

LINCOLN PROGRESS.

An Independent Family Newspaper: For the Promotion of the Political, Social, Agricultural and Commercial Interests of the South.

Vol. 1.

LINCOLNTON, N. C., SATURDAY, SEPT. 6, 1873.

NO. 20

Selected Poetry.

Sleep! Warrior Sleep!

Lines written at the grave of General Pettigrew, by George M. Whiting, of Raleigh, N. C., after his return from Sandusky, Ohio, prison, in June, 1865:

Sleep! warrior! sleep! the struggle o'er,
The battle cry is hushed,
Our standards have been lowered,
Our brightest hopes been crushed.

The valiant hosts that rallied,
Our glorious cause to save,
Are now among the conquered
Or with thee in the grave.

Sleep! for thy name is cherished
By the bravest and the best,
And soldiers' hearts and women's tears
Are with thee in thy rest.

And Fame hath brought a laurel crown
And placed it at thy head,
While memory bedews thy grave
With tears, Oh, noble dead!

They told me thou hadst fallen
When in prison I was bound,
By line of armed sentinels
And the waves that rolled around.

And I wept for thee my chieftain,
Went for thy early fall,
A Patriot and a Hero—
Thy name was loved by all.

But here beside thee kneeling
Bright flowers, not tears I give,
For they are treasured in my heart
To shield for those that live!

The flowers I joyfully strew o'er thee
Whose record is unstained,
For thou hast now thy freedom,
While I am left enchained.

Mr. Goodloe's Fourth Letter.

[From the Sentinel.]

WARRENTON, July 30, 1873.

My Dear Sir—Since writing my third letter, the Charlotte Democrat has published a series of essays in reply to me, over the signature of "Hornet," and at the close of them it is announced editorially, that they are from the pen of C. Dowd, Esq., of that place. The author is known to be a gentleman of great personal worth, as well as eminent at the bar; but although he is "native and to the manner born," there is reason to believe that his investigations into the history of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence are of very recent date, and therefore, that they have not been very thorough. If I am correct in this supposition, the fact will explain his facility of falling into numerous and very grave errors of statement and inference.

Before arraigning him, however, on these charges, it is proper I should acknowledge that he has detected a mistake of my own. He says: "There is a copy of the Mecklenburg Declaration in the State Department in Raleigh, in the handwriting of John M. Knitt Alexander, according to the testimony of the late Dr. Samuel Henderson, of Mecklenburg county." The existence of such a paper is admitted by Mr. Goodloe, but his position in regard to it is left in doubt, either intentionally or otherwise on his part. He does not state whether he discredits the testimony of Dr. Henderson as to this paper being in J. M. Knitt Alexander's handwriting, or whether he accepts that as true and still believes the document a forgery. He does, however, very directly assail the credibility of Dr. Henderson's testimony, and he does this by contrasting his certificate with another certificate in relation to the same paper in drawing the conclusion that the one can not be reconciled with the other."

Mr. Dowd has fallen into no less than three errors, while pointing out one of mine. For in the first place he makes Dr. Henderson perform a feat of legerdemain, by certifying in Mecklenburg to a paper "annexed," which at the same time was in the "State Department" in Raleigh. Secondly it is true that I made the mistake of supposing that Dr. Henderson's certificate to the "paper annexed," referred to the one immediately above it, and the inference was natural and legitimate. The fault was in the compiler of the legislative pamphlet who should have stated in connection with the certificate, that the "paper annexed" was not the one above it, but another which had been detached. If this had been done, the certificate of Dr. Henderson to the character of a paper which did not appear, would have been valueless, it is true, but it would not have created confusion. But Mr. Dowd is mistaken in supposing that I have admitted the existence of the paper referred to in Henderson's certificate, as something different from that certified to by J. M. Knitt. The truth is I had not thought of it as different, until on a perusal of the introduction to the testimony, I find it mentioned accompanied with the statement that "it is now in the Executive office of this State." In like manner, Mr. Dowd is mistaken in assuming that I meant to discredit the testimony of Dr. Henderson. I only showed, supposing he and J. M. Knitt referred to the same paper, that there existed a discrepancy between them. But I did not undertake to say which of them was in error.

But I will now proceed to show that one of them was at fault, and which one. Since my first letters were written, I have come into possession of essential facts, which if known at the outset, would have saved much labor, and should have put a summary period to the discussion. Printed, as the principal of these facts was, two-

years ago, in the University Magazine, it is surprising that it was so soon forgotten, and that now, it seems to be wholly unknown to the public.

Those who have read my letters carefully will remember that in the beginning, and repeatedly I pointed out the fact, that the paper which appeared in the Raleigh Register, April 30, 1819, purporting to be the official report of the Mecklenburg proceedings of May 20th, and bearing that date, had about it unmistakable marks of a later origin. It relates events which transpired long afterwards, and even the "Declaration" speaks of the British "invasion of our rights," in the past tense. I inferred from these internal evidences, that the paper must have been written as late as the year 1800, when a fire destroyed the house of Mr. John M. Knitt Alexander with all his papers, including the records of the county committee, of the revolutionary period. It turns out that I was precisely correct in this conjecture; and that what purports to be the official report of the proceedings of a meeting at Charlotte, May 20th, 1775, with the Declaration of Independence, which forms a conspicuous part of it, was all written and certified to as late as September 3d, 1800. This certificate is given by John M. Knitt Alexander himself, and constitutes a part of the report referred to. In it the writer admits that he writes from memory, of events which transpired a quarter of a century before; and that he gives the substance of what was done, without pretending that it was a literal copy. But I give his very words, which I find in the University Magazine for May, 1853. The writer of the Magazine article, judging from the clear and forcible style must have been one of the ablest of the Faculty; and there can be little doubt that the paper was submitted to Governor Swain before publication. He introduces the suppressed certificate of John M. Knitt Alexander with the remark that "the oldest edition of the 'Davie copy' was furnished by John M. Knitt Alexander to General Davie, then a resident of South Carolina. The age and the degree of reverence to be given to its contents are unanswerably fixed by this conclusion to the manuscript:

THE SUPPRESSED CERTIFICATE.
"It may be worthy of notice here to observe, that the foregoing statement, though fundamentally correct, yet may not literally correspond with the original record of the transactions of said delegation and court of enquiry, &c." In the body of the Report as copied in the Raleigh Register, April 30th, 1813, he says: "Conformably to these principles, Col. T. Polk, through solicitation, issued an order to each captain's company in the county of Mecklenburg, (then comprising the present county of Cabarrus,) directing each militia company to elect two persons and delegate to them ample power to devise ways and means to aid and assist their suffering brethren in Boston and also generally to adopt measures to extricate themselves from the impending storm and to secure unimpeded their inalienable rights, privileges and liberties from the dominant grasp of British imposition and tyranny." Further on after recording the adoption of the "Declaration," the same Report, dated May 20th, 1775, proceeds to state, that "From this delegation originated the Court of Enquiry of this county, who constituted and held their first session in Charlotte"—and goes on to relate other facts about its meetings and jurisdiction; and mentions that Tories were brought before it from Lincoln and Rowan. These anachronisms prove that however honorable and truthful Mr. John M. Knitt Alexander was, and he is spoken highly of by his contemporaries,—his memory cannot be relied on to chronicle facts, and to give the exact import of Resolves twenty-five years after their date. For certainly no man of unclouded memory and clear understanding, would give a history of events running through years, and record them all as having transpired on the very first day of the period. It was this anachronism to which I called attention at the beginning of this series of letters, as evidence of fraud; and since I have seen the suppressed certificate, I revert to it as infallible evidence of the author's failing memory. He confounds what the committee became in the course of months and years, with what it was when it met in May 1775. And in 1800, writing from memory from his "best recollection and belief," he attributes to the "Court of Enquiry," the adoption of the "Declaration of Independence." This is as if John Adams or Thomas Jefferson, in old age, should have referred in their writings to the Declaration of Independence, on July 4th, 1776 as the work of the Convention which framed the constitution eleven years later, or of Congress which assembled under it in 1789.

But Mr. Alexander's certificate proves that he had no purpose of palming off his "best recollection and belief," in the year 1800, as something he had written down on the 20th May, 1775. He, at least, is not responsible for this fraudulent attempt. The certificate attached to the paper as published in 1819, to the exclusion of the genuine one has already been given. But for the sake of perspicuity, I present it again, as follows: "The foregoing is a true copy of the paper on the above subject, left in my hands by John M. Knitt Alexander, dec'd. I find it mentioned on file

31st May resolves before them when they gave their certificates that the 20th May Declaration was genuine. In the first place, they say not a word in their certificates which implies they remembered that two Declarations, or sets of resolves, on two different days, were issued. No one interrogated them to this effect. No one said to them, "Do you regard the resolutions of May 20th, or those of May 31st, genuine, or are both papers genuine?" The introduction to the Legislative pamphlet says nothing about the 31st May resolves. The authors of it would have been delighted to point to them as a demonstration of the main fact; though they would have been fatal to the superstructure of fictitious history which has arisen upon the basis of the curtailed report. Jo. Seawell Jones in his "Defence of North Carolina," says not a word about the 31st May resolves. Martin in his history makes no allusion to them. Governor Swain had never heard of them, until they were found by Peter Foree, Esq., in a New York newspaper of the date 1775, and published by him in 1839; and in whole by Mr. Bancroft, in 1847. These discoveries deceived Gov. Swain, as I shall show before I am done; and for many years before his death, in spite of his amiable temper, which prompted him to hope all things and believe all things, he could not withhold the opinion that the 20th May "Declaration" and proceedings were of more than doubtful, not to say suspicious origin. "Not to put too fine a point upon it," his most intimate friends know that he believed not a word in the genuineness of that beggarly imitation of Jefferson. It is in vain, therefore, for Mr. Dowd to assert, with ever so much confidence, that the old gentlemen who gave their certificates during and prior to 1830 to the genuineness of the report of the proceedings on the 20th May, 1775, had before them the proceedings of May 31st.

To show how very unreliable is a man's recollection of events, even after the lapse of a quarter of a century. I need only cite this very Report of Mr. John M. Knitt Alexander, and compare one part with another. In the suppressed certificate to it, Mr. Alexander says, "that the foregoing statement though fundamentally correct, yet may not literally correspond with the original record of the transactions of said delegation and court of enquiry &c." In the body of the Report as copied in the Raleigh Register, April 30th, 1813, he says: "Conformably to these principles, Col. T. Polk, through solicitation, issued an order to each captain's company in the county of Mecklenburg, (then comprising the present county of Cabarrus,) directing each militia company to elect two persons and delegate to them ample power to devise ways and means to aid and assist their suffering brethren in Boston and also generally to adopt measures to extricate themselves from the impending storm and to secure unimpeded their inalienable rights, privileges and liberties from the dominant grasp of British imposition and tyranny." Further on after recording the adoption of the "Declaration," the same Report, dated May 20th, 1775, proceeds to state, that "From this delegation originated the Court of Enquiry of this county, who constituted and held their first session in Charlotte"—and goes on to relate other facts about its meetings and jurisdiction; and mentions that Tories were brought before it from Lincoln and Rowan. These anachronisms prove that however honorable and truthful Mr. John M. Knitt Alexander was, and he is spoken highly of by his contemporaries,—his memory cannot be relied on to chronicle facts, and to give the exact import of Resolves twenty-five years after their date. For certainly no man of unclouded memory and clear understanding, would give a history of events running through years, and record them all as having transpired on the very first day of the period. It was this anachronism to which I called attention at the beginning of this series of letters, as evidence of fraud; and since I have seen the suppressed certificate, I revert to it as infallible evidence of the author's failing memory. He confounds what the committee became in the course of months and years, with what it was when it met in May 1775. And in 1800, writing from memory from his "best recollection and belief," he attributes to the "Court of Enquiry," the adoption of the "Declaration of Independence." This is as if John Adams or Thomas Jefferson, in old age, should have referred in their writings to the Declaration of Independence, on July 4th, 1776 as the work of the Convention which framed the constitution eleven years later, or of Congress which assembled under it in 1789.

But Mr. Alexander's certificate proves that he had no purpose of palming off his "best recollection and belief," in the year 1800, as something he had written down on the 20th May, 1775. He, at least, is not responsible for this fraudulent attempt.

The certificate attached to the paper as published in 1819, to the exclusion of the genuine one has already been given. But for the sake of perspicuity, I present it again, as follows: "The foregoing is a true copy of the paper on the above subject, left in my hands by John M. Knitt Alexander, dec'd. I find it mentioned on file

that the original book was burned, April, 1800. That a copy of the proceedings was sent to Hugh Williamson, in New York, then writing a history of North Carolina, and that a copy was sent to Gen. W. R. Davie. J. M. Knitt.]

I learn from the papers, and from various sources, that "J. M. Knitt" is, or was, Dr. Joseph M. Knitt Alexander, a son of John M. Knitt Alexander. Why he should give a certificate to an important paper, with the omission of his proper name, and how it happens that the copy that he certifies to is entitled of the essential certificate which his father added to the same paper, in the copy which he sent to Gen. W. R. Davie, are matters to be explained by those who have undertaken to maintain the genuineness of the "Declaration" of May 20th, 1775. However the omission of that certificate was brought about, the effect was to change the whole character of the paper to which it was attached, and to palm it on the public as a genuine contemporaneous report, instead of a statement according to its author's "best recollection and belief," twenty-five years after the event. In other words, these "best recollections and belief" of an old man, by being antedated, are made to wear the aspect, and have all the effect of a forged paper.

I propose in another letter, to close the discussion, with some further notice of the essays of Messrs. Dowd and Wheeler, and the Lecture of Dr. Hawks.

I am very truly,
DANIEL R. GOODLOE.
T. B. Kingsbury, Raleigh, N. C.

A Happy Daddy.

We are not obliged to tell, says the Spirit of the Age, how the following funny letter fell into our hands; all the reader has to do is to read it and laugh. We congratulate the new made parent, and hope he will get over his confusion of ideas shortly, so as to be able to tell his baby from his horse:

Dear Sister Emma—I now take my seat and sit down to take this opportunity to inform you that I am a "daddy" at last; that is, I suppose I am, for Addie has got a nice, fat baby as ever made up faces. We hope that these few lines may find you enjoying the same blessing. Now, this is to be strictly a business letter. Firstly, as I said before, Addie has got a nice baby, nextly I have swapped away old John and think I have got a pretty nine pounds—I mean the baby—it is just as fat as butter, and has a good strong pair of lungs, she is red and has a bobtail—the horse, I mean—and a white stripe in her face, and is a good driver; she has got blue eyes and a dimple in her chin—I mean the baby—and just the prettiest mouth that ever open'd to receive pap; judging from her teeth, I think she is about six years old—I mean the horse now—she is sound, smooth and kind—I mean the horse or the baby either now—and the doctor says she is the fairest he ever saw, without any exception—he meant the baby—I got \$25 to boot not on the baby, though, for in its case the boot is on the other foot, and two or three sizes larger, as near as I can find out. I am going to harness the horse now and go after mother she was born last night at 20 minutes past nine—I hope you don't think I mean mother or the horse; I mean the baby. She is as hearty as a pig; eat at egg, a biscuit, and drank three cups of tea—I mean Addie—she is getting along nicely, and if she don't have any bad luck she will get along first-rate. She is subject to disorders of the stomach, and they say that is a sign of colic—I mean the baby—I hope it is, for the nurse says colicky-babies never die. She talks about her nose as she takes snuff—I mean the nurse. I am going to name it Edena—I mean the baby. There! I've been reading this over and I see plainly that I ain't fit to write. The amount of it is, I am frustrated; I am a happy father, and that accounts for it, so you must excuse me this time. Your brother, JIM.

"Lo Necs."—The following missive evidently written by one of our verdant city girl to a relation in the country was found in front of South-land Bros. yesterday, and handed to us for publication.—Piedmont Press.

"Dere nansey.—As for the lo necs the loer is the moar fashionable you are an les close you ware the moar you are dressed. Miss Goolia gave me a blue silk of herz an hi cut its nec orf and susan simoncz cut of herz an we attrax a great deal of attention to our necs promenadin in the streets like other ladies an holdin up our close."

The following conversation between two lawyers was overheard: "How much does your client like it?" "Not overmuch; begins to complain of the expense." "Mine is all right; bound to fight it out. Can we manage to get the jury to disagree again?" "Don't know; we must work for it." "You will get beat, of course, in the end; but you will appeal, of course?" "Of course."

A little girl was asked what was the meaning of the word happy. She said, "It is to feel as if you wanted to give all your things to your little sister."

Pettigrew's Brigade.

Messrs. Editors.—As a part of the history of the old State, which I, for one, am so glad you are rescuing from loss, will you not re-publish, if you can procure it anywhere, the correspondence that took place some six years ago between Major W. J. Baker and Captain Young, of Gen. Pettigrew's staff, with reference to the part that Brigade took in the fated field of Gettysburg? The reason I ask is, that in a recent communication in the Richmond Dispatch from Col. W. W. Wood, with reference to Rothermel's painting, "Battle of Gettysburg," the Philadelphia Centennial, &c., he repeats the statement that Pickett's supports did not come in time in the famous charge made by that gallant corps. Col. Wood does not charge the delinquency upon Gen. Pettigrew and the division (Heth's) which he commanded in that action. But this has been done without compunction and without retraction by writers in Virginia papers and in the "Histories" issued heretofore.

It is not to contravert Col. Wood's statement, which may be correct, that Pickett's support did not come up "either on the right or left," that I call for that correspondence. Nor is it to pluck one laurel from the scarred brows and well-earned glory of Gen. Pickett and his division, one of whom, and by no means the least, is the gallant leader of the conservative campaign and the nominee for Governor of Virginia. It is to get the truth of history, to rescue from forgetfulness what may yet be needed to defend the fair fame of North Carolina and her noble sons.

I was a member of Pettigrew's brigade. I joined it after the death of its loved General. But it was for a long time known as "Pettigrew's Brigade," and with mingled affection and pride its older members so called it. When I joined in August, 1863, its ranks were decimated, its spirit broken. Pettigrew was gone, and of the field officers perhaps not one in five were living or fit for duty. But I much mistake the temper and spirit of such men as were left, or languished at Johnson's Island and Fort Delaware, or mingled with the hallowed dust of the field of glory, if there was any flinching or failure in duty at Gettysburg, Bristow, Hanover, Wilderness (where the 11th and 47th began the fight), Spottsylvania, Richmond, Petersburg, Reams' and Appomattox showed the stuff they were made of. Few Divisions did more effective service than Heth's, during 1864 and '65, & were more frequently called on. McRae and Cook earned their laurels by hard fighting, and they were trusted. It was at Reams' Station, where, after an unsuccessful attack upon the enemy's works, Gen. Heth asked that he might take the defence, and Gen. A. P. Hill (Corps Commander) gave his approval. With Cook's and McRae's brigades of his own division, and Lane's, of Wilcox's division, (all North Carolinians,) Heth charged and carried the lines most beautifully. General Lee looked on with great gratification, and with a soldier's joy and pride, and said to the returning victorious brigades, "Brave fellows, all. I can always trust North Carolinians." I did not hear this, but many a one in the brigade did.

ONE OF THE 47TH.
It affords us pleasure to publish the above communication, from the pen of a gentleman of piety and excellent abilities. The Associate has on two occasions written in defence of Pettigrew's Brigade. His last article appeared in the Wilmington Journal some two years ago. Maj. Engelhard, one of the editors, made some corrections and additions. He has purposed for some time writing to Col. Chas. Marshall, of Baltimore, who is now engaged in preparing the life of General Lee, directing his attention to the gross injustice done Gen. Pettigrew's Brigade, and in fact Heth's division. We would gladly publish the correspondence referred to by our highly esteemed correspondent, but we have in vain tried to obtain it for years. The Sentinel was not in existence at the time it was published, and we have not a copy in the office. Probably the Journal, or some of our older State papers, can exhume it.

Gen. A. P. Hill told Maj. Engelhard that the best Brigade in his corps was Cook's North Carolina, and that the second best was McRae's, North Carolina. The third he said lay between Mahone's Virginia and Lane's North Carolina.—Ral. Sentinel.

The Sentinel says: The farmers are victimized more frequently than any other class. They are cheated by commission merchants, by railroads and by dealers in fertilizers. They buy guano, thinking it genuine and warranted, when it is often badly adulterated. The New York State Agricultural Society, once investigated the matter. A bag of the genuine celebrated Peruvian guano was purchased from ten different dealers and analyzed thoroughly. Six had sold the adulterated article and four the genuine. The adulterated had only from 3 to 6 per cent, of ammonia, whereas the genuine contains 15 per cent. It is said the genuine bags are refilled. They are branded genuine. The trade mark of the Peruvian government has been altered. Watch out for swindles in fertilizers. "Forewarned, forearmed."

Health of Women.

Farmer's wives are not as healthy and red-checked as city people suppose them to be.

In a journey of a hundred miles, we may see a few rosy, bright-eyed, happy women; but, as a rule, from Maine to California, care-worn faces, sunken eyes, and compressed lips, tell pitiful tales of disturbed rest, of weariness and suffering. We do not attribute this to the tyranny of husbands. We have yet to see the man who does not pity his sick wife.

It cannot be attributed to the tyranny of fashion; thousands of these suffering women do not read fashion-books. We do not propose to point out all the causes that operate so destructively, but will ask attention to a few not generally attended to by patients and physicians.

We speak of women who at marriage gave promise of a vigorous, healthy life, but as the years passed, their hopes faded like the baseless fabric of dreams.

Asking questions, and closely observing their habits, we learn that very soon after marriage the regular bath was omitted. "I knew it would refresh me, but it was not convenient. I had company, or was tired, and put it off from time to time, until the bath ceased to be a regular habit and is now the occasional luxury. The result was the waste matter, that should have been passed off by the skin, had to be carried along, to be cast out by the kidneys and bowels; or was retained in the blood, leaving the breath with impurities, and finally clogging the liver.

Here, we have, through neglect of the bath, overworked kidneys, constipated bowels, and a torpid, or tired liver. The vital force ever working to preserve life, and the machinery of life, tossed out flags of distress. Yellow flags, over tongue, skin and eyes; and finally took away relish for food. The wise woman would have "abstained from food and exhausting labor, and would have taken a thorough rubbing, sweating-bath, to open the pores. Before going in and while in, and after coming out of the bath, copious drinking of water to wash the blood would have assisted the vital force to go on with the cleansing processes.

"How?"
In this way: Water is very rapidly absorbed, taken into the circulation. Then, to speak very plainly, it dissolves dirt; and through the skin, kidneys, or bowels, floats it out of the body.

Every particle of worn-out matter, salts or medicines, dissolved and carried through the natural channels, by so much relieve the tired liver; when rested it will resume work without spurs or whips of any kind.

Sick women have not thus reasoned; have not thus been obedient to the Divinely appointed law of cleanliness.—Science of Health.

Gems of Thought.

FILIAL PIETY.—There is no greater human excellence than filial piety, and no better assurance of success in life than honor to the father and mother.

THE WORRIES OF LIFE.—The great worries of life are the so-called "little things" which are from day to day left unadjusted, till they fasten their victim like a net. The men who die of "over-work" are not so much destroyed by their great and useful labors as by the vexatious trifles which accumulate till they produce a condition of chronic fever and unrest.

"IS IT RIGHT?"—So long as any person seriously asks this question of himself, in regard to all his acts, the danger of any great departure from the path of rectitude must be small, and we wish that a system of education might be devised and adopted in this country, which might make it as common and controlling among our people in after years, as it now appears to be in youth.

PROPENSITIES.—Whenever an indulgent propensity becomes a passion, and the will is enslaved by blind impulse, the question of insanity is only one of time.

HAPPINESS AND VIRTUE.—Not happiness alone, not even virtue alone, is the chief end for man, but rather a condition that springs from both combined. Each in its highest forms includes the other, and they are as inseparable as is the sun from the light with which he blesses the world.

KEEP THE END IN VIEW.—It is of the first importance in undertaking any enterprise to form a correct idea of the end to be accomplished. Every occupation in life has some distinct purpose, and only as it is thoroughly kept in view can the efforts put forth prove successful.

If you love, love more. If you hate, hate less. Life is too short to spend in hating any one. Why war against a mortal who is going the same road with us? Why not expend the flower of life's happiness by tearing to love, by teaching those who are near, and dear the beautiful lesson?

Daniel Webster is not the only bright boy born in New Hampshire. Another has been discovered—a youth residing in Dover, who refused to take a pill. His crafty mother thereupon secretly placed the pill in a preserved pear, and gave it to him. Presently she asked, "Tom, have you eaten the pear?" He said, "Yes, mother, all but the seed."