Background & 1857-1860?

History is change over time

Students seek to understand change and think critically about it.

That means...

Class participation

Exams, with terms, short essays, maps

Two critical writing assignments
The North and the South were vastly different!!

Or were they?

Similarities?

Differences?
### Union vs. Confederate Resources 1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Confederate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>23,000,000</td>
<td>8,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Laborers</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Capital</td>
<td>$850,000,000</td>
<td>$95,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Mileage</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Property</td>
<td>$11,000,000,000</td>
<td>$5,370,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum questions chapters 1-3
National or Regional policies

North—high protective tariff, industrialization

Infrastructure

Coastal navigation (three admirals)

South—lower tariff, mono-crop economy

Local control, not regional or national. Little infrastructure

No true coastal navy—no “Admirals”

Why is tariff a big deal?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of the Union</th>
<th>Advantages of the Confederacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Banking, Factories and ships.</td>
<td>- Trading Relationships with Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More railroads to move supplies, men and equipment.</td>
<td>- Best Military officers (Robert E. Lee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Experienced government.</td>
<td>- They were convinced they were right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Larger population; 22 million to 9 million.</td>
<td>- They were fighting for their lives and on their own soil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Union Disadvantages**

- Less commitment
- Northerners were not in complete agreement over the abolition of slavery.
- Lost most of their good military officers to the South.

**Confederate Disadvantages**

- Their smaller Navy left them at a disadvantage due to the Union blockade.
- Their long coastline, while a benefit in sneaking in supplies was also a detriment in trying to defend it.
- Southern slaves, a large part of the population, were clearly no help.
- Little factory production.
Southern Cannon
Northern “Rodman” Cannon—fired both shot and shell. Had 10, 13, 15, & 20 inch bore. The 20 inch gun fired over 8,000 yards!
Yancey—fire-eater from Alabama. Lost the first diplomatic Opportunity of the South!
In contrast, Gideon Welles would plan ahead, create new ships and the iron sides.

His follow up with the blockade was perfect!
AT WAR & NOT AT WAR: 1857-1859

It was “Ignition” by rhetoric, and by blood!

Presidential Election of 1856—Republicans, nominate John C. Fremont arrogant, elitist, hero of California

Republican platform: “Free speech, free press, free soil, free men”

Democrats warned of civil war—win with Buchanan
James Buchanan, PA—
Rose above Kansas-Nebraska bloodshed because he was out of the country. He was a diplomat and many hoped his skills would be useful.

As Fremont openly condemned the South, anger and rhetoric grew.

He called the south “stagnant” and “backward”

He attacked “slavery”, but also attacked “Slave Power”—whites in the South.

The question is one of “tyranny” Fremont said.

Buchanan
  20 years in House and Senate, and Secretary of State
  Commanding figure who appeared to defer to others
  Likeable, and Americans hoped for the best

Despite his “southern” sympathies, he won enough free states and the South To defeat Fremont 174 to 114 electoral Votes
Army surgeon John Emerson, takes Dred Scott from Missouri, to Illinois...

...then to Minnesota Territory. Scott married a slave also owned by Emerson...

they had a daughter born “free” by the Missouri compromise.

In 1846, white friends of Scott urged him to sue for freedom on the grounds of lengthy residence in a free territory.

This will take eleven years and get national attention!!
In 1850 Scott denied, but wins in a St. Louis re-trial.

1852—Missouri Court overturns and returns Scott to slavery.

These same Missouri courts had previously granted freedom to other slaves, living in “free territories”.

Scott’s owners moved to New York, where lawyers used the Constitutional phrase “diverse-citizenship” meant to settle citizenship issues between the states.
1854, a Missouri circuit court accepted the case thereby affirming his status as a citizen.

But they denied his claim. Scott’s lawyers appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court—dominated by southerners. During the 1856 election year the court held the case over—perhaps because of the national elections.

Three Questions:
1. As a black man was Scott a black man with a right to sue in federal court?
2. Had two years or more in two free territories/states made Scott free?
3. Was Fort Snelling (Minnesota) actually free—meaning did Congress have the right to ban slavery in a territory before it was populated?
An earlier case, Strader v. Graham affirmed that a Kentucky slave taken to free Ohio was not free and should be returned as slave.

The court was leaning towards re-affirming Strader, but arguments became complex...

Northern justices may have threatened to affirm Scott’s freedom via minority reports which would eventually result in a conclusion that blacks had citizenship and that Congress could prohibit slavery in territories.

Many politicians asked for “judicial stewardship” to settle the issue...
Roger B. Taney, 80, was sick, and emotional about the death of his wife and daughter. For 28 years he had defended slavery.

So Q1—were black citizens “negroes” never part of the sovereign people
...not part of “all men”
“They had no rights... as a white man”

Q2—Taney wrote that Scott’s life in free lands—“even if they were free territories” did not make him free.

Q3—Could Congress declare a territory free, or slave?
This composed ½ of the written opinion.
“Congress never had the right to prohibit slavery in territories...
“Slavery was protected as a right of owners under the fifth amendment”
THE RULING BECAME A POLITICAL FOOTBALL

Republicans adopted the dissent

Southerners celebrated

The NY Tribune
“this decision by two slaveholders and two doughfaces..(had the)..moral weight...of a barroom”

Stephen Douglas embraced both sides
“yes” the Scott decision is law..a master has a right to take slaves into any territory...but citizens of a territory could still control slavery”...we debated How??
So, Dred Scott essentially said

“slavery could not ever be excluded”

And then a financial crisis shook the North

1. The Panic of 1857
2. Sectional votes on economic development issues
3. Rising Rhetoric 1857-1859
4. Lincoln Douglas Senate debates 1858
5. Harper’s Ferry & The Revolution of 1860
6. Three months later the Counter-Revolution of 1860
The U.S. had experienced 10 years of expansion

US Banks doubled their assets and loans
Economic expansion caused prices and profits to rise
Railroads alone inserted huge sums into the economy
The growth of textiles favored both N & S
California Gold created new wealth
The western land boom also fostered growth

However, the Crimean War (1854-1856) featured Russia against French, British and Ottoman forces. The war cut off supplies to England and France. And with less food, English and French investors began to tighten their credit to the U.S.

Turns out that most of the loans for U.S. expansion were from Europe.

On August 24, 1857 a New York branch bank suspended payments causing widespread panic. The suspension was due to embezzlement, but depositors made runs on banks and a wave of selling hit the Stock Exchange.

Factories shut down, Railroads went bankrupt, imports fell, immigration fell
The Impact of the Panic was wide spread & influenced the coming of the Civil War.

Several violent demonstrations took place
Northern cities proved capable of handling stimulus and unemployment
Religious revivalism grew

Thanks to California gold the worst was over when the gold arrived in the east and bank payments were resumed.

Democrats blamed big banking and did win over some converts.

Republicans called for Bank oversight, or blamed the lowering of the tariffs.

As reform focused on moving tariffs up, for domestic protection—sectionalism flared.

Several congressional votes showed Southerners against, and Northerners split.

“Congress was .. shamelessly prostituted ...to Slave Power.”
Sectionalism continued with the vote tallies for land grant bills:

Since the 1840s politicians hoped to use the nation’s vast land surplus for political gain.

One bill, the Pacific Railroad Act, would build the transcontinental railroad.

A Homestead Act would virtually give away western lands.

An another would give tracts of land for agricultural and mechanical colleges.

With the Panic of 1857 fresh in the public eye—many hoped for quick resolution of this obvious gift.

But the South was opposed. Reacting to the Homestead idea, one Southern Congressman said:

“Better for us that these territories should remain a waste, a howling wilderness, trod only by hunters...”
It was one thing for the South to bloc issues of slavery, but now they had blocked

Protective Tariffs

The Rail bill

The homestead bills

And land for education

As the Election of 1860 neared it was clear that Northerners might not be unified against slavery...

But they were definitely for the economic reforms held hostage by the South.
Rising rhetoric—both sides

James Hammond, “King Cotton”

George Fitzhugh publishes “Cannibals All” defends slavery

Slaves, "the negro is but a grown up child"...slavery assured security and moral civility

Hinton Rowan Helper, publishes “The Impending Crisis of the South”, angers Southerners everywhere!

...attacks slavery as inefficient and barrier to development—distributed by abolitionists—dedicated to “non-slave-holding-whites”
James Hammond, Senator, South Carolina. March 4, 1858. “King Cotton Speech”

If we never acquire another foot of territory for the South, look at her. Eight hundred and fifty thousand square miles. As large as Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia and Spain.

Is not that territory enough to make an empire that shall rule the world? With the finest soil, the most delightful climate, whose staple productions none of those great countries can grow, we have three thousand miles of continental sea-shore line so indented with bays and crowded with islands, that, when their shore lines are added, we have twelve thousand miles... In addition to this, we sent to the North $30,000,000 worth of cotton, which is not counted in the exports. We sent to her $7 or $8,000,000 worth of tobacco, which is not counted in the exports. We sent naval stores, lumber, rice, and many other minor articles. But the recorded exports of the South now are greater than the whole exports of the United States in any year before 1856...At any time, the South can raise, equip, and maintain in the field, a larger army than any Power of the earth can send against her....

Hammond’s assertion that no one should fight against cotton was a reaction to Northern speeches against the admission of the pro-slave Kansas constitution!
When Hammond commented that the South constitutes the “mudsill” of society he started a theme—the South is essential and the North had better leave it alone.

Virginian George Fitzhugh, wrote *Cannibals All* just as the Panic of 1857 started.

The book call “free labor” a system of cannibalism. Slavery he said was the “natural and normal condition” of life.

Fitzhugh wrote dramatically that free labor must at “all times” work or starve. He called this un-natural. He points out “the slaves are supported whether they work or not”.

Fitzhugh’s argument left open for debate the status of free WHITE labor in the North and South. Pro-slave factions quickly explained that Southerners were superior to Northerners – thus raising the rhetoric more.

The great evil of Northern free society is that is burdened with a servile class...
Rhetoric against the South came from one of its own— Hinton Rowan Helper. A North Carolina “yeomen”. Helper was from a poor white family. He had failed at jobs in his youth, and returned from the California gold mines empty handed.

But he soon became a spokesman for nonslaveholding whites.

Helper wrote that slavery “lies at the root of all evils”...calling slavery “hostile”.

In “The Impending Crisis of the South”, he used selective government data to assert that the hay crop of the North was worth more than the cotton crop of the South.

When he could not publish the book in the South, he got it published in the New York Tribune. Some Southern states passed laws against circulating the book, and it became all the more popular.

Sixty-eight Congressmen endorsed the book, setting off an hysteria.

His words inflamed...

“this entire system of ...despotism...(caused the South to) welter in a cesspool of Ignorance and degradation...”
Hinton Rowan Helper

THE IMPENDING CRISIS OF THE SOUTH

HOW TO MEET IT

Edited by George M. Fredrickson

A John Harvard Library Book
Through December 1859 into January 1860, the U. S. House of Representatives were caught up in a debate over Helper’s book.

John Sherman of Ohio had endorsed it, and he was up for Speaker of the House. Southern representatives were angry.

The House deadlocked after 44 votes, and Sherman withdrew. Nearly every House member wore pistols to meetings.

The rhetoric was clearly impacting politics.
Abraham Lincoln, was nomination for the Senate from Illinois in 1858. At his nomination speech he spoke one of the most famous lines in political history:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved -- I do not expect the house to fall -- but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."
Lincoln Douglas Debates

In 1858 Lincoln had become a spokesman for the new Republican Party, and he was nominated for the U.S. Senate from Illinois—as a challenger to Douglas.

Senators were elected by State legislators—not by direct vote as we do today. This meant that the campaign had to cross the entire state—picking up legislative support.

The two debated at seven different locations.

Lincoln was a successful “property” lawyer, with minimal service in Congress. Douglas was a powerhouse Senator.

Throughout the debates, the nation listened, thanks to telegraph, and they considered the question of slavery—the debates became a symbol of the nation’s attitudes. At one debate a sign appeared—”mud sills for A. Lincoln“ turning Hammond’s argument upside down.

“SMALL-FISTED FARMERS, MUD SILLS OF SOCIETY, GREASY MECHANICS FOR A. LINCOLN”
The Lincoln Douglas Debates were one of the most covered events in American history at the time. Not only did Americans flock to the telegraph. National newspapers had begun to hire “stenographers” who wrote down every word and sent it to the press.

Lincoln was relatively unknown, but Douglas was too well known. His advocacy of the Compromise of 1850; the Kansas-Nebraska Bill; “popular sovereignty”; and the Dred Scott decision placed him at odds with many Illinois voters.
Lincoln Douglas Debates. As the debates begin for the Illinois Senate, Douglas had spoken about the Kansas Lecompton Constitution.

Like many “gaffs” Douglas made a big one. He was quoted as saying he “cared not” whether slavery was voted up or down in Kansas, only that Kansas have a fair vote.

Like so many “sound bites” today, newspapers and Lincoln attacked his “cared not” statement. Lincoln said the cared not attitude had led to evil and the only way to stop them was the election of Republicans who do care.

Lincoln went on to say that Republicans consider “slavery a moral, social, and political wrong.”

During the summer of 1858, this was Lincoln's theme.

Douglas fought back calling Lincoln a “Black Republican” with radical abolitionist ideals that Would destroy the Union.

It was Lincoln who proposed the debates. The sole topic of these seven debates was slavery.
Freeport, IL, August 27, 1858.

In the second debate at Freeport, Lincoln sought to catch Douglas in a classic contradiction.

Lincoln asked if there was “any lawful way” that the people of a territory could exclude slavery if they wished it.

If Douglas answered “NO” he would alienate Illinois voters who wanted to ban slavery. If Douglas answered “YES” he would alienate Southerners and harm his chances for the Presidency in two years.

Douglas answered as he had in previous debates and said “yes”—it became known as the “Freeport doctrine.”
Tuesday, September 14, 1858.
Yesterday forenoon, there was a rousing meetings at Mattoon, to hear "Old Abe" on the great questions of the day. ..there were more than a thousand men present, – if not 1500. Douglas had about 200 or less, to hear him try to "make snakes" and fail. The Kentuckians in Coles are now for Lincoln to a man. He opened their eyes to the thimble riggery of the Little Dodger. Lincoln was frank, eloquent, and convincing – he carried the popular heart by acclamation.
– Chicago Press.
FRIDAY, OCT. 1, 1858.

The Little Giant [Douglas], in addition to his other merits, is said to be as brave as a lion, and his "bravery" in opposing the Administration is lauded to the skies. Little Giant asks a re-election; he goes through the State to let the people know what principles he professes. And what is the ground upon which he asks the support of freemen? It is nothing more nor less than his ability to kick a nigger.

... our Little – oh, how little – Giant exercises the immense powers of his mind in abusing them

Harsh satire from the “Weekly North-Western Gazette”
1. The Republican party hold that the Constitution of the United States does not recognize property in slaves.

2. The National Democracy stand by the Dred Scott decision which asserts that the Constitution recognizes slaves as property.

3. The Douglas party admit the authority and binding force of the Dred Scott decision; that slaves are recognized as property by the Constitution; that neither Congress nor a Territorial legislature can exclude slavery from a Territory – but still claim that the people of a Territory may evade their constitutional obligations, and deny it the protection of local law, without which they assert it cannot exist. This is truly Douglas like! Equivocal and sneaking.

Anti-Douglas editorial
More Debates

As the debates continued, Lincoln made the mistake of admitting he felt blacks were created equal.

Douglas attacked, and branded Lincoln with the race issue.

Douglas said...if you desire “them” to vote, then vote for Mr. Lincoln.

“them” of course referred to African Americans, free or slave.

Confronted several times Lincoln, was applauded in Charleston when he said...

“I am not, nor have I ever been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races.”

And later, Lincoln was forced by Douglas to admit that he had no intent

“to interfere with slavery where it exists...”
Who Won??

Douglas made many points. He won the Senate seat. But, Douglas used the “race” card to attack Lincoln.

Lincoln made a name for himself!

And he would be ready for 1860...

...economic development

...stop the expansion of salvery
JOHN BROWN AGAIN

1857--Freshly famous. Brown grows a beard to disguise himself, but he is not pursued.

Brown’s friend Franklin Sanborn, secretary for the Massachusetts state “Kansas Committee” introduces Brown to wealthy Boston abolitionists.

They form the “Secret Six”.
In 1858, Brown attacks two pro-slavery homesteads and liberates eleven slaves. He travels 82 days to take the slaves to Canada.


August 16 he meets in secret with Frederick Douglass. Douglass refuses to join Brown. October 16, Brown attacks

News and fear spread immediately via fliers like this one.
On October 16, 1859, a group of raiders led by John Brown attacked the United States Armory at Harpers Ferry, (West) Virginia.

After a day of fighting with the local militia, John Brown and his men took refuge in a building that housed the armory’s fire engines. On October 18, 1859, U.S. Marines under the leadership of Colonel Robert E. Lee stormed the engine house where the raiders were hiding and took them into custody.
From Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper, November 5, 1859
From *Harper’s Weekly Magazine*, November 5, 1859
From Harper’s Weekly, November 12, 1859
The trial of John Brown began on October 27, 1859. Four days later, on October 31, the jury found Brown guilty of treason against the Commonwealth of Virginia, inciting slaves to rebel and murder. He was sentenced to hang on December 2, 1859. The other men captured in the raid were also put on trial and faced a similar fate.
On December 2, 1859, Brown wrote:

I, John Brown, am now quite certain that the crimes of this guilty land will never be purged away but with blood. I had, as I now think, vainly flattered myself that without very much bloodshed it might be done."
On December 2, 1859, under heavy military guard John Brown was hanged on the Hunter Farm outside of Charles Town, (West) Virginia.
JOHN BROWN IN HIS Coffin—"His mouth was partly open and his eyes somewhat protruded from their sockets."
If John Brown did not end the war that ended slavery, he did at least begin the war that ended slavery.... Until this blow was struck, the prospect for freedom was dim, shadowy and uncertain.

Frederick Douglass, 1881
Conclusions.

Moving away from land issues...to...

Violence

And bitterness

Tuesday, complete through chapter Nine, we’ll cover Election of 1860 and the aftermath.

Also review for the test.