

The Anderson Intelligencer.

An Independent Family Journal--Devoted to Politics, News, Literature, &c.

BY JAMES A. HOYT.

ANDERSON C. H., S. C., THURSDAY MORNING, MARCH 22, 1866.

VOLUME I.—NUMBER 40.

The Intelligencer

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY
AT THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM,
IN U. S. CURRENCY,
OR, \$2.00 A YEAR IN SPECIE.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Advertisements inserted at the rates of One Dollar per square of twelve lines for the first insertion and Fifty Cents for each subsequent insertion. Obituaries and Marriage Notices charged for at these rates.

MILITARY TRIAL.

[CONTINUED.]

CITADEL, March 10, 1866.

The Commission met at 10.30, A. M., and continued the trial of James Crawford Keys, his son, Robert Keys, and Elisha Byren.

His Excellency James Lawrence Orr, witness for the defence, being examined out of order (the prosecution not having closed), to enable him to leave the city, deposed: That he went to school with Crawford Keys in 1833; that Keys is nine years his senior, being about 53 years of age; that he (Keys) lives two miles from Anderson, where he (witness) lives; that Keys is regarded as a prosperous man; that Crawford Keys came to his (witness') house, on Monday, 9th October, about 8 o'clock, and asked him to get his cotton at Brown's Ferry released by Provost Marshal, saying that eleven bales belonged to him (C. Keys), and five bales he had received as agent of tax in kind; that witness and Keys went to the Provost Marshal's office, and there heard of the murder at Brown's Ferry; that Crawford Keys exclaimed, "Good God! you don't say so—that was my cotton they were guarding; I desired that the guard should be placed there;" that the witness watched Keys closely; that his eyes were clear, not blood-shot as in cases of loss of rest, and his demeanor in consonance with his exclamation above related; that he (witness) had known Crawford Keys continuously for 30 years very intimately; that his character is good; that he had recommended him to Col. Brown for the position of Provost Judge, as being a just and fearless man, who would do justice between the black and white man.

Being cross-examined by the Judge Advocate, His Excellency said that Crawford Keys was an Agent of the Q. M. Department during the late war; that he (witness) had been Keys' counsel; that he was applied to to act as his counsel in this case; that he had not acted as such, but had advised Keys' friends as to the conduct of the case; that he has not conferred on behalf of Keys with the Military authorities to obtain his release; that his knowledge of Keys' character depends upon both public opinion and his personal knowledge; that C. Keys is a determined, self-reliant man.

The following questions were asked by the Judge Advocate:

Question—Have you ever known him (Crawford Keys) to employ violence in any transaction, public or private.

Answer—I have heard of it; whether it is true or not, I can't say.

Question—State what you heard on the subject.

The accused, by his counsel, objected to the question. "The witness cannot state what he heard. He must speak of his own knowledge; and further, on the question of character, the issue always is as to the general character and reputation, and not particular facts."

The Judge Advocate insisted on the question being put on the following grounds:

The witness is called to prove the general character of Crawford Keys; he states that the opinion which he has expressed is based on both personal knowledge and the opinion of others.

The object of the cross-examination is to ascertain upon what foundation the opinion or statement of the witness rests. The statement derived from general opinion must necessarily rest on the statements he has heard others make on the subject. Now it is just this basis of fact that is sought to be inquired into.

It is not contended that we can inquire into the actual existence of the facts as supposed by the counsel of the accused. All we can do is to find what statements form the groundwork of the opinion which the witness has expressed.

The decision of the Commission was as follows:

The subject before us is one of reputation, which is necessarily derived from the aggregate speech of people; upon this point the witness has testified that the character (using the word in the sense of reputation) of the defendant is good. It seems to the Commission that, on cross-examination, it is proper to show that

the witness has heard people speak against his character, or that it may be shown that the witness has heard of the defendant being connected with deeds of violence. By this cross-examination, no second issue will be raised, because the cross-examiner does not undertake to prove that the defendant has been guilty of the acts of any of which the witness has heard; but, if he can bring before the Court the evidence that the witness has heard of such transactions on the part of the defendant as tending to show that the witness is in error in stating that the reputation of defendant is good, the Court think, therefore, that the question may be put.

His Excellency having replied that he had heard five or six years ago that Crawford Keys was engaged, with others, in lynching two men, he was asked by the Judge Advocate the following question:

"State the names of the persons and the nature and circumstances of the transactions as you heard them related, as far as they concerned Crawford Keys."

The accused objected "that, under the ruling of the Court just given, the witness may be asked if he heard of any act done by the accused impeaching the good character given by the witness. This question goes further, and opens up all the particulars of the fact."

The question was withdrawn by the Judge Advocate, who proposed the following:

"Did you know for what cause the two persons mentioned by you were lynched? If so, what was the cause?"

The accused objected on the ground that the witness may testify as to the fact, but not as to the particulars of the fact or the motives which induced it, or the circumstances which accompanied it; and further, that if the witness is to testify as to the cause, we must go into an examination of his opportunities of observation; and further, that it is all hearsay.

The Commission sustained the objection, and the question was not put.

His Excellency said that the community at Anderson would not sanction acts of violence against persons guilty only of adherence to the United States Government. Being asked this question by the Judge Advocate—"Assuming that some action had been taken by such parties to express and communicate such opinion (favorable to the United States Government), what would the community have judged of acts of violence against such persons?"

The accused objected to the question because it asked the witness to suppose something, and then to suppose what would be the opinion of the community on that something. It is a supposition mounted on a supposition. Whereas, it is respectfully submitted, the witness must testify to facts, and to facts in his knowledge.

The Judge Advocate insisted on the question, urging "that the object of the question being to ascertain whether the standing and reputation of Crawford Keys among his neighbors was such as to be inconsistent with the commission of the offence in question, it is important to know how the community has, until recently, regarded acts of the class to which the case in question belongs; namely, cases in which a local interest is in conflict with the general interests of the United States Government. Without inquiring for the present into the precise class of motives concerned in the murder, we may assume for the present that they had a public and local character."

The objection was sustained.

His Excellency stated in reply to further questions, that the acts of violence referred to did not produce an unfavorable impression on his mind as to Keys being a just, upright man; that he had apprehended that suspicion would rest upon Crawford Keys, under the belief that the cotton belonging to Keys had been removed from the Ferry by the murderers; that the same belief led him to ask Crawford Keys if his sons were at home that night; that he replied, "All but Peter;" that from his experience in the Courts, he would suppose that the perpetrators of a grave offence would most likely exhibit symptoms of nervousness, restlessness, excitement, flushed face, blood-shot eyes, where they had lost sleep; that his observations of criminals was confined to those accused: that he scrutinized Crawford Keys, to judge by observation if he were implicated in the murder; that from an acquaintance of thirty years, he believed him incapable of such a crime; that his knowledge and appreciation of Keys' character may have produced a bias on his (witness's) mind, in concluding from his observations that Keys was not implicated in the murder, but that he was not conscious of such

bias; that Elisha Byren lives three-quarters of a mile from Crawford Keys.

CITADEL, March 12, 1866.

The Commission met at 10.30, A. M., and continued the trial of James Crawford Keys, his son, Robert Keys, and Elisha Byren.

The Judge Advocate stated that he received information from the Counsel for the accused, and from other sources, that one of the horses of the soldiers murdered at Brown's Ferry, on the 8th of October last, had been found in Anderson or Pickens District. An arrest of the person, in whose possession it was found, had been made. No such information has yet officially been communicated to the military authorities in Charleston, although a reply has been received from Gen. Ames to a telegraphic dispatch making an inquiry as to such rumored fact.

He further stated that he did not wish to delay the case, but at the same time deemed it proper to say that evidence may be elicited, in the event of such information proving true, which it would be important to introduce in this case. That, if no serious objections existed, he would prefer to suspend the prosecution, permitting the defence to introduce such testimony as they may deem proper to submit, before the final close of the prosecution, and renew the prosecution as soon as the result of the investigation into the matter can be known.

On motion, and in order to allow the Judge Advocate opportunity to obtain further information in the matter referred to, the Commission adjourned to meet on Wednesday, the 14th inst., at 10.30, A. M.

The Food we Eat.

In the first place, we shall consider what to eat. As every one knows, though but few observe it, that which is most nutritious and most digestible is the food most conducive to good health. While our diet should consist, to a certain extent, and in a large proportion, of animal food, yet it ought not to be entirely animal, but consist partly of vegetable; for, while both are good and necessary for us, it is pretty well admitted that neither one separately is adapted to man. Therefore, there should be a fair proportion of each. In the cooking of food much care should be observed, in preserving as much as possible its nutritive element, which is the essential part of it. The majority of people eat meat cooked almost to a cinder; the consequence is, that all the nutriment has been extracted, and to all practical purposes, as far as actual nourishment, as well as flavor, are concerned, they may as well eat a piece of shoe-leather. Beef and mutton should always be rare. An experienced eye can almost invariably distinguish those that eat rare meat from those that eat it as dry as a chip. While the former present a countenance ruddy, and as though there were some blood in their system, the latter look as if they lived on milk and water, a sort of nambypamby specimens of humanity.

Eat rare meat; but, at the same time not raw. When cut, it should look like meat, not a cinder. Ask some patients the question, "How do you eat your meat, rare or well done?" and the answer will be, "Oh, well done, of course," as though they were barbarians to eat it otherwise. Advise them to eat it rare, and they will turn up their noses with an expression of disgust, and tell you, "Oh, I never could bring my mind to eat it so—the idea alone is disgusting." They eat the superficial and throw away the material, for in the juice of the meat is the nutriment, not the meat itself. It is about as sensible as to squeeze an orange, throw away the juice, and eat the rind.

The plainer food is cooked the better, for no condiments conduce to health; but on the contrary, are invariably the cause of dyspepsia, constipation, and their hundred and one concomitants. Salt is the all-sufficient seasoning necessary.

Pork and veal every one is better without, for while it is generally supposed the former generates worms, besides being an unclean animal, the latter possesses little or no nourishment. Salted meats and fish should be avoided. Fresh beef, mutton, poultry, fish, etc., should be the diet of animal food. Of vegetables almost all are wholesome—therefore, it is not necessary to revert further to them.

Now we come to when we eat, which, though nature has indicated, and we don't always observe. The period of eating should be divided into three—morning, noon and evening—and the hours should be regular, not eating at this hour to-day, and another to-morrow, but every day at the same hour. The morning meal should be quite as substantial as any other. Many of our readers will no doubt bear evidence to our assertion, that there is nothing that will enable any one to

bear a hard day's work better than a hearty breakfast, for the reason that the hours since last eating being replenished, the system is invigorated, all the functions receiving fresh vigor, besides there being a greater supply to admit of waste, which naturally accompanies exertion or fatigue. For this to be substantial, a cup of coffee, a piece of toast, with an egg, is not sufficient, but should be meat and vegetables.

Dinner, if it is in the middle of the day, which is undoubtedly, the most healthy, does not require much notice, as every one well understands what dinner ought to be, and, therefore, it is generally substantial. Should the noon meal, however, be lunch, as it is frequently, instead of a piece of pie, or some light dyspepsia-generating trash of that sort, let it be something more substantial, resembling what tea or supper should be, if dinner were in the middle of the day.

Of this tea, a few remarks will not be out of place, as it is the meal most neglected. The word tea generally conveys the idea of what it too frequently is, an apology for a meal—bread and butter, some sweetmeat, and a cup of tea. Why should it be as light as it is, we cannot see. The system requires recuperation just as much after the waste intervening between noon and then as between the two previous meals, particularly when we consider the length of time that will elapse before the next meal. Now, we don't advocate stuffing and going to bed on a full stomach; but we advocate making the supper a more substantial meal than it is. It is very amusing to see persons advocate this meal being light, and then when they get hungry in an hour or two after, which they will, go out to a restaurant and eat a hearty supper, very soon after which they will probably retire. Now, did they eat a moderately substantial meal at the proper time there would be no necessity for this, and a sufficient time before going to bed would elapse for all injurious effects to be done away with. Let the meal, instead of slops, consist of something substantial, partly meat. While retiring on a full stomach is injurious, doing so on an empty or hungry one is equally so.

Lastly we come to the question, how to eat, which, though last and not least, has been, to a certain extent, alluded to above. But still there is something to be said about it. As we remarked before, have regular hours for eating, and be punctual to them. Nature admits of no delays and postponements, being one of the most exacting of all masters. Don't let business or anything else interfere with hours for eating. Let it constitute part of the business of the day, and, when eating, don't eat as though it were for a wager, with some one else, to see who could eat the most in the shortest space of time; but sit down and eat like a civilized being, chewing the food thoroughly. Food bolted without being chewed, does little or no good; for by it the wheels of digestion are clogged, and the whole machinery, more or less, thrown out of gear.

It is pretty well established that, while children are, in many instances, underfed, grown persons as often overeat themselves. Never eat until a feeling of overloading the stomach is produced, or, as we have heard it expressed, "I have eaten so much that I feel as though I should burst." This is equally as culpable and injurious, though not recognized as such, as drinking until drunk. Eat no more than can be borne with comfort. The mental and physical powers will be both better for it. Nature never intended the stomach to be a receptacle for all this miscellaneous trash people choose to cram into it; but the reservoir from which the various organs, which keep together the vital spark, receive their functional support. Therefore, do not overload it. The stomach, like a horse, can bear just so much, but no more. It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back.

In conclusion, what we wish to impress upon our readers is the necessity of nutritious and easily digested food, and as near as possible equalizing the quality and quantity at each meal—not making one a feast, and the other a fast; and at the same time, while care be observed in not overloading the stomach, yet the other extreme should not be gone to, of not eating enough, and that of too light and not sufficiently nutritious a nature.—*Lancet.*

The greatest man is he who chooses the right with invincible resolution; who resists the sorest temptations from within and without; who bears the heaviest burdens cheerfully; who is the calmest in storms, and whose reliance on truth, on virtue, on God, is the most unflinching.

"Wood is the thing after all," as the man with a pine leg said when a mad dog bit it.

Cotton or Grain?

Shall cotton or grain be our main crop this year, is a question of no little moment at this time.

In our impoverished condition, the future more than ordinarily uncertain, and free labor a problem of doubtful solution, it is natural that everybody should desire to plant all the cotton possible, which will pay at least \$150 per bale, and if the season be favorable, enable the planter to buy his provision, &c., and lay by something for contingencies.

Many are going to make cotton their sole crop—planting only little corn or other grain. Everybody is going to plant some cotton, and those who never saw a cotton stalk are now buying seed, and calculating with paper and pencil the great returns they are going to make. Cotton presents the readiest means of making money, and therefore, all are hat in hand to his Majesty—now, more than ever, King. But there is an old economical adage—"don't put all your eggs in one basket"—which might be advantageously remembered by the cotton-worshippers. If the season should be unfavorable, if the worm, the grasshopper, or any of the other enemies of the "great staple" should make the crop a failure, and bring all the pencilled estimates of profits to naught—nay, make the result, after paying the freedmen and supporting them, a loss instead of a gain, where is the money to come from to buy provisions, &c? Or suppose that the crops of the Northwest should fail, or be insufficient, and prices advance considerably above the present high standard, even supposing that we do make the cotton we expect, and get \$150 per bale for it, if we cannot buy provisions or are obliged to pay an immense price for them, where is our profit?

Last year all the labor that was available was employed in growing corn and wheat, and yet it is an admitted fact that the supply of breadstuffs in the country now, is insufficient, and that this is one of the causes of the present high prices of grain. The supply of labor is now materially reduced below what it was last year, both in quantity and quality, and if it be almost exclusively employed in the production of cotton, to the neglect of breadstuffs, we may depend on it, that when driven to a Northern market to buy all we want, and thrown on the tender mercies of railroad companies to bring us what we buy, we will find that the magnificent profits of our cotton, if we realize them, will pass out of our pockets into those of "our friends of the great Northwest," of whom we heard such flattering tales during the war, and into the insatiable maws of the railroads, to whom the direst popular necessity, is the most favorable opportunity.

The temptation to plant cotton is very strong. It will certainly pay largely if we make a crop; but that if depends on two other *ifs*, namely: if the season be favorable, and if the freedmen "conclude to work." It would be wise, therefore, to guard against contingencies, and let each agriculturist, whether he be the large planter with his thousands of acres, or the humble farmer, plant enough of grain at least for his own use, and then he may woo the smiles of King Cotton as much as he pleases.

"Make all the money we can this year, and sell out," is the cry of petulance and impatience, and has no wisdom in it, for it amounts to the same thing as killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

Plant cotton, but remember that roasting ears are not to be despised; that a few bushels of wheat at home, without sending to Cincinnati to get them, and then sending to the depot day after day to see if they have arrived, are a great contribution to comfort; and that a little rye for a grazing patch, and other purposes, may be cultivated with advantage, if used in moderation.—*Southern Banner.*

In a jolly party over a glass of champagne, the following good one was told by a jolly good fellow, and a Federal officer too. Raising his glass, he said, "Gentlemen, I give you the same toast that a sensible Dutch officer gave in New York. Being called on he said, 'Ladies and shenteelmen, I gives you Sheneral Putler!' Here there was great apparent indignation. 'Ladies and shenteelmen, I gives you Sheneral Putler!' Here the Dutchman stood his ground and kept his countenance. 'Ladies and Shenteelmen, I gives you Sheneral Putler, because I have no use for him myself!'"

Hours of joy go dancing by with down upon their feet; but those of sorrow drag as heavily as though they had tar on their heels.

THADDEUS STEVENS—HIS ANTECEDENTS

The notorious Thaddeus Stevens commenced his political life in 1836 in the Legislature of Pennsylvania, as an anti-Mason demagogue. His hobby then was anti-Masonry as it now is the negro. His first public act was to spy out the secrets of Masonry. It is thus alluded to by the *Pittsburg Post*, which says:

"The object of this inquisition was to extort from men connected with the institution of Masonry an exposition of their principles, including the secrets of the Order, which, it is alleged, they had sworn to preserve inviolate. To this end many of the most prominent statesmen of the Commonwealth were dragged before this Star Chamber, and held in durance vile for weeks, and compelled to submit to every indignity that malice could invent. Had they been the veriest criminals they could not have been subjected to greater ignominy."

"Among those who were thus outraged may be mentioned the lamented Governors Wolf and Shunk, and the Hon. George M. Dallas; nor did even the sacred desk escape the persecution of this fanatical anti-Mason. The Rev. Mr. Spralls, an eminent divine of the Presbyterian Church, was dragged by an officer of the House before the 'modern juggernaut,' as he appropriately styled the Committee, and put under the torture, with a view of compelling him to divulge, under oath, what he knew about this ancient and respectable institution. But he, following the example of the distinguished statesmen we have named, spurned the miserable tyrant who would thus have him violate his honor. These men were only released from duress by the united votes of the Democratic members, with a few of the opposition."

"We next find this man, Thaddeus Stevens, in 1838, at the head of a wicked conspiracy to overthrow civil government in our peaceful old Commonwealth, by ignoring the clearly expressed will of the people at the ballot-box, and but for the indomitable courage of the Democratic members of the Legislature, the hellish plot would have succeeded, and the election treated as though it had never been held."

THE TRAGIC HISTORY OF MR. BROWN STOUT.—The following will be immensely interesting to the drinkers of English beer:

A celebrated brewer in London had in his employ a fat porter by the name of Stout. One day Stout was missing, and they knew nothing of him for several weeks. In the mean time his London customers plied him with orders for more beer like the last supplied. The brewer was at a loss to know in what consisted the superiority of that particular brewing until the beer was drawn from the vat, when to their astonishment and horror they found the remains of poor Stout. He had fallen into the vat of hot beer and had been scalded to death. The citizens of London had drunk him up, with the exception of the parts not soluble in water; nothing was left of him but his hair, toe and finger nails and the bones. This circumstance gave the name to that particular kind of liquor known as "brown stout," which has established for itself a world-wide celebrity, and is sold in all parts of the civilized world at fabulous prices.

We desire to obalm the following extraordinarily sublime, eloquent, and elegant perorations. The first is said to have been delivered before a court of justice in Pennsylvania: "Your honor sits high upon the adorable of justice, like the Asiatic rock of Gibraltar, while the eternal streams of justice, like cadaverous clouds of the valley, flow meandering at your extended feet." The next is by a celebrated lawyer, of New Jersey: "Your honors, I fancy, do not sit there like marble statues, to be wafted about by every idle breeze."

There is a whole sermon in the saying of the old Persian:—"In all thy quarrels leave open the door of conciliation."

Some of our Western friends have a talent for the figurative. One of our Tennessee exchanges describes another, as "holding its left hand under the swallow tail of its constitutional dignity, and extending the nose-wiper of interrogative pathos in its right."

He who says what he likes hears what he does not like.

While the tall woman is stooping the little one hath swept the house.

A foolish friend does more harm than a wise enemy.

He who expects a friend without faults will never find one.

He who has no bread to spare should not keep a dog.

A thread-bare coat is armour against a highwayman.