Turtle Creek Pennsylvania
Dear Sir This to let you now
My Place of Residence
Daniel Weants

in Want of Democratic Documents

Dan'l Wearts
Turtle Creek, Pa
March 1860

Speeches &c.

10,635

Dr Sir

Your most formidable opponent for the nomination at Charleston is Guthrie of Kentucky He has engaged in his service an Employee of the Treasury Department by the name of Guthrie who receives eight Dollars per diem and travelling expenses paid and who traverses the union and particularly the Southern States making what capital he can for his namesake and relative. He calls himself an agent of the Treasury Department and is engaged chiefly in denunciations of Stephen A Douglass and in opposition to his claims to a nomination to the Presidency by Southern Delegates. If a northern man is to be nominated he advocates the claims of D.S. Dickinson of New York. This travelling luminary should be speedily extinguished.

A friend & Democrat.

— Anonymous. —

Guthrie, an Agent of the Treasury Dept, is travelling about at the North, doing all that he can to suppress the enthusiasm manifested in favor of Judge D. by denouncing him. He advocates Guthrie of K.Y. from the South, or Dickinson of N.Y. if the nomination is given to the North.

(Dec. 1860)

10,636

New York March 1860

Hon S. A. Douglass,
Senate Chamber,
Washington City.

Dear Sir,

I feel interested in accomplishing two important objects. The first, the election of a Democratic President, and I take this occasion to assure you that it would give me great pleasure to have that Honor fall upon the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and in thus expressing myself, it may not be amiss to say that I am not a seeker for Office.

The second is to secure Telegraphic communication between Washington City, and San Francisco. The Senator from California has introduced a bill for that purpose, - although not such an one as I could wish, yet it is believed to be the best that can be obtained from Congress and am inclined to favor it.

Taking into consideration the obstacles

to be overcome, in building a line through a country unsettled by a civilized people and the great difficulty in protecting it from depredations by the Indians, the subsidy proposed sinks into insignificance.-

If the line be protected from competition by the Government, by withholding of similar grants from other companies, it may be sustained in connection with the Lines leading from the Atlantic to the Mountains.

It is an undertaking second only to the Atlantic Cable, which cost over Two Millions, and failed.

It is a great work. National in its tendencies, and I think worthy the considerations of the representatives of a great Nation.-

If you can consistantly give it your support, I shall feel gratified.

Quite a number of our friends are in Washington to explain to members of the Senate the difficulties to be encountered in the undertaking, and the advantages to result to the citizens of the United States, if successful.

Hoping this will find yourself and lady, restored to health, I am dear Sir

Yours Very Truly,

Wilson & Hunt

Wilson G. Hunt.
New York City
March 1860

---

asking the support of
Judge D. to the Bill
before the Senate for a
line of telegraph to Cal.

10,637

Washington City. March. 1860.

If Mr Douglas would send copies of his last speech, and of any which he may now have upon the Kansas question, he would greatly oblige.

His Friend
Mrs Sarah J. Larned.

Mrs Sarah S. Larned
Washington
March – 1860

asks for last speech,
& those on the Kansas
question.

10,638

Louis H. Rowan
(atty at law)
Boonville, Oneida Co. New York.
March 1860

He is a Douglas Democrat, and wishes his name to be put on the list of those to whom the Judge sends speeches &c.

Hon Stephen A. Douglass
Dear Sir

Will you put my name among your list of those whom you favor by sending a copy of your Speeches, and other political documents of your Ships

Respectfully a
Douglass Democrat—
L. N. Rowan

10,639

Geo. Vail Shepstard
Troy, New York.
March 1860

asking for Autograph.

Hon Steuben. A. Douglass
Sir

May I take the liberty of asking for your Autograph—
If you will honor me please direct to care of my Father Mr W. A. Shepard Troy N.Y.

I am your humble servant
Geo. Vail. Shepard

10,640

☞ We notice that of the old-line Democrats of this State, men of prominence in the party, and who were active Buchanan men in 1856, there are David Tod, Rufus P. Ranney, Allen G. Thurman, Geo. W. McCook, Barnabas Burns, James McKenzie now active for Mr. Douglas.—*Cincinnati Enquirer.*

Within the last two weeks Col. TOD has openly proclaimed his belief that Mr. DOUGLAS cannot be nominated—Judge RANNEY is not regarded by his most intimate friends in this city as favoring the nomination of Judge DOUGLAS—Judge THURMAN is not now and never was a Douglas man. Col. MCCOOK is in favor of DOUGLAS for President if the South as a unit is willing to accept him, but not otherwise. Of Mr. BURNS and Mr. MCKENZIE we know nothing, and our private opinion is, we care less.

D. Tod, Ranney and
Thurman of Ohio
opposed to Douglas.

[~~Feb~~ Mar. 1860]

10,640

Vega Cumberland Co Ills

March 1st 1860

Hon. A. L. Douglas

Sir I wish to remind you that by migration from the State of N.Y I have become one of your Constituents and amongst the manny things that tends to make my new home unpleasant is the want of public documents which I have ben accustomed to receiving from those who represented me in the legislative halls of the Nation If you can supply the wants above alluded to without infringing on the rights of others who have a stronger claim on your favors than I had I will be thankful, wishing you entire success I remain

Your Obt. Servant

Edward Barrett

Edward Barrett
March 1st 1860
Neoga, Cumberland Co. Ills.

asks for speeches & docts.

John Bell, M.D.
March 1st 1860
Wapella, Iowa

asks for aid to start a pop. sov. paper in that town; all ready &c.

Ans March 18/60.

10,641

Wapello, Iowa
March 1, 60

Hon. S. A. Douglas

Dr Sir

We are making a strong effort in our town to start a Democratic paper there is already a Republican paper in operation here, if we succeed it will be an out & out Squatter sovereignty document, if started, we have succeeded so far very well but we are few and times hard could you inform us, at to any assistance, of the needful that may be obtained, even a small amot as fifty or one hundred Dollars, would put our press on a sure footing for one year with what we can do ourselves, we have [illegible]

in our County to change the political character of this County if we had an organ we have the press, & fixtures and an able man to conduct it but we shall have the press to support, without County aid, as the offices are mostly in the hands of the opposition,

I have taken the privilege of writing to you direct, hoping you may be more comfortably situated than standing on that long plank, at the Winchester, Scott to Landry on the Ill river, I was happy to be one of the rescuers on that occasion as you were about to embark for Winchester on a two horse Wagon, then we had a nice time at old Jim

Cheselaines on that occasion old Jim that he was a little tight but not much,

old Scott & Pike was both out, when little Doug was there as old Squire Tankersly would say, well that was a glorious campaign,

Hoping we may hear from you soon I am dear [illegible]

your most obedt

Prof Sell M.D.

10,642

Sam: S Bridge
New Orleans
La
March 1. 1860
Louisiana politics

New Orleans March 1. 1860

My Dear Sir

Having resided so long in California I found the climate of the North too severe for me so I concluded like the birds to fly South and for the first time in my life witness her peculiar institutions. I mixed freely with the people everywhere and have heard them talk in doors and out and I am quite certain you will receive the nomination at Charleston. The people are with you in the South and no mistake. The politicians against you, and so they were against Gen Jackson. The sporting men who have a cold nose & snuff coming events, are betting freely large sums on your nomination. I heard bleeding and wealthy gambler offer $ 5000 on your nomination last evening at the St Charles Hotel and although there was a large crowd present no one offered to take up the bet.

Very truly yours

Hon S. A. Douglas.

Sam S. Bridge

10,644

Nacogdoches, Texas.
March 1st 1860

Hon. Stephen A. Douglas.

Dear Sir:

I write to request you, to send to my address, at this place, a package of your late speech in the Senate, on your resolution. I wish to scatter it over the State, before the meeting of the State Convention at Galveston. In no other way will it reach the people, I am sure. "Douglas men" would be more plenty, if the people could have more light, and more truth. The voices of humble citizens, cannot accomplish what the Press might accomplish.

Very Respectfully
S. H. B. Chandler
Nacogdoches, Texas.

To Hon. Stephen A. Douglas.

S. H. B. Cundiff
Nacogdoches, Texas,
March 1–1860

---

asking for package of late speech in Senate, for distribution &c.

10,645

Texas Bonito P.O. Guadaloupe County
March 1st /60 Texas

Judge Douglas

See you will confer
a favor on a friend of yours politically
by sending me a copy of your
speech of January 23rd on your resolution
protecting States & Territories against the invasion
&c. we get nothing but garbeled extracts
in this country of your speeches. you may
think you have no friends in this state
if so you are mistaken. if it was not for
a few noisy politicians. you would be the
first choice for our next president

Respectfully
Yours
John B. Davis

Hon. S A Douglas ✓
Washington City

John B. Davis

Bonito P.O. Guadaloupe

County, Texas.

March 1 — 1860

---

asking for speech on

"Invasion of States."

If it was not for the

noisy politicians, Texas

would give her vote in

Convention for Judge D.

as her first Choice.

10,646

6. centre St New York
March 1. 1860

My dear Sir. You will excuse me for venturing to offer an opinion when you know that I have no object but your good - it is this that you should speak less in the Senate or indeed ~~anywhere~~. I think this to be the opinion of all your warmest friends, although none of them will tell you so perhaps. It is especially advisable not to speak on the spur of the moment when reflection is almost impossible, as in the case of answering Mr. Seward. It is the business of your friends to defend both your policy and yourself. And indeed I think this and very remiss in this here Two - men were brought here especially to assail you. Now the speech of Mr. Lincoln was exceedingly plausible and specious but I think not one of his positions is tenable ~~when examined~~. I repeatedly asked some of our people here to call a counter meeting for the purpose of opposing and refuting him, but they seem not to think that course prudent. This policy I confess I do not understand. It may be quite right indeed if you had not been made the special object of attack, but it is very different now when not answering this challenge looks like fear.

I have read all Seward's speeches and think it flimsy and entirely devoid of solid logic. His aim seems to be to gloss over its poverty with a redundance of ornament. I have not read any of your reply because I hate reading those telegraphic reports, which give the reporter's conception of the points of a speech rather than the speech itself and the one especially to which the speech you answered was carefully written and I have no doubt rewritten and elaborated for months upon months and in many parts of the world.

I will feel obliged by your letting me have your speech when printed in full and also any documents or speeches you would wish me to use. I will be most happy also to speak any where you would deem it advisable, I mean not by way of advocating your nomination but of refuting false

assailants.

Yours most sincerely

Mark H Dohenny

Michael Dahony
No 6. Centre St
New York
March 1. 1860.

Political advice
& offer of services

10,647

Post Office
Eldora Hardin Co
Iowa March 1st/60

Confidential

Hon Stephen A. Douglas
U.S.S.

Dear not being pers=
-ansly aquanted with you
but booth belonging to the Grate
Democratic family I have taken
the liberty to write to you asking
a favor I want 100 Copys of your
late Speach in the U.S.S. on a Bill
which was interdused by Sen Mulon
I think from Verging ~~to protect~~
for the Protection of ~~invaders~~ our
States from invaders &c

The Black Republicans
are felling up our State with public
Dockaments & I want to defend you
& I want the tools to do it with

I shall be please to
Rec^d any thing that you my think will
be of use to advance our Cause
should be nomanated at

Chartered I think in all Candor
that you may set down Iowa for
you our state Convention passed off
with the best of feeling in your favor
& the Delegates instructed for you
I am personally acquainted with
D O French & Ben M Sands & they are
strong Douglass men I have reas-
-ably written an Article in the
Dubuque Herald signed Bravo.

Should you receive the
paper please read it = the Republicans
in & about here begin to see that
your prospects are going & they say
& do all in their power against
you " let me hear from you
soon

Believe me I
remain your
Obt Servt
D. F. Ellsworth
R.M.

D. Z. Ellsworth, P.M.

March 2 – 1860

Eldora, Hardin Co. Iowa

Wants 100 copies of speech on "Invasion of States."

10,648

Rumney N.H. March 1st 1860

Hon S. A. Douglas

Dear Sir

Three or four weeks ago I wrote you some what lengthey in in relation to the political matters of some of our N E States. And my views of your prospects for the Presidency, Als my great anxiety for your nomination & Election — For the purpose of more Efficently acting, & upon the best plan I asked you to write me. & as I have had no reply, I think my mistake was in not marking the letter private, so that it might meet your observation, as your correspondence must be so large, that you likely adopt the plan of Gen Pierce. & other Predents, in not Examining Letter not so marked — Since I wrote you I have been to see the delegates to Charleston. Spoken of in my letter to

you— I have also been to Manchester to learn what I could— The main object of this Letter, that is to get communication with you in order to effectually work for you & in the line marked out by you, (if any) so as to all pull together. And if desired I will go to Washington this month to talk with you about it— I have some facts, which I do not wish to have opened by Correspondence yet they may be familiar to you— If you do not wish to risk written communication, will you write me when I can see you in Washington or Elsewhere?

Yours Samuel Herbert

Samuel Herbert to

Rumney. N.H.

March 1. 1860

Refers to former letter
— asks Special
communication, or
to know when
he should come to
Washington — as he
wishes to confer &c

Ans March 17/60.

10,649

Philada. March 1/60.

Hon. Stephen A. Douglas

Respected Sir

I take the liberty of requesting that you will furnish me with your autograph. By granting this favor you will greatly oblige

Your Most Obedient Servant

Jame B. Huey

39th & Spruce Sts

Philada.

10,650

Murfreesboro Tenn.
Mar. 1st 1860.

S. A. Douglas.

Hon Sir.

Please send me your autograph. If I did not think it presuming too much for a school-boy I would ask you to tell me the secret of your great success.

Your humble ser-
A. J. McGaughy.

Address.
Murfreesboro.
Tenn.

10,651-1

Clarksville Ams March 1/60

Hon S A Douglass.

Dear Sir

I take the liberty of sending you another effort of mine. The signature should be printed "Naylem" - my name transposed.

very respectfully

Your bad Sect

Jno E Manley

10,651-2

THE
Popular Sovereignty Controversy.

BY

NAYLEN,

OF

ARKANSAS.

So much pains have been taken by some to misrepresent the position of Judge Douglas, and *by others* to induce the public mind to test it by a standard that is by no means a democratic one ; that it is hard to find a half-a-dozen persons who understand it alike. The democratic masses feel, instinctively, with regard to the doctrines that are urged upon them with much earnestness so by the anti-Popular Sovereignty politicians that there is something about the logic they are not used to, *something wrong*, that they have not the *democratic jingle* about them that their understandings have been so long attuned to. But, as of yore, in such cases, old democratic reason will soon shine out, and dispel the fog that has been raised, when everything will be clearly seen in its true light. To assist in dispelling that fog is the object of the present effort.

With respect to a government framed to preside over a number of independent governments, each having a right to enjoy its own peculiar, internal polities, institutions, customs, &c., and where the people are de-jure and defacto the sovereigns of the land —the *legitimate source of power*—it is easy to understand that it should be a fundamental principle of this Federal government—that it must *not* interfere *in favor or against* any of the aforesaid internal polities, institutions, &c., of the respective communities over which it presides. The reason for this prohibition is too obvious to require a moment's reflection. And if there was vacant territory belonging, in common, to the people of these independent governments or States, out of which new independent States were to be raised, it is *equally plain* to understand that the *same* non-interference on the part of the Federal Government with regard to these local polities, &c., must be observed towards the new rising community. This is beyond the shadow of a doubt, the true character of our Federal system.

But we must expect to find in the course of events, that, prompted by powerful motives of *self-interest* or *bigotry* some people will be so wedded to their own polity or institutions as to be willing, nay, *eager* to obtain power from any source whatever to introduce them *everywhere*. This is one of the principal lever powers employed in the work of intolerance and aggression upon every subject in all places. And with regard to the subject before us, this local bigotry or self-interest is the principal popular sentiment appealed to by the ultra-leading men of the north, as well as of the ultra leading men of the South, as it was a few years since the moving power in the cause of Know Nothingism.

At the establishment of our Federative system the U. S. Government, by the consent of the people generally made a departure from its legitimate sphere of action by legislating to a certain extent against one of the local institutions found in the States. It prohibited slavery in a large portion of the common territory, at the same time recognized the slave as property.

A large portion of the people before that time, and have from that day to this held the negro to be a *proper man*, equal to the white man in the human race, and being such, could not, in this country be held as property. By the aid of this doctrine and the aforesaid anti-slavery legislature by the general government, the general government has been made until the last few years to continue this departure from its fundamental non-intervention principle. But our Congressional legislation for the said last few years upon the subject of the Territories has been in substance nothing more than corrections of the departure aforesaid placing it upon its natural primitive ground. In opposition to the abolitionists and the Wilmot Provisoists it simply declares that the Federal Government is clothed with the power to legislate for nor against any local institution or local interest—slavery included. That in the eye of the Constitution, each and every one of them stood upon equal footing, leaving each to advance among the people when its usefulness or popularity could make a way for it. Without the aid of Democratic common sense upon the subject every man conversant with the terms of this legislation know this to be the truth. It was so expressed in words plain as English language could make it. The discussion of the U. S. Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case re-affirmed it. In *contradiction* to the aforesaid doctrine of the abolitionists that the negro was a man equal to the white man, and could not be held as property &c.—The Court decided that the negro was not *such a man*. That the Constitution recognized the negro-slave as property, carrying with it all the rights and privileges incident to any other property, no more, no less. That the U. S. Govern- has no power to legislate for or against the institution of slavery or slave property any more than it had to legislate for or against any other local institutions, and having no such power itself, it could delegate none *for that purpose*. Therefore the Missouri Compromise law, by virtue of which Dred Scott claimed his freedom was unconstitutional. Such was the substance of the decision; and the law would have been just as unconstitutional if its object had been to prohibit Polygamy.

Although the U. S. Government can delegate no power for the purpose of doing that which it cannot do itself, to wit: establish or prohibit, encourage or discourage any local institution, whether it be slavery or anti-slavery, polygamy or monogamy, in a territory, yet in obedience to the fundamental principle of our democratic government, it is in duty bound, when the people of a territory are in sufficient numbers to require it, to permit those citizens to *assume* their right to legislate for themselves, and in the legitimate business of this legislation is included all those social interests which the U. S. Government has no power to regulate. This *necessary* duty on the part of the General Government towards the people of the Territories has always been discharged and the people who were the recipients have always proved by their legislation, that the exercise of the right was only equal to their wants.

In the face of common sense and the uniform practice of the U. S. Government, and in opposition to no such proposition from any quarter, some persons assume that the principle advocated by Judge Douglas requires that the first few—ten or twelve they say—inhabitants of a territory shall decide as to what shall be its internal polity. It is needless to say that no such a thing was ever thought of. But this, that they, the people may decide for themselves upon those things *hereafter* as they have ever in such cases *done heretofore*, when they get their legislature.

Our first territorial organic law-provided that when there were five thousand free male citizens in the Territory, (about thirty thousand free people) they should assume the right of legislating for themselves. And about this number of inhabitants every territory since has been required to have beforethe people thereof undertook the responsibilities of self-government. In the organic law for Ohio, Illinois, Indiana and Michigan, which was framed by the men who framed the Constitution of the U. S., in following up the progress of the territories to the period when they will be admitted into the Union, from the period when the people *assume* their right to provide for their social wants by legislation, the terms "State" and "new States" are applied to them. As the legislatures of those new States shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil," &c. And "whenever any of the said States shall have sixty thousand free inhabitants therein, such State shall be admitted into the Congress of the United States, and on equal footing," &c. The lower word territory is used now in a more comprehensive sense generally for the sinister purpose of making the impression that

people of the "new State" should exist in a condition subordinate to their rights.

The organic law for the Territories of Missouri and Arkansas provides for their taking this power of legislation. That "the General Assembly shall have power to make laws *in all cases*, both civic and criminal, for the good government of the people of said territory, not repugnant to or inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States." "That the House of Representatives shall be composed of members elected every second year by the people," &c. "That every bill that shall have passed the House of Representatives and the legislative council of the Legislature of the Territory, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the Governor of said territory; if he approve, he shall sign it; if not, he shall return it with his objections," &c., and goes on to provide if two-thirds approve it, it shall become a law. The limit to the territorial legislation is the same that every State is subject to. Here are some of the subjects of legislation upon which laws were enacted in the Territorial legislatures of Arkansas and Missouri; "Absconding Debtors, Attachment, Horse and Negro Stealing, punished with death. Bigamy, Adultery, Gaming, Divorce, Ejectment, Suits for Freedom, Insolvent Debtors to be imprisoned. Libel, certain persons may be outlawed, if he has a wife and children, to forfeit half his estate; no wife or children forfeit all. Tax on Slaves, Tax on Peddlers, Vagrants to be hired out, whipped," &c. In this manner the people of the Missouri and Arkansas Territories legislated to suit themselves. They taxed peddlers, they taxed slaves, they imprisoned debtors, they prohibited polygamy, they established slavery, and they provided all these laws because they had a right to regulate their own internal affairs in their own way; there being no "power on earth" but their own authorized to legislate upon those things for them. This is the so-called "squatter sovereignty," that the Constitution of the United States the Kansas-Nebraska act, Democratic principles, the Cincinnati platform, common sense and Judge Douglas require shall *continue* to prevail in all the Territories of the U. S. But if, according to some, the Territorial legislature can only interfere with and regulate such institutions and interests that the U. S. Government has power to interfere with and regulate, it is plain the territorial legislature can regulate nothing; 'twould be a mockery to give those people a legislature if the doctrine of those men was the law and the Gospel.

In the cities and towns of New Mexico and Kansas the canvass of the peddler's waggon might give us the notification.—"Cheap goods; no tax, no unfriendly legislation;" we might find written over the door of Polygamists' hall: "Men married to as many women as they want. The U. S. Government has no power to regulate the marriage institution, therefore it can confer none to regulate it upon the territorial legislation." Droves of infectious "Spanish cattle," may be introduced without let or hindrance; the leading bull would have upon his horns, "By virtue of the Constitution." The vagrant would declaim, "no hiring out here, no lashes for me here. The U. S. Government itself has not the power to do it. Then where does the legislature get the power to do it, I'd like to know?"

We, *who are used* to negro slavery may think it unreasonable that its chances for a foothold in a common territory should be left to the judgment of its people through their legislature. The most moderate of those who are used to the *non-slaveholding* condition of society think it is *equally unreasonable* to want such a foothold for it upon more favorable terms. Each prefers a different social condition. The world is full of these dissimilar conditions, and men often decide that this and that is wrong by the aid of a very little light on the subject. It is likely the truth is in most cases that that which is right in one place would be *wrong in another*. Natural local differences, climate, race and topographical peculiarities, naturally develope and solidify for each peculiar institutions and customs. In peopling an extensive portion of the globe like this continent, correct principles will teach us that trusting in the Supreme Ruler of mankind everything like local institutions should be left to the free action of the public mind as the surest means of making every one find its natural legitimate locality.

Custom and habit attaches people to anything. The Mahommedan feels that it is very unreasonable that any people should not allow a man to have more than one wife if he is able to support more. *We think* it is monstrous for a man to have more than one if he can support a hundred. In fact we have in our own domain a "new State," whose people, "by virtue (of the non-intervention principle) of the Constitu-

tion" do tolerate and are attached to polygamy. Suppose this principle was to spread and become the cherished institution of several of the States; and that there were territories yet left out of which new States might be raised. A majority of the people of some of those Territories would be opposed to the many-wife institution; they would look upon it as being destructive to good morals, as utterly abominable, and would accordingly legislate with all their might against its introduction among them. But the people of the Polygamaic States, standing upon the new doctrine, would be full of indignation, they would be excluded from the common territory." They would exclaim that the United States Government had no power to control the marriage institution, therefore the Territorial government could have none, &c., &c.

One mode of deciding what shall prevail as the law of the land, is by adopting the will of the majority, whatever refining process it may under any circumstances go through, that is the consummation at last. We see in every State in the Union, almost every year, the most important subjects decided upon by this common democratic principle. If there seems to be some points of imperfection about it, it is, nevertheless, the most perfect rule we can have, and is, probably, much more perfect than we think it is. There is more truth in the apothegm "Vox populi, vox Dei" than appears at first sight. It is certain that in this age "The voice of the people" is one of the main instruments by which mundane affairs are carried on and upward and if the Deity *continues* (who doubts it?) to have a hand in this on and upward work it must be one of the Divine instruments.

Do the practical operation of these democratic principles interpose a barrier to slavery beyond that which nature interposes? North America is a large portion of the globe including many varieties of climate, and, so far as internal politics are concerned, many independent sovereignties. Can a citizen of *one* section consider himself *excluded* from *another* section, because from the necessity of the case, arising from natural causes, he cannot carry with him everywhere all his sectional utilitarian appliances? We cannot require the General Government to adapt a country to negro-slavery that is naturally unsuitable for it. With regard to all subjects of this nature, the democratic appeal to the General Government has ever been "Leave us alone." Ultra Southern men admit that those northern countries are not adapted to slave labor, but they hold that the legislature has no right to legislate upon the subject. The truth is many of those men with whom democratic principles are entirely of secondary consideration, thought that something *better* could be done for the interests of slavery than could be obtained by the application of democratic principles, and so took bold ground against them. After a thorough investigation of the subject it is found that old Democracy is *yet* the best basis for the south to rest upon, but they do not like to acknowledge their error. There are others, mere politicians, who went into it as many democrats went into knownothingism, to be on the strong side *as they thought* who would now sacrifice the democratic party, and everything else to put down Judge Douglas because he has so clearly exposed the unsoundness of their doctrines.

There is a very singular paradoxical fact with regard to the history of slavery in this country. It is indebted for its preservation and consolidation infinitely more to the policy of its enemies than to the policy of its friends. If northern men had let slavery alone, if there had been no famous "ordinance," no Missouri compromise, no sectional abolitionists, by this time so much slavery would have evaporated that it would be confined almost entirely to the extreme Southern States. Maryland and Kentucky would have been free States beyond a doubt, while Virginia Tennessee and Missouri would have been nearly in the same condition. The hand of Providence must have been in it, for what an awful condition would society have been reduced to "to be infested with such a multitude of free negroes. Beyond a doubt free negroes among white people is the great evil and that the best remedy for it is slavery, and as sure as the rains come the northern people will yet confess it. While the natural results of abolition policy has been to preserve slavery, much of the southern policy has been calculated to dissipate it. For former instances I refer the reader to Mr. Calhoun. To come down to the present time. What have ultra Southern men for the last few years been struggling to accomplish? To send negro-slaves among anti-slavery populations, where if they do not escape from slavery they must come back thoroughly imbued with anti-slavery notions to spread discontent among the slaves of the South.

Manley

-10,651-3

Jno. E. Manley

Clarksville, Arkansas

March 1- 1860

Enclosing a printed article by him on Pop. Sov., explaining & defending the doctrine.

10,652

Philadelphia, March 1st 1860

Hon. Stephen A. Douglas

Dr. Sir — One thing, I fear, will kill you dead, if nominated, for the Presidency, and that is your & your wife's belonging to the Roman Catholicks. My Brother was over to the city of Washington, not long since, and was told by a Roman catholick, that you were one, and invited My brother to accompany him to the Catholic Church, I think he said, on New Jersey Avenue, Minnesota Row, and there he said he saw you and your Wife for the fist time. Now I know persons frequently attend a Church that they are not members, if you are not members, this Story Must be Contradicted, I have said that I never would vote for a Roman Catholic, therefore I do not believe this Story. When a Story gets in Circulation, it had to stop it. General Scott was defeated just because he was considered a Roman Catholick, nothing else. Our Convention is going on bravely.

Very Respectfully

Your Obedient Servant

Frederick Muhlholm

Frederick Mechlholm

Phil.a Pa

March 1. 1860.

Warning Judge
D. that the
Report he was
a Catholic would
"Kill him dead"

10,653

Hillsboro Hill Co Texas March 1st 1869

Hon S. A. Douglas.

Dr Sir

No doubt I am forgotten by you. I met you at Niagara Falls in 44. in company with my old friend John VanBuren Esq. Politically I have followed you and I am now determined to follow you to the End. My object in addressing you is simply to say, that situated as I am far in the interior of this great State I do not get all the news I desire, and that I am determined to bring about a change in the sentiment of many of the propl in this section and that I want assistance in the way of documents to read and distribute. Our representatives are men I cannot expect anything from tending to strengthening the cause I advocate.

Please place my name upon your state and anything everything I can do for you and our party shall be done I can but add public sentiment is changing and that you are gaining strength among the propl of this County.

Could you spare the time to correspond and think by so doing I can aid you I shall be pleased all correspondence strictly confidential

Very Truly

Your Yours &c

J. C. Patten

J. C. Patten

Hillsboro', Hill Co, Texas

March 1 - 1860

asks for speeches and pub. docts. for circu-
-lation.

10,654

C. B. Ransom
Secty of
Young Mens
Seymour Club.
Hartford
Ct.

March 1. 1860.

Invitation to
visit County &
address citizens

Ans. March
4. 1860.

Hartford March 1st 1860

Hon S. A. Douglas.

Sir

I take the liberty, / at the request of the Young Mens Seymour Club, which has been organized for the purpose of electing the Hon Thos H Seymour Gov of this State at the next election (which takes place on the 5th of April) of writing to you, to ascertain whether you can address the Citizens of this place during the present month.

The contest is to be an exceedingly close one, but we

hope to be able (by hard work) to carry the state, and show that there is at least one bright spot in New England where sectionalism has received its death blow.

If you can find it convenient to address us, and also the citizens of New Haven, you can without doubt accomplish great good.

Trusting to receive a favorable reply I remain

Yours Respt

E. B. Ransom

Sec.

"Hefd Conn"

10,655

Rochester Iowa March 1 1860

My dear sir

Will you be kind enough to send me the Organic Act of Kansas & Nebraska & any other good electioneering documents you may choose. Please send a good supply & I will distribute among your friends here a few copies of the Kansas nebraska act are much wanted

Respectfully &c

H. W. Cops

Hon S. A. Douglas

Rochester Cedar Co. Iowa

H. W. Rofs—
Rochester, Cedar Co. Ill
March 1—1860

asks for copies of
Kansas & Nebraska
acts, for distribution,
& other electioneering docts

10,656

Isaiah Rynders
New York
March 1. 1860.

Confidential

Confidential

Newyork 1st March 1860

Dear Sir

Every well aimed blow at the irrepressibles knocks the wind out of others Equally hostile to your Success.

Some of them begin to cave. You never hit with more advantage than Yesterday

Yours Truly

I Rynders

Hon
S A Douglas

10,657

Henry Sherman
Hartford Ct.
March 1. 1860.

Relating to Subscrip^n to his "Governmental History of U.S." —

Ans^d March 12. 1860
I enclosed $3.—

Hartford March 1st 1860

Hon S. A. Douglas
Hon & Dear Sir

On receipt of your letter of the 10th ult^o renewing your subscription for a copy of my work on our Gov^t Hist^y, I immediately forwarded a copy to your address at Washington, by mail, prepaid; and at the same time addressed you a letter informing you of it. Not having received any acknowledgement of it, I am apprehensive that it may not have reached you, & would be pleased to hear from you in the premises. Excuse me if I trespass too much upon your indulgence.

Yours Most Respectfully
Henry Sherman

Junction City K.T. March 12/60

Senator Douglas

Dear Sir

Will you be so kind as to send me documents &c -ationally- during the pres- -ent Session of Congress. If so you will oblige a good Democrat and one that agrees with you in political Sentiment

Yours Respectfully

D.W.C. Stevenson

Junction City

Kansas Territ

D. W. C. Stevenson
Junction City, Kansas Ty
March 1st 1860

asks for speeches &c.

10,658

Private

Herald Office
San Antonio Tex.
March 1st 1860

My Dear Judge.

I have just recd your speech on the "invasion of States &c. I am happy indeed to get this little token of remembrance from my old benefactor, whose standard still floats in the breeze, despite traitors and traducers of your private and public character - You and your principles Judge are as sacred to me as ever, and I yet hope to live to see both in the ascendency. I send you our paper, the San Antonio Herald. As Texians we have raised the name of Houston. but you are and have been all the time my first choice for the Presidency, and thank God! there are a not very few here who agree with me, but at present we have no political strength, but if you can get the nomination of the Charleston Convention, Our paper will then go for you, if it can possibly be done.

in this community. At the great mass meeting of the people of this State, which assembled at Austin on the 22nd last Dec, I stood up amid the multitude and defended your fair fame, against the charges of treason and Black Republicanism which was injustly heaped upon you. But yet not one voice would say, Amen! to what I said, though every word was truth, But I said it nevertheless. I would love dearly to hear from you by way of letter but amid the multiplicity of all your cares, duties and other friends, I cannot ask so much attention for myself- But you must keep my name upon your list of Documents, and we may make more leven here yet than some people have dreamed of. I believe the majority of the people of Texas to be National Democrats of the conservative school, and willing to promote the right when properly understood.

My kindest regards to Mrs. Douglas, and hoping you may yet be triumphant over the foes of pure Democracy and Conservativeism.

I Remain
Very Truly
Geo. H. Sweet

Hon S. A. Douglas
U. S. Senate

Geo. W. Sweet
Editor "Herald"
San Antonio, Texas
March 1– 1860

Political in regard to Texas, &c.
asks for documents & speeches.

Cedargrove Ind March 1st/60

Honorable Stephen A. Douglas

Dear Sir I am living in the fourth Congressional District Franklin Co. and am Brotherinlaw to D. D. Pones the Elector for this District and have ever Been your warm friend and if my life should last through the comeing Canvass I intend to do all I can for you Lecomptonism has quite a strong hold on the Democracy of this vicinity, and I had furnished myself with your Speeches and other documents, Suffcient to Combat Successfully the Strongest oposition from the anties or Black Republicans, (But Unfortunately On the 3d of January last my house Documents and furniture was all Burned to ashes) you will plees Send me your Speeches and Souch other documents as will arm me to fight the opposition Successfully and I Shall be ever yours Benj. Whitney

P. S. a Smeall amt. of material aid would would be thankfully received B. W.

Benj.n Whitney
Cedar Grove, Indiana
March 1– 1860

---

asking for speeches
&c.

10,659

Port Byron Rock Island County Illinois
March th 12th 1860

Mr S. A Douglass

Dear Sir

My object in writing to You is to Request of You to Send Me Some Political documents I want a Copy of the Compromise measures of 1850 and of the Kansas Nebraska Bill of 1854 And a Copy of the fugative Slave law and Some documents in Regard to the dred Scott decision

As I live in the midst of old John Browns friend they are in a bad way at present and I want to help them to Roll them selves Politicaly

the Canvas is opening here and the Ball is Roling in the Rite direction

If You can complly with My Request I will be obliged And You will confer a favour on a Politicle friend

Yours in haste

Robert H. Young

Adress R H Young
Port Byron Rock Island County Illinois

Robert H. Young

March 4th 1860

Port Byron, Rock Is. Co.

Illinois

---

asks for copies of

political speeches &c,