

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.	
SUNDAY,	on the following terms:
For one month,	\$1.00
Two months,	2.00
Three months,	3.00
Four months,	4.00
One year,	10.00
Semi-Weekly Sentinel one year.	10.00
Weekly Sentinel, one year.	12.00
six months.	6.00
Weekly Sentinel, one year.	12.00
six months.	6.00

## THE SENTINEL.

WM. E. PELL, J. SEATON GATES,  
EDITORS.

Saturday Evening, March 9, 1867.

### Duty of the South.

A correspondent undertakes to-day, to answer this important question. The reader will judge, whether or not he has succeeded. It is one which deeply agitates the public mind. We promptly confess, no question has been so difficult, to our minds, to determine fully and satisfactorily. Hence, we have submitted our thoughts upon the subject hypothetically, rather than in a form which indicated certainty or full conviction of their correctness.

There are many clear and astute minds, pondering this question. The public and ourselves would be glad to hear from them, and to consider their mature thoughts. We invite them to our columns.

Our correspondent thinks we should "do right if the Heaven's fall." All that is precisely our doctrine. But what is right?—There lies the rub. It is right and our plain duty, he thinks, to stand firmly up to Andrew Johnson and the Constitution. So do we think, precisely. But how else can the South stand up to President Johnson and the Constitution, but by its almost unanimous approval and endorsement of the rectitude of the principles it advocates and endeavors to sustain, and a protest equally unanimous against the injustice and unconstitutionality of Congressional reconstruction? Has not the South done this, and would she not continue to do it, even though under duress or force her people consent to submit to a fate they cannot avoid?

But our correspondent further insists that we should "have faith in God" and then "stand still to see the salvation of the Lord!" This we trust, all true Christians, who live by faith, are doing. But how can such counsel satisfy and relieve the great bulk of our people, many of who are mere nominal Christians and most of them unchristian, who live alone by sight. Our correspondent knows that the great concern of the Southern people is, not what party is to rule, or what system of politics is to control the country. Thousands of them do not care a fig for party or politics; but their great concern about public affairs is, that they shall be administered as to bring them the greatest amount of peace, protection, and personal prosperity. This is the great question with the Southern people, and it is on this ground they deprecate Radical rule and Radical reconstruction.

Now that Radical rule is inevitable, and the indications being that the more fiercely resisted by the South, the more violent, the more virulent and the stronger and more invincible that rule will become, the absorbing question is, what shall the South do, effectually to mitigate that rule and if possible to remove its harshness as soon as possible? How much we can bear, how long we can endure the continuous tumult and agitation, which must seriously militate against the material and essential prosperity of the South, we cannot tell. If God in his wisdom and grace would condescend to tell us what to do in this case, then we should have a fulcrum for our faith, and then it would be easy to "stand still and see the salvation of God," but until He speaks, we are necessarily left to our own erring judgments. To us, the duty to submit quietly to what we cannot help however hard, is plain. The only question of difficulty in the matter is this: Shall all of those who do not approve the reconstruction act, be still and do nothing, and allow only those who do approve of it, white and black, to form a new State Constitution, or shall all who are permitted by Congress to take part in the Congressional reconstruction bear their share in that important matter? The lights before us seem plainly to dictate the policy, that all should participate.

The Standard wantonly and wickedly attempts to interfere with the execution of law, by plainly counselling the people to resist the assessment and collection of taxes under the new Revenue Act. Does it for a moment suppose, that the Congress which professedly adopts the new reconstruction act, for the purpose of maintaining law and order and the preservation of peace, and which in the same act legalized secession of the State governments, at least as provisional, can sanction its Dorrance movements and its schemes to break up the Union, and encourage lawlessness in the State? It is editor, has the slightest concern for the peace of society, we begin to doubt. Until the Military District Commander assumes command in the State, the laws of the United States, and the laws of the State governments, not contrary to the Constitution of the United States, are not to be disregarded. I have no doubt that the attempt of Holden, Pool, Settle, Logan, and at least one-half of the delegates summoned to the contemplated Dorrance Convention on the 27th, by the disfranchised President of the late canons in this City, to "interfere with and embarrass" the work of reconstruction, is mischievous and impudent. Stand aside gentlemen. Take back seats, every one of you.

The Fireworks. The report to the Head Quarters of the Freedmen's Bureau at Washington, giving an account of its operations in North Carolina, states that, during the month of January last, no negroes had been committed upon Freedmen. And we would add, none need ever be looked for, so long as the Freedmen conduct themselves with the propriety which most of them seem disposed to evince. Our colored people feel they are at home among their friends, who will not *wantonly* do them injustice, or harm.

Walter A. Montgomery Esq., was elected County Solicitor, at the session of Warren County Court, the present week.

Four persons fell dead from heart disease last week in New England.

An unmarried man in Connecticut advertises for a five-twenty blonde.

There are in Indiana five hundred negroes in insane persons, outside the asylums.

His EXCELLENCE, Gov. Worth, accompanied by the Hons. D. L. Swain and D. M. Bar-

### Life and Campaigns of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

We have heretofore noticed the receipt of some advance sheets of the work bearing the above title, by James D. McCabe, of Virginia, and soon to be issued from the press of the National Publishing Co., in Richmond. Such work, under competent auspices, will be an invaluable acquisition, but we protest, if the sheets before us are to be regarded as a sample of its fitness and reliability, against this forthcoming book being regarded as authentic history.

The love of our people for the old *Standard* has been that of sons for a Christian mother. To behold her now prostrate and expiring in ignominy is death-wit a power to say or relieve, long-spared she the stern conviction that the time has come to part. Many will linger awhile to depart, and finding hope with despair, the tie which binds us to home, even when its root is failing in rains around us, and many are so strongly swayed by attachment to the land of their birth, that they will strive to live on in the trac-tured hands, and find a melancholy pleasure in sticking to their dissolution. Such men, not deserving of blame, and the incurable permanency of temporary events, stand above our pity, and, in some sort, console our sympathy. Few, if any, however, for this class of men, a field of omnipotence has come in of stupendous power and ill to the earth. All countries hold their people, and they still do as well, but better, than others to people such a country as ours, and such.

The triumph was dearly won, and was brief; it was glorious. The enemy rallied in the second line, and pointed a withering fire into the captured works, now held by the Virginians. Glancing around to look for his supports, Pickett found that he was alone, that Pettigrew's men had fled, and left him to fate. His grand charge had been in vain."

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

But there is another, and daily increasing class, who have looked in faithfully on the past, but left it to others to wag their heads over it. The author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that all this is perversion of fact. We will not charge that it is wilful. But an author, who has access to no better source of information, had better cease to assume to be of the historiographer. It is a matter of *fact* that the division in question, which, the author says, was composed almost entirely of North Carolina troops, had the command of their leaders, and while the former had been in the field, the latter had been in camp.

We say that