Events Leading to the Civil War
Vocabulary

Look each word up in your textbook. Many words can be found in the glossary. You may also have to look some up using the index. Write the definition or an explanation of each term below. Illustrate the term. Each illustration should include color.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrate</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/5 Compromise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sectionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fugitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Slave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law of 1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrate</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle Tom's Cabin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Rescue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Nebraska Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dred Scott Case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown's raid on Harpers Ferry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglass Debates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of 1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Events/Roots leading up to the Civil War

Three Fifths Compromise:
Should enslaved persons be counted in the population?

Northern States

Southern States

Three Fifths Compromise:

Industrialization:

**Cotton Production**

Source: Historical Statistics of the United States

**Slave Population**

Source: Historical Statistics of the United States
20.2 Confronting the Issue of Slavery

A traveler, heading west across the Appalachians after the War of 1812, wrote, “Old America seems to be breaking up and moving westward.” It was true. By 1819, restless settlers had formed seven new states west of the Appalachians.

Congress had established a process for forming new states in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Besides outlining the steps leading to statehood, this law also banned slavery north of the Ohio River. As a result, the three western states that were formed north of the river—Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois—were free states. The four states that were formed south of the Ohio River—Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Mississippi—all permitted slavery.

In 1819, Alabama and Missouri applied to Congress for statehood as slave states. No one in Congress questioned admitting Alabama as a slave state. Alabama was located far south of the Ohio River, and was surrounded by other slave states.

Congress had another reason for admitting Alabama with no debate. For years there had been an unspoken agreement in Congress to keep the number of slave states and free states equal. The admission of Illinois as a free state in 1818 had upset this balance. By accepting Alabama with slavery, Congress was able to restore the balance between slave and free states.

Missouri, however, was another matter.

Questions about Missouri Some northerners in Congress questioned whether Missouri should also be admitted as a slave state. Most of Missouri, they observed, lay north of the point where the Ohio River flows into the Mississippi. On the eastern side of the Mississippi, slavery was banned north of that point. Shouldn’t the same ban also be applied west of the Mississippi?

This question led to another one. If Missouri was allowed to enter the Union as a slave state, some asked, what would keep slavery from spreading across all of the Louisiana Territory? The vision of a block of new slave states stretching from the Mississippi to the Rocky Mountains was enough to give some northerners nightmares.

The Tallmadge Amendment When the bill to make Missouri a state came before Congress, Representative James Tallmadge of New York decided to keep that nightmare from coming true. Tallmadge proposed an amendment to the statehood bill. The amendment said that Missouri could join the Union, but only as a free state.

Southerners in Congress greeted Tallmadge’s amendment with a roar of protest. What right, they
asked, did Congress have to decide whether a new state should be slave or free? That decision, they said, belonged to the people of each state, not Congress.

A Deadlocked Congress  Southerners’ protests were based on their fear that if Congress was allowed to end slavery in Missouri, it might try to end slavery elsewhere. The North already had more votes in the House of Representatives than the South. Only in the Senate did the two sections have equal voting power. As long as the number of free states and slave states remained equal, southern senators could defeat any attempt to interfere with slavery. But if Missouri entered the Union as a free state, the South would lose its power to block anti-slavery bills in the Senate. If that happened, southerners warned, it would be a disaster for the South.

In the North, the Tallmadge Amendment awakened strong feelings against slavery. Many towns sent petitions, or formal written requests, to Congress, condemning slavery as immoral and unconstitutional. The petitions called on Congress to stop the spread of this evil. Arguing in favor of the amendment, New Hampshire representative Arthur Livermore spoke for many northerners when he said:

An opportunity is now presented to prevent the growth of a sin which sits heavy on the soul of every one of us. By embracing this opportunity, we may retrieve the national character and, in some degree our own. But if we suffer [allow] it to pass…let us at least be consistent, and declare that our Constitution was made to impose slavery, and not to establish liberty.

The House voted to approve the Tallmadge Amendment. In the Senate, however, southerners were able to defeat it. The two houses were now deadlocked over the issue of slavery in Missouri. They would remain so as the 1819 session of Congress drew to a close.

An auctioneer holds a baby during a slave auction, while the child’s mother begs not to be separated from her child. Scenes like this fueled the moral outrage many felt toward slavery.
20.3 The Missouri Compromise

When Congress returned to Washington in 1820, it took up the question of Missouri statehood once again. By then, the situation had changed, for Maine was now asking to enter the Union as a free state.

For weeks, Congress struggled to find a way out of its deadlock over Missouri. As the debate dragged on and tempers wore thin, southerners began using such dreaded words as "secession" and "civil war."

"If you persist," Thomas Cobb of Georgia warned supporters of the amendment, "the Union will be dissolved. You have kindled a fire which only a sea of blood can extinguish."

"If disunion must take place, let it be so!" thundered Tallmadge in reply. "If civil war must come, I can only say, let it come."

A Compromise Is Reached

Rather than risk the breakup of the Union, Congress finally agreed to a compromise crafted by Representative Henry Clay of Kentucky. The compromise admitted Missouri to the Union as a slave state and Maine as a free state. In this way, it maintained the balance of power between slave and free states.

At the same time, Congress drew an imaginary line across the Louisiana Territory at latitude 36°30'. North of this line, slavery was to be banned forever, except in Missouri. South of the line, slaveholding was permitted.

Reactions to the Compromise

The Missouri Compromise kept the Union together. But it pleased no one. In the North, Congressmen who voted to accept Missouri as a slave state were called traitors. In the South, slaveholders deeply resented the ban on slavery in part of the Louisiana Territory.

Meanwhile, as Secretary of State John Quincy Adams recognized, the compromise had not settled the future of slavery in the United States as a whole. "I have favored this Missouri compromise, believing it to be all that could be effected [accomplished] under the present Constitution, and from extreme unwillingness to put the Union at hazard [risk]," wrote Adams in his diary. "If the Union must be dissolved, slavery is precisely the question on which it ought to break. For the present, however, the contest is laid asleep."
By 1819 sections of the U.S. began pulling apart. Why? New developments, such as
1) westward expansion,
2) the rise of King Cotton in the South, and
3) an economic depression that created conflicting economic and political interests in the North, South, and West.

Each section wanted national laws favoring its economy. Conflicts arose because a law benefiting one section might harm another.

By inference you can see the logical consequences: Conflicting economic interests led to political rivalry, as each section wanted strong congressional representation to carry the vote for its economic interests.

Forty years of sectional rivalry led to the Civil War (1861-65). To unravel the causes of the War, let's tune in to what each section wanted.

Today I am interviewing 3 key persons on sectional issues, with me in the studio are a Western farmer, a Southern planter, and a Northern industrialist. They will explain their preferences on each issue below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>WESTERN FARMER</th>
<th>SOUTHERN PLANTER</th>
<th>NORTHERN INDUSTRIALIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW PRICES—to aid settlement by small farmers</td>
<td>LOW PRICES—1) to encourage westward expansion of slavery; 2) to expand cotton farming by replacing worn-out farm land</td>
<td>HIGH PRICES—to discourage westward migration of northeastern labor force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE LABOR (no slaves)—to avoid job competition on farms from cheap slave labor</td>
<td>SLAVE LABOR—to do the hard, non-wage work of producing cotton, the South's white gold</td>
<td>FREE LABOR (no slaves)—to provide a skilled work force for business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High Tariff—With revenue used to build roads, bridges, and canals for shipping western farm products to eastern markets

Low Tariff—1) to export raw farm products on favorable terms, and 2) to keep down cost of buying manufactured goods

High Tariff—to protect manufactured goods from being undersold by foreign competitors

Tariff Wall

For Internal Improvements (roads, bridges, canals)—to create eastern market for farm goods

Against Internal Improvements—to avoid large government expenditures which might require a higher tariff to refill the treasury

For Internal Improvements—to create western market for manufactured goods

That new road will help me market my manufactured items.

Soft (or "cheap") Money—paper money not backed by specie (gold), thus in large supply, of less worth, and easier for debtor farmers to obtain

Soft Money—Farmers (agrarians) often were in debt because crop markets were unpredictable. They liked paying their debts with cheap, inflated dollars, but their creditors didn't like it. Can you figure out why?

Hard Money—paper money backed by specie—Northern businessmen often were creditors (lenders). To get their dollars' worth, they wanted debts repaid in hard, sound money (backed by gold)—not soft, cheap, inflated money.

With these inflated dollars we can pay off our mortgage.

Tall the bottom line of these sectional economicviews, and you quickly see that the North and South differed on all five issues. This caused a political power struggle between the free labor states of the North and the slave labor states of the South. The section controlling the federal government would set economic policies, such as tariffs, that would affect the very livelihood of the other. Political power, then, became crucial to economic interests.

By 1861 the political power struggle between North and South would lead to the Civil War.
Define: Sectionalism -

In each region, summarize how the people felt about the following issues. Western Land, Tariffs, Labor, Internal Improvements, Money.
20.5 The Compromise of 1850

On January 21, 1850, Henry Clay, now a senator from Kentucky, trudged through a Washington snowstorm to pay an unexpected call on Senator Daniel Webster of Massachusetts. Clay, the creator of the Missouri Compromise, had come up with a plan to end the deadlock over California. But to get his plan through Congress, Clay needed Webster’s support.

Something for Everyone Clay’s new compromise had something to please just about everyone. It began by admitting California to the Union as a free state. That would please the North. Meanwhile, New Mexico and Utah would be organized as territories open to slavery, which would please the South.

In addition, Clay’s plan ended the slave trade in Washington, D.C. Although slaveholders in Washington would be able to keep their slaves, human beings would no longer be bought and sold in the nation’s capital. Clay and Webster agreed that this compromise would win support from abolitionists without threatening the rights of slaveholders.

Finally, Clay’s plan called for passage of a strong fugitive slave law. Slaveholders had long wanted such a law, which would make it easier to find and reclaim their runaway slaves.

The Compromise is Accepted Hoping that Clay’s compromise would end the crisis, Webster agreed to help push it through Congress. But despite his support, Congress debated Clay’s proposals for nine frustrating months. As tempers frayed, southerners talked of simply leaving the Union peacefully.

Webster dismissed such talk as foolish. “Secession! Peaceable secession!” he exclaimed. “Your eyes and mine are never destined to see that miracle.... I see it as plainly as I see the sun in heaven—I see that secession must produce such a war as I will not describe.”

A war over slavery? That was something few Americans wanted to face. In September 1850, Congress finally adopted Clay’s plan.

Most Americans were happy to see the crisis end. Some southerners, however, remained wary of the Compromise of 1850. A North Carolina newspaper warned the North to “let this question of Slavery alone, take it out and keep it out of Congress; and respect and enforce the Fugitive Slave Law as it stands. If not, we leave you!”

The Compromise of 1850 admitted California as a free state and allowed the southwestern territories to be set up with no restriction on slavery.
**Section 2  The Compromise of 1850**

**Vocabulary**
- secede: to withdraw from an organization, country or political party
- civil war: a war between people of the same country
- fugitive: runaway

**Summary**

The issue of slavery became important again in 1850. At that time, California requested to join the Union as a free state. If California were accepted, the North would gain control of the Senate. Southerners threatened to secede from the Union. Henry Clay, known as "the Great Compromiser," tried to avoid civil war and save the Union again. His Compromise of 1850 helped the two sides reach agreement—but only for a short time. (See chart.)

One key part of the Compromise of 1850 was the Fugitive Slave Act. This law required every American citizen to help catch fugitive slaves. This law pleased southerners but upset antislavery northerners. Northerners who believed that slavery was wrong did not like being forced to help slave owners. As a result, tensions over slavery remained high.

In 1852, Harriet Beecher Stowe wrote a book called *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Stowe told the story of Tom, a kind and religious slave who is treated cruelly. Many northerners read this powerful book. It persuaded more people that slavery was wrong and must be ended. Within a short time, the book sold millions of copies and was translated into many languages. But, despite its popularity, most southerners objected to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. They said it did not give an accurate picture of slave life.

---

**The Compromise of 1850**

- California joins the Union as a free state.
- New Mexico and Utah use popular sovereignty to decide the question of slavery.
- Slave trading is banned in the nation's capital, Washington, D.C.
- The Fugitive Slave Law is passed.
- The border between Texas and New Mexico is set.

---

1. Why did slavery become an issue in 1850?

2. Name two parts of the Compromise of 1850.
Compromise of 1850

Can California enter the United States as a free state even though some of the land in the state of California lies south of 36 30’?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1 California allowed:</th>
<th>#2 Mexican Cession:</th>
<th>#3 Slave trade:</th>
<th>#4 Strict new Fugitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Compromise of 1850

![Map of the United States showing territories and states in 1850]

Free State or Territory
Slave State or Territory
Territory Open to Slavery

Fugitive Slave Law of 1850:
Does everyone have to help catch runaway slaves?

This made Northerners ________ because it mad them feel they were part of the slave system.
Jerry Rescue
The Post Standard

No event captured that defiance better than the rescue of William "Jerry" Henry on October 1, 1851.

The year before, Congress had passed the Fugitive Slave Act, making it a crime for anyone in any state to help a slave escape punishable by six months in prison and a $1,000-dollar fine.

The law was enacted "because of places like Syracuse," said Douglas V. Armstrong, chairman of the anthropology department at SU. "Syracuse is actually mentioned in the Congressional Record of the time. You had people, escaped slaves by the hundreds, making their way to Syracuse."

"Why?"

"Because if they made it to Syracuse, they made it to freedom. Because nobody was taken back into slavery from Syracuse."

Jerry nearly was.

Originally called "William Henry" after his white father, Jerry had fled slavery in Missouri around 1843 and come to Syracuse. He was working as a barrel and cabinet maker when arrested, at the request of a Missouri slave hunter, by federal marshal on October 1, 1851. It was bad timing.

The year Congress made it a crime to aid fugitive slaves, Syracuse formed a bicameral vigilance committee and pledged: "No fugitive can be taken from our midst."

Now, a year later the city was crowded with abolitionists at a Liberty Party Convention. When a church bell signaled a fugitive's capture, a crowd gathered outside the Townsend Block Building at Water and Clinton streets. At a break in the hearing, Jerry, in handcuffs, was rushed out the door. Recaptured by city police, he was slapped in leg irons and jailed.

Gerrit Smith, Jermain Loguen, Samuel May, and others planned a rescue. Smith said a forcible one would "demonstrate the strength of public opinion against the possible legality of slavery and this Fugitive Slave Law in particular. It will honor Syracuse and be a powerful example everywhere."

The abolitionists backed by a crowd estimated at 2,000 used a battering ram to smash into police headquarters, where jailers let him be taken. He was taken from the city to Mexico in Oswego County and eventually into Canada. He died of tuberculosis in Kingston, Ontario, in 1853.

Eighteen were indicted in the "Jerry Rescue" plot. Most fled to Canada for a while. Only Enoch Reel, a black laborer, was convicted. He fell ill and died while his case was under appeal. For years, the city annually celebrated Jerry Rescue Day on Oct. 1. A monument now stands in Clinton Square.

Not all celebrated, just as not all supported the rescue or the abolitionists.

Syracuse, too, had its pro-slavery side. Many considered the Jerry Rescue an outrage against law and order; they held a rally and 677 signed a petition denouncing the "Jerry Riot."

In 1860, a pro-slavery mob drove anti-slavery conventioners from a Syracuse meeting hall. They burned effigies of May, a founder of the American Antislavery Society, who often harbored fugitives in his home, and Susan B Anthony in the streets of downtown.

The rescue was important in itself, but scholars say its greater significance was as a symbol of the deep and widespread anti-slavery sentiment in Central New York.

What fired this abolitionist zeal?

SU's Sennett says it likely sprang from the religious revivalism that swept the area in the 1820s and '30s. Sparked by Utica lawyer-turned-preacher Charles Finney, whom Sennett described as "10 Billy Gravams rolled into one," the revivalist spirit burned so hot here. The stretch from Utica to Rochester was nicknamed the "Burned Over District."

How did the Fugitive Slave law affect our local history?
20.6 The Compromise Satisfies No One

Clay and Webster hoped that the Compromise of 1850 would quiet the slavery controversy for years to come. In fact, it satisfied almost no one. Instead of quieting down, the debate grew louder each year.

The Fugitive Slave Law

Both sides were unhappy with the Fugitive Slave Law, though for different reasons. Northerners did not want to enforce the law. Southerners felt the law did not do enough to ensure the return of their escaped property.

Under the Fugitive Slave Law, any person arrested as a runaway slave had almost no legal rights. Many runaways fled to Canada rather than risk being caught and sent back to their masters. Others decided to stand and fight. Reverend Jarman Loguen, a former slave living in New York, said boldly, “I don’t respect this law—I don’t fear it—I won’t obey it...I will not live like a slave, and if force is employed to reenslave me, I shall make preparations to meet the crisis as becomes a man.”

The Fugitive Slave Law also said that any person who helped a slave escape, or even refused to aid slave catchers, could be jailed. This provocation, complained New England poet Ralph Waldo Emerson, made “slave catchers of us all.”

Opposition to the law was widespread in the North. When slave catchers came to Boston, they were hounded by crowds of angry citizens shouting, “Slave hunters—there go the slave hunters.” After a few days of this treatment, most slave catchers decided to leave.

Northerners’ refusal to support the law infuriated slaveholders. It also made enforcement of the law almost impossible. Of the tens of thousands of fugitives living in the North during the 1850s, only 299 were captured and returned to their owners.

Harriet Stowe’s Vision

On a wintry Sunday morning in 1851, Harriet Beecher Stowe was sitting in church when a horrifying vision played across her eyes. Stowe raced home and scribbled down what she had seen. Then she gathered her children around her and read what she had written.

Her vision began with a saintly slave known as Uncle Tom and his cruel master, Simon Legree. In a furious rage, Legree had the old slave whipped to death. Just before Uncle Tom’s soul slipped out of his bloodied body, he opened his eyes and whispered to Legree, “Ye poor miserable critter! There ain’t no more ye can do. I forgive ye, with all my soul!”
When she had finished reading, Stowe’s son cried out, “Oh Mama! Slavery is the cruelest thing in the world.”

**Uncle Tom’s Cabin** The scene of the old slave’s death became part of a much longer story entitled *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. The story was first published in installments in an abolitionist newspaper. In one issue, readers shared the pain of Uncle Tom’s first owner, a kind slaveholder named Colonel Shelby. Unable to pay his debts, Shelby was forced to sell Uncle Tom away from his family. The cruelty of this action drove Shelby’s wife to cry out, “This is God’s curse on slavery! I was a fool to think I could make anything good out of such a deadly evil.”

In a later issue, terrified readers held their breath as the beautiful slave Eliza chose to risk death rather than be sold away from her young son. Chased by slave hunters and their dogs, Eliza dashed to freedom across the ice-choked Ohio River, clutching her child in her arms.

Later still, Stowe’s readers found themselves weeping as Uncle Tom met his death at the hands of Simon Legree. By this time, most of them agreed with Stowe’s son that slavery was the cruelest thing in the world.

In 1852, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* was published as a novel. Plays based on the book toured the country, thrilling audiences with Eliza’s dramatic escape to freedom. No other work had ever aroused such powerful emotions about slavery. In the South, the novel and its author were scorned and cursed. In the North, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* turned millions of people against slavery.

**The Kansas-Nebraska Act** Early in 1854, Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois introduced a bill in Congress that would have far-reaching consequences. Douglas had no intention of opening up another painful debate on slavery. He simply wanted to get a railroad built to California. This was more likely to happen, he thought, if Congress organized the Great Plains into the Nebraska Territory and opened it to settlers. Because this territory lay north of the Missouri Compromise line, his bill said nothing about slavery.

Perhaps no other novel in American history has had the political impact of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. Upon meeting author Harriet Beecher Stowe, Abraham Lincoln said, “So you’re the little woman who wrote the book that made this great war.”
Southerners in Congress agreed to support Douglas's bill if he made a few changes. His final bill created two new territories, Kansas and Nebraska. It also scrapped the Missouri Compromise by leaving it up to the settlers themselves to decide what to do about slavery in the two territories. In other words, the bill opened the territories to slavery, provided voters approved. Douglas called this policy "popular sovereignty," or rule by the people.

Douglas's Kansas-Nebraska Act hit the North like a thunderbolt. Once again, northerners were haunted by nightmare visions of slavery marching across the plains. Douglas tried to calm their fears by saying that the climates of Kansas and Nebraska were not suited to slave labor. But when northerners studied maps, they were not so sure. Newspaper editor Horace Greeley charged in the New York Tribune:

_The pretense of Douglas & Co. that not even Kansas is to be made a slave state by his bill is a gag [joke]. Ask any Missourian what he thinks about it. The Kansas Territory...is bounded in its entire length by Missouri, with a whole tier of slave counties leaning against it. Won't be a slave state!...Gentlemen! Don't lie any more!_

**Bloodshed in Kansas** After the Kansas-Nebraska Act was passed, settlers poured into Kansas. Most were peaceable farmers looking for fertile soil. Some settlers, however, moved to Kansas either to support or to oppose slavery. In the South, towns took up collections to send their young men to Kansas. In the North, abolitionists raised money to send weapons to anti-slavery settlers. Before long, Kansas had two competing governments, one for slavery and one against it.

The struggle over slavery soon turned violent. On May 21, 1856, pro-slavery settlers and "border ruffians" from Missouri invaded Lawrence, Kansas, the home of the anti-slavery government. The invaders burned a hotel, looted several homes, and tossed the presses of two abolitionist newspapers into the Kaw River. As the invaders left Lawrence, one of them boasted, "Gentlemen, this is the happiest day of my life."

The raid on Lawrence provoked a wave of outrage in the North. Money was quickly raised to replace the destroyed presses. And more "free-soilers," as the anti-slavery settlers were called, prepared to move to Kansas.

Meanwhile, a fiery abolitionist named John Brown plotted his own revenge. Two days after the Lawrence raid, Brown and seven followers,
including four of Brown’s sons and his son-in-law, invaded the pro-slavery town of Pottawatomie. There they dragged five men they suspected of supporting slavery from their homes and hacked them to death with swords.

**Violence in Congress** The violence in Kansas greatly disturbed Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts. To Sumner, it was proof of what he had long suspected—that Senator Stephen Douglas had plotted with southerners to make Kansas a slave state.

In 1856, Sumner voiced his suspicions in a passionate speech entitled “The Crime against Kansas.” Using harsh, shocking language, Sumner described the “crime against Kansas” as a violent assault on an innocent territory, “compelling it to the hateful embrace of slavery.” He dismissed Douglas as “a noisome [offensive], squat, and nameless animal.” Sumner also heaped abuse on many southerners, including the distinguished Senator Andrew P. Butler of South Carolina.

Just what Sumner hoped to accomplish was not clear. However, copies of his speech were quickly printed up for distribution in the North. After reading it, New England poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow congratulated Sumner on the “brave and noble speech you made, never to die out in the memories of men.”

Certainly it was not about to die out in the memories of enraged southerners. Two days after the speech, Senator Butler’s nephew, South Carolina representative Preston Brooks, attacked Sumner in the Senate, beating him with his cane until it broke in half. By the time other senators could pull Brooks away, Sumner had collapsed, unconscious and bloody.

Reactions to the attack on Sumner showed how badly divided the country had become. Many southerners applauded Brooks for defending the honor of his family and the South. From across the South, supporters sent Brooks new canes to replace the one he had broken on Sumner’s head. Pro-slavery men from Missouri on their way to Lawrence, the “Free Soil” capital of Kansas. These “border ruffians” used violence and threats to frighten anti-slavery citizens.
Most northerners viewed the beating as another example of southern brutality. In their eyes, Brooks was no better than the pro-slavery bullies who had attacked the good people of Lawrence. One Connecticut student was so upset that she wrote to Sumner about going to war. "I don't think it is of very much use to stay any longer in the high school," she wrote. "The boys would be better learning to hold muskets, and the girls to make bullets."

**The Dred Scott Case** In 1857, the slavery controversy shifted from the bloodied floor of Congress to the Supreme Court. The Court was about to decide a case concerning a Missouri slave named Dred Scott. Years earlier, Scott had traveled with his owner to Wisconsin, where slavery was banned by the Missouri Compromise. Upon his return to Missouri, Scott went to court to win his freedom. He argued that his stay in Wisconsin had made him a free man.

There were nine justices on the Supreme Court in 1857. Five of them, including Chief Justice Roger Taney, were from the South. Four were from the North. The justices had two key questions to decide. First, as a slave, was Dred Scott a citizen who had the right to bring a case before a federal court? Second, did his time in Wisconsin make him a free man?

Taney, however, hoped to use the *Scott* case to settle the slavery controversy once and for all. And so he asked the Court to consider two more questions: Did Congress have the power to make any laws at all concerning slavery in the territories? And, if so, was the Missouri Compromise a constitutional use of that power?
Justify Your Answer!

Kansas-Nebraska Act 1854

Agree or Disagree with the following statement:

“Compromises over slavery were destined to fail because Southerners were fighting for more than slavery; they were trying to preserve a way of life”
THE BEATING OF CHARLES SUMNER

DIRECTIONS: Read the story; then answer the questions at the end.

Charles Sumner was a senator from Massachusetts who was known for his fiery speeches. He became famous in 1856 when one of his speeches resulted in Sumner's being beaten on the floor of the Senate.

Being from the North, Sumner favored an end to slavery. He felt that slaveowners in the South were wicked and cruel, and he often said so. On May 19, 1856, Sumner began a long, angry speech about the need to end slavery in America. He talked for two days. In his speech, Sumner spoke very badly about senators from the South. One of the senators he picked on was Andrew Butler of South Carolina, who was absent at the time.

Preston Brooks, a representative from South Carolina and Butler's nephew, read the speech and decided to get even with Sumner. On May 22, Brooks stormed into the Senate chamber and found Sumner working at his desk. Before the Northern senator could stand, Brooks clubbed him over the head with a large walking cane. Sumner fell to the floor, but Brooks kept swinging. The Southerner did not stop beating the forty-five-year-old Sumner until the cane broke. Brooks was removed from the Senate chamber as Sumner lay bloody on the floor.

Sumner went home to Massachusetts to rest. He was hurt so badly that he did not return to Washington for three years, but he was not replaced in the Senate. Instead, his chair sat empty to serve as a reminder of the attack on a Northerner by a Southerner. The House of Representatives tried to expel Brooks for his actions but failed. Brooks then resigned from the House. He was soon reelected to his seat by the people of South Carolina, who thought of Brooks as a hero. Many people sent him gifts, including several walking canes. Sumner later returned to the Senate and worked until 1874, when he died of a heart attack.

Answer the following questions about the story.

1. After each man's name, write the state that he represented in Congress.

   Brooks __________ ; Butler __________ ; Sumner __________

2. In what year was Charles Sumner born? ____________________________

3. Why did Brooks attack Sumner? ____________________________

4. What might be a reason that Brooks resigned from the House of Representatives?

   ____________________________
THE BEATING OF CHARLES SUMNER

DIRECTIONS: In drawing 1, write a sentence or two that Charles Sumner might have said in his speech against Southerners and slavery. Drawing 2 will be your own cartoon of Sumner and Brooks just before, during, or just after the beating.

1. Speeches by congressmen given in the Capitol Building are all recorded in the ________________________________ . (U.S. Constitution, Congressional Record, Bill of Rights, U.S. Patent Office)

2. Name the two United States senators from your state. ____________________________________________

3. Do you think Preston Brooks should have been allowed to return to Congress after what he did to Sumner? Give your reasons. __________________________________________________________

______________________________
20.7 The Dred Scott Decision

On March 6, 1857, Chief Justice Roger Taney prepared to deliver the most important decision of his career. Nearly 80 years old, the chief justice had long been opposed to slavery. As a young Maryland lawyer, he had publicly declared that "slavery is a blot upon our national character and every lover of freedom confidently hopes that it will be...wiped away."

True to his words, Taney had gone on to free his own slaves. Many observers wondered whether he and his fellow justices would now free Dred Scott as well.

Two Judicial Bombshells  The chief justice began by reviewing the facts of Dred Scott’s case. Then he dropped the first of two judicial bombshells. By a vote of five to four, the Court had decided that Scott could not sue for his freedom in a federal court because he was not a citizen. Nor, said Taney, could Scott become a citizen. No African American, whether slave or free, was an American citizen—or could ever become one.

Next, Taney dropped bombshell number two. The Court had also rejected Scott’s argument that his stay in Wisconsin had made him a free man. The reason was simple. The Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional.

Taney’s argument went something like this. Slaves are property. The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution says that property cannot be taken from people without due process of law—that is, a proper court hearing. Banning slavery in a territory, Taney reasoned, is the same as taking property away from slaveholders who would like to bring their slaves into that territory. And that is unconstitutional. Rather than banning slavery, Congress has a constitutional responsibility to protect the property rights of slaveholders in a territory.

The Dred Scott decision delighted slaveholders. They hoped that, at long last, the issue of slavery in the territories had been settled—and in their favor.

Many northerners, however, were stunned and enraged by the Court’s ruling. The New York Tribune called the decision a “wicked and false judgment.” Another New York newspaper expressed outrage in its bold headlines:

The Decision of the Supreme Court
Is the Moral Assassination of a Race
and Cannot Be Obeyed!
VOCABULARY

guerrilla warfare the use of hit-and-run tactics

lawsuit a legal case brought to settle a dispute between persons or groups

SUMMARY

In 1854, the issue of slavery in the western territories arose again. Two new states—Kansas and Nebraska—were created by the Kansas-Nebraska Act. In each state, the issue of slavery would be decided by popular sovereignty. Both proslavery and antislavery settlers moved to Kansas. Proslavery bands from the state of Missouri flooded Kansas. Known as “Border Ruffians,” members of the bands used violence and voted illegally. As a result, the proslavery group won control of the legislature. It soon passed laws in support of slavery. The antislavery settlers refused to accept these laws. People on each side engaged in guerrilla warfare. More than 200 people were killed in what became known as “Bleeding Kansas.”

 Violence even spilled onto the floor of the Senate. During one session, an abolitionist senator from Massachusetts, Charles Sumner, denounced the proslavery legislature of Kansas and criticized one of its supporters, Andrew Butler, an elderly southern senator. A few days later, Butler’s nephew stormed into the Senate chamber and viciously beat Sumner with a cane. It took Sumner three years to recover from the beating.

During this time, people hoped that the Supreme Court could settle the issue of slavery. In 1857, however, the Court ruled on a lawsuit that divided the nation even further. Dred Scott, a slave whose owner had died, asked the courts for his freedom. He claimed he should be free because he had lived for a time in a free state and free territory. The Supreme Court decided against Scott. It went on to say that Congress did not have the power to outlaw slavery in any territory. The Court’s ruling on Dred Scott v. Sandford—that slaves were considered property, not people, and that Congress could not outlaw slavery anywhere in the United States—pleased slave owners but outraged opponents of slavery. (See chart.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE DRED SCOTT DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHEN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESULT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Why was Kansas known as “Bleeding Kansas”?

2. Why did Supreme Court decide that Dred Scott could not file a request in court?
20.8 From Compromise to Crisis

During the controversy over the Kansas-Nebraska Act, anti-slavery activists formed a new political organization called the Republican Party. The Republicans were united by their beliefs that "no man can own another man...that slavery must be prohibited in the territories...that all new states must be free states...that the rights of our colored citizen...must be protected."

In 1858, Republicans in Illinois nominated Abraham Lincoln to run for the Senate. In his speech accepting this honor, Lincoln pointed out that all attempts to reach compromise on the slavery issue had failed. Quoting from the Bible, he warned, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Lincoln went on: "I believe this government cannot endure, permanently halfslave 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."

The Lincoln-Douglas Debates

Lincoln's opponent in the Senate race was Senator Stephen Douglas. The Illinois senator saw no reason why the nation could not go on half-slave and half-free. When Lincoln challenged him to debate the slavery issue, Douglas agreed.

During the debates, Douglas argued that the Dred Scott decision had put the slavery issue to rest. Lincoln disagreed. In his eyes, slavery was a moral, not a legal, issue. He declared, "The real issue in this controversy—the one pressing on every mind—is the sentiment of one class [group] that looks upon the institution of slavery as a wrong, and of the other class that does not look upon it as a wrong."

Lincoln lost the election. But he was not discouraged. In a letter to a friend, he wrote, "The fight must go on. The cause of civil liberty must not be surrendered at the end of one or even one hundred defeats."

John Brown's Raid

While Lincoln fought to stop the spread of slavery through politics, John Brown adopted a more extreme approach. Rather than wait for Congress to act, Brown planned to seize the federal arsenal (a place
where weapons and ammunition are stored) at Harpers Ferry, Virginia. He wanted to use the weapons to arm slaves for a rebellion that would destroy slavery forever.

It was an insane scheme. All of Brown’s men were killed or captured during the raid on the arsenal. Brown himself was convicted of treason and sentenced to die. On the day of his hanging, he left a note that read, “I John Brown am now quite certain that the crimes of this guilty land will never be purged away but with blood.”

Such words filled white southerners with fear. If a slave rebellion did begin, it was their blood that would be spilled. The fact that many northerners viewed Brown as a hero, rather than a lunatic, also left white southerners uneasy.

**The Election of 1860**  The 1860 presidential race showed just how divided the nation had become. While the Republicans were united behind Lincoln, the Democrats had split between northern and southern factions. Northern Democrats nominated Stephen Douglas. Southern Democrats supported John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky. The election became even more confusing when a group called the Constitutional Union Party nominated John Bell of Tennessee.

With his opposition divided three ways, Lincoln sailed to victory. But it was a strange sort of victory. Lincoln won with just 40 percent of the votes, all of them cast in the North. In ten southern states, he was not even on the ballot.

For white southerners, the election had an unmistakable message. The South was now a minority section. It no longer had the power to shape national events or policies. Sooner or later, southerners feared, Congress would try to abolish slavery. And that, wrote a South Carolina newspaper, would mean “the loss of liberty, property, home, country—everything that makes life worth living.”

In the weeks following the election, talk of secession filled the air. Alarmed senators formed a committee to search for yet another compromise that might hold the nation together. They knew that finding one would not be easy. Still, they had to do something to stop the rush toward disunion and disaster.
Section 4 The Republican Party Emerges

Vocabulary
Republican party the new political party formed by Free-Soilers, northern Democrats, and antislavery Whigs
arsenal a place for storing weapons
treason an act against one’s country
martyr one who gives up one’s life for one’s beliefs

Summary
In 1854, the Republican party came into being. The party was formed because the Whig party and the Democratic party would not take a strong stand against slavery. Antislavery members of the Whigs and the Democrats, along with the Free-Soilers, formed the Republican party.

In 1858, Abraham Lincoln ran for the Senate in Illinois as a Republican. He and his opponent, Senator Stephen Douglas, held a series of famous debates. (See chart.) The main issue in these debates was slavery. Lincoln believed that slavery was a “moral, social, and political wrong.” Lincoln lost the election but became nationally known during the campaign.

John Brown, an abolitionist who had fought in Kansas, wanted to start an armed revolt against slavery. In 1859, Brown led a raid on an arsenal in Harpers Ferry, Virginia. He hoped to get guns from the arsenal. Brown planned to give the guns to enslaved African Americans and lead them in a revolt. Brown was caught and sentenced to death for treason. Southerners thought he deserved his sentence. Northerners were impressed by the dignity he showed at his trial. On the day of his death, church bells rang in the North. In the South, people were outraged that a man who tried to lead a slave revolt could be considered a martyr and a hero in the North.

Lincoln-Douglas Debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abraham Lincoln</th>
<th>Stephen Douglas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>believed slavery to be morally wrong</td>
<td>disliked slavery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed slavery in the western territories</td>
<td>would allow popular sovereignty to decide slavery issue in the western territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would not interfere with slavery in the South</td>
<td>would not interfere with slavery in the South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Who formed the Republican party? Why?

2. Compare the views of Douglas and Lincoln about slavery?
Abe Lincoln
* Successful lawyer
* Saw slavery as morally wrong but thought there was no way to end slavery where it already existed
* didn’t want slavery to be spread

Stephen Douglas
* successful lawyer
* Democrat: elected to House of Reps. in 1842
* elected to Senate: 1846
* known as the “little giant”

Men meet 7 times to debate the issue of slavery from August – October in 1858 in different villages throughout Illinois. Topic: Slavery

*challenges Douglas’ idea of popular sovereignty

* Claims Lincoln wants blacks to be EQUAL to whites

After the debates, Lincoln says that the real issue is between men who think slavery is wrong and those who do not.

Election of 1860

Republicans nominate:
Abraham Lincoln

Northern Democrats nominate:
Stephen Douglas

Lincoln wins election and shortly after our country enters into a civil war!
Abraham Lincoln Web Quest

Directions: Use the websites provided to answer the following questions. Answer all questions in complete sentences.

http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents/abrahamlincoln
http://www.biography.com/articles/Abraham-Lincoln-9382540
http://www.history.co.uk/encyclopedia/lincoln-abraham.html

1. Describe Abe Lincoln's life as a child

2. As an adult, what types of jobs did Abe Lincoln have?

3. Why did Lincoln lose the Senate race in 1868?

4. How did Lincoln overcome his loss?

5. List Lincoln's challenges as President.

6. List Lincoln's accomplishments as President
7. What were some personal tragedies Lincoln faced in his life.

8. Describe Lincoln’s wife. Include her name.

9. What are some other interesting facts you found out about Abraham Lincoln?

10. List adjectives that describe Abraham Lincoln

11. Write a famous quote of Abraham Lincoln’s.

12. Why did you choose this quote over others?

13. What was special about February 12, 2009?
Bio Poem: Using the information gathered in the webquest, write a “Bio Poem” for Abraham Lincoln.

Title: First and Last Name

Line 1: First name

Line 2: Four traits that describe the person

Line 3: Brother/ Sister of ... (may substitute son/daughter of...friend of...Husband of...)

Line 4: Likes ... (Give names of people, ideas, and/or things)

Line 5: Who feels ... (Give two feelings)

Line 6: Who fears/dislikes ... (Give two things)

Line 7: Who.... (Give two accomplishments)

Line 8: Resident of ... (Give city and state)

Line 9: Last name only

EXAMPLE:

George Washington

George

Brother, Surveyor, General, President

Husband of Martha

Likes farming and his good friend Marquis de LaFayette

Who feels sympathy for his slaves and a love for his horses

Who dislikes political parities and foreign alliances

Who fought in the French and Indian War and served as President of the Constitutional Convention

Resident of Mount Vernon, Virginia

Washington

****DO NOT REPEAT INFORMATION IN YOUR BIO POEM. YOU WILL LOSE POINTS IF YOU REPEAT ANY INFORMATION.
The Trouble at Harper’s Ferry

At last we have more definite information as to the origin of the outbreak at Harper’s Ferry. It seems that some fifteen or twenty misguided and desperate men engaged in a plot to bring about a revolt of the Slaves. Nor did they stop at the crime of seeking to plunge a peaceful community into the horrors of a servile insurrection. Seizing Government arms and turning them against Government officers, they intended, if they did not accomplish Treason, of the gravest sort. But as might be expected, the attempt failed to gain supporters; the entire community was thrown into a panic, and an overwhelming force of Troops, of the State and the United States, a hundred to one, crushed the riot, and either shot down the rioters or took them prisoners.

Such is the version which comes over the telegraphic wires. While panic has evidently exaggerated the affair in many details, yet if the conspirators were guilty of but half what is attributed to them, the authorities did no more than their duty in dealing with them as sternly and summarily as they have done.

The leader of the conspiracy is stated to be Captain BROWN, of Kansas notoriety. This fact affords an explanation of some points in it otherwise inexplicable. BROWN was one of the victims of the Border Ruffian Invasion from Missouri. He was robbed of his property, maltreated, his house was burned, and three of his sons were murdered in cold blood. It is not strange that these wrongs kindled in him a thirst for revenge amounting to monomania. Brooding over them, he has conceived the wildest plans for repaying them, not only upon the guilty authors of his own misery, but upon all Slaveholders. The whole transaction at Harper’s Ferry evinces this. None but a madman could seriously expect that twenty men could make head against the whole Union, and none but those whose sense of justice was blunted by deep passion could fail to see that they were committing a crime against innocent men, women and children, which would inevitably meet, and justly deserve, universal condemnation.

Transcribed and reverse-order proofed by T. Lloyd Benson from the Albany Evening Journal, 19 October 1859.
Who Encourage Insurrections?

"Curses, like chickens, come home to roost," and lies return to plague their inventors. The Slaveholders and the Democratic Party are proving these trite truths by their experience.

Ever since the Republican organization began, they have deliberately and persistently misrepresented its character. All its platforms and declarations, and the life-long action of its members, show that it contemplates only legal, peaceful and constitutional measures -- neither interfering with Slavery in the States, nor countenancing mob violence anywhere. Yet its Democratic opponents have have pertinaciously insisted that it was an Abolition Party, seeking to liberate the Slaves by fire and sword; have trumpeted this lie through their newspapers, shouted it in their public meetings, inserted it in their resolutions, reiterated it in their conversation, at home and abroad, in the streets, at the table and by the fireside, until ignorant, uneducated negro slaves at the South, having it thus dinned daily into their ears, by their masters, have come to believe it! Slaveholders themselves created the insurrection of 1857, by their lying stories about Fremont, which encouraged their Slaves to expect and and prepare for the coming of a liberator. The Slaveholders themselves are continually putting the idea of insurrection into the heads of their chattels by these absurd fictions, which the latter accept as true. If they will thus sow the wind, who can be surprised that they reap, every year or two, the whirlwind? If there is now, as they assert, any wide spread conspiracy among the Slaves, Slaveholders themselves are its creators and fomentors. They madly and blindly endanger the safety of their own homes by their persistent political falsehoods!

Nor is it the blacks alone whom the Democratic Party encourages to deeds of violence. Within the past few years it has lent its sanction to lawless enterprises of every sort, Border Invasions, Filibuster Expeditions, Lynch Law to suppress discussion, brutality and bloodshed among Congressmen, violence at Elections, &c., thus ministering to the vilest passions, encouraging contempt for law, and resort to the bludgeon, the pistol and the bowie-knife. Here are the madman Brown, and his crazy crew, endangering the lives and property of innocent people by an insane outbreak. But who made Brown a madman by murdering his sons? Who taught that crazy crew to band together with arms in their hands, as the most effective way to accomplish political purposes? The Border Ruffians of Kansas and the Democratic Administration at Washington!

The classic fable relates that he who went out and sowed dragon's teeth suddenly found himself surrounded by a crop of armed men. Buchanan and Pierce have been sowing dragon's teeth seven years. Their encouragement of lawlessness and violence is hurrying one locality after another into scenes of anarchy, for which the only sure, speedy and permanent cure is the peaceful transfer, at the next election, of the reins of Government, from the imbecile hands that hold them, into the grasp of men who neither deal in mob violence themselves, nor will permit it to be attempted by others.
The opening shots of the Civil War were fired at Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861. No one was killed in the 33-hour bombardment. It was a bloodless opening to the bloodiest war in American history.

The Senate committee held its first meeting on December 20, 1860. Just as the senators began their work, events in two distant cities dashed their hopes for a settlement.

In Springfield, Illinois, a reporter called on president-elect Abraham Lincoln. When asked whether he could support a compromise on slavery, Lincoln's answer was clear. He would not interfere with slavery in the South. And he would support enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law. But Lincoln drew the line at letting slavery extend into the territories. On this question, he declared, "Let there be no compromise."

In Charleston, South Carolina, delegates attending a state convention voted that same day to leave the Union. The city went wild. Church bells rang. Huge crowds filled the streets, roaring their approval. A South Carolina newspaper boldly proclaimed, "THE UNION IS DISSOLVED!" Six more states soon followed South Carolina's lead.

Civil War On March 4, 1861, Lincoln became president of the not-so-United States. In his inaugural address, Lincoln stated his belief that secession was both wrong and unconstitutional. He then appealed to the rebellious states to return in peace. "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine," he said, "is the momentous issue of civil war."

A month later, hotheads in Charleston, South Carolina, forced the issue. On April 12, they opened fire on Fort Sumter, a federal fort in Charleston Harbor. After 33 hours of heavy shelling, the defenders of the fort hauled down the Stars and Stripes and replaced it with the white flag of surrender.

The news that rebels had fired on the American flag unleashed a wave of patriotic fury in the North. All the doubts that people had about using force to save the Union vanished. A New York newspaper reported excitedly, "There is no more thought of bribing or coaxing the traitors who have dared to aim their cannon balls at the flag of the Union.... Fort Sumter is temporarily lost, but the country is saved."

The time for compromise was over. The issues that had divided the nation for so many years would now be decided by war.
Interpreting a Source

The two letters below show how much the attitudes of master and slave differed by 1860. The first letter was written to a former slave by Mrs. Sarah Logue of Tennessee on February 20, 1860. The former slave, the Reverend J.W. Logan of Syracuse, New York, answered her letter on March 28, 1860. Logan had been Mrs. Logue’s slave “Jarm” before he escaped to the North.

To Jarm: I take my pen to write you a few lines, to let you know how we all are. I am a cripple, but I am still able to get about. The rest of the family are all well.

I write you these lines to let you know the situation we are in — partly [as a result] of your running away and stealing Old Rock, our fine mare.... As I now stand in need of some funds, I have determined to sell you.... If you will send me $1,000, and pay for the old mare, I will give up all claim I have to you. Write to me as soon as you get these lines, and let me know if you will accept my proposition. In consequence of your running away, we had to sell Abe and Ann [Logan's brother and sister] and 12 acres [almost five hectares] of land; and I want you to send me the money, that I may be able to redeem the land that you was the cause of our selling, and on receipt [delivery] of the above-named sum of money, I will send you your bill of sale.... You had better comply with my request.

Mrs. Sarah Logue: Yours of the 20th of February is duly received, and I thank you for it....

You are a woman; but, had you a woman's heart, you never could have insulted a brother by telling him you sold his only remaining brother and sister, because he put himself beyond your power to convert him into money.

You sold my brother and sister, Abe and Ann, and 12 acres of land, you say, because I ran away. Now you have the... meanness to ask me to return and be your miserable chattel, or in lieu thereof, send you $1,000 to enable you to redeem the land, but not to redeem my poor brother and sister! If I were to send you money, it would be to get my brother and sister, and not that you should get land. You say you are a cripple, and doubtless you say it to stir my pity... I do pity you from the bottom of my heart. Nevertheless I am indignant... that you should be so sunken and cruel as to tear the hearts I love so much all in pieces; that you should be willing to impale and crucify us all, out of compassion for your poor foot or leg. Wretched woman! Be it known to you that I value my freedom, to say nothing of my mother, brothers, and sisters, more than your whole body; more, indeed, than my own life; more than all the lives of all the slave-holders and tyrants under heaven.

1. The Reverend Logan calls Mrs. Logue “sunken and cruel.” Why? Do you agree with him? Does she intend to be “cruel”?

2. What are Mrs. Logue’s attitudes about how a slave should behave? Do you think her neighbors in Tennessee probably shared these attitudes? Might some neighbors have different attitudes? Why or why not?

---

1A proposition is a plan or proposal.
2A consequence is a result or outcome.
3To redeem is to buy back or regain possession of something by payment in money or action.
4To comply is to act as requested or ordered.
5To convert means, in this sense, to change from one form to another.

6A chattel is, in this sense, a slave.
7In lieu means instead.
8To be indignant is to be angry at something considered unfair, mean, or cruel.
9To impale is to torture or kill by fixing on a sharp stake.
10Compassion is a feeling of sorrow or sympathy for others.
Interpreting Pre-Civil War Statistics: Answer the following questions regarding the accompanying tables/statistics.

### Slaveholding, 1860

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Own slaves</th>
<th>% with 20 or more slaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-slaveholders</td>
<td>76.1 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9 slaves</td>
<td>17.2 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-99</td>
<td>6.6 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 100</td>
<td>0.1 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Slaveholdings of the Political Elite, Lower South, 1860

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Own slaves</th>
<th>% with 20 or more slaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County government officials</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State legislators</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to secession conventions</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Timing of Secession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial states to secede</th>
<th>Percent Slaves in Population</th>
<th>Percentage of White Families Owning Slaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States seceding later</th>
<th>Percent Slaves in Population</th>
<th>Percentage of White Families Owning Slaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remained in Union</th>
<th>Percent Slaves in Population</th>
<th>Percentage of White Families Owning Slaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How does the number of slaveholding families compare to non-slaveholding families?

2. How well did the southern political elite represent the population of the south (in regards to slavery)? Cite specific statistics.

3. Why was the political elite especially motivated to maintain slavery?

4. Synthesis: What do you notice about geography, slaveholding, and secession (or states NOT seceding)? You may use a map if you need to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Income per capita by region as a percentage of U.S. average</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of nation's population</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of nation's:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white population</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of nation's railroads</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of nation's farm acreage</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of nation's manufacturing workers</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of nation's manufacturing output</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of factories</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad mileage</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What material advantages did the North possess on the eve of the Civil War?

6. Opinion: Based on your knowledge of American History: Do you think material advantages are decisive in the outcome of wars? Why or why not?
Causes of the Civil War:
Political, Economic & Social Issues

Political

- _________ Compromise keeps equal power in the Senate.
- Larger population gives the _________ more power in the House of Representatives.
- The Compromise of 1850 used _________ to decide issue of slavery in the Utah/New Mexico territories.
- The Compromise of 1850 allowed __________ to enter the Union as a free state – this gave the Northern states more power in the Senate as well as the House of Representatives.
- Dred Scott Case allows slavery to spread into the _________. Slaves are property & cannot be outlawed – anywhere.
- _________ Party formed to not necessarily to abolish slavery but to stop the spread of slavery into the territories.

- With the _______ election of Lincoln, the South believes that it has lost all power or "voice" in the _________.
- Many in the South believed in ___________ – the individual state has the ultimate power to decide whether or not to follow the federal government.

Social

- _________ is urban, industrial and growing.
- _________ is rural, agricultural and stagnant.
- North uses labor & South uses slaves.

Economic

- The North passes higher _______ to protect their industries.
- The South wants all tariffs removed so they can buy cheaper goods from _________.
- The South comes to depend on _________ goods because the South lacks industries.

- Abolitionist Movement strong in the North.
- Southern life revolves around plantation system.
- HB Stowe’s book ___________ sirs up Northern sympathy for slaves & angers the South for making slavery look evil.
- John Brown’s raid on ___________ makes Southerners believe that abolitionist are becoming more violent & active in trying to end slavery. The South organizes more _________ to protect themselves.
The Causes of the Civil War

In the beginning the Civil War was not about ________________________________.
Lincoln and most Northerners were not determined to force the Southerners to free their
__________________________.

I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it
exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so...

Abraham Lincoln

In the beginning of the war, the North and South disagreed about the following issues:

2. Should slavery be allowed to spread to the ________________________________?
   A. Would new states be ________________________________ or ________________________________ states?
   B. Would new states have ________________________________ or ________________________________ economies?

3. How would the ________________________________ of ________________________________ in Congress be ________________________________ as the country grew?
   A. The ________________________________ had more representatives in the ________________________________ of
      ________________________________ because they had a larger ________________________________.
   B. Each ________________________________ had the same number of representatives in the
      ________________________________.
   C. When a new ________________________________ was added to the country, the
      ________________________________ of power in ________________________________ was shifted.
   D. The North and South fought over every new ________________________________ that was added to the
country because of the ________________________________ in the Congress.

   E. There was so much anger about the balance of power in Congress, there were sometimes
      ________________________________ on the floor of the House of Representatives.

4. Who should have more power – the ________________________________ or ________________________________ government?
   A. The South wanted to ________________________________ federal laws.
B. Lincoln did not think that Southern states had the right ____________, or leave the government.

5. The Civil War only became about ____________ when Lincoln issued the ____________ ________________ in 1863.
   A. Even then, Lincoln did not ____________ any ________________.
   B. He had no ________________ to free slaves in the ________________.
   C. There were no ________________ to free in the ________________.
He did not try to free slaves in ________________ states that stayed part of the ________________.
Civil War Causes Worksheet

(I) Pre-1820: Slaves worked in the South picking cotton and tobacco. Slaves had to do whatever their masters told them to do.

(VIII) Cause #4 (1859) John Brown's Raid
John Brown was an abolitionist who tried to get weapons to give to slaves for an uprising against their masters. He was unsuccessful but he was considered a hero by the North.

(II) Missouri Compromise of 1820
1.

(VII) Illinois Election for Senator (1858) (Lincoln/Douglas Debates)
Stephen Douglas supported the Dred Scott Decision. Abraham Lincoln opposed it. Douglas believed in popular sovereignty for the new territories and Lincoln was against allowing slavery to expand west. Douglas wins the election.

2.

3.

(III) Compromise of 1850
1.

(V) Cause #3: (1857) The Dred Scott Decision
1.

2.

3.

4.

(V) Cause #2: Kansas-Nebraska Act (1854)/Bleeding Kansas (1856)
Kansas & Nebraska decide by vote whether or not they want slavery. (Popular sovereignty) Stephen Douglas came up with the idea of allowing Kansas and Nebraska to vote on whether or not there should be slavery.

(VI) Cause #1: (1852) Uncle Tom's Cabin, by Harriet Beecher Stowe: Abolitionist
Told about the horrors of slavery.

Violence breaks out: Pro-Slavery and Anti-Slavery people are killed. Some believe this is the first action of the Civil War.
(IX) Cause # 5: Election of 1860
1. Candidates:

2. Who won?

3. Why did that person win?

(IX): Secession/Attack at Ft. Sumter (1861)
1. Who seceded?

2. Why did the South secede?

Attack at Fort Sumter: Spark of the war.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of the Civil War</th>
<th>Effects of those causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncle Tom's Cabin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas-Nebraska Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dred Scott Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown's Raid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of 1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Civil War Compromise Chart
Can you stop the Civil War before it starts?

Directions:
- Go to the website: [http://www.fredericksburg.com/CivilWar/Teaching/index.html](http://www.fredericksburg.com/CivilWar/Teaching/index.html)
- Scroll down to the "activities" and choose "what would you do?"
- You will read about several problems that occurred between the North and the South prior to the Civil War. It is your job to read the background information and make YOUR CHOICE about what should happen. See if your guess really happened!
- Fill out the chart filling out: The Problem   Your Choice   What really happened?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Problem</th>
<th>Your Choice</th>
<th>What Really Happened?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Compromise of 1820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise of 1850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Slave Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Nebraska Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dred Scott Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>