

# Lexington and Radkin Flag.

VOL. 2. LEXINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 29, 1856. NO. 4.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY  
BY  
**JAMES A. LONG,**  
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.  
\$2.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

## Mr. Wise's Defamation of General Washington.

Attention ought to be directed, we think, to the utterly unfounded statements of Gen. Wise in his late address at Lexington, in reference to the Father of his Country.—What the motive of these unhappy declarations was, we are at a loss to know, unless it was the wish of Mr. Wise to endeavor to bring down the immortal Washington to his own level of angry and scurrilous demagoguery. This gentleman has been so severely criticised in all quarters of late for his unscrupulous and unbecoming and undignified abuse, that, as it appears to us, he has determined to secure, if possible, the sanction of the great and worthy name which the men of America rejoice to honor. But Mr. Wise's failure is a miserable one. Gen. Washington resembles him in no particular, and those who will take the trouble to read his great and immortal production, will not think more lightly of its author for thus attempting to bring down the name of Washington from the exalted pedestal on which it stands.

Mr. Wise aims to represent Gen. Washington as at times giving way to his passions and to his tongue in the vulgar and unbecoming manner. He gives the students at Lexington the old exploded story of Washington's swearing at Gen. Lee on account of his retreat at Monmouth. His language is that Washington "stormed and raved louder than the battle" at Lee for his ill-timed and shameful retreat from the presence of the enemy. By anathemas of course, it was meant out. An anathema means a curse, and nothing else, and the impression made on the mind of every reader is that Washington cursed and swore at the command General. This statement is utterly unfounded, and Mr. Wise had no possible evidence of its truth when he made it. No historian has asserted it.—We can believe that Washington, who, in his character of Commander-in-Chief, had just led his protest to the army against a feeble surrender, declaring it a vice which would man of sense detests and despises, would after that have sworn out his anathemas "louder than the battle" in the presence of the very soldiers to whom his orders on this subject had been given?

The evidence that Washington did not swear at Monmouth is of the most conclusive character possible. The proof could not be more satisfactory. Judge Marshall, in writing the history of the battle, had no evidence before him to lead him to say more than that Washington addressed Lee "in terms of some warmth, implying disapprobation of his conduct." Headly, in the 21st vol. of Washington and his Generals, at page 118, says that it was the "sartificial passion and the manner of Washington on this occasion, and not his words, which made his rebuke of Lee so terrible.—Would the statement of either Marshall or Headly be true, if Washington had sworn at Lee or uttered "anathemas louder than the battle"?

Loosing, in his Field Book of the Revolution, vol. 3d, page 359, gives substantially the same account, and says, among other things, that Lee was "stung not so much by the words as by the manner of Washington"—a statement which, of course, would be untrue and inadequate to the circumstances if Washington had cursed or sworn on the occasion.

It is well known that, after the battle of Monmouth, a correspondence took place between Lee and the Commander-in-Chief, in reference to what had passed between them on the day of the battle. It was begun by Lee, in which he complained of the "singular expressions" made use of towards him by Washington. Would Lee have characterized out and anathemas as singular expressions? Gen. Lee found fault with these singular expressions, because, as he said, they implied that I was guilty either of disobedience to orders, want of conduct, or want of courage. How absurd to suppose now, that Lee would have said that the words of Washington on this occasion implied disapprobation of his course, if he knew that Washington had cursed and sworn at him—an act which would not have implied disapprobation, but would have been the most direct condemnation of Washington was not sensible of having used even "singular expressions." His reply was as follows:

"Sir—I received your letter, (dated through mistake the 1st July,) expressed, as I conceive, in terms highly improper. I

am not conscious of having made use of any very singular expressions, at the time of meeting you, as you intimate. What I recollect to have said was dictated by duty and warranted by the occasion." &c., &c. Can any person, who knows anything of the character of Washington, believe that he would have penned these lines if he had cursed Lee, or hurled at him "anathemas louder than the battle." If he did swear on the occasion referred to, and yet wrote these lines, where is the truthfulness of him whom the world venerates after so exalted a manner?

The next evidence to be adduced is that of the late Major James Morton, of Virginia, a soldier of the revolution. The account is given by Rev. Dr. Plumer, of the Presbyterian Church, who had it from Major Morton's lips, in 1827. Major M. was well known in Virginia. He was a gentleman of high standing in social life, as he had been in the army. He was the brother of the late Benj. Morton of Halifax, Virginia, of the late Nathaniel Morton, of Baltimore, and of the late Jno. Morton, of Bordeaux, in France. He was the father of the wife of Rev. Dr. John H. Rice, of Va., and of the wife of the Rev. James Wharey, of Va.—He was the father of the present distinguished physician and agriculturist, Dr. Wm. S. Morton, of Cumberland county, Virginia.—Many of the readers of the Whig will know to whom we refer from these circumstances. Dr. Plumer, in a letter published about eight years ago, (and now before me) says he has never known a more truthful man than Major James Morton, and here is the Major's account. "He told me that he was within six yards of Gen. Washington when he met Lee, and that no expression which could fairly be called profane escaped the lips of the Com. in Chief. Major M. said that Washington used the name of God two or three times, but in a manner which no one had a right to pronounce profane.—He said that he heard all that passed between the Generals, and that Washington never cursed nor swore."

This account of the matter, had by Dr. Plumer, from Major M's own mouth, we deem to be entirely conclusive, but will add of the Marquis Lafayette. The Rev. Jared Sparks, a well known writer of our country, and one who has identified himself more thoroughly than any one else with the history and writings of Washington, questioned Lafayette in respect to the language addressed by Washington to Lee at Monmouth. He replied that though he was near them both at the time, he could not have old an hour afterwards what he said. He said it was not the language, but the manner—no one had ever seen Washington so excited before. We simply ask in reply to this, is it possible, could Lafayette have failed to recollect it, if Washington had cursed or sworn, or as the extravagant author of the address at Lexington has it, had stormed a madman louder than the battle? It is utterly beyond belief, except perhaps the belief of some unreflecting and hap-hazard person like the writer of the words we have quoted.

A other statement of Mr. Wise, relative to Washington's fierce and angry temper, is equally unfounded, with the declaration just commented on. It is that on the 21st of the news of St. Clair's defeat, Washington "raged without restraint." I wonder, sir, where Mr. W. procures his history. It is singular, indeed, to see how he talks. The truth is, that so far from Gen. Washington's being in a rage with poor St. Clair, he seems to have been about the only person who took the part of the unhappy General, amid the storm of public indignation. St. Clair was defeated twice. Once after evacuating Ticonderoga, and once in the Northwest Territory. To whichever of these the author of the address refers, he has been mistaken. Mr. Peterson, in his "Heroes of the Revolution," says that after the first failure of St. Clair, he did not lose the confidence of Washington; and after the second, was still continued in office by him, and says nothing of the anger of the Chief towards him. Pages 282-283. Judge Marshall, in vol. 3, p. 252, confirms the statement of Peterson, in regard to the first defeat. In respect to the second he says—vol. 5, p. 336—that St. Clair "still retained the undiminished esteem and good opinion of the President." Headly, vol. 2, p. 218, states in regard to the first failure of St. Clair, that "he was not unsuccessful from want of patriotism, or willingness to sacrifice himself. Washington knew this, and hence never withdrew his confidence." How does this consist with Mr. W's declaration, that Washington "raged without restraint" on the occasion. In reference to the second defeat of St. Clair, Headly, on p. 222, vol. 2, says,

"Headly's Washington and Generals, 2nd vol., page 155.

that the country was filled with gloom, and that "loud and deep were the clamors" against St. Clair, but that, Washington, refusing to sympathize with the popular feeling against him, still gave him his confidence." The same author also gives, on p. 223 of vol. 2, an anecdote which goes to show that on this occasion, the President conducted himself with the utmost deliberation and decorum. So much for this reckless misrepresentation.

One other statement of Mr. Wise on the subject of Washington's alleged proneness to rough abuse, needs a notice of a few words. He asserts that in the canvass for Congress, between Col. Peyton and Gen. Lee, which took place after the Presidency of Washington, that world renowned man, and the excitement of an election, personally insulted a gentleman, and therefore was "stricken in the face in the market house at Alexandria." We hardly hesitate to say that scarcely any schoolboy in the land, writing upon the subject of Washington, would display such ignorance as is here exhibited. When Washington had fought all the battles of the Revolution, had filled the Presidential chair with a moral grandeur unapproached by Kings, and was reposing amid the shades of Mount Vernon, an object, as Lord Erskine would express it, of "awful reverence" to mankind; at this severe and dignified period of his life Mr. Wise represents him as mingling in the discussion and strife of an election day, and receiving a blow in the face for insulting a gentleman. Shame, shame on such a statement. The historical truth of the case we hardly feel called on to state. It is simply this, however. When a young man, and Colonel of the Virginia Troops, in 1754 he was stationed by his superiors at Alexandria, and at this era of his life, when his character was comparatively unformed, he became excited on the occasion of an election to the House of Burgesses, and used offensive language to a Mr. Payne, who avenged himself by a blow. History states that Washington did not return the blow, but feeling him to be in the wrong exerted himself to save Mr. Payne from the wrath of his soldiers, and with success. Had this thing occurred when Mr. Wise so recklessly asserts it did, that is when Washington had become "the first in War, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen," nothing perhaps but the very life of the antagonist of Washington could have dispelled the gathered wrath of the Nation. With an expression of our pity for the deplorable ignorance (if it is nothing more) which Mr. Wise here exhibits, we pass to one more declaration of the author of the address at Lexington, very degrading to Washington. It is, that Washington "shared his sacred person" to allow Houdon, the French Satirist, acting by the order of the Virginia Legislature, to take the impression of that "person" for the purposes of a statue, the statue now in the Capitol at Richmond.—The impression evidently designed to be made by the writer of the address, was, that the Father of his Country completely unclothed himself before this foreigner, at Mount Vernon, on the occasion alluded to. Could anything possibly be more disgusting than this assertion! Mr. Wise is the first person, I think, who has ever made it, and it is utterly without foundation, as it is utterly repugnant to all our conception of the eminent delicacy and dignity of the august and immortal man to whom it refers. The simple fact, as Mr. Sparks, in his life of Washington states, was, that a mere bust of Gen. Washington was modelled by Houdon during his stay at Mount Vernon. Sparks's life, p. 390.

In addition to the testimony of Mr. Sparks, who, it is well known, before writing his book, was furnished with information concerning Washington's private life, by members of his family and household, I give that of Judge Bushrod Washington, the nephew of and immediate successor of the General at Mount Vernon, and of Major Lawrence Lewis, also who resided in the neighborhood, and was exceedingly intimate with his illustrious Uncle.—Their evidence is furnished me by Mrs. A., of King George county, Va., a niece of Judge Washington, and for thirty years of her early life, a frequent sojourner at Mount Vernon. She assured the writer of this article, but a few weeks ago, that she has repeatedly heard the gentleman named above described by Houdon, in connexion with the person of Washington. They said that General Washington only exposed his head neck, and upper breast to Houdon.

We dismiss this repulsive representation of Mr. Wise, which he has made without historical authority, and the whole subject, with the expression of a hope that when the author of this oration next speaks on the character of Washington, he will endeavor to do so with more credit to himself, than he has done in this unhappy production. W. M. FREDERICKSBURG.

## Buchanan's Northern and Southern Face.

That this "piddling" Filibustering old gentleman has two faces, one for the North and another for the South, no sane man can doubt who will only open his eyes long enough to see the facts as they actually exist. In the South he is supported as the special and anointed champion of Southern rights and interests—as even more Southern in his principles and feelings than Southern men themselves; while at the North his election is urged upon the almost sole ground of his never having done or said any thing which his most malignant enemies could construe into even a remote wish on his part to be instrumental in upholding the institutions of the South. And yet the spurious humbugging Democracy of both sections profess to stand upon exactly the same platform, and to act in concert upon all public questions. That the ignorant and unsophisticated should be deceived by an assertion so bold and reckless is not to be wondered at. But that intelligent reading men should be imposed upon by it, is also, a matter of the deepest surprise to us. We lay their misfortune to the blindness of party idolatry and zeal. It can be attributed to nothing else.

To illustrate the double facedness of the Democratic candidate, and the fraudulent game which his supporters, both North and South are diligently practising upon the honest and confiding voters of the country, we select a couple of passages from two Buchanan papers, one of which is published in Mississippi and the other in Rhode Island. The Southern face of the Cincinnati nominee is, of course, presented by his Southern organ; and here it is as painted by the Vicksburg Sentinel. It says:

"We dare and defy any one to point to a single vote that Mr. Buchanan ever gave during his Congressional career, involving the question of slavery, that was not on the side of the South and opposed to the Abolitionists."

A very bold and beautiful front for the South, as all will admit. But let us see how his Northern friends exhibit him to the Freesoilers. What sort of face does he wear in that quarter? The Providence, Rhode Island Post, as zealous Buchanan organ as the Richmond Enquirer introduced him to a New England public thus:

"Mr. Buchanan never uttered a sentence in defence of slavery or whispered a word in favor of its existence, or cast a vote which any honest man could construe into a wish to support the institution." There, then, is Old Buck as portrayed by a zealous Northern advocate of his election. How does it harmonize with that which his Southern supporters have presented? Are not the two as radically and essentially different as black and white? And yet these two Buchanan organs profess to stand upon the same platform; to hold the same principles, and to be struggling for the same objects. Is it not clear that one or the other is deceived? Is it not equally clear that either the North or the South will be obliged to be disappointed, in the event of Buchanan's election? And judging the future by the past, will not the South again be the victim of the cheat?

Would that conservative, reflecting, patriotic men would pause and consider before committing their destinies and the destinies of this great Republic to the keeping of a man who as sure as that the sun will rise to-morrow, will be but a nose of wax in the hands of that arch-traitor to the South—Martin Van Buren.—Richmond Whig.

## New York.

The State Convention of old line Whigs met in Albany on the 14th, and was presided over by the Hon. Francis Granger.—There were about 800 delegates in attendance, and the utmost enthusiasm prevailed. An address and a series of resolutions were adopted by acclamation.

The address refers to the novel position of the Whigs of New York, who find themselves for the first time without a candidate for the highest office within the gift of a free people. It declares that the National Whigs have no regrets for the past, as they have always done their duty. It reviews the three candidates before the country, setting forth strongly that Whigs cannot support Mr. Buchanan because of his principles, nor Mr. Fremont, because he is the candidate of a party sectional in spirit. It then declares that in Mr. Fillmore's late administration all Whigs have just cause to take pride, and expresses the fullest confidence in him "as a national and conservative statesman." It continues as follows:

"Domestic tranquility is what the country now specially and almost solely needs, and it is that which will not result from the election of either of the other candidates. Mr. Fillmore's election will secure the restoration of peace at home and the perpetu-

ation of peace abroad. We are told, however, that he is no longer a straight Whig! Be it so. What then? Is Mr. Buchanan a Whig, or Mr. Fremont? The gulf between us as Whigs and Mr. Buchanan, or Mr. Fremont, is immeasurably wider than it is between us and Mr. Fillmore. He is a Whig and something more. We are Whigs and nothing else, and it is to be distinctly understood that it is not the something more that recommends Mr. Fillmore to us (who still maintain our Whig principles, Whig character, and Whig organization) but the certainty that of the candidates to whom our choice is necessarily confined, he is far in advance of those attributes of character, which we deem essential in a Presidential candidate at this crisis. We no more endorse, by this selection from the candidates, the platform of the party we believe it to be our duty to support, than we do the platform of the Democratic or Republican party." The address declares the conviction that Fillmore stands a chance of election while Mr. Fremont's chances are hopeless, and concludes by declaring the intention to maintain the organization with every confidence in the result.—Observer.

The following are the resolutions: Whereas, the Old Line Whigs of the State of New York have, in mass convention, duly considered their position as Whigs in connection with their duty to the country in the present crisis, and have candidly examined also the merits of the three Presidential candidates now before the people, and the probable consequences of either, therefore

Resolved, That we cannot support Mr. Buchanan, because we believe that an administration established upon the Cincinnati platform, would perpetuate internal agitation, and endanger our amicable relations with foreign powers.

Resolved, That we will oppose to the utmost extent of our ability the election of Mr. Fremont; that he is not qualified for the Presidency of this Union, because we firmly believe his election would increase the internal strife, and that the party he represents, is in spirit, sectional, and inevitably tends to disunion.

Resolved, That in the election of Millard Fillmore, we find a sure guarantee that domestic agitation would be quelled, harmony between the States restored, peace with foreign nations secured, and the interests of agriculture, commerce, and the manufacturer promoted; and therefore, that we will labor unitedly and earnestly for his election.

Resolved, That while thus lending our aid to promote the election of the American candidates, Messrs. Fillmore and Donelson, as the conviction that such is our solemn duty, we nevertheless retain inviolate our cherished Whig principles and our Whig organization, and as soon after the present contest as may be convenient that we will resume our separate party action.

Resolved, That the Whig State Central Committee be and they are hereby required to take measures at an early day to secure the appointment of a county committee, in each county of the State, with power to appoint town committees, and that such committees be earnestly requested to co-operate during the present campaign with all other organizations friendly to the election of Fillmore and Donelson.

One hundred thousand copies of the address and resolutions were ordered to be printed and circulated.

Delegates to the Whig National Convention at Baltimore were appointed, consisting of Francis Granger, Washington Hunt, Hiram Ketchum and Henry Grinnell, for the State at large, and two from each of the 33 districts.

## FROM THE RICHMOND WHIG. An Appeal from the North to the South.

EDITOR OF THE WHIG: DEAR SIR—I doubt not you are fully aware of the strenuous efforts now being made by the friends of Mr. Buchanan to create the impression, in your section of the country, that contest in the present political campaign is entirely between Buchanan and Fremont. I hope for the sake of justice and truth they will not succeed, for it is far from being true.

No doubt longer remains in the minds of all clear observers that the Empire State will go, by a large majority, for Mr. Fillmore. The Democracy long ago ceased to be a serious obstacle to Mr. Fillmore's success.

I hope that the people of Virginia, and the South, will not suffer themselves to be deceived with the expectation that Mr. Buchanan has much strength at the North. He has no strength in the North. The great desideratum now is, as it seems to me, that a proper understanding should be obtained between the men of the North and the South. This done we can act unitedly and advisedly. The conservative men of Virginia and of New York need a better understanding. It

is as much the duty of men in Virginia to fight for our common country as the men of New York. Virginia gave to the country a Washington.

The conservative, Union loving men of New York will vote for Millard Fillmore. This is their only way to defeat the Republicans and Abolitionists. I have, in a previous letter, (a portion of which you published,) demonstrated the fact that Buchanan has not sufficient strength in New York to obtain a vote equal to either the Republican or American parties. Now, such being the fact, I hold that it belongs to the Union men of the North and South to rally against the common enemy.

Few men appreciate the nature of the opposition here. Under the guidance of such men as Seward, Greeley and Weed, and I may add, with the bad management of the present Administration, the old Abolition party has grown to a monster "disunion."

I here insert a portion of an article which I clip from the editorial of the "Buffalo Express," a paper which flies the banner of "Fremont and Dayton" at its mast head. The Hon. J. W. C. Watson alluded to, is a gentleman, known and honored in his native State, Mississippi, and beloved by all who know him. He addressed a body of 5000 men at the "Fillmore and Donelson club room," last Thursday evening, and his speech, for eloquence, patriotism and argument, has seldom been excelled or equalled by any of New York's sons.

## FROM THE BUFFALO EXPRESS, AUG. 9, 1856. A LIVE SLAVEHOLDER AT THE "SLAVE PEN."

The worshippers at the "Slave Pen" have vindicated their consistency by importing a Mississippi slave holder to address them and abuse the North and Northern sentiments. It had been announced that on Thursday evening the Hon. J. W. C. Watson, a Mississippi slave holder and driver, and an eloquent orator, would address the slaveocracy of Buffalo at the "Pen," on that evening, and a fair audience was gathered to see a live trafficker in the flesh and blood of the human kind, as well as to hear what he had to say. A friend of ours who was prompted to see one of those fire eaters of the South, dropped into the "Pen," and saw and heard him. As he describes the personnel of the orator we judge that there would be no difficulty in selecting him from a party of freemen any where, as one who would coin money from the flesh and blood of his fellow beings and crack the whip upon the backs of the slaves without mercy. He bears a family likeness, to one lean, lank, Gaspus, who hung around Rome and excited bad blood among the people in days of yore. That, however, is no fault of his own, and we will pass on to what we understand he said.

Your readers will be able from this to gain something like an adequate idea of the hatred and malignity with which Mr. Fillmore and his supporters are assailed.

Mr. Fillmore is the only obstacle to the success of the Republicans in the North, they would overwhelm the Buchanan men like a flood. But Mr. Fillmore stands nobly up, and battles back the waves of fanaticism with a master hand. Mr. Fillmore was nominated against his will. Had his own wishes been consulted, he would have been left entirely out of the conflict.

Who is it, men of Virginia, that now stands the burden and heat of this contest? Is it James Buchanan? No! Is it Democratic party? No! It is Mr. Fillmore. Will you not come to the rescue and help us to maintain the Government? to maintain you and us the Union?

Suppose Mr. Buchanan were to carry every Southern State in the Union and Pennsylvania, (a very absurd supposition I opine,) all these would not elect him. If there were a human possibility that he could carry one more Northern State, there might be some reason to unite upon him. But it is vain. What are likely to be the real facts?

Mr. Fillmore will probably carry Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, Missouri and Florida, Delaware, New York, Massachusetts and Connecticut. He will thus start off with 107 electoral votes. Allowing the other Southern States for Buchanan, and also Pennsylvania, he gets 64. The election then goes out of the hands of the people into the House of Representatives, and perhaps from the House into the Senate.

But let Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia and Alabama, do their duty by voting for Mr. Fillmore, and you ensure the election of a good, honest, faithful, competent man.

If the people of the South choose the first proposition, they must remember that it is fraught with danger. For when the people of the North, who are disposed to do battle against sectionalism, and are looking to the South for assistance—when they discover that you are not willing to join

\*Orley Book, Aug. 30, 1770. Battle of Monmouth fought in 1778.