

# The Independent Republican.

66 FREEDOM AND RIGHT AGAINST SLAVERY AND WRONG.

C. F. READ & H. H. FRAZIER, EDITORS.

MONTROSE, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1857.

H. H. FRAZIER, PUBLISHER—VOL. 3, NO. 39.

## THE CHILDREN'S PRAYER.

By R. L. STODARD.

There is something that will endure  
The eye of God, because it still is pure,  
It is the spirit of a little child,  
Fresh from his hand, and therefore undefiled,  
Near the gate of Paradise than we,  
Our children breathe its air, its angels see;  
And when they pray, God hears their simple prayer,  
Yes, even shades his word, in judgment bare:  
Witness the legend of a bygone time,  
Joculi's song, though yet untried in rhyme:

Where stretches Egypt, and its garden smile,  
Went from the desert by the Nile's side,  
Famine and pestilence went hand in hand,  
And ravaged that unhappy land;  
For lo! the Nile, whose waters flow  
The fertilizing Nile, forgot to flow,  
Day after day it lay, a sluggish flood,  
And slung its waters in the sand;  
When spread the news, and illness flies apace,  
A fearful panic seized the Moslem race;  
For not alone its native tribes it fed,  
But all the East to Egypt looked for bread,  
In Cairo first, then most impromptu,  
Then in the town, and in the wandering tent,  
Under the palm, and in the open air,  
Singing their hymns, and praising their God,  
At first, they merely staved; but by-and-by  
A dead infection brooded in the sky;  
There was no time to flee, no time to breathe,  
They drew in death, a tainted, loathsome death,  
All business ceased; bazaars and mosques were closed;  
Somewhere about his lower the Muezzin dozed;  
He heard no more his voice, he heard no more,  
"There is no God but God! God is great!"  
No more the faithful bowed the east;  
Was kept no more the Haram sacred ground,  
(The seas, alas! they could not help but keep)  
The had was shrouded in a deadly sleep,  
You might have walked through Cairo street by street,  
No man a soul—treading dead, and dead,  
The firing thief, the murderer abhorred,  
Or placed—struck legions—such were those abroad,  
As leeches a sickle reaper which was writ,  
(Through faith and death, the world is hid)  
That—Children are the keys of Paradise!"  
Alas!—that—They alone are good and wise,  
Deceive their thoughts, their eyes, their ears,  
He needs no money, he needs no people there,  
Told them his thought, and made its meaning plain,  
That they by childish lips should pray again,  
"Twas said, and done, he said, and he was true,  
And straight the Muezzin sang it through the land,  
The hour was fixed at dawn; at last dawn came,  
Slowly the sun arose, a globe of flame,  
Struggling with blood-stained clouds, in every street  
Was seen a crowd, heard the tramp of feet;  
Around the mosques they gathered with a sigh,  
Wishing to know if they should live or die;  
The inmates crowded to the door, and stood,  
And bore them up the minarets and towers,  
Even to their topmost summits, where they stood  
And saw the Pyramid, the Nile, the sea,  
And Cairo at their feet, a breathless mass,  
Dying to their feet, pray, and see what came to pass!  
It was a beautiful, but solemn sight,  
To mark the crowd, bright, and second to the white,  
Painted against the red and angry sky,  
Stretching their arms to Him who dwells on high!  
But when they stood, and there they knelt and prayed,  
And from that hour the pestilence was stayed,  
For while they prayed there came a rush of wind  
That rent the clouds and showed the sun behind;  
There saw its load, bright, and second to the white,  
The wave of palms, the Nile of waters, near,  
Alas! 'twas true, the Nile began to rise,  
As if its springs were fed from the benignant skies!  
It rose, and rolled, and flowed, and second to the white,  
Its long waves followed like the stormy seas:  
Its mud was sweet away; its monsters sank;  
It spread and snuggled, and its waters were,  
Bubbled and roared, rising higher and higher,  
Far dancing in the sun, and sheet of windy fire,  
All eyes were fixed,  
And now there came a man  
Whom all eyes followed, and he said,  
"There is no God but God! God is great!  
Lain for all with words of sweet and grain."  
They fell upon their knees, and bent their heads,  
But they, the children, meek and undefiled,  
Marched through the streets, and clapped their hands,  
and smiled;

Now was their longer plague or famine there,  
Thanks be to God, who heard the children's prayer!

## AN HOUR'S STRUGGLE WITH POISON.

I was spending some days, not many years ago, in a beautiful little country village and in a family that had more than common attractions to one who loves domestic life as well as myself. The little circle had in it more of real interest than I have often seen developed in the same number of persons. A father of the family—almost too young to feel yet that he was entitled to that honorable appellation—was a fine, frank-hearted young mechanic, with a world of bounding life in his veins, an energy that, when fully aroused, drove everything violently before him, and a warmth of disposition that won him more friendship than it had given him of the world of his world.

His wife, to whom he had been married some four years, was singularly beautiful. They had two children—the one a laughing brown-eyed and brown-haired little fairy of three years. Her name was Evelyn. The second was a crowing, laughing, blue-eyed, plump little beauty of less than a year, promising to have all the charms of the older at her age.

I was sitting one afternoon in a quiet little room with my feet upon two chairs, reading a pleasant book, in a state between asleep and awake—my host away at his shop, a hundred yards off, and my pretty hostess engaged in her household labors—when I was thrown out of my indifference by a scream that brought me to my feet like an electric shock. It was a woman's voice, and had in it an excess of agony that cannot be indicated in words, so loud that it rang over that quiet little village and brought every one forth to ascertain the cause.

I sprang to the door that separated the sitting room from the dining apartments, and saw the whole at a glance. The young mother stood at the door with her first-born—our darling Evelyn—in her arms, dying—a life and hurried word from the servant told me the sad story. The little girl had accompanied a child uncle up stairs, and while the attention of the older child was for a moment turned away, she seized a bottle of corrosive sublimate in alcohol, and had taken enough to take away twenty such lives. The little thing had tottered down stairs and the mother laid her at the landing with the empty bottle in her hand, and the poison oozing from her mouth, the child all unconscious of the fearful thing she had done. Was it any wonder that terrible shriek rang out over the quiet little village, and that already the occupants of every house near were rushing towards the spot where the mother stood?

But a few moments could possibly have elapsed since the poison was taken, and yet the effect was already fatal. There the first shriek of terror, the mother had quieted to a calm despair for the moment, and stood with the child in her arms making no effort for its relief; and indeed it seemed hopeless, for although the subtle poison seemed diffused through the frame; the brown eyes had longed their lustre, the face was blackened as in after death, and the teeth were tight set in convulsive spasm, that evidently would not pass away. I examined the little lost darling for a moment, saw that it was hopeless, and turned away, unable to bear that moth-

er's agony. The little doorway was half-filled with villagers, and sobs, moans and lamentations over the fate of the dying child were heard in every direction, mingled with quick and hurried questions as to the manner of its occurrence, and vain attempts at answering, which added an oppressive confusion to the sadness of the scene.

The little play fellow uncle, who had been up stairs with the child, had run instantly to call the father and but a few moments had elapsed before he sprang into the middle of the group. He had been told all, and asked no questions. I had time to remark that his eye was very stern, and that his lip was very firmly compressed. Others, too, marked it, and I knew afterwards that a murmur ran round the circle, of how strange it was that he betrayed no feeling.

He reached out his hands and took the child from his mother. His eyes were closed now, and a white ooze coming from between the blackened lips. Was ever death more assured? I saw him open the eyelids and give a sigh of relief. He told me afterwards that the eye was not shrunken, and so death had not begun. He then attempted to open the mouth, but the teeth were tight set, and they resisted his efforts. But with a force that seemed almost brutal he wrenched the teeth apart, and opened the mouth.

"Bring me the egg basket," he spoke very sternly, almost without opening his teeth, to the servant.

"What do you want of it?" What can you do with it? "He is crazy!" and many such remarks followed, but the basket was there in a moment.

He seized one of the eggs, broke it, inserted his fingers again between the teeth and wrenched them open by force, though they shut with so convulsive a motion as to tear the flesh from his fingers, and poured the contents into the throat. There was a slight struggle, nothing more, and spectators were horrified at the action.

"Don't, the child is dying!" said one.

"Please don't hurt the little thing—it can't live!" the mother found voice to say, laying her hand upon his arm.

"Mary, be still!" he answered sternly, while his teeth were relaxing from their clenching, and his face was as hard as if he were entering a battle; "and don't any of you meddle with me—keep off!"

The bystanders involuntarily obeyed, with many harsh remarks upon his cruelty—but he did not heed them, and went on. Another egg was broken, and still there was no sign of life. Then the whole body of bystanders broke into a loud murmur, and cried out, "He is crazy—take the child away from him!" "He is crazy—take the child away from him!" they heard around him.

He desired for a moment from his efforts, and turned with a fierceness which had before been altogether foreign to his nature—but no one who saw him afterwards forgot the look of fury that shone in his own business, and leaved me to mine! Take her away, will you? Try it, and he went on, emptying egg after egg down the apparently lifeless throat.

The mother could bear this no longer—Her first-born was being tortured before her eyes in its death, and she imploringly flung herself on her knees before her husband's father, who had the moment before arrived, and cried, "do stop him!" she gasped: "he will obey you; do stop him. He is torturing that poor dying child."

The grandfather started forward a step to interfere, for he, too, thought the proceeding outrageous one; but he stopped and said, "Mary, let him alone. The child will die if he does not go on. It cannot do more than die if he does. I would not say a word to him for the world. The child is his; let him use his pleasure."

There was a silence then. In a moment more there was a quiver of the eyelids, a convulsive movement of the chest, and the teeth loosed their tension. The father seized his child, turned her face downward and the poison began to flow from her mouth—Again and again, as the retching ceased, he busied his experiment—the life returning still more, and the face losing its blank color every instant. More than twenty times all been had administered, and more than half those times followed by the expulsion of the poison; when the eyes opened, the father desisted, the little sufferer lay just alive in his arms, exhausted, his little life terribly shattered, but saved!

Then—when the necessity for exertion and determination was over—when the physician had been summoned, and they knew that darling little Evelyn might live, after many weeks of a struggle between life and death, when the relieved friends had acknowledged that they had wronged him first, when the beautiful and sorrowful wife had blessed him through her kisses and tears, and all knew that under God only such almost fierce determination could have saved the child—then the father sat down, unweary, and wept like a child.

Not in "Little Sister Evelyn" did the poison do its fearful office. Evelyn is alive to-day, and her brown eyes are opened up to womanhood. But there is no hour in my life that brings so thrilling a recollection as that of the young father's struggle for the life of his child.

## FROM THE NEW HAVEN DAILY PALLADIUM.

REPLY TO THE EXCELLENT JAMES BUCHANAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

In July last, a number of citizens of Connecticut addressed to you, as Chief Magistrate of this nation, a Memorial on the affairs in Kansas. To this you replied, under date of Aug. 15, 1857, in a manner which shows that you misunderstood, to some extent the ground taken by the Memorialists, for we would not impute to you the intention to misrepresent them. As you have thought proper to lay the Memorial and Reply before the public, a large part of the Memorialists have conferred on the subject, and have felt themselves compelled again to address you. We would remark, then, that the main facts alleged in the Memorial are either proved without denial, or are explicitly avowed in your reply.

These facts are two: First, "that the fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States, and of our political institutions, is that the people shall make their own laws, and elect their own rulers." Secondly, "that Gov. Walker of Kansas openly proclaims and proclaims, that the President of the United States is employing through him (Walker) an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws which are not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which, it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made, and rulers they never elected." As to these two facts, the material facts alleged by your Memorialists, and which chiefly require vindication from you, they say that they find no denial of them in your reply. They do not say that you have attempted no vindication of your acts and doings through Gov. Walker; but only, that they can find in your reply no plain or explicit denial of facts referred to—not even what they consider the shadow of a denial. These facts stand in the Memorial then, uncontroverted, by what you evidently consider a triumphant Reply. Why is this? As to these assertions, on which the whole substance of the Memorial rests, and yet no denial of them—not a word to prove them untrue? Without such denial, what can you expect your Memorialists of the country to believe and to say? What, but that the facts, which they allege, are notorious and undeniable?

As to the allegation respecting the fundamental principle of the Constitution, your Memorialists hope that the time is remote when the enlightened citizens of this country will deny that principle; though party zeal, in its infatuation, may one day trample it in the dust, when, in sight of the ruin, Liberty and Religion in exile will together weep over the desecration.

Your formal vindication next demands notice.

Of this your Memorialists are compelled to say that, in their view, it is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory.

Resting it solely on what you call "the plainest and most palpable historical facts," you say that, at the time of your inauguration, "you found in the Government of Kansas as well established as that of any other Territory." You then ask, was it not my duty to sustain this government—to prevent it from being overturned by force; in the language of the Constitution, "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." You then add: "It was for this purpose that I ordered a military force to Kansas to act as a posse comitatus in aiding the civil magistrates to carry the law into execution." Here, then, is the distinct admission and declaration on your part, that you ordered a military force to Kansas for the purpose of sustaining its Territorial Government, and of enforcing its Territorial laws. So far, then, in respect to one matter of fact, you admit the assertion of your Memorialists.

Your vindication, therefore, rests upon the assertion that there was, in fact, Government in Kansas—yet, the Government was your duty to sustain. The essential question on which the whole controversy turns, is thus raised; it is simply this: Was there a Government, or were there laws, in Kansas, in the just, proper, and authorized meaning of the language, "when you entered upon the duties of the Presidential office on the 4th of March last?"

If this can be proved true, your Memorialists will know something which they have yet to learn. If it can be proved not to be true, it will present a memorable example of the truth, that political prejudice is blind even to the existence of the plainest and most palpable of historical facts. Nor is this all. It will show that you ordered an army to Kansas to sustain a so-called Government which is not a Government, and laws which are not laws.

Here your Memorialists take the position, that NOTHING CAN BE TRULY GOVERNMENT OR LAW WHICH HAS NO AUTHORITY; and that NOTHING SHOULD BE TREATED AS GOVERNMENT OR LAW WHICH PRESENTS NO EVIDENCE OF AUTHORITY.

Can anything which tramples under foot all human rights, and is a known outrage upon our Constitution and our political institutions, whatever be its name or form, be justly regarded as government or law having authority under our Constitution? Can such an outrage be clothed with authority by a President, Senate, Congress, or a whole Congress of Presidents? Can usurpation be a valid government or law, or impart that right to govern which implies an obligation to obey? It might make it a matter of prudence to avoid its wrath by submission, but can usurpation create an obligation to obey when none exists?

Suppose the Great Mogul, or any other tyrant, had established the same so-called government and laws of Kansas by the same means by which, as all the world knows, they were established—by invasion and by force—would any citizen of the United States call these "a government and laws," except in derision and with loathing? Is a bogus government—government? Are bogus laws—laws? Is this "government established," and are these "laws enacted"—and yet known to possess no other of higher authority than that derived from BONNIE BARRERS? Are "we, the people of the United States" to be established into the belief of such a dogma? For that result, wait at least for the more absolute dominion of a tyrant.

Your Memorialists will now present what they consider the fundamental error of your reply. In their view, in recognizing the Territorial Government and laws of Kansas as a genuine Government and valid laws, you perverted the general principle upon which

you rest your vindication, and have violated its essential spirit and meaning.

That general principle may be thus stated: "When laws of action, claiming to be valid laws, present on the first aspect, evidence that they proceed from a rightful law-making power; it is the duty of the people and the executors of law to recognize them as authoritative. To this, as a general principle, your Memorialists subscribe. It is the only means of giving practical authority to law, and of preventing violence and anarchy; nor do they yield to any man or class of men a higher estimate of its importance, or a firmer determination to adopt and defend it, than the Memorialists themselves cherish. And here your Memorialists and all laws, claiming to be valid, must be recognized, executed and obeyed as such, is as preposterous as to deny the general principle itself. To mistake the general principle for a universal rule, the conditional for an unconditional principle, must lead to false reasoning and to practical conclusions of the most dangerous character. This, in view of your Memorialists, who believe that none are too wise or good to err, is what you (they trust inadvertently) have done.

In recognizing the Territorial Government and law, as authoritative, have you not violated the whole spirit and meaning of the general principle laid down? Have you not wholly disregarded the essential condition, that the only government which it is your duty to sanction must present some evidence of rightful authority? You recognize the Territorial laws as valid. What is this, but to act upon the principle that, when the so-called government and laws come before you, without the shadow of evidence of their proceeding from a regular, rightful law-making power, but with the most decisive and overwhelming proof that they have originated in a palpable and violent usurpation—that even then—even in a case so flagrant, it is your duty to sustain and execute them, even by the armies of the United States?

Your Memorialists are here anxious to call your attention to an important distinction, which you appear entirely to overlook. They readily concede that, in cases of no frequent occurrence, one government may properly recognize another as authoritative, or as a government de facto, on a very low degree of evidence, without rigidly investigating its authority, or even considering its origin. For example, the Government of Great Britain, when Louis Napoleon was exiled in France by the army of the Empire, and with the acquiescence and consent of the people, had no right to interfere with a government thus established. The British as a foreign Government had no right of question or of control in the matter. But does it follow, because the Government of Great Britain had no right to interfere with what was no longer a de facto government, that the Government of the United States had no right, and were not bound to interpose and put down in one of their own Territories, a ruffian usurper from Missouri? In respect to France, there was reason enough why other nations "for purposes of national intercourse should recognize its present government as an established government." It is not the Government of the United States that is the Government of the land? Has not our supreme law the right to authorize and regulate the government of its own Territories? Can Congress be more or less, than the government PROCEEDS FROM AN AUTHORIZED LAW-MAKING POWER.

And they further insist, that when such usurpation is within our own borders, and under the supervision and control of the Federal Government, and claiming to derive all its sanction from a law of Congress, THE EVIDENCE OF ITS AUTHORITY MUST BE CLEAR AND DECISIVE. But how is it when there is no such evidence? How is it when there is the best evidence the case admits of, even decisive, unquestionable proof, that the so-called Government has no other authority than Ruffianism, in violation of that existing law, trampling upon those inherent rights, Missouri invaders have set up a bloody tyranny, which has, in fact, produced anarchy and bloodshed. If you condemn the one, condemn the other also. Your Memorialists have nothing to ask of you in this matter but consistency of principle. Condemn the same conduct in both cases, put down the usurpation in Kansas, and the friends of truth, justice, and of the country, would rejoice.

Your Memorialists again ask, whether a case can be made out, in which the name of authoritative government could be applied with more palpable impropriety and untruth, than to the Territorial Government of Kansas? Might not even political shamelessness blush to call it by such a name? Was not the true and only character of this Government known to you and the whole country, when you were inaugurated, and during the Presidential canvass? Did you not, with the full knowledge of it, accept your nomination, which you were free to decline, and assume the responsibility of executing these odious laws; or, did you suppose that the oath of office would exempt you from this responsibility? You admit the Constitution to be the supreme law of the land, and yet you are not willing to be responsible and have not fully sanctioned, your Memorialists would ask, was there no law to be taken care of, by preventing a well-known projected invasion of the political rights of the people of Kansas? No law to be taken care of afterwards by compelling the invaders from the Territory? No law to be taken care of in respect to the thefts, the robberies, the incendiarism and the murders that were perpetrated? No law to be taken care of in the mode of civil administration adopted by the Federal officials? No law to be taken care of in not appointing officials whose names were known to be innocent blood? No law to be taken care of by securing to the people of the Territory that fundamental right of the Constitution—a right guarded by an express law of Congress—no law to make their own laws and elect their own rulers? No law to be taken care of in giving to Congress information at least of the state of the Union, and especially in recommending necessary and expedient measures for the relief of the people of Kansas from the injustice, the oppression and the barbarities to which they were subjected?—Had then Great Britain any such laws to take care of in France, when the present Emperor was enthroned there by usurpation, as those which our Government—our President—was bound to take care of in our own Territory? In utter neglect of these laws, have you not, with a full knowledge of the nature of this usurpation, its origin, its progress, its violation of Constitution and of fundamental rights, its violence, its rapine, its measures its confagration, and its shame, sustained at every step its authors and abettors to this hour? Have you not sanctioned such conduct by placing, or retaining, prominent leaders therein in official stations?

Again, are the troubles and calamities of Kansas the legitimate results of the wise administration of the true and right working in such an exigency—of the National Government? The most perfect specimen of human government that the world has seen, or ever will see, is the Government of the United States. Surely, such results bespeak some derangement, some disturbing force in the evolution of a machinery so fitted to do good, so powerful to its high design.

But if your example in administration, and that of your predecessor in office, are to be followed in future, whenever similar cases shall occur—in an outrage as wrong to hold Kansas subject to such usurpation by a United States army? The fires of ruffianism still burn there smothered in the dreariness of their own desolation, and ready to be kindled in their fury by the slightest movement for Liberty and Right on the part of the people, while the echo of their sufferings ever rings in the ears of our National Executive. Let it be remembered, that this Government comes to the people of Kansas not with the sanction of gray antiquity, nor yet has it come from any law of Congress as its true and proper source, nor yet from being even fully established. It is of recent origin and formation. It dates only from the imposition of it by the ruffianism from Missouri, upon the people who abhor and disown it. Every man who has, from the first, known its existence, has known its origin and its nature. Let it then be taken as it is; as it is, in its origin and its nature. And what is it? A code of laws, oppressive, unjust, cruel, imposed without a parallel, created, imposed by the usurpation of ruffians from Missouri. And these laws, and this "Government," without the least evidence to establish their authority, but with the most abundant proof to the contrary, you are proposing to sustain and execute by the United States army!

You speak of "numbers of lawless men," and "blatant evidence to the Topka Creek encampment." Of the particular considerations by which you have endeavored to support the fundamental principle of your reply, the first which demands notice is that, "when you entered upon your official duties, Congress had recognized the Legislature (of Kansas) in different forms, and by different enactments." This you informed your Memorialists what these various enactments were, and you might have made them the subject of duty, but they know of no "forms or enactments" of Congress which could be binding on you as authoritative, or which you had reason even to regard as evidence of the validity of that Legislature. Do you mean to say that the Treasury which made appropriations from the Treasury were used? Every one knows in what manner and for what reason that act was passed, and that many who voted for it regarded it as downright usurpation; nor had any suspicion that they were investing their money in the support of an act of usurpation with authority; you mean to undertake a separate Government, within its chartered limits for the purpose of redressing any grievance, real or imaginary, would be usurpation, and add that "such a principle, carried into execution, would destroy all lawful authority, and produce universal anarchy." Your Memorialists do not see how this is to be done, but how does one "lawless attempt" to establish a government, justify or palliate another lawless attempt, for the same purpose?

Further: In your reply you seem to your Memorialists to concede, in all its truth and force, the principle which they maintain—That, for a portion of the people of Connecticut to undertake a separate Government, within its chartered limits for the purpose of redressing any grievance, real or imaginary, would be usurpation, and add that "such a principle, carried into execution, would destroy all lawful authority, and produce universal anarchy." Your Memorialists do not see how this is to be done, but how does one "lawless attempt" to establish a government, justify or palliate another lawless attempt, for the same purpose?

Present. With the solemn decision of the House of Representatives, after a long investigation, that the Legislature of Kansas had no authority, and that its laws were no laws—with that direct, positive and unimpeachable evidence before you, your Memorialists cannot but express their surprise that you have relied upon your construction of indirect, inconclusive acts of that same body as evidence of the authority of that Legislature. You know of no rule of law by which you can view constructive, inferential evidence against direct and positive evidence of the same source. But this proof you pass over in utter silence.

Attending to the condition of the Territory, you speak of the course which you adopted as "absolutely necessary," and ask whether you would not have been justly condemned had you left what you assumed to be the government and its administration "inoperative," and thus have suffered it to become an object of contempt in the eyes of the people. Our first reply to this view of the case is, as before, there was no (Territorial) government in Kansas to be executed, as you suppose. And again, we say the usurped government ought to have been rendered inoperative, and to have become an object of contempt in the eyes of the people, as it has become. But further, Congress has passed a law for the establishment of a government in this Territory; with this formal and positive explanation that the people (in the Territory) be left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. Why, then, could not a Governor of Kansas have been appointed at any time, acting under your authority, and with an army under his control, who would have suppressed all

internal violence and contention, and "left the people free to form and regulate their domestic institutions," &c., as well as employ the army to act the absurd and farcical part of a posse comitatus, to enforce, under your direction, territorial laws which had no pretense of authority? Without saying who were or who were not, the responsible originators of the troubles in Kansas, can it be doubted that the President long before this time, by the course now suggested, or some other, might have put an end to these troubles? Has he not power to "take care that the laws"—and, of course, that the law of Congress, respecting Kansas—"be faithfully executed?"

You have introduced several topics into your reply, as that of Slavery, the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott, with others, on which your Memorialists have said nothing in their Memorial, and on which they intend to say nothing now, except to express their dissent from your opinions.

It is needless to prolong this discussion.—Your whole vindication, if it has any ground, rests, in the view of your Memorialists, upon one palpably false assumption: That whatever claims to be a government de facto, without a pretense of its proceeding from any rightful law-making power, is entitled to your support. The world has not seen a usurpation which this principle would not sanction. If adopted in the administration of our Government it must involve, sooner or later, its destruction.

Pardon, now, if need be, the plain and respectful earnestness of your Memorialists in unfolding what they consider false principles in your positions on the present subject.—They speak of no want of honesty in your opinions, nor of sincerity in your avowal of them—of no want of patriotism on your part, nor yet of that higher principle which God approves. They speak only of what they consider error in your reasonings, and of its consequences in political evils. They judge not the length. They have not forgotten, they would apply to you with as much honesty as you have thought fit to charge. Their language shows the contrary. They said, "By the foregoing you are held up—as violating," &c. The "foregoing" here spoken of is shown by the connection to be the claim of Gov. Walker that "the President of the United States is employing through him (Walker) an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which, it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made, and rulers they never elected." This claim of Gov. Walker, if admitted by you in its full extent, and admitted on the ground of making the general principle mentioned above a *vi veritas* of one, thus applying a more rule of international law to the internal government of this country—would, in our view, involve the most serious impositions upon any Chief Magistrate. But you had not at that time, so far as we are aware, given any public sanction to that claim, and the Memorial, therefore, did not contain the imputation you supposed.

Your Memorialists have dwelt on the error referred to above, as they regard it, not merely on account of its fatal tendency, and the calamities which have actually resulted from it, but also, because they are confident that you, in common with many of your honest fellow-citizens, have overlooked a fundamental principle in assuming that the ruffian usurpation in Kansas is an established government. Be assured that they intend to withhold no truth due to your intellectual eminence, or moral character. They believe, however, that many errors and misconceptions are compatible with the highest mental culture and intellectual ability.

Your Memorialists have spoken earnestly, because they deeply deplore the adoption of a principle which leads to the mal-administration of so perfect a system of government as that which our fathers, by their wisdom, their prayers, and their blood, have given to their posterity. They cannot believe in the unapproachable infallibility of their rulers, under this system of free liberty and, while they would honor them in the fear of God, they are confident that neither they, nor even "kings, have the right divine to govern wrong." They hope for the continuance of our national government, and for its wise and effective administration, in guarding the privileges and blessings it is so fitted to afford and perpetuate. They wait with hope for the emancipation of the nation, and of all men, by the light and power of the example of such a government. They trust that no unauthorized mode of its administration will cause it to fall of its design, and that you may yet see that in this respect one false principle, if adhered to, must prove a principle of weakness and decay—a sure prelude to the end of all our greatness, happiness and glory—a death-spot in the tree of Liberty, whose leaves, like those of the tree of life, are for the healing of the nations.

NATHANIEL W. TAYLOR, S. G. HUBBARD,  
THEO. D. WOOLLEY, JOHN A. BLAKE,  
HENRY DUTTON, WY. H. RUSSELL,  
CHARLES L. ENGLISH, A. N. SKINNER,  
JOHN H. BROCKWAY, CHARLES ROBINSON,  
ELI W. BLACK, JOEL HAYES,  
BENJ. SILLIMAN JR., G. A. CALHOUE,  
THOMAS A. TRACHER, LEONARD BACON,  
A. DAVENPORT, H. C. KROSBY,  
WHEATON HOOKER, BENJ. SILLIMAN SR.,  
PHILIP BLACK, CHARLES IVES,  
AMOS TOWNSEND, JAMES W. GIBBS,  
JAMES BREWSTER, JAMES F. BARCOCK,  
ELI IVES, ALFRED WALKER,  
HAWLEY OLMSTED.

The election day came, and Mr. Buchanan was made President.—"Foreign Affairs."

We are always gratified when we can bear witness to the truthfulness of any assertions made by our opponents; and the quotation above, we can endorse to the letter. Mr. Buchanan was made President. The Democratic party knows how to make Presidents. It has long ago abandoned the idea of electing them. Twenty reams of false naturalization papers; fifteen Italian organ-grinders voting upon the papers in one instance; a pocket full of pocket knives and "rangers," voting three, four and five times (see the evidence in the Mann and Cassidy case), were the means by which Mr. Buchanan was made President. Our country is great inventions, and the Democratic party is great at contriving means to make Presidents.

A band of gipsies is now encamped near Rochester.

ures for the relief of the people of Kansas from the injustice, the oppression and the barbarities to which they were subjected?—Had then Great Britain any such laws to take care of in France, when the present Emperor was enthroned there by usurpation, as those which our Government—our President—was bound to take care of in our own Territory? In utter neglect of these laws, have you not, with a full knowledge of the nature of this usurpation, its origin, its progress, its violation of Constitution and of fundamental rights, its violence, its rapine, its measures its confagration, and its shame, sustained at every step its authors and abettors to this hour? Have you not sanctioned such conduct by placing, or retaining, prominent leaders therein in official stations?

Again, are the troubles and calamities of Kansas the legitimate results of the wise administration of the true and right working in such an exigency—of the National Government? The most perfect specimen of human government that the world has seen, or ever will see, is the Government of the United States. Surely, such results bespeak some derangement, some disturbing force in the evolution of a machinery so fitted to do good, so powerful to its high design.

But if your example in administration, and that of your predecessor in office, are to be followed in future, whenever similar cases shall occur—in an outrage as wrong to hold Kansas subject to such usurpation by a United States army? The fires of ruffianism still burn there smothered in the dreariness of their own desolation, and ready to be kindled in their fury by the slightest movement for Liberty and Right on the part of the people, while the echo of their sufferings ever rings in the ears of our National Executive. Let it be remembered, that this Government comes to the people of Kansas not with the sanction of gray antiquity, nor yet has it come from any law of Congress as its true and proper source, nor yet from being even fully established. It is of recent origin and formation. It dates only from the imposition of it by the ruffianism from Missouri, upon the people who abhor and disown it. Every man who has, from the first, known its existence, has known its origin and its nature. Let it then be taken as it is; as it is, in its origin and its nature. And what is it? A code of laws, oppressive, unjust, cruel, imposed without a parallel, created, imposed by the usurpation of ruffians from Missouri. And these laws, and this "Government," without the least evidence to establish their authority, but with the most abundant proof to the contrary, you are proposing to sustain and execute by the United States army!

You speak of "numbers of lawless men," and "blatant evidence to the Topka Creek encampment." Of the particular considerations by which you have endeavored to support the fundamental principle of your reply, the first which demands notice is that, "when you entered upon your official duties, Congress had recognized the Legislature (of Kansas) in different forms, and by different enactments." This you informed your Memorialists what these various enactments were, and you might have made them the subject of duty, but they know of no "forms or enactments" of Congress which could be binding on you as authoritative, or which you had reason even to regard as evidence of the validity of that Legislature. Do you mean to say that the Treasury which made appropriations from the Treasury were used? Every one knows in what manner and for what reason that act was passed, and that many who voted for it regarded it as downright usurpation; nor had any suspicion that they were investing their money in the support of an act of usurpation with authority; you mean to undertake a separate Government, within its chartered limits for the purpose of redressing any grievance, real or imaginary, would be usurpation, and add that "such a principle, carried into execution, would destroy all lawful authority, and produce universal anarchy." Your Memorialists do not see how this is to be done, but how does one "lawless attempt" to establish a government, justify or palliate another lawless attempt, for the same purpose?

Further: In your reply you seem to your Memorialists to concede, in all its truth and force, the principle which they maintain—That, for a portion of the people of Connecticut to undertake a separate Government, within its chartered limits for the purpose of redressing any grievance, real or imaginary, would be usurpation, and add that "such a principle, carried into execution, would destroy all lawful authority, and produce universal anarchy." Your Memorialists do not see how this is to be done, but how does one "lawless attempt" to establish a government, justify or palliate another lawless attempt, for the same purpose?

Present. With the solemn decision of the House of Representatives, after a long investigation, that the Legislature of Kansas had no authority, and that its laws were no laws—with that direct, positive and unimpeachable evidence before you, your Memorialists cannot but express their surprise that you have relied upon your construction of indirect, inconclusive acts of that same body as evidence of the authority of that Legislature. You know of no rule of law by which you can view constructive, inferential evidence against direct and positive evidence of the same source. But this proof you pass over in utter silence.

Attending to the condition of the Territory, you speak of the course which you adopted as "absolutely necessary," and ask whether you would not have been justly condemned had you left what you assumed to be the government and its administration "inoperative," and thus have suffered it to become an object of contempt in the eyes of the people. Our first reply to this view of the case is, as before, there was no (Territorial) government in Kansas to be executed, as you suppose. And again, we say the usurped government ought to have been rendered inoperative, and to have become an object of contempt in the eyes of the people, as it has become. But further, Congress has passed a law for the establishment of a government in this Territory; with this formal and positive explanation that the people (in the Territory) be left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. Why, then, could not a Governor of Kansas have been appointed at any time, acting under your authority, and with an army under his control, who would have suppressed all

internal violence and contention, and "left the people free to form and regulate their domestic institutions," &c., as well as employ the army to act the absurd and farcical part of a posse comitatus, to enforce, under your direction, territorial laws which had no pretense of authority? Without saying who were or who were not, the responsible originators of the troubles in Kansas, can it be doubted that the President long before this time, by the course now suggested, or some other, might have put an end to these troubles? Has he not power to "take care that the laws"—and, of course, that the law of Congress, respecting Kansas—"be faithfully executed?"

You have introduced several topics into your reply, as that of Slavery, the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott, with others, on which your Memorialists have said nothing in their Memorial, and on which they intend to say nothing now, except to express their dissent from your opinions.

It is needless to prolong this discussion.—Your whole vindication, if it has any ground, rests, in the view of your Memorialists, upon one palpably false assumption: That whatever claims to be a government de facto, without a pretense of its proceeding from any rightful law-making power, is entitled to your support. The world has not seen a usurpation which this principle would not sanction. If adopted in the administration of our Government it must involve, sooner or later, its destruction.

Pardon, now, if need be, the plain and respectful earnestness of your Memorialists in unfolding what they consider false principles in your positions on the present subject.—They speak of no want of honesty in your opinions, nor of sincerity in your avowal of them—of no want of patriotism on your part, nor yet of that higher principle which God approves. They speak only of what they consider error in your reasonings, and of its consequences in political evils. They judge not the length. They have not forgotten, they would apply to you with as much honesty as you have thought fit to charge. Their language shows the contrary. They said, "By the foregoing you are held up—as violating," &c. The "foregoing" here spoken of is shown by the connection to be the claim of Gov. Walker that "the President of the United States is employing through him (Walker) an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which, it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made, and rulers they never elected." This claim of Gov. Walker, if admitted by you in its full extent, and admitted on the ground of making the general principle mentioned above a *vi veritas* of one, thus applying a more rule of international law to the internal government of this country—would, in our view, involve the most serious impositions upon any Chief Magistrate. But you had not at that time, so far as we are aware, given any public sanction to that claim, and the Memorial, therefore, did not contain the imputation you supposed.

Your Memorialists have dwelt on the error referred to above, as they regard it, not merely on account of its fatal tendency, and the calamities which have actually resulted from it, but also, because they are confident that you, in common with many of your honest fellow-citizens, have overlooked a fundamental principle in assuming that the ruffian usurpation in Kansas is an established government. Be assured that they intend to withhold no truth due to your intellectual eminence, or moral character. They believe, however, that many errors and misconceptions are compatible with the highest mental culture and intellectual ability.

Your Memorialists have spoken earnestly, because they deeply deplore the adoption of a principle which leads to the mal-administration of so perfect a system of government as that which our fathers, by their wisdom, their prayers, and their blood, have given to their posterity. They cannot believe in the unapproachable infallibility of their rulers, under this system of free liberty and, while they would honor them in the fear of God, they are confident that neither they, nor even "kings, have the right divine to govern wrong." They hope for the continuance of our national government, and for its wise and effective administration, in guarding the privileges and blessings it is so fitted to afford and perpetuate. They wait with hope for the emancipation of the nation, and of all men, by the light and power of the example of such a government. They trust that no unauthorized mode of its administration will cause it to fall of its design, and that you may yet see that in this respect one false principle, if adhered to, must prove a principle of weakness and decay—a sure prelude to the end of all our greatness, happiness and glory—a death-spot in the tree of Liberty, whose leaves, like those of the tree of life, are for the healing of the nations.

NATHANIEL W. TAYLOR, S. G. HUBBARD,  
THEO. D. WOOLLEY, JOHN A. BLAKE,  
HENRY DUTTON, WY. H. RUSSELL,  
CHARLES L. ENGLISH, A. N. SKINNER,  
JOHN H. BROCKWAY, CHARLES ROBINSON,  
ELI W. BLACK, JOEL HAYES,  
BENJ. SILLIMAN JR., G. A. CALHOUE,  
THOMAS A. TRACHER, LEONARD BACON,  
A. DAVENPORT, H. C. KROSBY,  
WHEATON HOOKER, BENJ. SILLIMAN SR.,  
PHILIP BLACK, CHARLES IVES,  
AMOS TOWNSEND, JAMES W. GIBBS,  
JAMES BREWSTER, JAMES F. BARCOCK,  
ELI IVES, ALFRED WALKER,  
HAWLEY OLMSTED.