam'l P. Allen at Sumner last Saturday on a charge of forgery, resulted in the defendant's being bound over to the grand jury at the next October term of circuit court at Keytesville. The facts in the alleged forgery are as follows:

In August, 1896, Henry Mueller, a farmer living near Sumner, wrote to his father living in Adams county, Ill., for the loan of \$60 for a short time. The father directed his bankers to send his son the money. In sending the draft it was made payable to Henry Miller and the letter containing it was so directed. By this means it fell into the hands of another than for whom it was intended—Henry Miller, who lived in the same locality. The man, however, knew it was not for him, for he consulted a friend in the neighborhood concerning the matter, who advised him to cash the draft. This he did, spent the money and now re-

fuses to repay it to the man to whom it belongs. For this offense he is now being prosecuted under the charge of forgery.

B. R. Buffington swore out a warrant before 'Squire John Bayne of Cockrell township for the arrest of Nathan Parks, James Barnes and J. C. Griffen, charging them with trespass by hunting on his land without permission. Mr. Buffington says that he has been annoyed a great deal in this way as well as put to considerable expense through damage to his stock, and that he is determined to put a stop to it by prosecuting all offenders. He has signified his willingness in the present case to permit the three defendants to plead guilty, and if they will do that Mr. B. desires that the court assess a nominal fine, but in case they refuse to enter a plea of guilty he proposes to prosecute them to the full extent of the law.

Pleasant Hicks has had John Moore, Chas. Noah and another party whose name we failed to learn arrested upon a warrant sworn out before 'Squire E. A. Chapman of Cockrell township, charging them with cutting timber on land belonging to E. F. Chapman, and which affiant has leased. The accused will have their trial before 'Squire Chapman next Tuesday, June 29th.

Prosecuting Attorney J. A. Collet received a letter the first of this week from 'Squire Wm. Clark of Clark township stating that a young man had been arrested in that bailwick on a charge of petit larceny. The name of the young man was not given by 'Squire Clark. The trial has been set for next Wednesday, June 30th.

Two Prominent Men Engage in Fisticuffs.

Bad blood between Walter Hyde and Geo. West, both of near Keytesville, over a rent settlement, was the cause of two fights last Saturday between those two well-known and prominent citizens. Lute Hyde, a brother to Walter, also got into the city mill of justice and paid \$5 and costs in toll for striking Mr. West while he was under arrest. As is always the case under such circumstances it has been impossible to get at a statement of facts that receives the corroboration of all the eye-witnesses of the affair. Just before the first fight began the two gentlemen met in front of Chapman Bros. place of business and began to talk about the matter at issue. It had been agreed, it seems, a few days previous that Mr. Hyde would accept \$52.30 in full discharge of rent due him from Mr. West. When they met, Mr. West informed him that he had just left that amount in the Farmers' bank for him. Mr. Hyde understood him to say that he had left \$52.20 and informed him that the amount he had deposited was not in accordance with the agreement. This brought on a war of words, the final outcome of which was, according to Mr. West's statement, that Mr. Hyde called him a liar and thereupon the fight began. A gentleman who was sitting in a few feet of them contradicts this statement and says that Mr. Hyde had begun to walk away, and had gotten off a few feet when Mr. West applied to him the most opprobrious epithet known in our language and at the same time struck at or struck him—thus being the aggressor both in word and assault.

Both men were placed under arrest by the marshal. It was while he was in charge of the marshal that Lute Hyde struck Mr. West. Lute was also placed under arrest and all three men arraigned before the mayor, where, on a plea of guilty, each received a fine of \$5 and costs, making in each case between \$9 and \$10.

Not long after the first fight, Mr. West was sitting in front of the Key-

tesville Mercantile Co.'s store-room when he saw a man enter the Farmers' bank, whom he took to be Lute Hyde. Still fighting mad from the treatment he had received from that gentleman, West followed into the bank intending to give Lute a thrashing. Seeing it was Walter instead of Lute Hyde, and not being satisfied with the result of their former set to he proceeded to assault Walter the second time. Mutual friends, however, interfered before either had sustained any damage. For this second assault Mr. West was again arrested and on Monday was fined another \$5 and costs.

The fights and fines have not settled the matter, but Mr. Hyde has declared the compromise on the rent claim off, and has sued Mr. West for the full amount of the original claim, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$105. Thus a small misunderstanding as to the exact language of one man has already cost two fights, four fines at \$10 each and a law-suit and has resulted in a state of bad blood between neighbors that will not be eradicated in all probability during their life time.

The King of Liars.

J. E. Phillips of Michigan was in town Tuesday. Believing implicitly in his own importance, we suppose he does not wish to arouse local jealousies and contentions for the honor of claiming him for any particular town, and, therefore, he is generous and dedicates his greatness to the entire body of a grateful and admiring constituency.

He came to town to sell bath tubs, but from the fact that he failed to sell a single one, we presume, judging from the immense quantities of the man, his tub is of those huge dimensions, and is the property of an entire populous community at a single bath and was too big for Keytesville. It would have become necessary to divert the course of the Chariton river to run by our very doors in order to have filled it for the annual bath.

He was one of those innately depraved bipeds, or his raising was among such vicious environments, that he professed to believe in the apocryphal nature of female virtue. And his disbelief in the universal dishonesty of the human race was, as the sequel will show, equally traceable to the unfortunate surroundings of the place of his birth.

He was born and his early life was spent amid the sand-hills and mosquito bogs of that portion of this imperial union of free "republics" geographers lay down as the state of New Jersey. Coming as he did by birth from the very center of learning, (?) virtue (?) and refinement (?) he was bound to be patronizing. As illustrating the superiority of that favored country over our unprogressive West, he boastfully told us of a penitentiary in New Jersey that was filled with bank cashiers and railroad presidents. They are so progressive and advanced in Jersey that they lock up juries in civil cases from the time the jury is sworn to the moment of their discharge, and will not even let the sheriff approach to feed and water them, except through the services of an interpreter. He also dwelt at some length on the cuteness of their rich men, who change their domicile annually, between two days, in their successful efforts to elude the assessor.

Oh, but he was a giant sunflower of liars in a garden of dwarf dandelions! He was the Washington monument among monumental liars—the unblushing, unshattering, utter reckless kind. He was one of the kind of liars so filled with his own egotism that he regarded all listeners as fools, and lied without "rhyme or reason."

"No pent up Ulica" could confine the powers of this wonderful product of Jersey humanity to any single business or profession. According to himself he could give points to Blackstone and all the commentators, with all the famous *in primis* advocates thrown in to fill the hand and beat

"Adam Lost a Rib."

Ever since then, from early dawn till "Eve" comes, men have been hunting for a rib. Once in awhile a man will get a spare rib from the packing houses, but he joins the hunt again. We sell ribs. We dress them up in silks and send them on their way to protect men from the storms of life, for men to lean on in old age, for young men to gaily swing them on their arms on sunny days, or to proudly keep step with them on dress parade. We sell seven ribs covered with gloria, with stick handles of natural wood, for 50c. Umbrellas? Yes, our ribs (that are for sale) are all in Umbrellas. No store does better for you than we do in Umbrellas. We carry glorias, both American and English twills—gloria silks, silk serges. We carry all sorts of handles on our Umbrellas, from a peach tree twist to a Madagascar. We sell splendid silk serge Umbrellas for \$1.25. We sell Umbrellas with steel rods for 75c., and steel means steel. We sell Umbrellas for as much as \$3.00, but we sell more of them at \$75c., \$1.45, \$1.65 and \$1.85 than at any other prices, for that'll buy Umbrellas good enough for any of us to carry—or to lose.

Do you think it'll rain to-morrow?

HERBERT WHITE,
MEN'S FURNISHER.
KEYTESVILLE, MO.

them on the "show down" every time. His creative powers were so great that he did not confine himself to individual practice, but has constituted himself counsel extraordinary to the profession, and is now traveling *incognito* as a vendor of bath tubs to advise with the attorneys in important trials in the courts, both civil and criminal. He was up at Liberty the other week during the Foley murder trial and has advised defendant's attorneys how they may surely acquit him, or the state how it may as certainly convict on the next trial.

He gave us an illustration of his originality in desperate emergencies which, though we cannot even faintly reproduce the dramatic effect of his recital, we will try to give, in proof of the transcendent genius of the man.

The *locus in quo* of his exploit was a Michigan town. Living there was one of those kind of lawyers that infest almost every community who had an unmarried female client who desired to levy \$10,000 tribute of a rich resident bachelor under the guise of a suit for seduction under promise of marriage. Doubtless she was a person of unsavory reputation for virtue and veracity (as all this fellow's acquaintances of both sexes seem to be), and having no corroborating or criminating evidence to support her own declaration it became necessary to supply the missing link before her lawyer felt safe in submitting the case to the jury. The rich bachelor was still in blissful ignorance of the conspiracy that was forming against his bank account. In the very nick of the emergency our Jersey "smart Alec" set the machinery of his ponderous brain in motion and soon ground out the following plan to obtain the convincing evidence of the *corpus delicti*. The simplicity (?) of the idea and the potentiality of the proof when it was obtained forcibly illustrates both the artlessness and the fearful power of genius. The rich bachelor wore shirts having those flaps (of uncertain use) on the lower extremity of the bosom, but on which, unfortunately for him, he had placed the initials of his name. The plan, which worked beautifully and smoothly as do all the inventions of real genius, was for the female client to conceal at some convenient place about her person a pair of sharp shears, invite the unsuspecting bachelor to a private interview and in an unguarded moment detach that incriminating flap from his shirt front. The thing was done, and the bachelor lost \$10,000. all on account of that incriminating piece of linen. A Missouri jury would have concluded that a woman who would resort to such tactics didn't have any virtue that could have been damaged, and would have found for defendant. An ordinary lawyer, if he had wanted to obtain that flap in such a manner, would have corrupted the washerwoman as an easier and just as effective way of getting it. There again, though, we discover the subtle distinction between genius and ordinary methods.

We have longed all our life to meet this Jersey kind of liar and blowhard, but never expected to have a personal interview with the chief of his tribe. Our curiosity is now thoroughly satisfied, and we now as sincerely pray he will never come our way again. Vale, Jersey liar, and may you never meet your mate.

Leach vs. Leach.

The case of W. T. Leach against Robert Leach for unlawful detainer came up for trial for the second time last Friday before 'Squire J. M. DeMoss. The testimony was substantially the same as on the former trial, but must have been more conclusive to the jury, as they were not long in bringing in a verdict in favor of the plaintiff. The case has been appealed to circuit court and will probably be tried next October.

This case has aroused considerable interest, if not bitterness, in Missouri township where all the parties reside. And much of this feeling was so manifested at the trial of the case last Friday as put some of the parties to considerable trouble, if it does not result in their being fined for contempt of court. During the progress of the trial and while Capt. Wallace was addressing the jury for the plaintiff, several of the partisans of W. T. Leach indulged in some boisterous demonstrations in his favor, such as clapping of hands and stamping with the feet. Mr. Shaughnessy complained to the court, 'Squire DeMoss, of such a demonstration as a contempt of the court and an attempt to influence the decision of the jury by informing them that the sympathies of his neighbors were with the plaintiff. 'Squire DeMoss said that if Mr. Shaughnessy would make affidavit informing the court of the names of the persons he would summons them for contempt. Accordingly that gentleman did file an affidavit informing him that the plaintiff, W. T. Leach, Bert Webb and John Maddox had to his knowledge, so applauded. The parties were thereupon arrested and upon application the hearing of the matter was postponed to July 2nd, in order to give Capt. Wallace opportunity to be present to conduct the defense.