

BY HUGH WILSON.

ABBEVILLE, S. C.

Published every Wednesday at 2 o'clock on Wednesday, Jan. 21, 1903.

The Shooting of Gonzales.

The most widely discussed event of the last week, was the shooting of Editor N. G. Gonzales by Lieutenant Governor James H. Tillman. In other columns of this paper, particulars of the sad affair are copied from other newspapers, and it would be useless to repeat the story here. The parties to this trouble are so well known to our people that nothing which we might say would add anything, or contribute anything, to what is already known to every reader of the Press and Banner.

But as the Governor and some of the brethren of the press, notably the Spartanburg Herald and the Charleston News and Courier, have delivered homilies on the subject of carrying pistols and the resultant evils of so doing, we would add to what they have so well said, that as long as human nature is the same as it is today, and as long as the existing contest exists, pistols will be carried and men will be shot.

If the influence of our brethren of the press, who are so shocked at the recent homicide in Columbia, had prevailed against the unjournalistic use of the pen, they might not now be forced to lament the unwise use of the pistol.

The good name of any proud and ambitious citizen is scarcely less sacred than his life, and it is well known that an editor has no more right than any other citizen to assault the character of another citizen.

An editor may be justified in publishing news, from which the reader may form his own conclusions, but he has no right to write to characterize a man's conduct, or to apply to him epithets which are offensive and which would bring him into contempt or which might lead to bring about a breach of the peace.

The applying of epithets is unjournalistic, while the firing of a pistol is another unjournalistic act.

If, therefore, editors would suppress violence and murder, they must to order their conduct as to act within their rights, and must learn to be just and fair to all men.

This whole affair is most lamentable. The good name of a citizen has been assailed, and the life of another has been taken. Two families have been thrown into a sea of trouble.

The press and the public, the people and the officers of the law, may moralize as they please, but as long as there are assassins upon our shores, we shall have assassinations, and these assassinations will be bloodshed.

Mr. Gonzales was a man of ability, and a successful writer, though he was not a logical thinker nor an able debater.

He seemingly depended more upon personalities than upon anything else to win his controversies.

His possibilities for usefulness, however, were not exceeded by those of any man in the State. He was active and watchful and served his country well, but in his zeal he had not learned to yield the proper respect for the rights and the feelings of others.

Instead of carrying his notes and argument to sustain his position, he too often sought to defeat from the character of men—many of whom had given him no other offense than that of disagreeing from him in opinion, or in holding to different political views.

His ability and self-assertion led him to presume too far on the acquiescence or the cowardice of others.

And this failure to recognize the rights of others finally cost him his life, and deprived the State of the services of a citizen, who, with more conservative views, would have been a most useful and influential force for good. Unmolested, his impulses were good, and his speech was within bounds.

As far as we are able to judge, he was incorrigible. It was his intemperance or his lack of respect for others that injured his usefulness. Being intemperate he could see no good in those to whom he took a dislike, and he saw little else than evil in those who dared to differ from him. Because of these evils he sometimes had the appearance of being unfair though when free from feeling, he justly judged himself on the fairness of speech and when free from irritation and anger, he had reason to be proud of the correctness of his actions.

His life and death should prove the error of his style of conducting a newspaper, he will not have lived in vain. No editor has yet succeeded who antagonized everybody and fought everything which he did not lead or establish. The wonder is, as has often been expressed, that he did not long ago excite the violence which he so often invited.

Speaking for this newspaper, and he had often been unjust to us, we are sorry for his death. We hope for his recovery, and for days we believed that his good physical condition and the skill of the physicians would bring him through all right.

With more experience and with increasing years his disposition would have changed. He would have been more just to others, and his greater power for usefulness would have been put to rest. And having the commendation of the correctness of our own course, we are quite sure that he would, sooner or later, have recognized that fact and become our friend.

The Cry Against Pistols.

After every homicide, there is more or less outcry against the citizen arming himself with deadly weapons.

It is fair to presume that such outcry is from sincere effort to promote the public place and to advance the safety of the citizen.

In the pistol-carrying business there are, as in everything else, two sides. While all will admit that much evil can justly be charged to the pistol, yet we presume that no sane man will deny that the pistol has a most salutary influence, in protecting property, the person, and in good measure of those weaker citizens from the assaults of those who would injure or destroy.

If pistols or other weapons of offense or defense, were done away with, what protection would the weak have from the encroachments of the bully or the wrong doer? The able-bodied citizen then at his own sweet will might trample under foot the power of his neighbors possessing less physical power than himself.

Without the pistol no gentleman would be safe from insult.

Without the pistol the character of no man would be safe.

Without the pistol defenseless women might be trampled under foot with impunity.

Without the pistol the bully might be a terror for all those who dared act from their own convictions or failed to yield obedience to his usurpations.

If the foolish to talk about depriving the weakest citizens of the right to defend himself against the oppressions of the bold or usurpations of disorder, the bully and the wrong doer could have their own sweet way. Nothing so curbs the actions of some men as much as the knowledge that the wronged man may use his pistol.

And no doubt every body in all the land would be delighted to know that the pistol was abolished. It would not be right to deprive the people of the right to make such men observe the properties.

Nations in time of peace, prepare for war. All self-respecting nations employ soldiers along their frontiers. Then are citizens not to be allowed to protect themselves? Must the citizen be required to submit to the constant insult of newspapers? Or, must the gentleman be required to take the abuse or suffer the wrongs that may be inflicted upon him? Does there not come a time when forbearance ceases to be a virtue? Does there not come a time when a man must shoot?

As long as we have the pistol, it is not, therefore well to presume too far on the cowardice of anybody.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

DUE WEST.

Changes in Business—Crosses of Honor or Presented to Old Soldiers.

Due West, Jan. 20, 1903.

Mrs. Edith Little of Louisville, Ga., is visiting Mrs. M. J. Bryson and Mr. W. H. Bryson, both of whom are also visiting Mrs. Bryson. Both are handsome and popular young ladies and will enjoy themselves while in Due West.

Mr. Henry Presley, youngest son of Dr. Neil E. Presley of Columbia, entered Greenville College after the holidays.

The family of Senator J. K. Hood of Anderson is wintering at the home of the Senator in attending to his duties at the State Capitol.

A meeting of the Board of Foreign Missions a few days ago Miss Anna Strickland, Tenn., was selected as a missionary to Mexico. It is expected that she will go on about the 15th of next month.

Miss E. V. of Union County is visiting the family of Mr. W. B. Goings.

Mrs. Lucy Thompson, Mrs. Gary and Mrs. Richard Hill of Abbeville were in Due West Monday and Tuesday.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

Dr. J. W. Wideman made a stirring and eloquent address at the meeting of the Confederate Veterans of Camp J. R. Lytgoe and Camp Sam McGowan.

WEST END.

Happenings and Incidents of a Week About the City.

Abbeville, Jan. 20, 1903.

Mrs. Susie Brunson Hill of Edgefield is in the city the guest of her sister, Mrs. J. W. Adams.

Mrs. S. A. Allen of Warrenton was the guest of Mrs. and Mr. Harry M. Wilson.

Miss Willie Goodbold of Marion is in the city the guest of her sister Mrs. J. W. Adams.

Miss Lillian Miller of Laurens is in the city the guest of her sister Mrs. J. W. Adams.

Miss Winton Taggart has just returned from an extended trip to Harpers Ferry, Md.

Mr. and Mrs. G. W. Spoor of Monterey spent Thursday in the city.

Miss Mary Thompson one of Anderson's most attractive young women is in the city spending some time with her sister Mrs. J. W. Adams.

Mr. and Mrs. T. Gordon White returned Saturday from a two weeks stay in the "Land of Flowers."

Mr. John R. Blake came up from Columbia Saturday and was in the city until Monday.

Mr. C. C. Colburn of Greenville arrived in the city Monday to be present at the marriage of his niece Miss Jane J. Adams.

Mrs. George McDaniel will visit her daughter Mrs. W. W. Edwards for some time before returning to her home in Laurens.

Miss Ellen Gambrell spent Sunday in Hodges with her grand parents, Mr. and Mrs. Gambrell.

Mrs. Trench Pool and her little son of Newberry are in the city the guest of Mrs. J. W. Adams.

Mr. G. A. Vianaka has returned from a short trip to Atlanta where he went to visit his brother, Mr. Vianaka who has been sick.

Miss Cassie Fleming from Lone Cave was in the city last Friday, the guest of Mrs. Lawson.

Mr. W. A. Lanier of Monterey was in town Monday.

Miss L. O. Robertson came home Thursday from Lowndesville, where she has been spending some time as the guest of her cousin Mrs. J. O. Robertson.

Miss Louise Hamilton is in the city to spend some time. Miss Hamilton is always a popular guest.

The friends of Mr. and Mrs. Mansfield Hollingsworth will regret to know that their son, Mansfield Hollingsworth, who has been in the city for some time, is unable to go on his trip to the coast.

Mr. Frank Simmons and Mr. Kilmartin of Charleston are in the city to attend the meeting of the Board of Education.

Mrs. J. H. Lattimer and Mrs. Maggie Lattimer Bulluck have just returned from a ten days visit in Lowndesville.

Mr. and Mrs. Julius Roper have returned to their home in Columbia, after a short visit to the guests of Mr. and Mrs. Charles D. Brown.

BARKSDALE.

It is often interesting to know what there is in a name, where it came from and what it means.

Many names in America are of Indian origin and many found their way to this country from England, France and Germany.

The origin of some is given below as developed by the geological survey's study.

The geological survey is completing an exceedingly interesting work on the origin of names in this country.

When completed the work will be the most exhaustive of its kind to be had.

The derivation of the names of many historical places and cities and towns in the United States is given.

The State of Alabama derives its name from an Indian tribe. There are several explanations of the meaning of the word.

One author says it is "burnt clearing," and others say it is "here we rest." Still another authority says it is "thicket clearing."

Albany, N. Y., was named for the Duke of York, whose Scotch title was the Duke of Albany.

He was afterwards James II of England. The name takes its name from an Indian word meaning "great country," or "great land."

Aiton, Ill., was named by Rufus Easton, its founder, for his son Aiton, while Altoona, Pa. derives its name from the Latin word altus "high."

The word Appalachian, the general appellation of the mountain system in the southeastern part of this country, was given by the Spaniards under De Soto.

They derived it from neighboring Indians. Authorities differ as to the meaning of the word, one saying it comes from the Carib word apaliche, "man"; another that it is from the Esougeoo word apala, "the great sea or the great ocean."

Arkansas causes a diversity of opinion from scientists. Marquette and other French explorers wrote the word Arkansas and Akamark from the Indian tribe. The usual etymology writes the name from the French word "bow," and Kansas, "smoky water." Various other derivations are put forward.

Asbury Park was named for Francis Asbury, the pioneer bishop of Methodism in America. Several towns in the Southern States bear his name.

Atlanta, Ga., was designated by that name to show its relationship to the Atlantic ocean, which it is connected by a railroad.

Atlantic, as applied to the ocean, is a French word meaning "sea beyond Mount Atlas."

Bar Harbor, Me., gets its name from a sandy bar visible only at low tide. Baltimore is named for Lord Baltimore, who settled the province in 1638.

About even the historic city of Boston there is wide difference of opinion. By some its name is said to have been given in honor of John Cotton, a Vicar of St. Dunstons Church in Boston.

Brooklyn, N. Y., a corruption of the Dutch name Breuckelen, from a village in the province of Utrecht Holland, and the name signifies broken-up land or marshy land.

The word Butte as applied to several cities and towns in this country, is from the French word Butte, meaning "a small knob or hill."

Camden, N. J., a corruption of the Dutch name Camden, from a village in the province of Utrecht Holland, and the name signifies broken-up land or marshy land.

Camden, N. J., a corruption of the Dutch name Camden, from a village in the province of Utrecht Holland, and the name signifies broken-up land or marshy land.

Camden, N. J., a corruption of the Dutch name Camden, from a village in the province of Utrecht Holland, and the name signifies broken-up land or marshy land.

CAUSES OF INDIGESTION.

How Certain Ills Which Affect the Stomach Become Chronic.

(Youth's Companion.)

The causes of chronic indigestion are manifold, but usually, and almost always in the beginning, even when the stomach finally becomes actually diseased, the condition is due to improper eating. It may not be that the sufferer eats too much—although very many people who are gluttons do that—but he eats improperly. One who suffers from dyspepsia, or who wishes to avoid such suffering, should remember that the stomach cannot do all the work of digestion.

Before it enters the stomach the food must be finely divided and mixed with the saliva which is secreted through the salivary glands as a necessary digestive food as the gastric juice. Gladstone, it is said, used to chew every mouthful of food thirty-two times, one for each tooth, before he swallowed it.

Long mastication of the food is useful in many ways. In the first place, it should appeal to all who delight in the pleasures of the table, for if the food is savory it is tasted longer and better when well chewed. Again, long mastication mixes the food well with the saliva and begins its digestion, and this sweetens its taste. Finally, if one eats slowly he will have less time to eat much, and hunger is appeased and a feeling of satiety is attained before the stomach can become overloaded.

While one is chewing the food should be moved from side to side of the mouth that the mixture with the saliva may be more thorough. Too much fluid should not be taken with the meal, but it is not a wise plan to take none, as is sometimes recommended. The gastric juice should not be too much diluted, but if the food is well masticated the juice acts better and more rapidly. One glass of water with a meal is about the right amount. Cold water, moreover, in moderate quantity stimulates the secretion of gastric juice, and a wineglassful of ice water taken before the meal gives a fillip to the appetite without any of the drawbacks of liquor.

If in spite of all precautions chronic indigestion persists one should try the experiment of eating only one kind of food at a meal—meat, fish or eggs, without bread or potatoes, or bread and butter without animal food. The stomach which rebels at a mixed meal will often do its work satisfactorily if offered only one article of food at a time.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

J. Hayne McMillan, J. Fraser Lyon.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

J. Hayne McMillan, J. Fraser Lyon.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

J. Hayne McMillan, J. Fraser Lyon.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

J. Hayne McMillan, J. Fraser Lyon.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

J. Hayne McMillan, J. Fraser Lyon.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

J. Hayne McMillan, J. Fraser Lyon.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

J. Hayne McMillan, J. Fraser Lyon.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

J. Hayne McMillan, J. Fraser Lyon.

THE PARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing between J. Hayne McMillan and J. Fraser Lyon, under the firm name of McMillan & Lyon, in this day dissolved by mutual consent.

The Cry Against Pistols.

After every homicide, there is more or less outcry against the citizen arming himself with deadly weapons.

It is fair to presume that such outcry is from sincere effort to promote the public place and to advance the safety of the citizen.

In the pistol-carrying business there are, as in everything else, two sides. While all will admit that much evil can justly be charged to the pistol, yet we presume that no sane man will deny that the pistol has a most salutary influence, in protecting property, the person, and in good measure of those weaker citizens from the assaults of those who would injure or destroy.

If pistols or other weapons of offense or defense, were done away with, what protection would the weak have from the encroachments of the bully or the wrong doer? The able-bodied citizen then at his own sweet will might trample under foot the power of his neighbors possessing less physical power than himself.

Without the pistol no gentleman would be safe from insult.

Without the pistol the character of no man would be safe.

Without the pistol defenseless women might be trampled under foot with impunity.

Without the pistol the bully might be a terror for all those who dared act from their own convictions or failed to yield obedience to his usurpations.

If the foolish to talk about depriving the weakest citizens of the right to defend himself against the oppressions of the bold or usurpations of disorder, the bully and the wrong doer could have their own sweet way. Nothing so curbs the actions of some men as much as the knowledge that the wronged man may use his pistol.

And no doubt every body in all the land would be delighted to know that the pistol was abolished. It would not be right to deprive the people of the right to make such men observe the properties.

Nations in time of peace, prepare for war. All self-respecting nations employ soldiers along their frontiers. Then are citizens not to be allowed to protect themselves? Must the citizen be required to submit to the constant insult of newspapers? Or, must the gentleman be required to take the abuse or suffer the wrongs that may be inflicted upon him? Does there not come a time when forbearance ceases to be a virtue? Does there not come a time when a man must shoot?

As long as we have the pistol, it is not, therefore well to presume too far on the cowardice of anybody.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

Should our Legislature attempt to wick a law to prevent the citizen from carrying a pistol, it is a law which will do a very foolish thing in inauguration a system when the strong may do as they please and when the weak must do as they can, while being compelled to submit to outrage and insult.

The Cry Against Pistols.

After every homicide, there is more or less outcry against the citizen arming himself with deadly weapons.

It is fair to presume that such outcry is from sincere effort to promote the public place and to advance the safety of the citizen.

In the pistol-carrying business there are, as in everything else, two sides. While all will admit that much evil can justly be charged to the pistol, yet we presume that no sane man will deny that the pistol has a most salutary influence, in protecting property, the person, and in good measure of those weaker citizens from the assaults of those who would injure or destroy.

If pistols or other weapons of offense or defense, were done away with, what protection would the weak have from the encroachments of the bully or the wrong doer? The able-bodied citizen then at his own sweet will might trample under foot the power of his neighbors possessing less physical power than himself.

Without the pistol no gentleman would be safe from insult.

Without the pistol