

# HERALD OF



# FREEDOM.

Terms:--Two Dollars Per Annum--In Advance.

BY G. W. BROWN & CO.

LAWRENCE, KANSAS, NOVEMBER 6, 1858.

NUMBER 15.--VOLUME 4.

## Poetry.

Stand for the Right.  
DEDICATED TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD OF FREEDOM.

Speak it boldly, Truth is fearless  
And must conquer all its foes,  
Though crushed today, again 'twill peerless  
Rise to give death-dealing blows.  
Speak it forth in tones of thunder,  
What the conscience bids thee tell,  
Break Oppression's chains and fetters,  
With thy free-ironed clarion knell.  
Speak it out, thy heart's emotion,  
What thou think'st right or wrong,  
Freedom loves the soul's liberation,  
To her truthful, living song.  
What if tools of faction rattle  
Round thy head thy destined blow,  
Give to the valiant heart the signal,  
That will triumph o'er thy foe.  
Stand thou firm, a manly martyr  
In the cause of human right,  
While the thousands meekly better  
Virtue's crown to give thee sight.  
Storms which send their fury wild  
Against the oak to rend and shiver,  
Oft'ner fall, when storms are mild,  
The strongest chains of tyrants sever.  
Blest thou in the ship that's sailing,  
Gallant ship of information,  
O'er the sea of error sailing,  
Truth and Justice keep their station.  
Future ages will defend thee,  
Though the present would destroy;  
And the God of mercy will send thee  
Conscious aid in his employ.  
Concordville, Pa.

## Miscellaneous.

For the Herald of Freedom.  
"Sovereignty in the Territories."  
AS REVIEWED BY "A CITIZEN OF KANSAS"  
IN THE "LAWRENCE REPUBLICAN," ANSWERED BY "A REPUBLICAN."

LAWRENCE, OCT. 28, 1858.

In the issue of the Lawrence Republican of October 14th, there appeared a rather flippant rehearsal of assumptions and sophisms, bearing upon the tendency and progress of the doctrine of sovereignty over the people of the Territories of the American Union, over the cognomen "Kansas," in which the author seems to have become totally intoxicated with the profundity of his own arguments. Believing that the history of our country abounds in evidences contradictory to his assumed facts, and that the logic adduced to defend his political thesis is untenable, I feel it my duty to briefly reply.  
First, he gives the "venerable case" the sole credit of originating the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty" as promulgated in his Nicholson letter. Then Douglas, he says, robbed him of his livery and soon transferred the name to "popular sovereignty," in defense of which he had waded eloquent and strong--then the events in Utah and Kansas "exploded the bubble," but not until the people of Kansas went to work and made a government and laws for themselves, (and this correspondent, "Kansas," was an agent in that rebellious work, I suspect.) "When, lo! the army of the United States came down upon them, horse, foot and dragon, smashed their government and laws to pieces, and ruthlessly subjected the people to its authority." Then the United States army was sent to Utah, and the people and their institutions were both regulated "after the way of Douglas and the President, with sword and cannon."  
Sad, the picture, in the extreme; but confidence is found chiefly in the known fact that if we take Hamlet out of the play, there would be nothing of interest left--in other words, "Kansas" has produced the star characters for the occasion, by the wonderful power known to exist only "in the alembic of his genius." I purpose, therefore, for his benefit, in common with the general readers of this Territory, who are especially interested in the proper settlement of this question, to revert to the period styled that of "The Confederation," that was preceded by that of the revolutionary national government. Then, such doctrines as now seem to afford "Kansas" a pet theme for forensic folly, would have been scouted as the enemy of a Democratic rule, and akin to despotism. He forgets that when the Constitution of the United States was adopted, it became a substitute for the heretofore despotic State sovereignty, and brought back the government to the constituent sovereignty of the people. It became declaratory of rights, inherent and inalienable, and to this day the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence are engraven upon the deepest recesses of every true American heart--"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, &c., do ordain and establish this Constitution," was their language. Consequently, its protection extended alike to the whole people within its jurisdiction, whether they lived in a State or a Territory. This, like other governments, was made by and for the people, and not the people for the government, as would seem to be the time-faded idea of "Kansas," judging by its sanctity towards popular sovereignty.  
Under that Constitution certain powers are given to Congress, and every other power or privilege not thus delegated, is reserved with the people. It is contended, therefore, that indirectly, and sometimes directly, the doctrine of popular sovereignty has been vindicated from time to time by some of our ablest statesmen, ever since the present National Congress was established. In every instance, where a new State has been admitted into the Union, the vote on the question of admission proves that members in the South voted to admit a Northern State with a Constitution prohibiting slavery, while on

the other hand, Northern men voted in every instance to admit Southern States with Constitutions recognizing slavery--And why? In all their speeches they contended that the people of the Territories had a right to form their own institutions in their own way. Said John Quincy Adams, in the debate upon the admission of Arkansas with her slave Constitution, "I cannot, consistently with my sense of obligation as a citizen of the United States, object to the admission of Arkansas as a slave State."  
"Arkansas has a right to come into the Union with her slaves and her slave laws."  
What was this but popular sovereignty endorsed by one of the purest statesmen and most rigid moralist our country has ever known? Other sage and venerable men of the North took the same view of the question. A distinguished Senator from Ohio spoke to the same point, while explaining why he should vote for admission, as follows: "The wrong, in a moral sense, with which I view slavery, would be sufficient to induce me to vote against admission, did I not consider my political obligations and my duty as a member of this body, to vote in favor of the Constitution which I now act, clearly require of me the vote I shall give."  
The people of Arkansas having formed for themselves a State government, having presented their Constitution for admission into the Union, and believing that Congress has no right or power to regulate the system of police these people have established for themselves, "I cannot, as a member of this body, refuse my vote to admit this State into the Union, because her Constitution recognizes the right and existence of slavery."

When the question of admission has been presented by other States, the discussion has been a vindication of the same principle, and every observer of the general tenor of our Government, must admit that for more than half a century the supremacy of this doctrine has been, more or less directly established. Not in the character of a glaring absurdity, mounted as the hypocritical hobby, by a waning demagogue, perhaps, until it was thus prostituted by its modern apostles. I take the principle in its broadest sense, and contend that Congress finds no authority in the Constitution to dominate over the people of a Territory, while they remain loyal subjects, acknowledging their constitutional dependence just as far and no farther, than the people of all the States are required to do, and the only authority that any party has ever claimed to derive from that instrument, is found in the third section of Article IV, which says: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory, or other property belonging to the United States," which neither grammarian or jurist can strictly construe to apply only to its property jurisdiction to the right of possession to the soil, and not in any degree to the civil government of the inhabitants living thereon. In this, their own sovereignty is not infringed by the Constitution, and why should it be by Congress, that has no jurisdiction beyond its delegated powers? That Congress has assumed to place rulers over the people of the Territories for a long period, is no argument in its favor. It was evidently the intention of the framers of the Constitution, to secure the fullest rights to the people, and when the subject of extending protection to the inhabitants of the Territory ceded by Virginia, and the other border States was first agitated, it was only proposed to permit the States adjacent to exercise a species of protective power, or sub-conference, over such colony, that would always cease as soon as they were able to protect themselves, and it was not claimed that Congress had any right to interfere, so long as the Federal Constitution was not violated. There are volumes of proof going to show this fact, and still the correspondent "Kansas" would represent that Cass, Douglas, and a few abandoned political dotards were the only adherents he has ever known to this "modern humbug."

It is surprising that any gentleman, claiming the confidence of the public as a journalist, should so stupidly err as to say that popular sovereignty "is now without any responsible person to patronize it." "No sane person will touch it," &c. What are the facts? Why, it constitutes the substance of our whole Kansas cause. It is the fire by which the faith of our revered martyrs has been tried. It is the vitalizing spirit that makes strong the cause of Right to turn back the arm of despotism. We have borne this testimony for nearly four years, while we have been struggling to throw off the bondage of a slave-ridden oligarchy, as exhibited by foreign usurpation. And to-day the doctrine is more popular than at any other hour. Its defenders are found among the profoundest statesmen of the age, and its proselytes will multiply wherever civilization is sought. Already, a Blair, a Trumbull, a Thayer, a Chase, and other brave champions like them, have spoken for the people, consequently, if the arrogance of "Kansas" is taken for surrogating research and sagacity, all these devoted patriots of our Republican cause are, at one merciless sweep of this political Damascus, consigned "to a speedy oblivion."

But in the Republican of October 21st, there appears a second chapter from the same chalice, so filled with contempt for the principles that it is my hope to see written upon the ensign of victory in 1860, in which the author, by some species of black art or otherwise, is transmuted, as proved by his signature, from the incorporated exponent of "Kansas" to the more humble sphere of "A Citizen of Kansas." This second article of over four columns, with the exception of a few interludes of garbled Latin and Mother Goose melodies, is an elaborate and able examination of the general subject of a sovereignty in the people. Owing to their voluminousness, and the variety of points presented, I shall not copy the paragraphs to which my reply will be directed, but shall extend the positions in detail, as a whole, that I wish to present, bearing upon the subject of Territorial government, in opposition to the arguments presented by "A Citizen of Kansas."

It has been said, that it was unwise and impolitic to agitate this subject now in Kansas, that it will tend to divide the Free State party upon a "dead issue," and that the Republican party in the States is already dividing upon it. Now it matters not to those who seek nothing but truth, and the fullest security to the whole people of their sovereign rights, what becomes of the individual or the party, so that the principle in issue is not compromised, in the investigation. Where more than in the Territories, is popular sovereignty a living issue? Where, more than in Kansas, have the people suffered by foreign oppression, in violation of the spirit of that principle? Where, more properly than here, could a party, even, endorse that feature of national policy? Who, more than this chastened people, should hotly contest the nature and extent of the powers of the Federal Congress over the citizens who may settle in the Territories of our confederacy? Where else, more consistently than here, could discussion be tolerated upon the enumerated powers, delegated to Congress by the Constitution, relative to State and Territorial sovereignty? Forgetting our party biases, then, "let us reason together."

"A Citizen of Kansas" has defined popular sovereignty to be a "swindle," a "sham," a "humbug," a "mere subterfuge," and the like, that profane statesmen "laughed at." These epithets are easily applied, but after a full examination of the proof, it may be a query whether this doctrine, or "A Citizen" would be more justly "laughed at."  
There is but one source of light in this review, and that is the Constitution. In Article tenth of the Amendments, it provides that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Now, in that clause, are the people, living in the Territories, deprived of their sovereignty? The only section varying upon it, referring to the power of Congress to "make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property," &c., already quoted, can have no reference to the establishment of a civil government over a colony, but, as was decided by the Supreme Court in the case of the U. S. vs. Gratiot and others, as follows:  
"The term territory, as here used, is merely descriptive of one kind of property, and is equivalent to the word lands; and Congress has the same power over it, as over any other property vested in the United States," &c.  
Any other interpretation than this, is an outrage upon the principle of popular rights, as established in our revolutionary struggle, and a violation of that sovereignty, recognized by all our institutions as belonging exclusively to the people--Had the framers of the Constitution intended to give the General Government any jurisdiction over the citizens living in the Territories above those living in the States, it would have been easy to express the idea in definite language, but in fact, no such idea is provided. On the other hand, there is negative proof to the contrary, in the following, defining the powers of Congress:  
"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such districts (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings."  
There is neither any implied or expressed jurisdiction given therefore to Congress over the Territories, except a possessory one over the soil, and it will be vain to argue that the right to make needful rules and regulations for that purpose, would convey any political jurisdiction whatever, over the rightful people, and wherever Congress has such jurisdiction, it is clearly pointed out in the above section. If, then, Congress derives no exclusive powers from the Constitution over the people living in a Territory, it can possess no such power, and all attempts to exercise it, is arbitrary and high-handed despotism, against which it is the province of the people, to rebel.  
The only additional clause, that is ever cited in proof of the opposite position, is that giving the treaty-making power to the President, by and with the advice

and consent of the Senate. Now in what does the acquisition of territory consist? "A citizen of Kansas" says it "is nothing else than the extension of sovereignty over it," and with that position I shall take issue. What can there be in the exercise of supreme jurisdiction over a territory that is peculiarly desirable or remunerative to a government, except what lies in the right of landlord merely? What was there gained when the treasures of this nation were paid out like water for the acquisition of Texas and the Mexican States, if it was not that wide and verdant expanse of acres that would in the future swell the treasury deposits? Whatever authority the government derives over the territory thus acquired, from the treaty-making power, must be rigidly within the purview of their delegated powers under the Constitution. Treaties can have no supremacy over the acknowledged elements of international law, or over the organic law of the nations that become parties to the treaty. A treaty thus becomes a limited contract. It has been decided repeatedly, that because the Constitution grants an undivided power to the President and the Senate, it should not therefore be construed as an unlimited power.  
I present Mr. Madison as authority on this point, who said in closing a lengthy debate upon the subject of treaties, in the House of Representatives, in 1794, "That though it was an undivided grant, it was a limited one, and that you could not, by treaty, exercise any power which was granted by the Constitution, to the other departments of the government."  
How was it with Texas? By the terms of her annexation, that sovereignty did our government secure over her people beyond that exercised over South Carolina? There was no enslavement, no conquest, no subjugation in that act on the part of our government. As President Polk is quoted for the opposite position, he will be good authority in this instance. In his first annual message, when referring to the diplomatic interference of France in the event of the annexation of Texas, he said: "We may rejoice that the tranquil and pervading influence of the American principle of self-government was sufficient to defeat the purposes of British and French interference, and that the almost unanimous voice of the people of Texas has given to that interference a peaceful and effective rebuke. From this example, European governments may learn how vain diplomatic acts and intrigues must ever prove upon this continent, against that system of self-government which seems so natural to our soil, and which will ever resist foreign interference."  
That event, then, was an illustration of the success and sanctity of popular sovereignty, and the only true sovereignty remained, afterwards, as it was before, only with the people, without any change or reservation secured in the compact of union. Neither do treaties usually disturb the local institutions, or municipal regulations that previously exist with the people of the district purchased or annexed, therefore it is difficult to draw any valid argument against popular sovereignty from that provision in the Constitution giving power to acquire territory, but not to exercise supreme jurisdiction over it.  
Again, in the article of October 21st, it is said that it is a matter of regret that a gentleman of Mr. Thayer's ability [referring to Eli Thayer's late speech] should lend himself to such rude quackery. "He proposes that the Republican party shall go with him in this direction." We must suppose that there are few men of influence in that party in favor of a proceeding so insane. But if it should happen as Mr. Thayer wishes--if that gallant party should abandon the high ground of Jefferson and Madison, to adopt an idea so repugnant to common sense, it needs no prophetic inspiration to foresee that it would very soon die out of existence," &c.  
Now, without assuming to retort for Mr. Thayer upon "A Citizen" for the very dignified and courtly (?) style of his pronouncements, where he says, "that it is just possible that Mr. Thayer does not know what he preaches." I leave the public to judge for themselves of the intelligence of the two gentlemen, and will recur back again to an examination of facts in our past history. It is true that both Jefferson and Madison were among the ablest statesmen who lived at the period when our independence was achieved, and the magna charta of our liberties proclaimed to the world, and Mr. Madison was a member of the Convention that framed it. The ground is taken, that because these gentlemen had some agency in the construction of the "Ordinance for the government of the Territory of the United States north-west of the Ohio river," which was adopted by the Congress of the confederation on the 13th day of July, 1787, therefore they were forever in favor of Congressional intervention in the Territories. But an important point overlooked here. The Constitution was not adopted by the Philadelphia Convention until the 17th of Sept. of the same year, and was not ratified by all of the thirteen old States until nearly three years afterwards. Under the articles of confederation ratified July 9, 1778, the government had proceeded as a gigantic league of powers, not a union of rights secured to the people. The Federal Congress then acted upon, and dealt with

States--not persons. Consequently it became a piece of tyranny that endangered its own perpetuity. Under that dispensation it was highly fit for Congress to claim supremacy over all the inhabitants of the territories, with a right to dictate to them their peculiar institutions. Thus was born the Ordinance of '87, but when the Constitution came to be the supreme law of the land, this ordinance, made under a previous law, was superseded and was no longer a law. It is true, that a specific act of Congress did revise some portions of it, but not that section referring to the prohibition of involuntary servitude. And when it was in past restoratory thirty years afterwards, in the act admitting Missouri as a State, both Madison and Jefferson denounced the measure as a violation of the Federal Constitution, which secured to all its subjects their primitive rights. In a letter to Mr. Monroe, Mr. Madison says, relative to the restrictive clause, "Though for myself, I must own that I have always leaned to the belief that the restriction was not within the true scope of the Constitution." Mr. Jefferson said about the same time, in a letter to Mr. Madison, "This Missouri question, by a geographical line of division, is the most portentous one I have ever contemplated." He said, also, in another letter: "An abstinence, too, from this act of power, would remove the jealousy excited by the undertaking of Congress to regulate the condition of different descriptions of men composing a State. This certainly is the exclusive right of every State, which nothing in the Constitution has taken from them, and given to the general government. Could Congress, for example, say that the non-free men of Connecticut should be freemen, and that they shall not emigrate into any other State?"  
Such were the views of the authors of the Ordinance of 1787, upon the subject of intervention as expressed in 1820, therefore Mr. Thayer can rightly claim them as his endorers. "A citizen of Kansas" wishes to drag them in, now, as authority against the doctrine of popular rights. What obsolete or absurd interdict was ever promulgated, that has not claimed the sanction of these historic fathers?

Again, turn back to the opening paragraph in the article of our astute "Citizen," where he says, "The popular sovereignty of Mr. Douglas has been justly denounced as a 'swindle,' for pretending to be that which it was not. But if it had not been a 'swindle,' it would have been an absurdity." That is, if it had been just what it pretended to be, it would have been an absurdity. Now, without wishing to palliate one job of that mountain of infamy that rests upon the political character of Stephen A. Douglas, and seemingly overlords all his good deeds, I purpose to answer the above extract by quoting from the speech of this same "Citizen" made in New York city, in the Spring of 1856. At a meeting in the Tabernacle, on the evening of March 27th, attended by about fifteen hundred persons, the gentleman is made, by the reporters of the New York Times, to say:  
"He did not propose to enter into any detailed statement of the invasions of the border ruffians, but preferred to discuss the cause which had been pursued by the southern settlers of Kansas; those who had not seen fit to unite with the border ruffians in their assaults upon the Free State men. He was himself a southern man, he was wedded to the doctrine of State Sovereignty, as the fundamental principle of our National structure--that every State was an individual and distinct sovereignty, and entitled to govern itself and provide its own institutions. Believing in this doctrine, he had left his native city of Baltimore to make his home in Kansas. But when he arrived there, he found that it was the aim of Missouri to violate the integrity of Kansas. As a southern man, he resisted to the last this daring and unscrupulous attempt at usurpation. As a Democrat, also, in order to preserve that great principle of the Kansas-Nebraska act, to endorse its observance, he felt impelled to sever all connection, with those who came in from Missouri, and to go heart and hand with the resistants. As a southern man, and as a Democrat, therefore, he had acted. The aggressors came into the State with a military force. The Free-State men determined that if the obnoxious institutions were fastened upon them, it would be in spite of all the opposition they could make. They pledged to this, as their fathers did before them, their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. This resolution they have since adhered to. They proceeded to establish a law for themselves. As their fathers acted before them, they proceeded to the organization of a Government--a Government which is now in the full tide of successful experiment, and the State of Kansas will present herself for admission to the glorious sisterhood of States. Shall we not receive her? Shall the petty schemes of politicians prevail? Shall the integrity of this Union be imperiled to subserve the purpose of ambitious men? I think not. I think that the masses of Kansas will find that support and encouragement they need."  
"Place this and that together," and I have no comments to add, upon the general subject. That alliance however to our Free State men, as having proceeded to establish a law for themselves; to the organization of a government, as their fathers acted before them--a government that should be their organic law, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, is precisely to the point, and

climches the nail for him. "Out of their own mouth will I condemn them." Every friend of our Free State movement knows that it was of itself nothing else than a declaration of our right to repel all foreign intervention, and make our own laws to accord with the sentiment of the majority when fully expressed, loyal ever to the American flag. Give us free exercise of that principle, and it is the only sovereignty I claim. Let it become the fundamental law, and we are prepared to resist the Buchanan doctrine, that slavery now exists here as much as in Georgia, and that when the people of a Territory come to make a State Constitution, they must not intrude upon the right of property in man. This should be carefully studied, therefore, as a party issue, and it becomes the friends of free institutions to make it the shibboleth of party faith, or they have no alternative but submission. No other proof can be necessary, than to present the following on the subject of slavery in the Territories, taken from a late number of the Washington Union the exponent of the National Democratic party--

"This at last appears to be yielded as the true Democratic doctrine, that the question of slavery cannot be legitimately controlled by the people of a Territory until they come to make a Constitution, and that they cannot interfere with the rights of property already vested."  
Are we not, by this declaration, forced to make popular sovereignty a party measure, and show an unbroken phalanx against the unscrupulous Democracy that says "might makes right." Let Kansas rule Kansas, and the chains will soon fall from her bondmen, and her future will be as illustrious as her past has been bloody and treacherous.  
"Perk! perk! perk! perk!  
Strike together, while ye can,  
Like the arm of one strong man."  
Work for the Legislature.

It is very evident to the most casual observer, that the coming session of our Legislature will be a very important one in many points of view. First and foremost our Legislature will be called upon to undo a great many things their predecessors have done, and do a great many things which they left undone. Under the latter head, the most prominent thing to be remedied is the vice system of voting, by substituting that of ballot. This must be done at all hazards. The next thing is a law, on equalization of roads and bridges in constant repair; whilst all this is being accomplished, must not lose sight of the great benefits that will accrue to us by having a few Railroad and Bank charters; these two last items are of the greatest importance, and doubtless will receive that attention their importance demands, within and without the bar. Then comes the passage of the Constitutional Convention Bill, and the selection of these officers under the State government. The whole thing will be arranged during the session of the Legislature, and the old dog; "if you vote for me for Governor, I'll vote for you for dogcatcher," will be played up to the top of the head. Before any of the above enactments are accomplished, however, the preliminaries must be settled by affecting the petty officers, such as Public Printer, Clerk of the House, Sergeant-at-Arms, Scrolling Clerk, &c.  
In the selection of these officers we may expect to witness a general guerrilla warfare amongst the host of candidates who are at this distant day "hoovering" like crows in search of a dead carcass to feast upon.  
Thus it will be seen that our Legislature will have arduous duties to perform, and aside from the difficulties attendant upon getting through some favorite measure for the advancement of the general welfare of our people, the settling of "preliminaries," and the "farming out" will be likely to produce great dissatisfaction, and perhaps create strife and contention.  
We counsel them to be cool, calm and collected, and above all, do not be blinded by fanaticism or put to sleep by shares in some "incipient city" or one horse town, or led astray by the golden promises of unprincipled broken down political hacks, who will command and control the lobby. Head not their promises and pledges, and aid not counsel nothing that will not accomplish some practical good for the people. That point being kept steadily in view, we have nothing to fear, and they have nothing to lose.  
We have great confidence in a large majority of the members elected, and particularly those who represent this city, for they are gentlemen of strict integrity and great personal worth, and will command the confidence, respect and esteem of their fellow men.  
Let the work be done as speedily as possible, always keeping in view the people, the dear people.--Lawrence Ledger.

The Soil of Kansas.  
Kansas occupies an area 500 miles long by 200 wide, and the average depth of the soil throughout the whole extent, is eighteen inches. Scope of country 100 miles square can be selected where the depth will average two feet and a half, and in many places the soil is five, six and seven feet deep.  
The soil is a red loam, and is very fertile, and gives away your lives upon the worn out lands and barren hills of the older States. Here in Kansas we have millions of acres of good land, unoccupied, which only needs "tickling to laugh with abundant crops" while you are laboring to pick a scanty subsistence from amid the rocks and stumps. The rich prairies of Kansas, as they lie smiling in the warm rays of the sun, are inviting you to come and cultivate them. He is really covetous, and the innate vulgarity of his nature manifests itself here. Uniformly kind, courteous and polite treatment of all persons is the mark of a true gentleman.

Mineral Resources of Kansas.  
But a few short years ago, and the country which now embraces our Territory was regarded only as a desert waste, incapable of supporting a white population, and only fit for a hunting ground for the wild and savage tribes of Indians. Not only did the opinion prevail among the beginners in the rudiments of geography, who were just entering upon the mysteries of Olney, but even prominent statesmen entertained the same opinion, and scouted the idea that American progress would ever reach the heart of our vast continent. It is but five or six years ago since Missouri's greatest statesman ridiculed the project of a line of telegraph to California, and the accompanying presented arguments, in the way of difficulties, so great and discouraging, that the most sanguine friends of the measure were forced to abandon it in silence. Now, ere the grass of an early spring has lost its greenness upon his grave, that same project is begun, and with most flattering prospects of completion.  
But our object is not to review the many explicated theories of earlier days, but to speak of the mineral resources of Kansas. To those who suppose we have a country composed of large prairies and a little timber, we say, never were mortals more mistaken. All now admit that Kansas is a great agricultural and grazing country, but we claim more advantages than this.  
Kansas is a mineral country. All of the most important minerals are here found in abundance, with the exception of lead, and we may reasonably expect to find the tin, when our resources are developed.  
We have coal beds of untold extent. These beds underlie the country for miles and miles, and they have already been opened, and many are worked to advantage. From personal observation, we know that the outcroppings of coal banks can be seen, from one to five feet thick, in several portions of the Territory. These "open leads" generally appear along the banks and beds of streams, at low elevations, and every indication, such as cones, similarity, re-appearance, and theory of strata, teach us that these beds are continuous, and are but one large coal field, only interrupted by natural undulations of surface, caused by streams and rivers. Coal deposits of iron ore which are innumerable quantities, and of the best quality.  
Iron ore abounds throughout the whole country, but not always in sufficient quantities and quality to justify working. Yet we have deposits of iron ore which will, in long call for the erection of furnaces and foundries. Upon the head waters of the Republican and Smoky Hill Forks, the Big and Little Blue, iron ore exists in large quantities.  
Our Copper resources are far superior to any other. Upon the Little Blue, copper ore exists which will yield at least 30 per cent of the metal. There is scarcely any need of mining, for the ore lies exposed upon the surface, and thousands of tons can be loaded without the use of tools.  
Gypsum, one of the best fertilizers now known, exists in Kansas. The quantity is almost beyond computation; and the opinion has been advanced by a learned geologist, that the depositing of gypsum in Kansas to fertilize and redeem from barren waste all the scope of country between us and the Pacific shores.  
Tin mines have been discovered upon the head of the Kansas river. As an evidence of the vast quantities of tin, the discoverers have kept the locality a well-kept secret. In time they will be developed.  
Last, and not least, are our Gold mines. If the discoveries of gold in our Territory had partaken of the same character as those made in other localities, then we would indeed regard them as of the least importance. But sufficient is known of the recent gold discoveries to warrant us in the assertion, that they are of a very great effect on the progress and prosperity of our Territory. Gold exists in Kansas. That fact is beyond a doubt; and also in such quantities as to encourage emigration to our western borders; and possibly create a great influx of population, as did similar discoveries in California.  
With such resources as these, who can doubt but that we are destined to occupy a glorious position? A finished agricultural and grazing country, with inexhaustible mineral resources, and a central position in this great Union, on the highway of commerce, and a station on the road of civilization, our destiny is bright indeed.--Lawrence Herald.

Outlook of the Session.  
I venture to predict that, before next May, primary assemblies of the people will occur in every part of the Republic in which opposition to caucus tyranny will be asserted. Fidelity to coalition proclaimed, and the great principle of popular self-government vindicated. The people, in their primary assemblies--the people interested in the preservation of freedom, and the securing of a central position in the Republic--the people, too honest to be bought, too numerous to be controlled by caucus machinery; the people, mindful of their rights and resolved to rescue them from further abuse, will nominate their own candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the nation, and not only nominate them, but elect them too. The intellect and virtue of the land, so long held in unnatural suppression, will be once more liberated and be allowed to wield more legitimate and successful weapons. The people will be restrained within the limits of the Constitution; State sovereignty will be saved from engulfment in the vortex of consolidation; popular freedom will be once more enjoyed in its primitive purity; the right of independent thought and action will be gloriously restored; the myriads of caucus will be driven into retirement; the panders of corruption will be no longer allowed to infest the high places of the nation; and the saving grace of the slaves of a worldly politician will find themselves effectually deprived of the power to do mischief.--Es-Dev. Foot.

Mr. J. Miller, Indian Agent, arrived here on Friday last, on his return from the Plains, where he has been paying the Indians. At Pawnee Fork, he met the largest collection of Indians ever before seen on the Plains. The Indians were sent to the Big Horn, to see Mr. Cassin, the business, but did not meet with him.--Lawrence Herald.  
Polish fair dupes duped.

## Poetry.

Early Autumn.  
Morning breaks in gladness now,  
O'er mountains, lakes and plains;  
Trembling foliage on each bough,  
Murmur like the falling rain;  
On each blade of grass a dew,  
On each quivering leaf a gem,  
Under wild and transient sun,  
Snowy mist, and wild birds hum  
Forewell to the summer hours,  
Is the warning that speak.  
Through the sunshine gleam not bright,  
In the summer hours,  
Still it falls with softened light,  
On the wild daisy, and wild rose,  
Big leafed maple and fallen leaves,  
On the grass and on the fern,  
Save the wild rose and the fern,  
Or the wild rose and the fern,  
Is the warning that speak.  
Like the toll of funeral bell.  
Gleaming coronals of gold,  
Wreathed with gems of tremble dew,  
Towering upward to the sky,  
Glowing bright in their dew,  
Like the toll of funeral bell,  
All things earthly pass away,  
Is the warning that speak.  
Head the warning while you may,  
Soon life's fragile flowers decay.

## Miscellaneous.

This Year and Next.  
Whilst bitter political strife and an unexampled interference of a sectional Administration in the legitimate business and rights of the people of Kansas, in framing their domestic laws, (subject alone to the Constitution of the United States,) have given it a world-wide celebrity, there has also been attained by a great natural resource a just and appropriate remedy which has caused a general desire through the States to emigrate to the Territory. The superiority and unexceptionable excellence of the soil, and the immense mineral wealth of Kansas can be attested by thousands who have sought their homes here, and who are now in the "wide which, taken at its flood, leads on to fortune;" tilling the broad prairies, reaping luxuriant and bounteous harvests, and building up new cities, whose commerce and manufacturing interests will, in a few years, be felt throughout the Union. The people of Kansas are hard-working and enterprising, and the tide of immigration that is turned this way is bringing men of the right stamp, men who will develop the resources of the country, and who will make it what nature intended, the garden spot of the world. A man's welcome is proportionate to his industry and good behavior, and the immigration of the present season has been a class receiving the most cordial welcome. Many people labor under the misapprehension that this immigration is very small; that but few people have arrived within the Territory, and that is a great mistake. There are now in the Territory, at least, 100,000 people, and the general excitement, led here by curiosity, is general excitement, and no constant, filibustering, carpet-bag arrivals, carrying the idea abroad of a "tremendous rush"; but there has been a steady, constant influx of people, coming from all directions and by every manner of conveyance.  
Upon every road leading hither has daily been seen teams loaded with families, men on foot and on horse, coming from Missouri, Iowa, Illinois, and even further East, and every steamboat coming up from St. Louis, or Kansas river from Nebraska, has brought its living freight for Kansas; a very train of cars from Hannibal to St. Joseph has had its passengers en route for the Territory. Thus, through every avenue of travel, by public and private conveyance, have thousands arrived in our midst and permanently located their homes. Another spring will come upon us, with a great increase in the immigration. We are in constant receipt of letters, forming us of business men arranging to be here in the spring; of merchants, manufacturers and mechanics preparing to build their stores, factories and shops here at that time, and many of them have already bought their lots and commenced building their homes. There is hardly a man in the Territory who is not in receipt of tidings, by letter or otherwise, of his friends preparing for Kansas. The main causes and inducements for an increased immigration are obvious, and we briefly give them. The recent LeCompton Convention question is settled in favor of the white man. Our oppressors have been rebuked. Right has triumphed over the ill-begotten power of outrageous wrong, and Kansas (to the astonishment of all) will be a free State, and have families and have children are now ready to come. The postponement of the land sales until next July is an adequate inducement in itself to men in want of one hundred and sixty acres of land in the Territory, at the best possible price; and some of the best lands in this district are yet unoccupied. Every one familiar with the geographical position of Kansas, must see that it will monopolize all the trade of Utah, California and New Mexico, which is abundant together with the government trade to make a State of immense wealth, and that the railroads of the vast uncultivated domains surrounding us will center here, and the Pacific Railroad will run the whole length of the Territory, and establish, as we believe every one is, the natural advantages of soil and climate are superior to any State in the Union, is fully convinced that Kansas is the place to make money--to find a home and surround it with the most material and social comforts of life. Aside from the sterling reason stands "Pike's Peak," an independent candidate of "monied power," whose influence will increase in greatness as the clouds of dust which now envelop its character are carried away, and its true merit fully tested. That gold has been found there no one doubts, and that, in the favorable season of the year, the mines can be made to yield an ample remuneration for labor, there is no reason to doubt--even if gaining this winter should prove fruitless. We can then reasonably look for an immense immigration in the spring, which will last until the soil on our vast prairies is all turned over, and golden grain grows in the place of prairie grass; until our embryo cities are far advanced in population and wealth, and are alive with the busy hum of labor and fashion; until our contemplated railroads are built, and "iron horses" are substituted for Indian ponies; until Kansas achieves that importance which her position renders inevitable, and until she is the acknowledged "flower of Uncle Sam's family," and the main stay of his good old ship, Constitution.--Palmer Leader.

Mineral Resources of Kansas.  
But a few short years ago, and the country which now embraces our Territory was regarded only as a desert waste, incapable of supporting a white population, and only fit for a hunting ground for the wild and savage tribes of Indians. Not only did the opinion prevail among the beginners in the rudiments of geography, who were just entering upon the mysteries of Olney, but even prominent statesmen entertained the same opinion, and scouted the idea that American progress would ever reach the heart of our vast continent. It is but five or six years ago since Missouri's greatest statesman ridiculed the project of a line of telegraph to California, and the accompanying presented arguments, in the way of difficulties, so great and discouraging, that the most sanguine friends of the measure were forced to abandon it in silence. Now, ere the grass of an early spring has lost its greenness upon his grave, that same project is begun, and with most flattering prospects of completion.  
But our object is not to review the many explicated theories of earlier days, but to speak of the mineral resources of Kansas. To those who suppose we have a country composed of large prairies and a little timber, we say, never were mortals more mistaken. All now admit that Kansas is a great agricultural and grazing country, but we claim more advantages than this.  
Kansas is a mineral country. All of the most important minerals are here found in abundance, with the exception of lead, and we may reasonably expect to find the tin, when our resources are developed.  
We have coal beds of untold extent. These beds underlie the country for miles and miles, and they have already been opened, and many are worked to advantage. From personal observation, we know that the outcroppings of coal banks can be seen, from one to five feet thick, in several portions of the Territory. These "open leads" generally appear along the banks and beds of streams, at low elevations, and every indication, such as cones, similarity, re-appearance, and theory of strata, teach us that these beds are continuous, and are but one large coal field, only interrupted by natural undulations of surface, caused by streams and rivers. Coal deposits of iron ore which are innumerable quantities, and of the best quality.  
Iron ore abounds throughout the whole country, but not always in sufficient quantities and quality to justify working. Yet we have deposits of iron ore which will, in long call for the erection of furnaces and foundries. Upon the head waters of the Republican and Smoky Hill Forks, the Big and Little Blue, iron ore exists in large quantities.  
Our Copper resources are far superior to any other. Upon the Little Blue, copper ore exists which will yield at least 30 per cent of the metal. There is scarcely any need of mining, for the ore lies exposed upon the surface, and thousands of tons can be loaded without the use of tools.  
Gypsum, one of the best fertilizers now known, exists in Kansas. The quantity is almost beyond computation; and the opinion has been advanced by a learned geologist, that the depositing of gypsum in Kansas to fertilize and redeem from barren waste all the scope of country between us and the Pacific shores.  
Tin mines have been discovered upon the head of the Kansas river. As an evidence of the vast quantities of tin, the discoverers have kept the locality a well-kept secret. In time they will be developed.  
Last, and not least, are our Gold mines. If the discoveries of gold in our Territory had partaken of the same character as those made in other localities, then we would indeed regard them as of the least importance. But sufficient is known of the recent gold discoveries to warrant us in the assertion, that they are of a very great effect on the progress and prosperity of our Territory. Gold exists in Kansas. That fact is beyond a doubt; and also in such quantities as to encourage emigration to our western borders; and possibly create a great influx of population, as did similar discoveries in California.  
With such resources as these, who can doubt but that we are destined to occupy a glorious position? A finished agricultural and grazing country, with inexhaustible mineral resources, and a central position in this great Union, on the highway of commerce, and a station on the road of civilization, our destiny is bright indeed.--Lawrence Herald.

Outlook of the Session.  
I venture to predict that, before next May, primary assemblies of the people will occur in every part of the Republic in which opposition to caucus tyranny will be asserted. Fidelity to coalition proclaimed, and the great principle of popular self-government vindicated. The people, in their primary assemblies--the people interested in the preservation of freedom, and the securing of a central position in the Republic--the people, too honest to be bought, too numerous to be controlled by caucus machinery; the people, mindful of their rights and resolved to rescue them from further abuse, will nominate their own candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the nation, and not only nominate them, but elect them too. The intellect and virtue of the land, so long held in unnatural suppression, will be once more liberated and be allowed to wield more legitimate and successful weapons. The people will be restrained within the limits of the Constitution; State sovereignty will be saved from engulfment in the vortex of consolidation; popular freedom will be once more enjoyed in its primitive purity; the right of independent thought and action will be gloriously restored; the myriads of caucus will be driven into retirement; the panders of corruption will be no longer allowed to infest the high places of the nation; and the saving grace of the slaves of a worldly politician will find themselves effectually deprived of the power to do mischief.--Es-Dev. Foot.

Mr. J. Miller, Indian Agent, arrived here on Friday last, on his return from the Plains, where he has been paying the Indians. At Pawnee Fork, he met the largest collection of Indians ever before seen on the Plains. The Indians were sent to the Big Horn, to see Mr. Cassin, the business, but did not meet with him.--Lawrence Herald.  
Polish fair dupes duped.