was settled on mere demonstrations. Nor do I doubt it to know — I saw exceedingly young to learn what practical wisdom the gentleman had in view — how shall the Camps of
our forefathers in their struggle for freedom? Meeting the Camp of Kinderhook — the de
Blauwe, or Yorktown? Or was it the gentleman's inconsiderate eagerness — this
sacredness in the war's peculiar character of the defenders of our? Moreover in the
Camps to which the gentleman alluded I at what time they knew they had the existence of
one thing? As I am sure — at the Centre of liberty and not dissent with such a body
of people as the gentleman has dictated — the idea are entirely incompatible. What is it?
A free people invest their Commanders with almost incomparable dignity and let them
silence, say in imitation of his virtue and in imitation! If our Commanders would thus
inspire the people, as the military respect the national character, if they could thus
inspire the RightFULLNESS, which they are trusted to use, the words of the gentleman "speak
their authority merely for the purpose of exhibiting its extent & latitude", if the
Camps were to bring out the protection of corruption — the right of speaking
— unpalatable to the gentlemen has no cachet — to him we must not see
part of national defence serve but to check and animale the free — then it is of
true would our countrymen be more noble, complete, powerful. And we can
ever have been successful, our flag has never reared high or on the breach of freedom and
our enemies have ever been taught that liberty, economy, patriotism and the guarding
our Camps. And it is a well known fact, as my colleague he said, at the military
is strictly subservient to civil authority — constituted by it and answerable to it for
very slight power. And can it be supposed that we could entrust an individual,
with whom would paint him

"Make no Compromise — terrible as he is, with the Com
mand of an Army or those efficiency, the word is nothing but in the hand of a 10 or 15
meeting of five people were itent."

"Cannot think with the gentleman that this ex
gement is a "confirmation, a principle of King in Britain" and hence in the
argument of the gentleman that it is one and we are to teach to mutual char
acter, and the affairs of civil government — they are to his de
ing in the life and death of people. When the reports of their lives and fortunes of 14 millions of free people are in imminent sea
where their reputation of centuries and dearness is open to assault — violence
and ruin when all that is dear to freedom is at stake, then we
report upon hope and confidence in the wisdom, judgment, & patriotism
of a Commander & deep brooke while he fights our battles. But when victory
by those who seek peace & independence restored to an enemy, we con
sign him to retirement & a peace upon both sides. The highest hor
not in our gift — to "twice the sword" in another hand. In what form for this is
see the logic of this? Why compounding the argument of the gentleman
it will readily occur, that the very identity must endure a radical reso