

disturbed, nor intended to be disturbed, by the non-committal report made by the committee actually appointed.

It may be asked, Why, after the lapse of more than forty years, seek to disturb an arrangement which is admitted to be the most *comfortable* that could have been made—that is, the one which inflicted the least pain upon individuals? The troops generally were little inconvenienced by the obloquy, and went about their business as unconcernedly as if nothing had happened; whereas, if public censure had been concentrated upon a few powerful party leaders, their wrath and that of their partisans might have thrown the country into an uproar.

It might seem Pharisaical to profess an abstract love of truth, and not imperatively necessary to contend for it as an essential ingredient in history. If works of fiction or parables are written for the purpose of moral instruction, and are found to answer that purpose, why should truth be considered an essential ingredient in history? or why should any more of such a precious ingredient be used than is necessary to give a flavor of probability?

But moral instruction is not the sole object of history, which furnishes, or ought to furnish, valuable lessons in the art of government and art of war, and these lessons can not be so well learned from imaginary events as from a faithful statement of real occurrences. National disasters, too, are often more pregnant with instruction than national successes, and more may sometimes be learned from a defeat well studied than from half a dozen victories; and in this