

over the other classes. The aristocratic training of the South also gave them power, because it taught the masses to place in their hands all political control. Before the war, therefore, the South was an aristocracy in fact though not, perhaps, in name. To an observer, our country presented the appearance of two confederated nations rather than of a true federal union. The sectional differences were so strongly marked and so antagonistic, that there was continual clashing between the rival parties. Under such circumstances even comparative harmony could not long continue. It was evident, that either one section or the other must finally submit to the overthrow of its social fabric, or that our country must fall to pieces.

Slavery was the chief cause of discord. The institution was upheld by the South as the corner-stone of its aristocratic fabric; but it was opposed by the North. Though it was inconsistent with our free institutions, and was doomed, in case of their further success, to extirpation, yet the South thought its cotton industry would be ruined should slavery cease. The South, therefore, watched over this institution with a most jealous eye, and beheld with indignation the progressive efforts of abolitionists. This and the other social and political questions with which the two sections were at variance, all contributed to mutual suspicion and distrust. This was shown by the direction of the great lines of railroad. These ran East and West, not North and South.

Mr. Henry C. Cary, in an interview with President Lincoln, expressed the opinion that had the North and South been as firmly linked together by railroads as were the East and West, the war could scarcely have happened. Mr. Lincoln agreed with him. Now this lack of intercommunication caused false ideas of each other. This state of things was exaggerated and misrepresented by the extreme partisans of both sections. Their efforts were very successful, for they fanned the coals of mutual distrust into a flame of fierce hostility.

As to war itself, we need not speak. Its result is well enough known, and let us now, in conclusion, briefly view the condition of the South since the war. Many of us have impressions, more or less false, regarding that section as it is to-day. This is little to be wondered at, owing to the diligence with which the issues of the war have, for low political ends, been kept alive. Those who berate the South scorn to affiliate with the whites of that section. They seem to regard them, if not as a subjugated people, at least as one scarcely to be entrusted with the right of suffrage. They denounce them as fire-eaters, in whom the spirit of rebellion still lingers in full strength.

Now as to this alleged rebellious spirit, these questions are pertinent: Are the southern people superhuman? Can they reasonably be expected to drop at once, views that have ever ruled them? Is it in accordance with human nature for a vanquished people to feel otherwise than downcast and sullen? Notwithstanding all this, very many of the southern whites have accepted the result of the war in good spirit. They reason in the words of Gen. Longstreet: "We have made a square stand-up fight; we have been beaten, and now let us make the best of it." No doubt there is yet a rebellious element in the South, but that it predominates we do not believe. If it did, that section would be another Mexico or Cuba. A barking dog, it is said, never bites. In like manner, the malicious partisan, whether he be Northern copper-head or Southern fire-eater, is little to be feared. He may howl very loudly, but when danger comes, he slinks away into a corner like a whipped cur.

If the South shows no more moderation it is not to be wondered at. It has suffered much from many sources. One of these was the sudden emancipation of the slaves. Their liberation, justice demanded, yet the very abruptness of the act, which the war made inevitable, was the cause of untold mischief. Three millions of degraded bondmen were at once invest-