

Private.

Olympia W. T.
Feb. 10, 1861

Dear Bush,

I am under obligations to you for the several fair extracts you have published in the Statesman about the killing of Newell by Smith in San Francisco. Smith is my friend. We studied law at the same place. He was then a high minded honorable man. Since he came to Cal. in 1850 I've heard nothing against him except that he drank too freely. As mayor of Sacramento in '52 or '3 he acquitted himself with credit. And as a lawyer he has always been regarded straight-forward and correct. I believe from a knowledge of the man in early life his justification will be fully proven on his trial. I've heard nothing from him or his friends since the affair occurred, but from every statement of the case made in the papers it would be unfair, and unjust for any press to forestall public opinion against him.

From the tone of the Statesman since Lincoln's election I fear you have taken a chute in which I an old supporter and friend cannot follow you. It seems to me now that you advocate doctrines against which the Democratic Party has fought since its organization. As I read it, you now believe that the Government of the United States is a centralized consolidated government, -- not with "delegated" powers, but sovereign and supreme in its authority, -- constitutionally competent to ignore the reserved sovereign powers of a state within its borders. Or to be more explicit you claim that South Carolina can and ought to be coerced into obedience to the Laws of the U. S. at the present time. If so, Tennessee when she acts more deliberately and places herself in the same position, can also be coerced. And so with Ky. Va. & Ind. For it certainly cannot be held that the indecent and unbecoming haste with which So. Ca. has acted is the only reason for coercion. If such doctrine is sound and correct I have read my lessons in Democracy to very little purpose. Unless our Government can rest upon the voluntary and free consent of those sovereignties which formed it in my judgment it must go by the board. You are doubtless honest in your convictions as I am in mine. If I have not mis-interpreted your position you will see the broad distinction between us. And as I have agreed in the main with the principles you have advocated for the past two years I deemed it due to condescend to embrace the first opportunity to let you know this difference. I will not attempt to elaborate or give my reasons for this faith that is in me. It would be vain and useless at this time, as the question has perhaps already been settled, or referred to the arbitrament of arms.

Times are terribly hard here. We are all feeling the effect of the disturbances on the other side of the mountains -- and feeling them sorely. Everything is stagnant. All men are waiting with that intense anxiety which always precedes the news of a battle, to hear the final result of affairs in the east. That all-absorbing question "who shall be

our next Delegate" which usually excites the greatest interest just at this time, receives no attention now. The aspirants may be at work. If so they are very quick about it.

This, by the way, reminds me. Garfield's conduct about that money received by him on private deposit (of which bid P. & D.) has shaken my confidence in him. I hold with you that a man who does not manage his own affairs well and "on the square" ought not to be entrusted with public business. Three or four of the Depositors of that Money employed me to get it and perfect their titles to the land. Garfield does not pay it over promptly and gives the flimsiest excuses for not having done so long ago. He promises to pay and doubtless will, as suits on his receipts would compel him to do so. That does not justify him for holding and using that money long after his receipts promised it should be paid over. In fact I can see no reason why he ought not to have paid the money into the treasury when he gave up his office, even if it is admitted that he had a right to hold it till then. His course from the beginning, in my judgment, was wrong and as our upright man he cannot justify it. I should be more loath now than ever to support him for Delegate.

My regards to friends. Let me hear from you.

Yours truly

Butler P. Anderson

Asahel Bush, Esqr.
Salem,
Oregon.

Private.

Olympia W.T.
July 10, 1861.

Dear Bush,

I am under obligations to you for the several fair extracts you have published in the Statesman about the killing of Newell by Smith in San Francisco. Smith is my friend. We studied law at the same place. He was then a high minded honorable man. Since he came to Cal. in 1838 I've heard nothing against him except that he drank too freely. As Mayor of Sacramento in '52 or '3 he acquitted himself with credit. And as a lawyer he has always been regarded straight-forward and correct. I believe from a knowledge of the man in early life his justification will be fully proved on his trial. I've heard nothing from him or his friends since the affair occurred, but from every statement of the case made in the papers it would be unfair and unjust for any Press to forestall public opinion against him.

From the tone of the Statesman since Lincoln's election I fear you have taken a stance in which I an old supporter and friend cannot follow you. It seems to me now that you advocate doctrines against which the Democratic Party has

fought since its organization. As I read it, you
now believe that the Government of the United States
is a centralized consolidated government, not
with "delegated" powers, but sovereign and supreme
in its authority, constitutionally competent to ignore
the reserved sovereign powers of a state within
its borders. Or to be more explicit you claim that
South Carolina can and ought to be coerced
into obedience to the laws of the U. S. at the
present time. If so, Tennessee when she acts
more deliberately and places herself in the same
position, can also be coerced - and so with Ky,
Va. & Mo. For it certainly cannot be held that
the indignant and unbending haste with which
So. Ca. has acted is the only reason for coercion.
If such doctrine is sound and correct I
have had my lesson in Democracy to very
little purpose. Unless our Government can
rest upon the voluntary and free consent
of those sovereignties which formed it
in my judgment it must go by the board.
You are doubtless honest in your con-
victions as I am in mine. If I have not
mis-interpreted your position you will see
the broad distinction between us. And as
I have agreed in the main with the principles
you have advocated for the past two years
I deemed it due to candor to embrace the first
opportunity to let you know this difference. I will

not attempt to elaborate or give my reasons for this
faith that is in me. It would be vain and use-
less at this time, as the question has perhaps al-
ready been settled, or referred to the arbitrament
of arms.

Times are terribly hard here. We are all feeling
the effect of the disturbances on the other side
of the mountains - and feeling them lonely. Every-
thing is stagnant - all men are waiting with their
intense anxiety which always precedes the news
of a battle to hear the final result of affairs
in the east. That all-absorbing question "who
shall be our next Delegate" which usually excites
the greatest interest just at this time, receives
no attention now. The aspirants may be at work
if so they are very quiet about it.

This, by the way, reminds me. Garfield's con-
duct about that money received by him on pri-
vate deposit (of which vide P. & D.) has shaken
my confidence in him. I hold with you
that a man who does not manage his own af-
fairs well and "on the square" ought not to
be entrusted with public business. Three or
four of the depositions of that money employed
me to get it and perfect their titles to the land.
Garbilde does not pay it over promptly and
gives the financial excuses for not having
done so long ago. He promises to pay and doubt-
less will, as suits on his receipts would counsel

him to do so. That does not justify him for holding
and using that money long after his receipts pro-
mised it should be paid over. In fact I can see
no reason why he ought not to have paid the
money into the treasury when he gave up his
office, even if it is admitted that he had a right
to hold it till then. His course from the begin-
ning, in my judgment, was wrong and as an
upright man he cannot justify it. I should
be more loath now than ever to support him
for Delegate.

My regards to friends
Let me hear from you -
Yours truly
Butler P. Anderson

Asahel Bush, Esq.,
Polina
Oregon.