

E 458

.2

.B 95



E 458  
.2  
.B95  
Copy 1

AN

# ORATION,

DELIVERED AT

Huntington, L. I., New-York,

BY

RICHARD BUSTEED, ESQ.,

ON

FRIDAY, JULY 4th, 1862.



New-York:

C. S. WESTCOTT & CO., PRINTERS,  
NO. 79 JOHN STREET.

1862.

~~5~~

E452  
12  
B03

63791  
'05

# ORATION.

---

WE are to-day actors in the grandest drama of real life ; we stand upon the threshold of momentous events, and touch the garment of occurrences which are to shape the future condition of a Continent.

Republican Institutions, and their chief feature, the capacity of man for self-government, are upon trial before the assembled world.

To this strange political and social entanglement the American people sustain the relation of both the contending parties. A large minority on the one side have inaugurated, and are carrying on, a war against the Constitution and the Federal Union, and attempt to cover their conduct beneath the shield of a justifiable revolution ; for this purpose, and with a view to disrupt the old government, they have organized rebellion into an appearance of sovereignty, and have sent forth to the world an appeal to "the last argument of kings," and a declaration of hatred for, and independence of, the institutions of the United States of America.

On the other hand, the majority of the people, a majority composed of the better intellect, greater wealth, and more liberal instincts, stand up for the government, under which the nation has grown to be a chief power in the earth, and by expressions of individual opinion and legislative enactment, have solemnly declared, their unalterable purpose, that there shall be no severance of the parts which constitute us one country—that, in the language of instruction to one of their representatives at a foreign Court, there shall be, on all the soil con-

secrated to freedom and baptized at the font of American independence, or by the American people since acquired, or hereafter, in the order of things and the Providence of God, by them to be acquired, "only one nation and one government, and that there is not now, nor has there been, nor will there be, any, the least idea of suffering a dissolution of this Union, to take place in any way whatever."

Just so distinct are the views of the combatants, and just so irreconcilable the differences which exist between them.

Nothing is simpler than the proposition that there can be no adjustment of the quarrel, and that the absolute submission of one to the demands of the other, is the only method by which the matter in dispute can be disposed of.

It is of the utmost consequence to those immediately concerned that, in so grave an affair, their cause shall be just, and their motives and aims such as to sanctify the means adopted by them, to effectuate the ends they propose. This consequence is aggrandized by the fact that the American people have in charge the future of rational liberty, man's equality, and true representative government. For the preservation of each of these, we are responsible to posterity.

All mankind, and especially the enslaved and oppressed of mankind, are concerned in the civil struggle into which this nation has been plunged by the madness of many and the wickedness of a few. As this struggle terminates, we maintain national unity and power, or become separated into petty factions, contemptible and puerile, the weakest to be preyed upon by the strongest, and the strongest in turn, to be the spoil of any considerable foreign rival. As it terminates, we are a nation of bankrupts, or unrivalled in the sources of material and political affluence; as it terminates, the memory and act of our fathers will be revered or derided. God save the Republic!

In this connection I propose to consider, HOW THE STRUGGLE OUGHT TO TERMINATE, HOW IT WILL TERMINATE, AND WHEN?

To present a sufficient answer to the first of these inquiries,

it will be necessary to examine the grounds upon which the contestants claim success should of right crown their particular designs. To this it is not material to go into a formal examination of the *origin* of our government. The origin of the government belongs wholly to the past. It concerns us now to know whether the government is to be maintained, and by what means it is most likely this result can be reached.

The question before us to day is not as to the causes which impelled the separation of the North American colonies from England, or whether these were sufficient to justify our revolutionary ancestors. "The logic of accomplished results," is the completest vindication the men of '76 could desire. Judged by the standard of increased prosperity and good to the race, our fathers have eulogists in every improved human condition, in every success of civilized life, and in every triumph of constitutional liberty. They need neither poetry nor oratory to sound their fame. Every gathered harvest—every successful adventure—every increasing source of national revenue—every exhibition of charity or religion—each, in its turn, sings a pœan in their praise. The question of concern, as I have suggested, is whether their work shall be allowed to remain, or whether a new state of things shall take its place, and crude experiment be substituted for ripe experience.

Nothing is more certain than that the founders of the Republic intended that it should exist for ever in concrete ; that it should be as incapable of incohesion as a ray of light or a glance of the eye.

Before the convention of the memorable 7th of October, 1765, when committees from nine colonies met in New-York to discuss the policy of forcible resistance to the Stamp Act, the idea of an indissoluble Union, as the future destiny of the struggling colonies, had filled the minds of the people. The coming event was clearly discernible. Its lengthening shadows proclaimed the doom of tyranny and king-craft, and ere yet purpose had taken tangible outline and shape, Patrick

Henry—gifted with prophetic power, exclaimed, “All America is thrown into one mass—where are your land-marks—your boundaries of colonies? They are all thrown down. The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New-Yorkers, and New-Englanders, are no more. I am not a Virginian, but an American;” and before the adoption of the federal Constitution, and while the states were only linked together as friendly confederates for common defence and mutual welfare, they adopted the title of *United States* of America, and the 13th article of their league declared that their union should be perpetual. This, in 1778. Nine years afterwards, the *people* of the United States—not the politicians, nor the wire-pulling leaders, not the directors of party caucuses, nor the selfish place-seekers—the people of the states, who before were united by the articles of confederation, “in order to form a more perfect union” among themselves, “establish justice, insure their domestic tranquillity, provide for their common defence, promote their general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity,” ordained and established the Constitution to defend the *principles of which* six hundred thousand men in arms are to day on the fields of sanguinary strife.

This compact was made by and between the people; it was intended to be, and is, a perpetual contract of alliance; it is indissoluble in its nature, as it is in the terms used to express its inseparableness. It is “a covenant running with the land,” and the heirs, if they take the inheritance, cannot avoid the conditions which their ancestors imposed upon its enjoyment. The agreement cannot be avoided or altered except in the express manner provided, or by the concurrence of all the parties in interest. It is too late for South Carolina to say to Massachusetts, “I don’t like you, and I won’t live with you.” If the Palmetto state did not desire the association, she should not have entered into the Union. Being in, by God’s help, she shall stay. She shall neither bluster out, nor fight out, nor secede out, nor skedaddle out. New-York, too, is a joint



tenant with Mississippi and Georgia, and it looks very much as if the Knickerbockers would enjoy the whole estate of the Tadpoles and Buzzards, by mere right of survivorship.

It is asked : Is there, then, no power inherent in a people to change their government ? Are they forever to remain stationary in their ideas, and so arrest the progress of the mind, and its capacity for improvement ? Certainly not. No such exigence has occurred here. The difficulty with rebellion is, that the majority of the people do not desire change, and when they do, the Constitution itself provides how it shall be altered, or amended, or substituted for another. Congress, on application of two thirds of the members of both its houses, or of two thirds of the legislatures of the several states, *is obliged* to call a convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution, and if these propositions are subsequently ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by Conventions in three fourths of them, the amendments become part of the organic law. Now it is a well-known legal maxim, “*expressio unius est exclusio alterius ;*” the naming of an express mode by which a thing may be done, excludes its performance in any other than the given manner. And, in the language of Mr. Madison, the Constitution “being a compact among the states in their highest sovereign capacity, and constituting the people thereof one people for certain purposes, it is not revocable or alterable at the will of these states individually, as the constitution of a state is revocable at its individual will, and no state can at pleasure release itself therefrom and set up for itself. The compact can only be dissolved by the consent of the other parties, or by usurpations or abuses of power justly having that effect.”

When the great North, and the wise East, and the brave West, get ready for inglorious national oblivion, the vain, supercilious and barbaric South, may play the hand of empire alone ; but until then, her boasted chivalry will be made to march and keep step to the music of an undivided Union. When three fourths

of our entire people shall have approved the amendments to the Constitution which shall have been proposed by two thirds of their number, the so-called "Confederate States" will have a new constitution, but not until then. God hasten the hour! So let every lover of liberty pray. So only shall we escape the withering sarcasm which taunts us with our boasted freedom while it points its scornful finger at four millions of human beings in bondage and in chains! When that day comes, the Genius of Liberty, herself emancipated from the fetters of a written code, will shed a truer light on the American mind. Then shall our anthems to Liberty not be drowned in the dissonant cry of the manacled slave. Our incense will not be driven before the hot breath of an oppressed and servile race, but rise to the throne of God, an honest, as well as grateful sacrifice! There will be in the new constitution no saving clause, no ambiguous provision in favor of man's right to hold his fellow-man in perpetual bondage; the waters of freedom will cover the face of the whole empire, and slavery find no rest upon it for the sole of her foot. The source of all our national misfortunes—the disturbing element in our life—the cancer in our body politic will be destroyed forever. Our cause of shame, and sin, and sorrow, will cease further to afflict ourselves, and exasperate humanity. We will then have a constitution as well as a country, to which an American can refer with pride. We will have a consistent theory of government, and a Declaration of Independence concurrent in sentiment and expression with the law of the land.

For one, I desire the change. While I will obey and faithfully observe *all* that the Constitution of my country requires, I yet wish the supreme law to be founded on the principles of God's eternal justice, and to square with His golden rule. I desire that the law of might shall be the law of right. As the case now stands, my moral nature shrinks while I yield to the command that, if the enslaved escape into a society where freedom is not dependent upon complexion, he shall be delivered up on the demand of his owner, and so a stronger mana-

cle put upon him for obeying an irresistible and universal instinct? Men and brethren, ought such things be?

“ *Can* such things be,  
And overcome us like a summer’s cloud  
Without our special wonder?”

I frankly confess I want an amendment of the Constitution on this subject. I believe that if this civil war, which the slave oligarchists have fomented, shall, of itself, sow the death-seeds of African bondage among us, the harvest of self-respect the nation will thereby reap, and the consideration it will thereby gain, will be worth more than the cost of the war.

A most distinguished American, who filled the highest office in the people’s gift, and who brought to the discharge of its duties the aid of a blameless life, a cultivated mind, a comprehensive intellect, and a long experience, writing on this subject, says: “The impression produced on my mind by the progress of this discussion is, that the bargain between freedom and slavery, contained in the Constitution of the United States, is morally and politically vicious; inconsistent with the principles upon which alone our revolution can be justified; cruel and oppressive, by riveting the chains of slavery, in pledging the faith of freedom to maintain and perpetuate the tyranny of the master, and grossly unequal and impolitic, by admitting that slaves are at once *enemies*, to be kept in subjugation; *property*, to be secured and restored to their owners; and *persons*, not to be represented themselves, but for whom their masters are privileged with nearly a double share of representation. The consequence has been that this slave representation has governed the Union. Benjamin, portioned above his brethren, has ravened as a wolf.”

For these, and my own, and kindred sentiments on this question, I invite from flippancy, ignorance, or sin, some better objection than calling the person who holds them agitator, abolitionist, and the like. I invite these and all disapprovers

to talk less and think more, and to study the history of their country, and the sentiments and opinions of her statesmen, patriots, and guides.

That cause is indeed bad for which nothing that is necessary, expedient, or good, can be urged as a reason why it should succeed. This is the exact plight of rebellion. Nor traitor, nor sympathizer with treason, can to-day assign any fair, just, or reasonable pretext for the precipitation on our beloved land of a catastrophe so appalling in its proportions that all Christendom is disturbed and anxious.

Why did these southerners make war upon the country, converting their own domain into a receptacle of stolen goods, and the hiding-place of mercenaries, murderers, and madmen, and ours into one vast recruiting tent? Tell me, you, cowardly and traitorous northman, who talk about peace before the last armed foe has expired on the soil his attainted blood defiles, or of compromise, while yet the walls of our hospitals resound with the groans of the mangled, and are damp with the death-dew of the expiring? Tell me, you, sneaking, hypocritical, mean, envious England, with professions of goodwill to us on your false lip, and hatred and all uncharitableness to us on your falser heart? Tell me, you, weak imitator of the virtues and base servitor of the vices of the Bonaparte, with your proffered mediation in a neighbor's quarrel? Tell me, you, traitors Davis, Pickens, Stevens, and Floyd? what do *you* say provoked you to the point where forbearance ceased to be a virtue?

What had we of the North usurped that belonged to you? I inquire not now of what some among us may have said. I challenge any *act* of usurpation by the non-slaveholding states against your rights as members of the confederacy. Facts are incontrovertible. What had we *done*? What provision of the federal Constitution had we violated? For once lay aside your declamation and abuse, and soberly and truthfully state your grievances.

You know, and we know, and the world knows, that we

made no encroachment upon your reserved rights as a party to the compact between your fathers and ours. You know, also, that we have been so terrified at your reiterated threats against the family peace and general welfare, that, in our anxiety to preserve national concord, we have sacrificed personal honor and state pride. You called us "mud-sills" and "greasy mechanics," until labor almost began to be ashamed of its God-given dignity. You beat our representatives in the national council chambers because they expressed the views of those whom they served. You denied us freedom of speech in all your borders. This and much else, before the last burden which broke our uncomplaining patience into active, and, as you are destined to learn, terrible resistance and deserved retribution.

But what had we *done*? How sinned against you? In 1820 you wanted a geographical limit assigned to your peculiar institution, and we passed the law known as the Missouri Compromise. You got sick of this when it appeared that slavery would not be a gainer thereby, as it was supposed, and begged a repeal of the act. It was repealed. In 1850, you clamored for further legislation in favor of your property in human beings, and the fugitive slave law was placed on the nation's statute book. You were the daughter of the horse leech. You continually cried, "Give, give!" and we gave. We kept giving until we had not an oat left in the bin, and on your demand, gave you the bin too. But nothing would satisfy your rapacity; you had resolved to quarrel with us.

Do you remind me that we did not return your escaped slaves? This is only half the truth. Whenever you came after your chattel, with legal proofs of ownership, we caught and caged him, and sent him back to you, often at our own expense. If you did not think it worth your while to hunt up your runaway, it was none of our concern. Sometimes a man among us, more of a humanitarian than a juris-consult, and better versed in the law of nature than the law of the land, illegally, but conscientiously, aided your bondman to

escape. *John Brown did so, and you hanged him for it!* But no state, as such, and no authority within a state, ever hesitated or refused to perform its constitutional obligations to you on this head. The contrary of this cannot be truthfully maintained.

Do you remind me, also, that some of our free states (would to God yours were all free) passed what are known as the personal liberty bills, and that these enactments were in violation of the Constitution? It is true that they did, and that they were wholly without warrant for it. But, *audi alteram partem!* Hear the other side. Not one of these states attempted to enforce these laws, nor did the judicial tribunals, in any instance, pronounce in favor of their validity, and several of them very soon repealed the obnoxious enactments. Young Wisconsin has done so even since you plunged us into an internecine war.

What else have we done? What other cause of grievance have you growing out of any *committed breach* of our duty towards you?

I hear you go about complaining that, in 1860, a sectional party at the North elected a President. In your declaration of causes which induced the secession of South Carolina, you state, among other things, that a "geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the states north of that line have been united in the election of a man to the high office of President, whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery."

This is false, and you know it to be. Mr. Lincoln was elected by less than one third of the entire vote cast. You know this is true. Figures will not lie to help your cause. You set up John C. Breckinridge as a candidate, and tried to bully and wheedle the democratic party of the North into the support of your sectional, time-serving aspirant. In its death-throes, this once great political power redeemed the folly, and expiated the wickedness of a life spent in alternate fear and worship of you. It refused to honor your idol. The vote of this party organization was given to Mr. Douglas, only a few

irreversible “dough-faces” throwing away their patronage on Mr. Breckinridge. The northern states *did not unite* in the election of Mr. Lincoln.

If Mr. Lincoln *be* sectional—if his purposes are hostile to slavery, *you* have brought the calamity upon yourselves and us. The man who omits to do an act he may perform, by which the life of his fellow can be saved, is morally guilty of murder, if death be the result of his omission, as much as he who lies in wait and wilfully kills. You pretend to believe that Mr. Lincoln entertained hostile purposes to African slavery as it exists among you, and omitted to cast your vote for Mr. Douglas, which you knew was the only means to prevent the election of the man you charged with entertaining sectional views and unconstitutional prejudices! But your want of candor is again transparent. You knew that Mr. Lincoln was on record against the subversion of the constitutional provisions respecting slavery. You knew that in his senatorial contest in Illinois, he had publicly and deliberately declared himself as disfavoring an unconditional repeal of the fugitive slave law; as unpledged against the admission of any more slave states; as unpledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and to the prohibition of the slave trade between the different states. You knew all this when you sought justification for folly in falsehood, and are now in the condition of a man obliged to utter a dozen untruths to save his first false statement from falling into hopeless disgrace.

I recur to the question, what have we of the North *done by way of aggression, usurpation, or abuse of power*, which can be urged in palliation of the treason of the South, or the attempt to destroy the most utterly benign government that ever blessed a people?

Concede now, *causa argumenti*, that the last presidential election resulted in the choice of a man whose declared opinions on the subject of slavery were in opposition to the well-

ascertained provisions of the Constitution. What then? The upshot of the matter is, that a new political party had succeeded in electing its candidate, not by reason of its own strength, but because of dissensions which distracted its adversary. The opponents of Mr. Lincoln and of his political sentiments, had a clear working majority in both houses of Congress, and the President elect, for two years at least, could wield but a nominal sceptre. He could not even distribute the spoils of success. The South knew and understood this; knew that the supreme legislative and judicial power were in its own grasp and interest, and yet, with a duplicity even more remarkable for weakness than meanness, abandons its post, and flaunts in the face of an astonished age its apprehensions that the guarantees of the Constitution are in danger of being destroyed, and its rights under it, trampled upon and denied; then, with an audacity of profaneness, unequalled in the annals of blasphemy, appeals to the Supreme Judge of the Universe for the purity and rectitude of its intentions.

Upon the election of Mr. Lincoln, produced, as I have shown, by the South itself, treason, which had been hatching in secrecy and sin, exhibited a hostile front to the country and the Constitution. South Carolina, the hot-bed of disloyalty; ever vain, self-glorious and troublesome, led the way. The national fortress erected in her harbor at the national expense, and defended by a mere handful of our soldiers, was exposed to the murderous fire of six thousand perjured scions of chivalry, and the national ensign—our hitherto untarnished flag—shot away from its staff, and a bastard rag run up in its dishonored place.

The first overt act of treason was committed! The bad example set by South Carolina was imitated by other states, until step by step, armed resistance to the constituted tribunals of the country, was substituted for obedience to the laws of the land, and civil war, with all its attendant horrors, was forced upon us.

Enough has been shown to prove rebellion disentitled to



success. It is not an appeal to justice ; it is a resort to force and fraud ; and unless mankind are prepared to confound distinctions between fair and foul, between right and wrong, between good and bad ; unless our liberties are indeed the sport and at the mercy of unscrupulous and selfish demagogues, and unless this world was made for the Catilines, the Borgias, and the Machiavellis of the race, surely this unholy crusade against an enlightened and paternal government, should not be favored with success.

But how *will* the struggle terminate ? Will the treason succeed ? Will it ?

“ Oh, country, marvel of the earth !  
 Oh, realm to sudden greatness grown !  
 The age that gloried in thy birth,  
 Shall it behold thee overthrown ?  
 Shall traitors lay that greatness low ?  
 No ! Land of Hope and Blessing, No !

“ Our humming marts, our iron ways,  
 Our wind-tossed woods on mountain crest,  
 The hoarse Atlantic, with his bays,  
 The calm, broad ocean of the West,  
 And Mississippi's torrent flow,  
 And loud Niagara, answer, No !

“ And we, who wear thy glorious name,  
 Shall we, like cravens, stand apart,  
 When those whom thou hast trusted, aim  
 The death blow at thy generous heart ?  
 Forth goes the batte-cry, and lo !  
 Hosts rise in harness, shouting, No !”

It must terminate in shame and disaster to those who so wantonly paltered with allegiance and imbrued their traitorous hands in brothers' blood. It must so terminate because of controlling moral and material considerations applicable to it. The time has not gone by when the success of a cause may reasonably be estimated by its claims on truth, honor, and justice. These are still, and ever will be, cardinal to success ; their absence from any enterprise may be taken as evidence that it will come to naught.

“For right is right, since God is God,  
 And right the day must win;  
 To doubt would be disloyalty,  
 To falter, would be sin.”

However delayed the final victory may be—however impeded by repulse or intermediate defeat—the end is as assured as though the last gun had been fired, or the last sabre drawn, in the flush of ultimate triumph. And this not alone or so much because we are numerically stronger than the foe, but because “right the day must win.” The mathematics of morals have as much to do with armies as the tactics of Scott or Hardie. “Courage must be born of conscience,” and “Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just.” A sense of right in men enables them to achieve acts of valor, which no mere physical capacity could ever accomplish. The purpose that is begotten of patriotism and duty carries with it an energy, resistless as the lightning and certain as fate. Cowardice is the natural ally of crime; wrong-doing and fear, are, to each other, as the cloud and the rain. “The wicked flee when no man pursueth.” It is “the thief doth fear each bush an officer;” and it is because of this moral power inherent in a good cause, that the Union arms must succeed. If the United States were prosecuting this war to gratify the lust of empire, or to satiate revenge, or to deprive a people of any of the blessings of civilization or Christianity, or to fasten upon them chains of servitude, we might well have misgivings as to the issue. We are not fighting for these, or any of these. We *are* fighting to conquer a peace, to subdue a rebellion, to extinguish a treason, to save a country and preserve its liberties. We are fighting on holy ground, for the ark of constitutional freedom. We are fighting for the lands which contain the dust of our fathers, through which our broad rivers run, and over which our towering mountains cast their protecting shadow. We are fighting to relieve liberty—beleagured in the house of its professed friends—and firm, and free, and one forever, have sworn

“By our children’s golden future,  
 By our fathers’ stainless shield :  
 That which God and heroes left us,  
 We will never, never yield !

When to this moral aspect of the struggle, we add circumstances of material or physical advantage, it does not require the gift of prophecy to foretell the end.

And first, there never has been, in history, an instance of a northern race permanently defeated by a southern one. The influences of climate, the traits of character transmitted by race, or whatever other subtle cause may be assigned by students of nature or philosophy, have been sufficient always to produce the result.

From the time of Attila, or even earlier ; from the days when the monarchs of Assyria over-run Asia, and the Pharaohs of Egypt conquered Nubia and Abyssinia, there has been no grand exception to this general law. Whenever the north was fairly pitted against the south, the south succumbed. Witness even the fall of the Roman Empire, when the incursions of Goths and Vandals overturned the work of the Cæsars ; witness the expulsion of the Moors from Spain ; witness the superiority of northern races, as manifested in the crusades ; witness Poland swallowed up, despite of heroic resistance, by Russia ; witness the defeat and decline, both long continued, of the Moslem rule ; witness Spain and Italy, conquered again and again by France, and France herself always beaten, when really matched against England.

And will the stars in their courses *now* fight for Sisera ? Will the order of nature be disturbed for the southern race on this continent ? Have not southern races heretofore established in America already melted away before the superior prowess, or mettle, or skill, or endurance, of northerners ? Has not Mexico confessed herself subject to this law ? Do not Louisiana, and Florida, and Texas, and California, attest that, no matter by whom settled, and by whom claimed, they must belong to the descendants of northern races ? Who imagines that their future history will, in this respect, belie their past.

The south has chosen to throw down the gauntlet, and long as we delayed, bitterly as we regretted the necessity, the gauge is accepted. The fight is one to which, unless Nature contradicts herself, there can only be one result. The cold, steady determination of the temperate zone, will, now as ever, be more than a match for the impetuous but transient enthusiasm of those who come from the regions of the equator. *Snow cools fire, but fire never inflames ice.*

There are, however, other and yet more material reasons to predict a victory for the Union ; reasons that need no philosophy of race, nor historical knowledge, to aid in their discovery or application. The simple reason that is told in Rob Roy's song, that

“ They will take who have the power,  
And they will *keep who can.*”

Nations have sometimes ere now had right on their side and seemed to fail. Exceptions may have been apparent, though not real, even to the rule just referred to ; but it has been when the preponderance of power has been so terrible that there was no resisting it ; it was because a greater rule came into play. This rule will help us now. We *think* we have Providence on our side : so, perhaps, the south think of themselves ; but we *know* we have the heaviest artillery, and “ Hercules himself must yield to odds.”

To back our confidence in our cause, we have the mightiest armies, the largest hosts, the best-equipped soldiers, the most terrible engines of war. It is a contest between twenty millions and eight millions, and of the eight at least two are wishing us to succeed. It is a contest between those who are strong in wealth of every sort—in capital and the products of labor—in the results of skill and the achievements of philosophy—in the hardihood that comes from exercise of every faculty, physical or mental—in the confidence that results from a knowledge of this superiority—in resources that, by a comparison with those of our enemy, or of any people that

ever went to war, are inexhaustible. Supplies of men and means pour in till government is embarrassed to know what to do with them. We have generals instructed in the best schools of modern warfare, and troops, at last pronounced by competent and impartial judges, worthy of comparison with the best-disciplined armies of continental Europe.

What does our enemy oppose? Not what he did oppose a year ago; but what does he oppose now? Large armies, doubtless, composed in part of desperate and brave men, who fight knowing that defeat is ruin—but armies that cannot be replenished. *Their* all is staked on the hazard of a single throw; *we* can double our armies in ninety days. Their stock of offensive weapons was at the outset equal to ours, for they stole the best we had; but we have taken back the stolen property, and they have no more arsenals to rob; no foundries where they can cast cannon on which they dare rely; no outlet or inlet now by which foreign sympathies can supply the resources they have not in themselves. Their cities are desolate. Their country is in part laid waste; for no army, friendly or hostile, passes over a country without devastating its fields, and spreading ruin among its inhabitants. Its people is impoverished. Its currency is worthless. *We* are constantly producing new inventions, increasing our power, infusing into our gunnery new principles, and into our guns new force. *They*, if by chance they hit upon a principle, have no means to apply it, and blow up their Merrimacs while we cover the rivers and seas with Monitors. They mass their armies only to withdraw them before yet greater masses, and throw up mighty fortifications only to desert them before still greater threatenings. If in the field they attack us and fight well, it is yet ever with one result. An unexpected movement may catch us unawares and do us harm; but our steadier and more resolute men never fail to find their recuperative energy, and demonstrate their real courage by wringing a final victory from what at first seemed defeat and overthrow.











LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 933 394 5