

Riverton, N. C.

Apr. 25<sup>th</sup> 1867

Dear Sir:-

Yours of the 23<sup>rd</sup> inst. <sup>has been</sup> justifying your attack on Mr Holden & the Standard, <sup>as</sup> ~~is~~ before me. I had hoped that the Considerations I suggested in my letter to you, as to the injury of the Courant persons, palpable & irremediable, would have been considered weighed - by <sup>& made evident to</sup> you. But I regret they have not been. You have not met the points I presented at all - But how our - in true destructive style - pitched in, pounding away on "Holden" & the Standard, & thus simply continuing the warfare, without giving showing the good policy therefore, or without answering my position relative

to the attacks on him & the Standard.  
I have yet to see the good policy in  
it, & I have yet to see that my  
suggestions as to its evident harm  
to the cause are not correct. Look  
at Pell & Co's Course. All of them are  
down upon <sup>Holden</sup> the Standard. And why? Would  
they be pulling away at him & it if they  
were not formidable, & likely to do them  
serious harm? Evidently they would

not. When we beat down Holden, we beat down <sup>in the Union, partly South</sup> a tower of strength.  
How do ~~you~~ your attacks on the Stou-  
dard suit - please so well? The Seces-  
sionists & rebels. They are delight-  
ed at it. Hence Brother Pell's quotations  
& favorable Comments on your articles. This  
proves that I am right <sup>in</sup> my position,  
which, I believe, you don't directly deny.  
Then, what I desire is, that this bick-  
ering between you shall cease, because  
it injures our cause & strengthens that  
of our enemies. This is what I

would wish, <sup>upon</sup> you. I know of no good  
it could. As I said before, we are weak  
enough, without dissension. We can't af-  
ford that. Every disruption in the Row  
is pleased at those attacks. That fact  
is sufficient, of course, to determine its  
impolicy; because it's evident why he  
is pleased.

But you speak of your large sub-  
scription. While I am pleased to know that  
you are succeeding, & making your paper  
pay, I still suggest that the argument  
is not as good as you might think as to  
the Correctness of your position. 1<sup>st</sup> harm  
Many of your subscribers (although your  
paper is in a country once 9/10 Union, &  
not yet all hopeless) are bitter as brother  
Pell, but bow the head that is getting  
up in our ranks & desire to join the Seces-  
sionists & thus strengthen themselves by it. 2<sup>nd</sup> If  
your argument is good, then Brother Pell,  
& other leading <sup>as they claim & we deny</sup> organs of that part, are more

1861  
I hate Union men than you. Don't  
you see where your argument carries  
you? I do hope it is becoming apparent.  
You are equally <sup>and</sup> unfortunate in your  
further attack on The Standard. Now,  
I repeat to you, I don't either endorse or justify  
all that paper has said, or even yet says.  
Mr. Holden now, almost weekly, says some  
things I don't endorse. But he is on the right  
side, & is working hard, & I think, Co-operat-  
ing as harmoniously as he can, to push on  
the Union Cause. I see, in his paper no  
attacks, on the Union Register. None of  
it. If he designed "killing" it, I think  
he would not have noticed favorably, as  
he did, the prospect of its being started  
sometime before its existence. Nor would  
he, after its start, have noticed it so  
favorably, calling special attention to its  
being a true union paper, soon after  
it started. This I well recollect. And  
now, although you have been after

him so long & so shortly, he has not  
even yet retaliated. Now to the point  
referred to in the first of this paragraph.  
~~Yesterday~~ I regretted to see you use the  
same secession argument against him that  
Pell, Morris, Thompson, Robinson & co do  
by urging that he has been on every side  
of old questions, that therefore he is not to  
be supported & encouraged now. When he is  
on the right side. Now, if you are going  
to admit now to be true, except old Union  
things, I think you may give up the ship  
it because they, when all falling together,  
in 1860 for Pool & odolorem, were a  
long way behind. Since then, by way of  
Carrying food, making bread & butter &  
other causes, a large portion of that Min-  
ority have struck hands with & gone over  
body & breeches to Spelman, Broeg, Mor-  
ris & co. For instance, Sect. Gale, brother Pell  
Gov. Watha - Gov. Vance & thousands getting  
leaving us, you see, with a very few votes,  
unless we get votes & supporters elsewhere.

I say, get old Democrats, even old  
presidents, if they will make a clean  
breast & purge themselves well, or any  
other class who will act, vote & co-oper-  
ate with us. Your argument says no. If  
a leading (former) Democrat comes to us, you  
say "get you gone, you have been on both  
sides" & therefore unfit. Now I submit,  
Will that course strengthen a party, or  
cause? If we get strength, it must come  
from somewhere! But if it comes it  
must be denuded & driven off because  
it has been on "both sides" of old ques-  
tions heretofore. Allow me to suggest  
that you never would strengthen a  
party or cause by this means. Don't  
you now see this error of your way?  
It is very plain to me. But by way  
of the clincher I intend to run you off  
your own ground. You emphasize the  
"old line Whig," ~~stick~~ stick in them.  
Did you ever hear of a man away

out in Kentucky (sent out of the world  
100 years ago) by the name of Henry Clay?  
Was he always on the same side of every  
important question of public policy? I  
just wish I could see you now! Do you  
remember that a very able & prominent speaker  
of his was against a National Bank?  
And did not he afterwards become the  
Candidate for Presidency & <sup>receive</sup> support & aid from  
a great & glorious party and a friend of a  
National Bank. And did not he - the  
same Henry Clay aforesaid, pitch  
in & abuse & denounce Capt. Tyler for veto-  
ing a bank - an institution which he  
the same Clay aforesaid offered & de-  
clared as impolitic and unconstitutional?  
Did you ever hear of George B. Badger? Did  
not he advocate the election of Gen. Jackson  
& abuse & denounce Henry Clay most  
bitterly, & afterwards become a prominent  
Whig & Clay man? Does anyone at  
Greenboro remember a certain person

Morehead? Who once praised Jackson  
& the Whigs & afterward became a lead-  
ing Clay man? And yet all these men  
died, leading Clay men & leading Whigs,  
in the full confidence of their party. And  
although these various changes in their  
political life were known, yet our  
friends did not choose to array these  
things against them. But it was done.  
But by whom? Now answer. I will. By  
their political enemies who were working  
so hard to break them down. Did  
we join in & help them? Not a bit. We  
united & defended them. We did not pitch  
in & aid our enemies there to pull  
them down, & then justify our course  
in the fact that they had been incon-  
sistent in their course. No, we did  
not. It was enough for us to know that  
they were with us there, & we were

(3)  
there for ~~us~~ <sup>co-operating with & aided</sup>  
them, to build them up. I hope this  
will settle the "both sides" question.  
Now, to one other branch of this. You ask if  
the Standard was not the organ of the rebel  
Convention of '61. I take it that you offer this &  
other things because ~~you~~ they have great  
weight with you in making up your judgment, of  
course. Some paper had to be. I well know that  
Holden was a special object of abuse & denunciation  
by the secession orators from the fall of '60  
when he turned his batteries strongly & pointedly  
against secession, & was during the Convention  
of '61 - & has been ever since. Why? If they  
deemed him working for & co-operating with them  
why did they do that? This ought to be a suf-  
ficient answer for any Union man, as to  
his principles, & as to his fideli<sup>ty</sup> to the Union  
Cause, <sup>at heart</sup> until he begins to co-operate with  
them in his course. But while I do deem  
this sufficient, yet by way of completely loos-  
ing your grip upon this secession ladder

I mean the main <sup>kind of</sup> ladder upon which  
Secessionists Crawl - I will surprise  
you by stating that the Standard was  
not "the organ of the Convention of  
1861," as you assumed. And as you  
are wrong in this, & you deem it impor-  
tant I think you should give up your  
opposition of <sup>public</sup> opposition.

As to his being the organ of the rebel legis-  
latures of 62-3-4. It is well known here  
that that body was anti-war as far as it  
dared to go. I know it even called  
down the opposition of the Reconstruction  
leaders & press. Then his being the official  
organ of that body is against you. Own  
up! And as to the Convention of 65, that  
was generally acknowledged to be a loyal  
Union Convention. Own up, again.

When he was the organ of Preston John-  
son, the latter was thought to be the  
"organ" of the Union party of the Country.  
Own up, again. If the Standard is

to be blamed for our supporting & now  
opposing President Johnson, ~~then~~ <sup>then</sup> down you  
shoot the whole (except Thaddeus Stephens)  
Republican Union party of the North,  
including Mr. Henry Wilson who is to  
be at New York Saturday to deliver  
a speech in aid in the Union cause.  
Seeing where you are leading yourself  
my dear Sir, Own up, & Cease that  
warfare - untenable as you see it is,  
upon one who is now & has <sup>long</sup> been work-  
ing & co-operating with the Union  
element of the Country, against the se-  
cession & rebellious element.

Whenever, if ever, he deserts & goes  
over & aids <sup>whether five years, or one month hence,</sup> them, it will be time enough  
to turn our batteries on him. I hope,  
I begin to believe, you now see  
the horrible wrong of the present war on him.  
As you suggest, I was not appointed  
Dr. O. Raleigh. I thought it a little sharp  
to be sent, as I had <sup>long</sup> co-operated with the Union

sentiment & could - having favored the ~~defeat~~  
tion of the Howard Amendment ever since its  
passage by Congress - while some who were  
making points against it, were appointed  
all this I could not exactly understand, not  
only with regard to myself, but others. But  
I determined not to let that concern  
to encourage any friend in the ranks. I  
trusted to time & to those who knew & had  
long known my position & feelings on  
the great issue - men like you &  
others who had <sup>long</sup> known me <sup>in my position</sup> & to them  
I yet trust. Still I can't aid in "killing"  
Holden, doing & suffering what he has & is  
in the good cause, seeing they would be so  
rejoiced at it. He is an able man, & has  
the benefit of much information & knowledge  
& ~~has~~ the Confidence of the great body  
(what body it has) of the Union feeling  
& sentiment of people of the state. I therefore  
can't unite in this ~~me~~ - every agent  
him - it will please our enemies too  
well. Remember that

(4)

Could I have been supported I should  
have been pleased to set the Am. Adv.  
to going again. But I saw I could not  
with my sentiment. I was solicited to go  
to Greensboro the first year of the war. But  
I could not. Mr. Holden, himself, request-  
ed me to go there.

You refer to something of Mr. N's try-  
ing the "killing" piece on the Rep. in the  
late Convention. <sup>If so, it was a great wrong, certainly.</sup> Of that I was not aware.  
I know of no matter, not public, between  
you. If it's all personal, then I respectfully  
submit that it's very bad policy to be  
allowing personal matters to interfere  
with & interrupt the harmony of  
the Cause, admitting as we must, the  
importance of harmony. I therefore still  
hope that this & the kindred considerations  
how unengaging will yet inspire you to  
a hearty Co-operation, not merely

by public flings & bee keeping only  
encourage feud, from which <sup>only</sup> our  
enemies will reap benefit. It is  
for the good of the Cause I have written  
a long letter - longer than I expected  
by two-thirds when I began - But Con-  
siderations crowded so thick - & I felt  
leave out many - that I gave vent  
until I fear they will weary you, &  
therefore I must close - still

appealing for  
Union, Harmony & Co-operation  
in the good Cause.

As ever

W. D. Dunning



718

1867

CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY NY HISTORICAL SOCIETY 2013