

# Exhibit 169

---

in the case of:

**People of the Republic of Texas  
and the  
Sovereign Nation of the Republic of Texas**

**v.**

**UNITED NATIONS  
(and all it's Political Subdivisions)  
and  
UNITED STATES  
(and all it's Political Subdivisions)**

**Under Pains and Penalties of perjury and the laws of the Almighty, and being sworn under a vow and oath, I attest that the attached pages are true and correct reprints of the:**

**Causes of the Civil War: The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, from the Suite101.com American Civil War website.**

**This attestation is made on August 18, 1998.**

*Attest:* Jacelyn Savage

D. Lynn West  
*Witness to source and above signature*

Merle Ann West  
*Witness to above signatures*



## American Civil War

Editor: [Mike Swogger](#)

E-mail: [mj711@geocities.com](mailto:mj711@geocities.com)

Homepage: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/7945>

Go to

December 12, 1997 - American Civil War Article

-Topic

>[More Articles](#)

-[More Links](#)

-[Discussions](#)

[\[Back\]](#) [\[Previous Article\]](#) [\[Next Article\]](#)

### Causes of the Civil War: The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854

In the years following the Compromise of 1850, questions and controversy began to surface over the issue of slavery in the Nebraska Territory west of Missouri. In 1853 the House failed to outlaw slavery in Nebraska though it was officially north of the Missouri Compromise line. Thus, as more and more people settled in the area, the issue of slavery there became heavily debated.

In 1854, Senator Stephen Douglas of Illinois proposed a bill that would address the issue. The provisions of the bill were as follows: it repealed the original Missouri Compromise line, split the Nebraska Territory into two sections, Nebraska and Kansas and supported the notion of popular sovereignty (let the settlers decide on the slavery issue). There was ample Northern opposition to this bill. Horace Greeley, editor of the *New York Tribune*, made an all-telling statement in saying that "the bill created more abolitionists in two months than William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips had created in 20 years" (MacPherson, 93).

The following is a segment of the debate in the Senate over the future of slavery in Kansas:

**Sen. George Badger (NC):** *"If some Southern gentleman wishes to take the old woman who nursed him in childhood and whom he called 'Mammy' into on of these new territories for the betterment of the fortunes of his whole family—why, in the name of God, should anybody prevent it?"*

**Sen. Benjamin Wade (OH) in response to Badger:** *"We have not in the least objection to the Senator's migrating to Kansas and taking his old 'Mammy' along with him. We only insist that he shall not be empowered to sell her after taking her there" (MacPherson, 93).*

When the vote in Congress occurred, the tally followed geographical and party lines. In the Senate, the vote was for the bill 37-14 (Northern Democrats voted "yes" 14-5). The House's vote was much closer with 113 for and 100 against the bill (Northern Democrats' vote was even at 44-44). Overall, a total of 61 percent of the "yes" votes were Southern, while 91 percent of the "no" votes were from Northerners.

This was clearly the biggest victory thus far for Southern interests.

Source Used: *Ordeal By Fire*, James MacPherson: 1992.

*Next article: "Bleeding Kansas" and the Dred Scott decision*

### Join for Free!

Newsletter,  
More links,  
Options,  
Phonebook,  
and more!

