The present contention of arms is called by some a civil war. We of the North do not however consider it in such a light, notwithstanding the strife is between portions of the same nation, which usually defines a civil war. Indeed, this ought not to be called a war of any kind, much less a civil war. It is emphatically a rebellion. The North, on the one hand, assert that the South are in rebellion against a just and magnanimous government. They of the South, declare on the other hand, that they are striving for a glorious revolution and are fighting for liberty. The difference between the two terms "rebellion" and "revolution" is, as I understand them, something as follows: Revolution signifies a material change in the constitution of government. Hence should Jeff. Davis be successful, the Southern uprising would be called a revolution; but if—which is more probably—he is unsuccessful, it would be forever called a rebellion. This is the world's distinction between success and failure. So whether a Rebellion be right or wrong, and is only successful, it becomes a Revolution, since a radical change has been effected in government. So we say if the proposed fire-eaters of the South wish a change in government why let them effect it if they can!
but if not let them expect the doom of traitors.

Before taking up arms, the South, by their Ordinances of Secession, declared themselves absolved from all allegiance to our government, also asserting that they had the right to withdraw at pleasure from membership in the U.S. states. We deny that right and claim that no state or states have a right to secede from the federal government. The question of "Is it to be debated, then proceeds itself thus: "Has a state the right to secede?" The South has taken the affirmative and declare that any state may secede at pleasure. As I understand their arguments they are briefly these: "All states came voluntarily into the Union: therefore if they choose they may withdraw." Their next argument is this: "We of the South are now receiving the rights due us from our sister states—thus withholding theirs, and we, being disposed with the course they pursue towards us, do, therefore, declare, that we have a perfect right to perform the act of secession." On the negative of this question stands the North, and in a few words I will endeavor to state, as I understand it, the position which our people take. In relation to the first argument of the Southerns I acknowledge their statement that all states came voluntarily into the Union, that we, as a common and insistent upon it that it does not follow from that a state may at pleasure withdraw.
draw from the Union. Our example from every-day affairs will suffice to show
the validity of our objection. Suppose a few or
eight men enter into co-partnership
having equal capitals and equal rights.
The writings are drawn and signed, nothing
being said about dissolution. The firm got
smoothly on for several years until at
length two or three of the partners become
dissatisfied and, withdrawing out the general
counsel, withdraw from the concern,
taking with them all the property which
was in their hands, though much of it
was property, and also leaving all of
the co-partners debts to be discharged by
the remaining partners. Would this be
just or right? Certainly not. Now in the
case of the South they have a vast amount
of Union States property which they refuse to
give up to proper owners. This likewise
would be without the general consent,
in violation of oaths given years ago,
to stand by the government. Moreover there
is a strong objection against secession
which, cannot be raised against the dissolution
of a firm. Is this? Should one state or
majority of states be allowed to secede, any
state might with such a precedent, hereby
beyond the same act. Hence you see
that our country would probably be
composed of numerous petty governments.
which would keep the country in a constant state of anarchy. And again, if secession be allowable in the South, what would the national credit of the remaining states be worth? It would most certainly be worthless as our creditors would have no security against future dissolutions.

For these various reasons our government considers the first argument in favor of secession wholly unfounded. The answer to the second plea for secession, namely, that they have not been receiving the rights due them from other states, our people say: If you had grievances, you should have presented them before the whole people in a meeting of the states, which might have been called for that purpose where you could have had justice meted out to you. But instead of doing this without our consent and also in violation of your oaths, therefore we demand that you, city and your leaders and return to your former allegiance. The sentence in the Declaration of Independence gives that document such authority as it the clause in which it is stated and now present their grievances and neglect to inform the mother country.
of the iniquities to which they were subject, with what degree of reason could they have expected redress.

Advocates of Secession further assert that it is the avowed policy of the present administration to interfere with the peculiar institution of the South. This is not the case as anyone at all versed in the declarations and course of the President must well know. And that this is not a war upon slavery Mr. Lincoln’s late instructions to Gen. Benjamin shows conclusively. And this fact just mentioned is well known to the leaders of the Southern rebellion but with baseness and wickedness seldom if ever before equalled, they have done and are continuing to misrepresent to the convinced north of the South to conceal the actual intentions of the Southern people.

These gross misrepresentations together with their late loss of power when the free states elected a President appear to be the true cause of the rebellion. With but one or two exceptions, the South have ruled this country, almost since the days of Adams and Jefferson, and now the loss of that power is the mainspring of their late movement.

Again the South allege it as their a right that they should be let alone in their secession, for the granting of this request they can give no good reason but present a mis-
crude plea for state rights and a general right to do as they please. This last right the Southernvse began to think was especially designed for a Southern gentleman. But they will find that to whip a negro requires a little more muscle than to flag a poppet.

What accord more closely with the wishes of an abounding member of a form than to be left alone on what suited his thief or robber better than to be left unassailed?

In the whole, the plea of the South most closely resembles the plea of a fugitive from justice.

But the tide of war has passed, the South has manfully declared her intention to maintain her independence at all hazards, peaceably if possible, by war the word is necessary. Our government has demanded her allegiance and is now making strenuous efforts to bring her back to her wonted loyalty. We have a powerful enemy whose leading are well aware that defeat is death and who will make every effort, use every means in their power to overthrow this—the best of earth's government.

In this time of trial our government is obligated to use it every resource and it demands northern states, northerners, statesmen, northern people, northerners, all as well. That a traitor here is two at the South who are at all disloyal. This however is the
fact—we do find traitors in our very midst, loyal men when their conduct continues as traitors. In our state we may be thankful we find but few whose actions may be called disloyal, but we have only to go into Ohio, N. York or Conn., to find alas! too many whom we can call by no name other than traitors.

I will speak only of Ohio, where these traitors of heart were unfortunately members of a loyal party well known as her Democratic, and as members thereof called a convention of delegates at Columbus, and at the nomination of a party ticket, passed resolutions which would have done justice to Jeff. Davis himself. This convention, however, did not, of course, openly side with the South yet they had no sympathy to express, no support to offer to our government greatly embarrassed under its present trials. But instead of this, they denounced it as partial, corrupt, dishonest, and guilty of violating inviolable laws the Constitution of the U. States. Although all this is not openly advocating secession doctrines yet such conduct cannot be expected to go unpunished men. The accidents of injury that these resolutions have and will cause is very great, not only here at the North, but also at the South, where all such documents are
raptly circulated and gradually devoured. Nort of confidence in our government will be more rying than a thousand rebel soldiers. It is well known that not long since the government caused the suppression of several newspapers in New York City on the ground that they favored secession or at all events were injurious to the cause of Union. How this dict any Union people will acknowledge right, perfectly so, but the members of this constitution, mentioned before, realized by strongly turning to the government for this act, which they called "abridging the right of the press." They also had much to say about the abridgment of free speech and press and showed the checks placed by agents to the country. It did in the sense in which they meant it in reply to the objection raised against newspaper suppression a prominent Union man had presented an answer like this: "Sabezze," say the woodman born using his ax as to surgical and outrageous, but should and instead of chopping down trees, should should consider a law to prohibit the use of the ax for that purpose perfectly right and good.
But with the rights of the press and
the right of free speech and of free
speech, it is not abridging the
right of free speech, but of free
speech, that the "peace meetings"
ought to be and are broken up
are unwise. But why not allow
them to be held, for purely
peace is desirable? Did we know
nothing of what is done at those meetings, the
simple fact that the advocate of this move-
ment are with, but few exceptions, men
whose loyalty is with reason doubted, this,
would be sufficient to condemn them.

Another reason is this: These peace meetings
have evidence to believe, are only another
of secessionists, a fact proved in various
ways but especially by the confession of the
editor of one of the suppressed papers. He
stated, indeed, that he had been receiving
a large amount of gold in payment for his
news in the South, and that the peace articles
were furnished by secessionists of the Southern
States. All this occurred in the city of New
York. I further learn from the Louisville
Journal, a strong Union paper of Ky.,
that the "peace" speeches of a leading\make\u2013and Seiten Matthias, a young
secessionist, were circulated through the
State, secessionists as being favorably, taking
the peace of their designs.
of Louisville further states that without doubt the above mentioned Kij. Inquiring with a few more of the like stripe has done more harm to the Union cause in Ky. than all the rebel sheets and that state put combined.

A word more and I am done. It is the opinion of good Union men that should the year of the people coincide, in their own with the advocate of those peace meetings there could not be another soldier raised to support the government. This then is the reason for the suppression of those rebel sheets and peace meetings and when any man will advocate and address such meetings, and allow a secession flag to be placed at his window, he must either meddle his way leave the country, or be hung.

Sept. 28th, 1861. Jas. Cadman
No. 1 Junior year. Essay.

[*The allusion is to Dr. J. Bird of Kalorama, who has been democratic, anti-Maine, Lincoln, Lee and finally pro-slavery and anti-Union. A flag of the December hung from his window a few moments one afternoon. It came near receiving violence from our defamed people.]*