

LEWISBURG CHRONICLE.

BY O. N. WORDEN & J. R. CORNELIUS.
AN INDEPENDENT FAMILY AND NEWS JOURNAL.

LEWISBURG, UNION CO., PA., FRIDAY, OCT. 17, 1856.

YEAR XIII...WHOLE NUMBER, 653.
AT \$1.50 PER YEAR, ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

The Chronicle.

FRIDAY, OCT. 17, 1856.

Politics and Preachers.

In another column will be found a letter from Rev. GEORGE B. BLISS, some time pastor of a church at New Brunswick in New Jersey, now Greek Professor in the University at Lewisburg, Pa. It is called forth by a letter from Senator Bigler, copies of which have been sent by that functionary to very many if not all the clergymen in the North, thus inviting them into the political arena, and laying himself open to the searching retort which he has received. It will be observed that while the "Pennsylvania," the leading Democratic press in Pennsylvania, is edited by Rev. Theophilus Fisk, a Universalist preacher, and there are ministers of all denominations (to say nothing of the whole corps of Catholic priests and Mormon elders) who support the Buchanan party, yet that party have, since the "3,000 ministers" of New England reprobated against the iniquitous repeal of the Missouri Compromise, been constantly engaged in denouncing Ministers of the Gospel for "interfering in politics," and the abuse heaped upon the heads of those who labor against the extension of slavery, has been unsparring. Senator Bigler's "Open Letter" is a censure upon those who denounce ministers in this respect; they have the same interest in the welfare of the country, as other citizens in our land where are no privileged or proscribed classes; and in some respects they have superior means for acquiring information and forming an unbiased judgment.

THE SHAKERS FOR FREEMONT.—A gentleman who was at the Shaker establishment in Lebanon last Sunday states that he heard Elder Evans deliver a very earnest and effective Republican discourse to four hundred of his Shaker brethren, all of whom intend to vote for Freedom and Fremont in November next. The Elder said that when there was nothing of more importance in politics than questions of tariffs and sub-treasures, it was not their duty to interfere—then politics might be left entirely to the "World's people." But when Freedom was at stake it became a duty to let their votes be given in its defence. The announcement was received with great applause.

[There is no more pure and blameless (though singular) sect than the Shakers. It is also believed that the members of many other small religious communities, throughout the Northern States, who usually do not vote, will this year vote for the preservation of Liberty in the Western world.]

SANDERS' NEW SERIES OF SCHOOL READERS.—Copies of Sanders New Readers have been handed to us for examination, and have afforded more satisfaction than is usually to be expected from the perusal of school books. The old series have been long in use, and have done good service in the cause of popular education. But fifteen years of experience in teaching, and an extensive intercourse with other teachers, have suggested to the author many improvements; and these are now introduced into an entirely new series, which seems to be one of the most nearly perfect that have yet appeared. The plan is well adapted to overcome gradually the many obstacles to be met with in learning to read our language well, and to throw interest around what is too often a dull task.

The selections for reading lessons are well suited, not only to accomplish the chief end of making good readers, but also to exert an excellent moral influence, to impart intelligently to the scholar a large amount of really valuable knowledge, and to cultivate his literary taste by familiarizing him with many specimens of good style.

The books are kept for sale wholesale and retail by the publishers, Sower & Barnes, No. 33 North Third St., Phila., and by T. G. Orwig, Mifflinburg.

AN UNLUCKY DAY FOR THEM.—In Ottawa, Ill., last week, the following good one was got off. The Democrats had a grand rally and barbecue. An Irishman went to some of the Democratic leaders and said: "And sure didn't ye know better than to have a barbecue on Friday, when two-thirds of the Democratic party can't eat mate!"

The Democrats ought to have more respect for their party than to appoint their barbecue on a day when two-thirds of it "can't eat mate."

EPIDEMIC.—A fatal epidemic has broken out among the Swine at the distilleries in the vicinity of Easton, Pa. We were informed by a Gentleman from that place, that one establishment had lost over one thousand hogs, and the disease, which is somewhat similar to the cholera, was spreading among the farm stock of the neighborhood.

THE WELSH.—Only one solitary Welshman was found in the Buchanan procession on Saturday, and he is an infidel, who denies the authority of God, and every moral obligation of Man.—*The Danville American.*

[Correspondence of the Lewisburg Chronicle.]
GREENSBURG, Westmoreland Co., }
Oct. 8, 1856.

This has been another great day in the calendar of glorious days for the cause of the people and the constitution as against the cause of nullification and slavery propaganda, with its demagogic attributes of fire and sword, and rape and robbery and murder on the plains of Kansas; with violence and outrage in one-half the States, and threatened piracy in the future—another evidence that God reigns, and the people are not struck with judicial blindness, when all the constitutional and human rights are at stake, in the dread and solemn issue of the present hour; when men who love their country and their race, pray while they work, and will vote as they pray; men who will follow the dictates of their judgment and their consciences, and not the behests of party, or insulting appeals to their cowardly fears; but working, praying, voting, will march forward to such a victory for the right, and such an overthrow of the wrong, as will send the hounds of nullification howling to their kennels, and seal the doom of all such for all time.

But I only sat down to make a brief statement of facts, that friends east may know what friends west are doing, and gather fresh energy for the mighty struggle. Yesterday the Shamocracy tried a mass meeting here in this their ancient stronghold. It was as strong as they could make it; but not strong enough for their purposes. To-day, the friends of freedom and Fremont came together, 8,000 in number; and as I write the wild huzzas of an excited and resolute people are ringing in my ears, like the thanksgivings of political redemption, already achieved.

Speaker Banks was introduced amidst such a stormy shout of welcome, as made the old forest trees around him, ring with its echoing thunders. He occupied an hour and a half with a clear, strong, compact argument, worthy of his keen intellect and iron will, that carried conviction to every mind—welded and knit together with caustic satire, and side splitting jokes that fell upon the hearers like point blank volleys of canister and grape, and left no loop hole of escape from the merciless force of his logic and illustrations.

He was followed by Judge George W. Smith, just arrived yesterday from Kansas, where for three months and twenty days, he was imprisoned in tents on the open prairie, under the dews and drenching rains, and the scorching sun of the dog days, sometimes shivering with ague, or burning with fever, and guarded by the dragons of the American people, all on the false and perjured charge of treason! And as the people looked on his venerable countenance marked with lines of suffering, and heard his plain, straight forward testimony as to the past in Kansas, and to the fact that peace and security and right do not now exist there, but that the people are subjugated and oppressed, and that, too, by Buchanan's boasted Gov. Geary, who is not as drunken, but fully as tyrannical and partial as was the vile and infamous Shannon—old men wept, and young men listened with swelling hearts, as their blazing eyes and stern countenances, spoke of new and stronger vows to be discharged at the ballot box.

But I can not trust myself to dwell on these things. They go down too deep into the hearts' core. The enemy die hard, and fight with the energy of despair. But be assured the voters of old Westmoreland are awake and working for the right principles and the right candidates, and will do their whole duty in the hour of trial. I am sure little Union will gloriously back up our efforts here. God speed the right.

Yours,
T. B. TAYLOR.

For the Lewisburg Chronicle.

AN OPEN LETTER

To Wm. Bigler, Esq., U.S. Senator.

DEAR SIR: I had the honor to receive under your frank several copies of a Tract entitled "Infidelity and Abolitionism! an open Letter to the friends of Religion, Morality, and the American Union." It is designed apparently to awaken the attention of religious people, and especially Christian ministers, to the solemnity of the issues involved in the coming Presidential election. Being anonymous, I take it to be the production of your own pen, or at least one for which you make yourself responsible, and therefore looked to find in it that truthfulness of statement and candor of discussion which would befit your exalted station.

Before proceeding to the topics directly presented in your letter, I am happy to observe that you do not share in what amounts almost to a panic with many at the present time, the horror of a minister's participating in politics. I think you must in your wide political experience have witnessed the feeling to which I refer, and pitied its absurdity. A certain grade of political organs seem to regard it little less than a crime for a clergyman to have an opinion concerning controverted questions of civil administration, or at any rate, to try by any means to influence others in regard to them. They deem us to a kind of outlawry. All other men may think

and speak of these subjects; we may speak on other subjects, but when these are engrossing the deepest feelings of the people, for whom we minister, we must walk among them as though we were of another and an unrelated sphere. "Let them," doubtless you have heard it said, "confine themselves to their own vocation. Let them attend to holy things, and not defile their sacred vestments in the filthy pool of politics!" As if clergymen, had not, like mechanics, and farmers, and editors, and senators, besides their special calling also the general and most noble calling of a citizen and a man! As if they and their children were not interested in the measures which their government may pursue! As if they were not equally competent with the generality of people to understand what would be for the good of the country! And what an idea of politics! in its true and lofty sense, the noblest study next to religion, and coupled with it by ALGERNON SIDNEY as together the main concern of man! the science which shows how the best good of men in the state is to be secured, this their groveling minds would degrade to a rivalry of greedy office seekers, a squabble for the leaves and fishes of patronage, a worship over the ofal of public interests with which it would be pollution for any but the buzzards and hyenas of the state to interfere! A "dirty pool" indeed they make of it! Their sublime self-devotion to such abominable functions seems to demonstrate the feasibility of the most monstrous feature in the social scheme of Fourier, that where he supposes that in a natural arrangement of society some would be found as ready to perform the foulest and most disgusting offices for the public behoof as others to take upon them what is intrinsically honorable and pleasant! And you can not have failed to notice that while these creatures profess to allow ministers to deal with moral and religious subjects—"Oh! yes, let them attend to the morals and religion of the community"—still, no sooner do they find it convenient to entangle one of them within their selfish and ambitious schemes, than they cry "hands off! let politics alone!" Thus, temperance is a moral subject, until the means of promoting it are found to involve legislation, when it suddenly sinks into a base and degrading political question about which a minister should not speak. That a man should do to others as he would be done by, be just and kind to his neighbor of whatever complexion and degree, and even "remember those that are in bonds as bound with them," is innocent morality of which a clergyman may safely speak, until the growth of slavery crowds upon doctrines, and then forthwith he must qualify, and speak with "bated breath," lest some vested interest and party programme should suffer. So I will venture to predict that when, not long hence, the sanctioning of polygamy becomes a party question, "parents" will be politely requested to keep clear of that ground. Then, if the Chinese should multiply in California as they have in the "old country," and idolatry claim to be one of the "institutions" of the land, they will doubtless be politicians shrewd enough to see the danger of discouraging too strongly about "the one living and true God"! Perhaps we ought to be thankful to them for making our office a secure, and if we want to handle the obsolete themes of morality and religion, we shall need only to get into Congress, or the Legislature, or at least an editor's chair, and take them up as "politics."

But, I repeat it, I am glad to see that you do not countenance that sort of complaint. The very fact of your sending me this pamphlet implies that you suppose I, as a minister, may properly think of such themes. Your sending it in view of an approaching election implies that you would not deem me blameworthy for voting upon them. Your sending several of them together, implies that you would approve of my distributing them, and so influencing others to vote on them; and of course you would not object, when these are exhausted, to my taking the sentiments therein contained, or others like them, and by word of mouth making them effective, at proper times, and by proper ways, in promoting the important objects you have at heart. And I have too much regard for your professions of democracy, and of the belief and duty of all men to use their best judgment in these affairs, to doubt that if after conscientious deliberation, I should feel constrained to act in some respects differently from what you desire, you would concede my perfect right so to do. Thus you fairly confront me the obvious, though somewhat disputed principle of justice and equal rights. And it is what I should expect of the candor and intelligence adequate to your high office. Doubtless you see that a minister is a man, and may say, as well as an old Roman "nothing of human concern do I hold as foreign to myself." That he should sink into a mere partisan I take it for granted, you would deprecate; indeed you say as much; that he should allow even the civil and social welfare of his brethren to engross too large a share of his concerns would be manifestly injurious even to his political influence; but that he should be alive to the moral

and religious interests involved in the political and partisan, as well as all the other relations of his people, and from time to time indicate the motives which ought to influence them in discharging their duties here as elsewhere, you do, by the transmission of such a document, in such circumstances, unmistakably proclaim. I thank you for it, and shall endeavor to comply according to my honest convictions, with your implied recommendation.

I quite agree with your severe reprehension of "a political preacher hurrying his anathemas against his fellow man [men?] for their political opinions from the pulpit reared as an altar(?) to the ever living God." You speak of having "often seen it." I never have. But I have no hesitation in saying that it would be a censurable thing. I think a preacher should never hurl anathemas at his fellow men for any cause. He should rather strive to win them by preaching the truth in love, remembering, when compelled to do so, that "vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." I doubt whether he ought to say much about men's political opinions, in the pulpit, at all. Let him confine himself to the great principles of duty to God as supreme, and to our fellow men as all brethren black and white alike, Jew and Gentile, not sparing indeed solemnly to warn and faithfully to reprove men for their neglect of their duties in any of their relations, as they would give account to God. I am not certain but I should be somewhat more strict in my cautions to preachers, on this subject, than yourself. Still, in all essential points, what you say is quite according to my mind. I am clear that a prudent minister could find other opportunities more appropriate for what could fairly be called political discourse, than in the pulpit; times and places when even the most carping criticism could not pretend that he stood on any different footing from other good citizens.

I have dwelt on this point unduly, perhaps, but it is one, you see, of personal and as I may say, professional interest to myself, on which I could hardly look for another occasion, so proper, even in the eye of the most perverse objectors, as you have given me.

I should be glad if a careful perusal of your document suggested other aspects of it worthy of commendation. But I must now notice its direct and leading inculcations.

"Infidelity and Abolitionism!" Portentous terms! and what have they to do with my duty or the public welfare on this occasion? Your argument concerning them, briefly stated, is, that Col. Fremont is supported in the present canvass by abolitionists and infidels (indeed, you have the hardihood to assert, by "every infidel organization,") and from this you would have us infer... what? evidently something awful, but just what, is left a little vague. It can hardly be less than that Fremont is himself an abolitionist or infidel, or that he will at least unduly favor such men, and that so religion will somehow be ruined by his election. This is an argument of the validity of which with a little elucidation any one can judge.

Knowing positively and directly that Mr. Fremont is not only an amiable and upright man, but also an irreproachable Christian of the Episcopalian persuasion, and having heard him in private calmly declare his determination to do all in his power to preserve the Union, I was curious to see how your Senatorial ability, misled by partisan bias, would contrive to connect his name with the topics so ominously stated at the head of your tract. I have stated how it is done. And I am sorry to be obliged to say, that the manner of it is little calculated to sustain the confidence of serious people in the accuracy or fairness of even Senatorial reasoning.

In the first place, your main proposition does by no means hold good. Fremont is not supported by every infidel organization, and that you so boldly assert this enables us to judge at once what qualification your other assertions may require. You surely overlooked the infamously notorious Empire Club, of New York city, whose vile chief, Isaiah Rynders, figured as one of the moving spirits at the late Cincinnati Convention. Your religious readers must know perfectly well, that individual infidels, as they see them scattered through the land, are wonderfully transfigured in their "organizations," if they are there in favor of Fremont. Let ministers ask themselves whether the deists and atheists of their respective neighborhoods are generally for him! How is it that you have allowed yourself to make such a representation? I see how it is: "abolitionists, forsooth! support Fremont, and abolitionists are infidels!" Of this also your readers can judge. And here let me ask you, sir, as an honest man, talking to men of common sense, a gentleman, and a philanthropist, won for him eminent respect even at the hands of Southern gentlemen there—an orator, one breath of whose commanding eloquence would have swept all the sophistry of that aristocratic speech out of the grove—a Christian, the mere superfluity of whose excellence would furnish religion to many Tylers: to hear such a man so maligned from such a source, in the interest of Democracy, was an instructive phenomenon!

"The Hon. Gerrit Smith, of Peterboro', N. Y. You have not attempted in this paper directly to traduce him, I am happy to say. You did, however, I think, with "Hon." Mr. Wallack, listen smilingly to the vituperation which Robert Tyler thought fit to cast upon him here the other day. Yes, sir, you laughed gravely to hear Robert Tyler rank Gerrit Smith with Garrison and Remond as all alike disorganizers and infidels! Gerrit Smith, lately a Member of Congress, whose (not worldly-wise, perhaps, but) noble bearing as a man, a gentleman, and a philanthropist, won for him eminent respect even at the hands of Southern gentlemen there—an orator, one breath of whose commanding eloquence would have swept all the sophistry of that aristocratic speech out of the grove—a Christian, the mere superfluity of whose excellence would furnish religion to many Tylers: to hear such a man so maligned from such a source, in the interest of Democracy, was an instructive phenomenon!

interest and duty to rid themselves at once of the pernicious institution. I never knew one who advocated any other means. I have read indeed that Frederick Douglass, Remond, and some few other men who have themselves tasted the sweets of bondage, have talked of compelling emancipation; and I should not wonder in case even you or I, with manhood no way more noble, and an eloquence greatly inferior to that of Fred Douglass, had enjoyed his experience, we should speak somewhat extravagantly of the remedies for slavery. But you may meet a hundred abolitionists before you will find one who upholds violence in combating even this compound of all oppressions and iniquities. I say a hundred, and yet you must go far to meet a hundred abolitionists at all. It is seldom that I hear a man advocating the unconditional liberation of the slaves. The bugaboo abolitionists are, like ghosts, frightful things, of very rare occurrence. Their formidable conclaves are there where the innocent youth found the end of the rainbow. There are said to be many of them about Boston, as there are many men about Charleston and Richmond who advocate Slavery at the North, and proclaim "free society" a failure; and I venture the opinion there are not more men in all the North who deserve to be called abolitionists, than there are in the slave States who urge the abolition of free labor in the North. Of their abolitionism you betray no apprehension.

I am not careful to defend abolitionists. You know that not I in 50 of the Republican party agree with them in their peculiar views; that they partly explicitly and earnestly repudiate them; and that the Abolition party have not nominated Fremont and Dayton, but have nominated Smith and M'Farland, as their candidates for President and Vice President. I have said thus much merely as an act of justice to a class of men scattered sparsely thro' the community, whom your readers will recognize as generally persons of sincere piety and not at all dangerous to the public weal. We all know that abolitionism and infidelity are not identical; so that even if abolitionists were on the side of Fremont, and ten-fold more numerous than they are, this would not argue any great danger from infidelity. Doubtless there are men heterodox in religion, and those who reject the Bible, that are also warmly opposed to slavery, and such we should expect to find most violent in the expression of their views. So there are infidels and free-thinkers, as you are well aware, who favor Mr. Buchanan. But what is to be thought either of your intelligence or your candor, when you mingle together as one religious stamp, and all infidels, such men as Gerrit Smith, John Jay and J. G. Birney, with Garrison, Phillips and Parker? Do you not know that the three former, and others like them, are, I will not say superior to the current herd of partisan demagogues, but eminent for the practice of a style of Christianity to which, if any in our time, the Savior will one day say "well done"? And where have you told your readers that abolitionists, few and scattered, are widely at variance among themselves as to the proper course of political action for them? that many of them, including Garrison and his school, conscientiously abstain from voting altogether, while others—the only ones who exert any direct political influence—have a Presidential candidate of their own? to whom they will as conscientiously give their suffrages? that some of the most violent of them (Garrison and Wendell Phillips are said to be of this number) express a decided preference for the election of Buchanan, as being more likely by his subservience to the slave power to rouse the North to separation and independence? Can it be that by virtue of your position at the seat of government of this enlightened nation you are ignorant of facts patent to every other man who has acquired the art of reading? The statements of many Senators in regard also to events in Kansas, might lead us to think there was some baleful obstruction there to the knowledge of the truth, were it not that the contrasted course of a few men who adorn that body frustrates the supposition. But can any salvo redeem the intelligence of those who are so economical, so parsimonious even of cheap, vulgar truths, and well

known facts, without still more seriously damaging their credit in respect to common honesty? What matters it, then, that Theodore Parker and Garrison have denounced the Constitution as hopelessly entangled with Slavery, and have also shown themselves deists? or that the N. Y. Standard, if there be such a paper, has spoken hard of the course of the Tract Society? or that either of these papers advocated (if it did, which you do not even "assert") the cause of Fremont? Are there not an equal number of disunionists in the South who are also deists or worse and warmly in favor of Buchanan? or is Mr. Brooks, or Keitt, or Atchison, a good Christian in your eyes, from whom no harm is threatened to religion and morality? Perhaps Mr. Buchanan is quite as likely to be influenced by these, as Fremont by the "fanatics" of Boston. I would fain hope that the greatly preponderant favor towards the latter candidate from ministers of all denominations, and the countenance given him by almost every religious newspaper where people are free to think on slavery, may outweigh with serious people the disastrous passage of any "infidel" abolitionist who may chance to go the same way.

What reliance is to be placed on your apparent quotations from sources not accessible to all, may be judged from your perversion of Mr. Burlingame's remark. If he has spoken his "one speech fifty times," as is charged upon him, a good many people have heard it, and know that what he said, for the encouragement of Republicans struggling against a desperate aristocracy wielding all the allures and intimidations of the Government, was that "we have on our side an anti-slavery Constitution, an anti-slavery Bible, and an anti-slavery God." I hope this may be all found true.

It is with a logical dexterity which savors strongly of the "hococus presto!" knack, that you bring the N. Y. Tribune into your jumble of infidel abolitionism. And here again I would respectfully answer you, by simply referring all concerned, to the pages of the Tribune itself. That paper is now extensively circulated, however unwelcome the news may be to you, and any man who does not take it himself, has only to ask one of his neighbors if what you say of it is true. It would not be wicked for him even to look at the paper himself just enough to become satisfied whether it is the mad dog which it is cried up to be. It is probably perused regularly by nearly a million of readers, for some time past, and I confidently ask whether one of all these has found its editors advocating "infidelity," "free love," or any of the bug-bears which you associate with it. To call it the "organ" of such men as Garrison and W. Phillips, (whose organ, then, is the Liberator?) is to throw out assertions with more than the recklessness of a pot-house declaimer. I have seen it almost constantly since its origin. I have found it more than any other paper a mirror of the actual, living world, in all its aspects; and if I have thus been shown many things to grieve or shock me, I have been led the more to strive and pray for their removal from the earth. It has itself eminently furnished, through the latitude it has given to replies, the antidote to its own errors; and when I have been troubled by opinions promulgated in it, I have generally felt that the spirit with which they were put forth, and the freedom with which they were criticised, rendered their discussion rather an advantage than an injury to the truth. Most of the mischief imputed to it by its enemies, it was never guilty of, and the rest it has I think long since discontinued. It did, indeed, in its earlier days, advocate an extensive re-adjustment of our social relations, (as James Buchanan did the doctrines of Federalism) of which the hint was given by Fourier; but never simple Fourierism. This advocacy having accomplished a most important object, in awakening attention to crying evils in our social system, has been for years abandoned. That the Tribune has ever advocated "free love," is so utterly untrue, that the practices thus designated have been in no quarter more strongly rebuked, and the sanctity of marriage has had no more strenuous defender. That it has countenanced the delusions of spiritualism, is, according to my belief, equally without foundation. It has, on the other hand, nobly fought the battles of Temperance. It has plead the cause of the laboring man, and preached the obligations which accompany wealth. It has taught society the duty of instructing the ignorant and cultivating the morality of his more sunken classes, as well as punishing their crimes. It has extended a friendly hand to humanity struggling for its rights, on either continent. It has not spared usurpers, tyrants, and oppressors in the old world, nor demagogues, misrepresentatives and oligarchs at home. It has pointed out the evils of slavery as manifested where the system has been tried, and roused the minds of men to the danger of its impudent encroachments. Therefore I do not wonder that you give it your reprobation. Its religious creed, if obtruded, might not satisfy me, and would doubtless fall far below the orthodoxy of

the Journal of Commerce or the Pennsylvania, but the character of its "fruits" is in danger of raising the question in simple minds, whether, in his political relations, an Editor or a Senator may not profitably exchange some jobs and titles of theological strictness for a decent practice of good common morality. I have no doubt it is more widely taken by clergymen than any other secular paper in the land, and while the upholders of ancient and profitable abuses will always have occasion to hate and fear it, the friends of social and political improvement will more and more welcome a champion so vigilant, so faithful, so earnest, so fearless, so strong.

Yet what right have you to call the Tribune, the organ of Fremont? None at all. It does indeed support him, ably and well; but no more ably or earnestly than the Courier, and Times, and the good old Democratic Evening Post—excellent papers all, which even your sensitive scrupulosity would hardly put below the rabid partizanship of the Pennsylvania, or the cold, Jesuitical neutrality of the Public Ledger.

As for the New York Herald, I willingly resign it to your reprobation. I can only account for its having partially broken away from its old alliance with the quasi-democracy, by its proverbial shrewdness in taking the winning side. Should Fremont be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed, in its issue of the 24th Sept., I casually noticed a long and elaborate argument for slavery and Buchanan. Meanwhile, if it utters lies in behalf of Republicanism, let them be beaten, (which may Heaven avert!) it will fall back as promptly to your support as water runs down hill. Indeed