

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE OBSERVER.

CHAPEL HILL, Sept. 9, 1857.

To the Editors of the Fayetteville Observer: When your paper of the 3d inst. reached me, two days ago, I was engaged in investigating the question, "Who commanded at Moore's Creek Bridge?" In this investigation I designed to go over the whole ground, and to present, if possible, a statement of the evidence that should be conclusive. This I hope ere long to accomplish. My attention has been drawn, meanwhile, to a discussion of the same question in your paper, written, as I suppose, by an accomplished townsmen of yours. I have given this article a very careful examination, and weighed well all its facts and reasonings. It is certainly the strongest presentation I have seen of the argument in favor of Col. Lillington's claim to "the honors of that day," and is both elaborate and ingenious; and while I thus do justice to the ability of the author of it, I save him thanks also for his courtesy to me. But, with every disposition to give his arguments all the weight to which they are entitled, I am still satisfied that my position on the subject is the true one and that it can be as well proved by any other fact in the history of that day. I still assert, and hope to make good the assertion, that all the authorities, the histories, the records, the letters, for the first half century after the battle, point to Caswell, as the actual commander and the leading spirit in the engagement; and that none of them name Col. Lillington in that capacity. I intend to give to the public in a few weeks the facts and documents, some of them as yet unpublished, on which I rely for the proof of this position, and which will reflect me, I trust, from any further discussion of it. In the interim, that your readers may have before them what has been written on both sides; that they may see what has been criticized, and thus more justly appreciate the criticisms; let me ask you to vary in your paper so much of my lecture as refers to the point in debate. And, as in some instances your correspondent seems to have mistaken my reasonings, will you allow me to set him right in them, and also to correct some errors of fact into which he has fallen? I demand then in this interpretation of the despatches of Col. Moore and Col. Caswell. I do not deny that they sustain the inference that "Caswell obeyed Moore, and followed Lillington"; but the inference has nothing to do with the issue. That he "obeyed Moore" certainly does not touch the question between him and Lillington; and that he "followed Lillington" is true only in respect to time, i. e., Caswell came on the ground the day after Lillington; and this accident does not help us to decide which was the superior. Your correspondent goes into an elaborate argument to show that the Provincial Congress of August 1775 established a method of determining priority of rank among the Colonists which method, he shows, was not that each should in his own district out-rank his peers. Yet his argument that Lillington was the superior officer at Moore's Creek, and "entitled to command," proceeds simply on the ground that the battle was fought in Lillington's district. Even if Col Lillington had 700 men somewhere in the Province subject to his orders, I submit, that this would not entitle him to the command on the ground of numbers; though it might have had weight had they all been at the Bridge. Where two occupy the same camp, it is hardly to be supposed that the leader of a regiment, full in numbers, and made up of cavalry, artillery and infantry, would be required to serve under the leader of a small detachment, who was in no official respect his superior. Your correspondent says, "It is further argued, that because Col. Ashe was appointed a Brigadier General before Col. Lillington, that therefore he was unfitted for the command. This is an unkind remark." Remarking only that the priority of Col. Ashe's appointment is but a very small part of my argument, I must be allowed to say, the unkindness is not mine; for the reason is not mine. There is no trace in the lecture, as there had been none in my mind, of the inference, or "reason," that he was "unfitted for the command." My argument was, that if Col Lillington had been chief in command at Moore's Creek, he would naturally, as a reward for such services, have been promoted; that the promotion of Col. Ashe under the circumstances, was inconsistent with that supposition; in short, that our fathers were not the men to requite such services as is claimed for Col. Lillington, by putting his inferior over his head, — the grossest affront that men in power can offer to a military man. But, let me ask, is not the suggestion of the "stronger reason," which your correspondent brings forward, "that John and Samuel Ashe were both members of Congress," an insinuation full of enmity to the memory of both of those brave men, implying that they sought to supplant their Chief; and hardly less cruel to the good name of the Congress, implying that that venerable body could be induced by an underling or sinister influence to disregard the claim which his Leadership on that day must have made for the promotion of Col. Lillington? Next, touching the letter of Col. Purviance, I had not "forgotten" (as your correspondent asks) that Lillington and Purviance "were together in the same camp at Rockfish with Col. Moore," &c., for the simple reason that they were not together in the same camp &c. Col. Purviance was not at Rockfish at all during that campaign. He stayed at Wilmington with his troops from about the 9th to the 24th of February, as his letter plainly shows, and doubtless till after the battle. My statement then remains unanswered. Again, in respect to Col. Moore's statement that "The Tories advanced with intrepidity to attack Col. Caswell, who was entrenched." &c., your correspondent mistakes the meaning. The fact of his being "entrenched" &c. is certainly not, though "B" dwells on that alone; but that Col. Moore says nothing of Lillington, and declares the attack to have been made on "Col. Caswell," certainly indicates his opinion on the question now in discussion. This inference has not been noticed. In regard to "Caswell's camp" to which Col. Moore says "Richard Campbell was carried. He meant the camp at Moore's Creek, occupied by the combined forces of Lillington and Caswell, as I shall show, ere long, when the letters are published. It had not "escaped" (my attention) that on the 29th Caswell's camp was at Long Creek. But Col. Moore's letter was written on the 28th, and speaks of the transaction as already past. A mere comparison of dates should have satisfied your correspondent. Finally as to the vote of the Provincial Congress, in April, '76, Col. Richard Caswell and the brave officers and soldiers under his command," &c., I cannot admit that your correspondent has given the true account of it. I do not see the force of the reason assigned, viz: that Col. Caswell and his soldiers were thanked because they fought out of their own district; while yet no thanks are given to Lillington, who, (on his ground,) not only fought, but commanded within his district. The general vote of thanks by the Provincial Council to Col. Moore and his soldiers is utterly irrelevant to this issue. That covered the entire campaign, and included Caswell, and Lillington, and Martin, and Thackston, and all who were under arms. The vote of the Congress was specifically for "Caswell and those who were under his command," and no mention is made in it of Lillington, who it is alleged was the commander.

vote of thanks by the Council was a sufficient acknowledgment of the services of Col. Lillington at Moore's Creek, it must have been deemed enough for Col. Caswell also; and if a special vote of thanks by the Congress was only just to Caswell, the alleged subordinate, surely it was far less than justice to Lillington, the supposed superior officer, to omit him altogether. Your correspondent, as if not himself satisfied with the reason he has rendered for this strange proceeding, has felt compelled to intimate, that the vote of thanks to Caswell and his men may have been due to the presence of his troops at Halifax. I say nothing of the imputation on this point on the virtue and courage of that Assembly; nothing of the insinuation that Harnett, and John Ashe, and Samuel Johnston could be so over-awed and intimidated, as to cheat their personal friend, and the valiant conqueror of their personal enemy, of the honor which they knew he had deserved, and bestow it on another. Not so, however, have I understood the men of that day. But it is enough to say that your correspondent is mistaken again in his facts. The truth is that neither Caswell nor his troops were in Halifax previous to the passage of the vote of thanks. His troops were not there at all. The Resolution of the Congress which authorized the troops to be disbanded contains the proof of my assertion. In conclusion, let me ask your correspondent, if, with this review of his facts and reasonings, his argument remains in full force? I have thus notified his paper because it was a manly attempt to grapple with this question. I shall once more ask to be heard in a fuller examination of it, in no temper of controversy, but of calm, historical investigation, and then to take final leave of a subject, whose greatest interest for me has been its character as a doubtful and perplexed inquiry. I am, with great respect, Yours, &c., F. M. HUBBARD

"into consideration the state and arrangement of the militia of the Province." The first thing to be done was to select six persons, the best fitted for such office, by personal character and military skill and experience, to take the chief command of the militia in the six Judicial Districts as Brigadier Generals. The choice for each District said naturally fall upon some one residing in that District. But we cannot suppose that in this first distribution of high honors, the Congress would overlook him, whose courage and skill had been so recently signalized at Moore's Creek, and who had rendered them so great and invaluable service to his country. It would have been poor encouragement to soldierly virtues, and sadly silly policy for men who were anxious, above all things, to create an efficient military organization, to pass by one who had thus proved himself the "chief of all their strength," and place another, or less tried man over his head. Yet what was the result? Allen Jones was chosen for Halifax District; Edward Vail for Eden; Griffith Rutherford for Salisbury; Thomas Person for Hillsboro; for Wilmington, not Lillington but John Ashe; for Newbern Richard Caswell. Lillington was retained in his former rank only, and put in charge of the Sixth Provincial Regiment. Had Lillington been the first in command at Moore's Creek, could our Fathers have shown themselves so far forgetful of propriety and so regardless of their own interests, as openly and deliberately to have given the honors of the victory and the rewards of the victory, to one who fought under him? It is observable that neither Caswell nor Lillington was a member of the Congress, when these resolutions were passed, — and these appointments made. Lillington was not a member at all. Caswell had been returned from Dobbs county, but the House refused him a seat (had they been especially partial to him, the difficulty might have been gotten over); on the ground of his holding a commission "in the Minute Service." He was re-elected from the same county and allowed to take his seat on the 27th. What Mr. Caswell may have had to do with the subsequent movement, we do not know, but on the 1st of May the resolution appointing six Brigadier Generals was rescinded, and on the 4th, those formerly appointed to that office were re-appointed with one exception, — that in the Newbern District Wm. Bryan was put in the place of Mr. Caswell. As he was made Brig. General while yet not a member of the Congress, and the substitution of Wm. Bryan took place while he was a member, and soon after he took his seat and had been placed on the Military Committee, we must presume that the change was made with his concurrence, and very likely at his suggestion. What prompted this on his part we can only conjecture. Certainly the honors and offices so freely showered upon him, by this and later Legislatures, forbid us to suppose that he was now dropped from this office with any design to mortify him, or with any tincture of his unfitness for the place. As a slight circumstance, yet showing the popular judgment of the times, I may mention that a child born in Duplin, not very far from the place of the action, on the day when the battle was fought was named Caswell, by his delighted father, in honor of him who commanded on that day. Had the general opinion been at the time that Lillington commanded, the infant would have been named Lillington. That infant, I believe, still survives in the person of Rev. Caswell Drake, a venerable and highly respected minister of the Methodist Church. This, to be sure, is only tradition, but tradition of that peculiar kind which, being contemporaneous with the event, and continued to our time, has, to us, the solid value of almost recent evidence.

Colored Meteors. — We have no accounts of meteors in this country, during the August meteoric term, but very brilliant and extraordinary meteors were seen in Europe, on the nights of the 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th. They assumed very unusual forms and colors. A scientific writer at Ostend says: "Many hundreds fell in various directions, but particularly towards S. W. and W., not N. W. as usual. They did not in general move fast and leave the white trains behind them, as is usual, but descended slowly, with a bright yellow flame; others were splendidly crimson, and some bright blue and purple. This fact is very curious, as favoring the hypothesis of ignited gases, adopted by M. De Luc, of Geneva; and it would be interesting to ascertain whether this coloration of meteors has been observed in other places far from the influence of the sea. I have ascertained that during the whole of this month meteors have been numerous all along the Rhine and in Germany. Such numbers have not fallen since the 10th of August, 1811, nor have we any record of such a quantity as on the present occasion, extending over four days consecutively, and exhibiting such very brilliant and diversified tints of light."

The Size of London. — When the stone in Panyer's alley was placed on its site, three centuries since, the circumference was about five miles. At present, however, to make a pedestrian expedition around the metropolis would to most persons be an undertaking of some importance, as may be seen by referring to the following particulars, which have been gathered from a recently published map: From Chiswick to Kew, twelve miles; from Kew to Richmond, sixteen and a half miles; from Millwall to Chiswick, twenty-eight miles — total, fifty-seven and a half miles, very nearly three days' journey at the rate of twenty miles a day; and it will be observed that, in the line drawn, Battersea, Clapham, Canningtown, and many other places, which even at present can be scarcely said to be separated from London, have been left out. "As the crowd would fly" across streets and houses from the point whence we started at Chiswick to the farthest east the distance is nearly eleven miles, and the greatest width from north to south upwards of seven miles. — The Builder.

Question for a Wife. — Do you recollect what your feelings were immediately after you had spoken the first unkind word to your husband? Did you not feel ashamed and grieved, and yet too proud to admit it? That was, is, and ever will be your evil genius! It is the tempter which labors incessantly to destroy your peace, which cheats you with an evil delusion that your husband deserved your anger, when he really most required your love. It is the cancer which feeds on those unexpressed emotions you felt on the first pressure of his hand and lip. Never forget the manner in which the duties of that calling can alone be fulfilled. If your husband is hasty, your example of patience will elude as well as teach him. Your violence may alienate his heart, and your neglect impel him to desperation. Your soothing will redeem — your softness subdue him; and the goodnatured twinkle of those eyes, now filling beautifully with priceless tears, will make him all your own.

A Quencher for Vesuvius. — Among a party of Americans travelling in Europe was one (a Yankee) who, unwilling to admit of any superiority in Europe over his own country, would always tell of something to "match" whatever he was taken to see. In Italy they ascended Vesuvius when that volcano was much disturbed, and he remarked, "Well, it is considerable of a fire, but we have a water privilege in America (meaning Niagara) that, I guess, would squirt it out in most moments. At Madras the panic has been intense; I believe, too, that the fears are reasonable. We have at Bangalore a strong force, and the Madras Sepoys have hitherto proved loyal. There is one circumstance in our favor. We allow all our regiments to have their women and children with them in their lines, whereas in Bengal the Sepoy leaves his wife in his village, and is allowed to visit her for a certain period every year. Our system doubtless is a great check on the Sepoys, as they know that, in the event of their rising, their families are in our power, but the Bega soldier can roam at will."

THE SOUTHERN HARMONY. BY THE SOUTHERN HARMONY. LONDON PORTER, EDINBURGH ALE, JUST RECEIVED BY S. J. HINDSALL, 38th. "REDUCED BY DYSPEPSIA TO A NERE SKELETON." CURED BY "BERHAVE'S HOLLAND BITTERS." Mr. A. Matchett, a trader probably as well known as any man in Western Pennsylvania, states as follows: "I met with a farmer in Armstrong county who was reduced by Dyspepsia to a mere skeleton; I persuaded him to buy a bottle of Berhave's Holland Bitters, believing it would cure him. Meeting him some months after, what was my astonishment at finding him a hale, hearty man; he told me he had now weighed 200 pounds, and that this wonderful change had been produced by Berhave's Holland Bitters, to which he attributed solely his restoration." Sept 12. 42-2td